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ABSTRACT

For many elites, the creation of power and regional identities during and after the Late pre-Roman Iron Age, at levels beyond that of the local community, was enabled by the consolidation of previously loosely structured social networks. This course of action may have been influenced by Continental contacts and, in some cases, encouraged by political contact with the Roman Empire. Within this process, material culture and styles imported from the Continent (and perhaps directly from the Mediterranean) were incorporated in a variety of ways. To some, this new culture embodied ‘Roman’ cultural values, and as such, it was used in the negotiation and expression of a new worldview, through which the idea of cultural superiority might be conveyed. But it is argued that the notion of ‘being Roman’ was meaningful to relatively few. To many, the new culture – selectively appropriated and transformed – provided a means to (re)construct local and regional identities, in the light of changing conditions.

Across Southwest Britain – in common with the rest of the Roman Empire – ‘Roman’ identity held no ethnic connotations. However, it is proposed that during the LPRIA and Roman period, some of the elites of the Southwest appropriated Gallo-Mediterranean culture in the construction of ethnic identity. Interaction with the Roman world provoked some to internalise and transform the Classical ethnographic category of ‘British’. In some cases, this was in reaction to regional identities that may have been based upon, or incorporated, notions of opposition to the Roman world. Shared elite culture, and perceived common ancestry, combined to inform the development of this group identity - as the past was re-written to make sense of, and accommodate, changing historical conditions. This identity was based upon the idea of common elite ancestry in the ‘Mediterranean’ world, supported by mythologies incorporating the notion of shared tradition.

‘Britishness’ was unlikely to have been strong at this stage, or meaningful to many outside (or probably even within) the aristocracy. However, a ‘national consciousness’ increasingly developed during the later Roman period, when social instability and external threats encouraged greater emphasis on ethnicity. As the Roman political system collapsed, ethnic identity acted as a mechanism by which to legitimise authority and to support combined military action against the threat of invasion.

The reconstruction of society during and after the late fourth century resulted in the complex and selective amalgamation of culture from the ‘Roman’ and more ancient past, alongside cultural influences from the West and North, and we cannot see these developments simply in terms of either ‘Celtic revival’, or Romano-British continuity. For many, symbols of power derived from the Roman world continued to hold significance in the negotiation of local and regional power. However any, continuity of ‘Roman’ culture into the post-Roman period is unlikely to indicate the widespread extension or continuity of Roman cultural identity – particularly considering the close association between Roman identity and citizenship.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Methodology and Application of Theoretical Models

INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims to determine the significance and signification of ethnic, cultural, and regional identities in Southwest Britain, between c. AD 350 and 450. It will be argued that these identities were primarily elite constructs - changing in response to historical and material conditions – but that they began to become disseminated throughout society towards the end of and after the Roman period. The thesis will explore how these identities affected, or were affected by, intra-regional, inter-regional, and international relationships during the late- to post-Roman period. Study of changing ethnic, cultural, and social identities during this period therefore has the potential to illustrate cultural responses to radical social, economic, and political change – a key issue given current global circumstances.

Several studies into ethnic change during this time have been undertaken for Continental regions (e.g. Amory 1997; Ausenda 1995; Amory 1997; Curta 2005; Derks and Roymans 2009; Geary 1983; Geary 2001, 2002; Gillett 2006; Goetz, Jarnut and Pohl 2003; Halsall 1995a; Miles 1999; Pohl 1997a; Pohl and Reimitz 1998; Smith 1986). But, studies of ethnic change within Britain during the ‘migration period’ have in the main been confined to the superimposition of generalised models for ethnic transformations within England (e.g. Welch 1992). There has also been little attempt to bridge the transition between the Late Roman to Early Medieval period. In particular, there has hitherto been minimal consideration of ‘British’ identity within post-Roman Britain, or of any form of ethnic or social identity for that matter, within Western Britain (but see Faull 1977; Higham 2002, 2007; Matthews, K J 1999; Pearce 2004; Petts 1998a). With the exception of one work examining post-colonial change in the Bristol Channel region (Bowles 2007), there has been no general study of the relationship between changing identities and material culture in Southwest Britain (see Thomas 1973; but see Pearce 1981, 2004). Rather, the Southwest has often been seen as ‘highland’ and ‘Celtic’, and endowed with the same trajectory as that assumed for Wales and the North – notwithstanding the dearth of research into changing identities within these latter regions (but see Campbell 2005; Driscoll 2000; James 1999; Petts 2004). However, the landscape – and society – of Southwest Britain is (and was) diverse. A major reassessment of the evidence from

---

1 The dearth of theory within Early Medieval studies was highlighted in 1999 (in a seminar led by Paul Blinkhorn and Chris Cumberpatch, at the Theoretical Archaeology Group conference, University of Birmingham). Recent studies of post-Roman Western Britain informed by modern archaeological theories are limited, but on the increase - for example, work by David Petts (2002, 2003a, 2004), and Sam Turner (2003a, 2004a, 2004b, 2006).
across the Southwest, to consider the construction of ethnic and other collective identities, through application of theoretical models, is therefore long overdue, and will be presented here.

The methodological approach applied in this thesis is as follows.

**METHODOLOGY**

**GEOGRAPHICAL CONTEXT**

To facilitate and organise access to primary and secondary sources, the study includes material from the modern counties of Wiltshire (up to and including the Western Avon Valley), Gloucestershire (up to and including the Severn Valley), Avon / North Somerset, Somerset, Dorset, Devon, and Cornwall (fig. 1.1). This region incorporates a number of Romano-British civitates (including the Northwest part of the Belgic region), Dobunnia, Durotrigia, and Dumnonia, and the possible ‘Cornovian’ pagus (fig. 1.2). These civitas units will be used to structure discussion of the material culture, in order to consider the relationship between regional identity and political organisation. Their changing significance from the pre- to post-Roman period will be considered.

Previous archaeological research into late- and post-Roman Southwest Britain has been limited, as compared to research into post-Roman Eastern Britain. However, reinvigorated interest in Arthurian legendary literature during the 1960s encouraged regional investigations (e.g. Alcock 1971; Ashe 1968). Many of these studies produced tenuous historical narratives, dependent upon uncritical use of the textual evidence, using archaeological data primarily to support culture-historic interpretations (for example, Alcock 1971; Fox and Fox 1958; Hawkes 1961; Morris 1965; O’Brien 1999). Recent research has demonstrated that such approaches are essentially unsound (for recent analytical studies, e.g. see Dickinson 2002; Frazer and Tyrell et al. 2000; Woolf 1999a, 2003). In this thesis, I will focus upon the archaeological evidence in the light of recent archaeological and social theory, whilst also acknowledging the information that may be gained from the textual evidence.
A number of case study sites across the region have been analysed in detail (fig. 1.3) to facilitate the diachronic examination of changing practices. But, allowing for possible bias within the data due to the greater visibility of high status sites, a general survey of the region has also been undertaken - so as to enable the study of a wide range of socio-economic contexts. Using data from numerous settlements, several hundred burials, and various ritual contexts from Southwest Britain, as well as the texts, I intend to seek the material traces of behaviour related to the construction and expression of ethnic and social identities, and attempt to identify aspects of material culture that may have been appropriated within this process.

A multitude of social identities may be negotiated through time and space, utilising objects located and created within and through particular spatial and temporal frameworks (which at the same time contribute to the construction of those frameworks), leaving material traces of the active and reflective, and habitual, expression of identity. This multiplicity requires the combined study of an extensive range of social contexts, over a wide chronological period. It will be shown throughout this thesis that the study of these varied locales (including settlement, industrial, mortuary, and ritual sites) reveals their interdependence in the construction of ethnic (and other social) and cultural identities.
The significance of settlement organisation and location within the landscape will be considered, as will the role of architecture within settlements. Anthropological, sociological, and archaeological studies have indicated the role of architecture in the negotiation of social relationships and identities through bodily movement (Barrett 1994; Parker Pearson and Richards 1994). Domestic architecture has been considered as a microcosm of society (Hingley 1990), suggesting the necessity for particular consideration of household contexts within multiscalar analyses (see Beaudry 2004). Analysis of architectural change (in particular, of features within buildings) may therefore reveal the renegotiation of identities, considering that such transformations were most likely embedded within social relationships (Appadurai 1986: 31-2, 57; see Miller 2001). Transformations in behaviour are to be expected in response to changing historical conditions, as the new symbolic universe is mediated through practices and material culture (Barrett 1988). Conversely, the continuity or modification of particular styles is equally informative, suggesting attempts to perpetuate or reconstruct particular identities, although it is acknowledged that the ‘meaning’ of space may change whilst identities remain constant, and vice versa (Barrett 1994; Lefebvre 1974). Previous analyses of behaviour within the Roman house in particular have demonstrated a close relationship between public and private negotiation and expression of social and cultural identities (see Hales 2003: 1-2). There is therefore a need to consider a wide range of contexts, if we are to explore potential contradictions between social (and cultural) identities and personal identities (see Miller 2001).
Social studies have also demonstrated the moment of burial to be a particularly significant time in terms of the emphasis placed upon social and ethnic identity (Middleton 1982: 148). The importance of ritual and religion as mechanisms for constructing and legitimising collective identities and developing authorities is also well known through anthropological and sociological studies (e.g. see Alkemade 1997: 182; Hodder 1982; Rapoaport 1999; Turner 1995).

The liminality of funerary ceremonies provides a period of readjustment in which the social order might be contested and renegotiated, providing particularly significant arenas for the construction of identities (see Turner 1995). Funerals enable the transferral of property and distribution of critical resources (Chapman 1977; 1980: 66; Ucko 1969), requiring rituals to define the social persona - the constructed, selective, enduring image - of the deceased - in order to consolidate the position of the kin within society (Bloch and Parry 1982: 6; Huntington and Metcalf 1979: 189; Palgi and Abramovitch 1984: 389).

The diversity of social identities in any particular society may result in a number of methods of corporeal transformation corresponding to the varied status of individuals in life (Chapman 1981: 21; Pospisil 1978: 70; Ucko 1969: 270). In general, non-elite burials seem to be more individually variable, with less differentiation between particular groups (Pader 1982: 28). Therefore, whilst anthropological and sociological models clearly highlight the need to consider mortuary contexts when investigating ethnic and social identity in past societies, there are inherent problems of doing so without an awareness of social structure. Differentials of power are of vital significance (see Scott 1985, 1992), and the relationship between spatial control and power must be considered within all contexts. This may only be achieved through analysing the use of space, and symbolism within that space.

Specific signs and symbols are selected within both ritual and settlement practices in the construction of social space. These choices are dependent upon the social ‘meaning’ of the objects, with respect to their given associations within society, dictated by their relationship to one another and the context within which they are used (Appadurai 1986: 5-6; Kopytoff 1986; Pader 1982: 9-10, 13, 16). Meanings often change - certain associations may be ignored, whilst others are reinforced. A number of perceptions of reality may be reflected, relating to a multitude of identities, and inappropriate social identities might be suppressed, depending on the situation.

However, symbolic systems form social realities through public performance, relating material and ideology within group formation through social interaction (see Robb 1998; Thomas 1996; Turner 1974), at particular points in time, and within particular locales. By analysing the interrelationships of artefacts (including the human body) and spatial contexts, we may be able to detect the ‘meaning’ behind the material culture and examine the construction of social relationships and identities.
Historical evidence indicates widespread economic and political stress, leading to competition and conflict, during the period of study. These are prime circumstances (when there is a perceived threat to cultural integrity) in which ethnic identities tend to be constructed in the emphasis of social and political similarities and differences (Hodder 1979), as individuals attempt to control their situation within changing historical conditions (Cohen 1993: 199, 200; Jones 1997; Shennan 1989: 19). Therefore, ethnic change might be profitably explored within this chronological context.

Until relatively recently, studies of the Late Roman to Early Medieval transition within Britain have often been appended to Romano-centric research, asserting a high level of Romano-British continuity (e.g. Dark 1994), or approached from the Medievalist standpoint, frequently purporting early systemic collapse and direct succession of the ‘Middle Ages’ (e.g. Faulkner 2000; Reece 1989). Such perspectives develop from the tendency to bracket human activity within ‘eras’ – a process commonly related to the uncritical acceptance of inherited ‘culture-historical’ views (see above), disguising often subtle long-term developments. More recently, it has been recognised that processes of change traversing this time frame might be productively studied: distinct changes and common trajectories are evidently witnessed between the late third- and late sixth century across much of the Empire. Yet still, in constructing another historical period – albeit often seen as one of transition (e.g. Webster and Brown 1997: vii-ix) - this approach again runs the risk of neglecting issues that might be highlighted through investigation of the longue durée.²

In order to see how the past may have informed subsequent socio-political developments, it is clearly necessary to investigate any prospective attempts to perpetuate Roman identity after the withdrawal of the Imperial State system. However, definitive answers to the issue of collapse versus continuity are unobtainable, particularly considering local variability. Detailed investigation into the particular mechanisms of cultural continuity and change at a local level (through study of practices, see Bourdieu 1977; Giddens 1979, 1984), and their relationship to wider changes over time and space, is essential (Thomas 1996: 98). It is believed that, only by adopting such an approach, might we begin to piece together the significance and meaning of material culture that informed the renegotiation of cultural identities at this time.

² Braudel’s concept of longue durée historical study is adopted to avoid overly rigid periodisation that might neglect structural changes and continuities (Braudel 1980: 3, 31). Long-term analysis, alongside the study of short-term ‘events’, allows the historian to consider the role of individual in relation to wider social and economic processes and structural frameworks (ibid. 27-8, 31; see Bailey1983; Bradley 1991: 209-10).
‘Celtic revival’ or ‘renaissance’ - commonly believed to represent a ‘return’ to pre-Roman culture after a Roman ‘interlude’ – is supposedly recognisable across the Western Empire during and after the later fourth century (e.g. MacMullen 1965; see also Cunliffe 1993). This concept has also been used as a causal explanation for early Anglo-Saxon cultural dominance of eastern regions of Britain. However, it will be argued that this notion is flawed, for it ignores evident processes of cultural and structural change. Material culture that for some embodied the Roman symbolic universe was for others variously appropriated and reworked, and thus became deeply embedded within a diverse range of social contexts - even within possible situations of resistance (see Fincham 2001). Nevertheless, the apparent ‘reinvigoration’ of ‘pre-Roman’ culture at this time must be investigated, to determine the role that the past may have played in the transformation of social structure and identities. The extent to which these changes may represent the ‘emergence’ of identity based upon reference to the pre-Roman past, in opposition to Roman rule (possibly incorporating the active rejection of previous cultural identities), and the extent to which these changes were in response to raiding and migration from the Continent, Ireland, and Northern Britain will be investigated.

In considering the longue durée, we are better equipped to recognise assumptions derived from previous studies of late- to post-Roman change that developed from uncritical reading of the texts, in part to comply with a worldview derived from recent and current historical conditions (e.g. imperialism, see Hingley 2000). There is also a greater likelihood of being able to detect cultural continuities as opposed to ‘revivals’, and thus more accurately assess the processes by which the latter might have been achieved, as well as its possible social significance. Consequently, the archaeology of the region will be appraised from the late pre-Roman Iron Age (LPRIA), and through the Roman period, to provide a cultural context within which to place the changes witnessed during and after the later fourth century. This approach will also enable exploration of processes of ethnogenesis (see Pohl 2006; Smith 2004: 196-97, 199), and consideration of the development of so-called ‘tribal’ identities, from the LPRIA through to the creation of post-Roman (proto) ‘kingdoms’.

However, the primary focus of this thesis is to consider changes across the region during and after the mid fourth century, recognisable through the analysis of material culture. Comparable changes are witnessed across the Empire at this time (Wickham 2005), arguably demonstrating the impact of socio-economic reforms to the Imperial super-structure. However, it will be shown that internal developments were also significant. A terminal date of c. AD 450 is adopted for this thesis, as again, widespread cultural, political, and social transformations are noted at this time. Within Britain, key changes are evident to support this framework: around this time, politically fragmented
communities may have begun to coalesce under dominant elites to form centralised polities (see Alkemade 1997, for a North European perspective).

The chronological phase upon which this thesis will concentrate has been termed ‘Late Antiquity’ by many (e.g. Bowersock, Brown, and Graber 2001), although much debate has centred upon the suitability of this idiom, and some contest its use due to its foundation within paradigms of Roman cultural and social continuity (e.g. Faulkner 2004). However, for want of an alternative, equally recognisable (but less loaded) term, it will be used in this thesis, to denote the timeframe AD 350-450 (though no accompanying cultural assumptions are intended).

THEORETICAL APPROACH

The role of anthropological and social studies in archaeological research has been introduced above to highlight the significance of settlement, mortuary, and ritual contexts when investigating ethnic and social identities. It is now widely acknowledged that the use of anthropology and sociology in historical inquiry may provide, respectively, particular and general models, by which we might broaden interpretation through analogies with other societies (Hodder 1982). Consequently, the application of theoretical models drawn from these disciplines has steadily increased (e.g. Jones, S 1997).

Initially, these models were generally restricted to studies of prehistoric societies in proxy for textual evidence, perpetuating the ideology of textual primacy and discouraging their use in studies of well-documented (in particular Classical) societies (Moreland 2001: 10; Trigger 1989: 266; see Alkemade 1997: 182). However, since the later 1990s, anthropologically- and sociologically-derived models have increasingly been seen as relevant to studies of all historical periods, gaining prominence in recent discussions of ethnic identity.

As touched upon above, the most enlightening approach to identifying the use of material culture in the emphasis on ethnic identity is through investigating changing practices over time (e.g. Gardner 2002, 2007; Jenkins 2004, 2008; Jones, S 1997; see Bentley 1987). This approach facilitates examination at varied levels of social interaction and focuses detailed, coherent, study within a range of social and physical contexts. Through such diachronic study, within a geographically defined region, it is anticipated that this thesis will go some way to identifying the changing significance of artefacts over time in relation to identities.

THE APPLICATION OF THEORIES OF ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION

Considering recent and current events, in which it is evident that oppositional ethnic identities are embedded within territorial and religious conflict, the development of ethnicity studies is
unsurprising. It is well known that social and political circumstances, and contemporaneous historical events, affect the methodology and approach applied within archaeological and historical research (Moreland 1998: 88). Observation of present day socio-political transformations is informative: but it is clear that, whilst generalised social models are of value in understanding human behaviour, specific chronological and geographical contexts must necessarily be investigated.

Archaeological studies into ethnic identity have until relatively recently been limited, due to misunderstanding of the concepts of ethnic identity and race. Political agendas have previously manipulated culture-historical studies to promote exclusion and to support ethnic segregation and genocide (see Fein 1996; Gilroy 1997; Kuper 1996). However, recent research into ethnic and racial categorisation has recognised the role of human action in the construction of ‘race’ and ethnic identity. It has been recognised that both are historically contingent social constructs, defined most often within the pursuit of power (Jenkins 2008: 10, 23, 24, 49, 83). It is acknowledged that physical appearance might sometimes be appropriated to mark ethnic identity, but fundamentally, ethnic identity reflects social relationships based upon a perceived sense of belonging and difference, enabling or preventing alliance between individuals and groups (Jenkins 2008). This understanding will inform the basis of this inquiry, which attempts to interpret the significance and signification of ethnic identity within a defined geographical and chronological context.

Archaeology, in studying the remnants of past human activity, is equipped to examine the construction of identity through material culture. Artefacts may be appropriated to ‘objectify’ cultural disparity in the formation of ethnic and other social identities; and, simultaneously, material culture may be structured by ethnic and other social identities (Jones, S 1997: 120). In order to identify ethnic markers within the archaeological record, attempts must be made to recognise the particular cultural elements selected in self-definition by the society under study (Hutchinson and Smith 1996: 6). To determine markers within the archaeological record, social models will be applied throughout the empirical appraisal of the material.

**Outline of theories of identity**

Before examining the archaeological and historical evidence for the construction of ethnic identity, it is necessary to understand exactly what is meant by ‘ethnicity’. A sense of common history may perpetuate ideas of unity (Hutchinson and Smith 1996: 6; Smith 1996: 189, 190). Shared ‘traditions’ are often used to legitimise ethnic identities: ethnogenesis frequently incorporates foundation myths and genealogies in order to ‘naturalise’ ethnic affiliation; the ‘ancestors’ may be appropriated to validate the idea of ‘ancient established communities’ (see Smith 1996: 189-97; Weber 1996: 35).

---

3 In particular, conflicts in Eastern Europe have resulted in social studies concerned with the construction of ethnic identity (see Woodward 1997: 3; Geary 2002; Gilroy 1997: 303). [end 9]
Consequently, concepts of ancestry – of shared ‘blood’ - are of prime importance in the construction of ethnic identity, as common origin forms the focus of shared experience, differentiating ethnicity from notions of cultural identity (see below). Mythology might sustain territorial affiliation at the local, regional, or national level - any or all of these identities may simultaneously coexist, depending upon situation and necessity: an individual or group may hold a number of intersecting or discrete identities (Jenkins 2008: 41). Ethnicity often supports unified political ideologies and activities, and encourages the emphasis of collective interests (ibid. 10).

Ethnic identity is malleable: any aspect of culture might be selected to express commonality and exclusion, and cultural attributes appropriated towards this end at any one time are liable to change (Barth 1969: 14; Jenkins 2008: 10, 84; Shennan 1989: 19, 20). Identities are rarely static, and may remain dormant at times of stability (Alkemade 1997: 184). Ethnicity thus has no universal conditions, although it is not arbitrarily conceived, and common traits that might be emphasised in the construction of ethnic identity have been recognised (although in effect any cultural element might be incorporated within this process). Ritual and religious affiliation are often significant elements, as are language or dialect forms, kinship, physical contiguity (e.g. localism or sectionalism – which may include tribal affiliation), nationality, physical characteristics, or any combination of these, though none of these is in itself diagnostic of ethnic identity (Hutchinson and Smith 1996: 6). These attributes will all be considered in attempting to recognise and define the demarcation of ethnic identity during the late-to-post-Roman period in Southwest Britain.

Throughout the thesis, attention will be paid to the fact that other identities, such as gender, age, and status might be all interconnected with ethnicity, considering the situational nature of ethnic categorisation and self-identification: material culture used to define ethnic identity may also involve other social identities in its definition. Conversely, the affirmation of ethnic identities might also reinforce internal social divisions, in order to naturalise inequality (e.g. see Alkemade 1997: 184; Woodward 1997: 10).

**The relationship between social, ethnic, national, regional, and cultural identity**

Social identity is essentially the notion of similarity and difference generated through social interaction, by which people may form attachments (Jenkins 2004: 4, 16). In essence, all identity is social (ibid. 4): consequently, the concept of ‘social identity’ incorporates the notion of both cultural (ibid.) and ethnic (Jenkins 2008: 82) identities.

Within this thesis, where ethnicity and cultural identity form the focus for study, the term ‘social identity’ is employed to express consideration of other identities, in questioning the potential constitution of, these ethnic and cultural identities. Therefore, gender and status, identities based upon notions of co-residence (such as regionalism and localism), and other forms of community identity (such as those based upon militarism, or religious beliefs) will be discussed where they
[start 11] inter-relate with ethnic or cultural identity. In addition, other social identities will be discussed, when reassessment of the evidence has suggested that assertions of ethnicity within previous studies might be alternatively interpreted.

Ethnicity may, but need not, incorporate concepts of territorial attachment - in particular, attempts to regain or retain an associated ‘homeland’ might mobilise mass participation within processes of ethnogenesis (Jenkins 2008: 11, 146). Ethnic constructs in which a land and ‘people’ appear to be insolubly integrated might be found at various levels of social interaction – from the small community to the wider region (ibid.; see Cohen 1985).

Whether or not supra-regional identities in the past might be described in any way as ‘national’ is a particularly controversial topic. National identity is frequently argued to be a product of modernity, found only in post-industrial (Gellner 2006), or at least capitalist (see Tierney 1996), societies. Conversely, others argue that national sentiments are categorically evident within pre-modern societies (e.g. Bartlett 1996; Davies 1994; Finley 1996; Llobera 1996; Smith 1986). However, it is important to distinguish between national constructs in the modern world, and more amorphous notions of supra-regional identity within ancient societies.

Late Antique associations between nationes, ‘peoples’, and defined territories are evident, though (as today) terminology is ambiguous. Natione is applied as an external (Classical) category, or as a self-identification to denote a sense of regional belonging (Amory 1997: 319), but is also used to emphasise belonging to supra-regional groups, such as the Brittones (see Birley 1991: 103-04), being interchangeable with the terms gene – ‘tribe’ (pl. genos), and ethne – ‘people’ (Geary 2002: 43). There is nevertheless some correlation between natione and modern understandings of ‘nation’, if the latter is taken to mean ‘a human group conscious of forming a community, sharing a common culture, attached to a clearly demarcated territory, having a common past and a common project for the future and claiming the right to rule itself’ (Guibernau 2004: 132). However, the existence of nations defined by standardised notions of similarity across their territories - as generated within the more recent past - is not implied for past societies. Rather, the potential incorporation of rhetoric in which ethnic identity is given a supra-regional territorial component is proposed in some cases. The construction of such a group in Early Medieval (c. AD 450-650) Southwest Britain has already been explored (Jarrett 2009): but in this thesis it will be argued that the construction of such a group is related not only to processes witnessed during and after the later fourth century, but also in the LPRIA.
Cultural identity may be defined as the self-conscious identification of shared culture, enabling an emphasis on similarity and difference between groups (van Dommelen 1998: 26). In this sense, ethnic and cultural identities are analogous, and it has been claimed that ethnicity is in effect politicised cultural identity, in which culture and identity are linked through the materialisation of symbols (Cohen 1993: 198-200). However, whilst the emphasis on cultural similarity and difference also distinguishes the construction of ethnicity, it is argued (and accepted here) that belief in shared ancestry and origin differentiates ethnic from cultural identity (Bentley 1987; Jenkins 2008; Jones, S 1997: 86). That is to say, the sense of where ‘we’ have come from is used to show where ‘we’ are going, and how we must act.

It is therefore suggested that cultural identity might be differentiated from ethnicity (and from alternative forms of cultural appropriation and manipulation), when the emphasis of a shared culture within a common worldview (that clearly influences the structures of everyday life) incorporates the idea of a common ancestry. It is acknowledged that the level of detail generally accessible in the data can currently support only tentative conclusions. But, it is hoped that the proposals derived from this research might be used to inform future data collection strategies, so that we come closer to recognising these subtle differences within subsequent studies.

The application of post-colonial theories

Other approaches to identity are also informative. Examination of modern post-colonial situations has revealed the varying creation and employment of material culture in response to situations of colonial and imperial domination (e.g. Honeychurch 1997; Knepper 2006; Peers 1989; see Loomba 1998; Vial 1989). Such knowledge has led to the increasingly frequent application of post-colonial theories in questioning the use of artefacts within comparable situations in the past – viz the Roman Empire (e.g. Bartel 1980; van Dommelen 1997; Webster 1997a and b, 2001; Webster and Cooper 1996; but see Fincham 2001). There is even one such study of a small sector of Late Antique Southwest Britain (Bowles 2007). Processes of colonisation witnessed during the nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries – often concealed under the aegis of a civilising mission (see Said 1978) - may be compared to certain pre-industrial situations. In the modern world, the construction of ethnicity has been linked to decolonisation (Cohen 1993: 200). Again, perhaps there are parallels with Late Antiquity that are worth investigating. Post-colonial approaches provide useful insights, especially in considering acts of resistance against external control (e.g. Hingley 1997; see Scott 1985, 1992). However, it is recognised that when investigating the archaeology of late- to post-Roman Southwest Britain, this approach is in itself limited and constraining. Without the application of practice theories and the acknowledgement of mechanisms of ethnic identity construction, post-colonial views may encourage the tendency to concentrate upon external influences, at the
expense of long-term processes of change and internal development. Nonetheless, with this in mind, post-colonial theories will be considered alongside the application of ethnicity theories.

**THESIS STRUCTURE**

The thesis has been split into two sections: in Section One, I examine the regional archaeology from the late pre-Roman Iron Age, up until the later Roman period; this section incorporates Chapters 2 and 3. Chapter 2 provides a general survey of late pre-Roman Iron Age regional archaeology, considering historical developments. Here I will provide an outline of pre-Conquest indigenous regional culture, against which Roman period and later changes may be measured. This background enables the assessment of cultural changes and continuities through the Roman period, which follows in Chapter 3, so that the concept of later Roman period ‘Celtic revival’ may discussed in relation to the construction of ethnic identity in Chapters 4 - 6. Chapter 7 will form the conclusion.

Chapter 3 explores post-Conquest changes within settlement, mortuary and ritual archaeology, and considers changes to portable material culture, to determine the effects of socio-political transformations upon identities at local and regional levels. It includes a brief appraisal of the evidence for the construction of regional identities in opposition to imperial rule during the early Roman period within the region, and examines the construction of regional identities from the first to third centuries.

Section Two examines the late Roman to early post-Roman regional archaeology, and is comprised of Chapters 4 to 6, which examine the evidence from this time frame to determine how identities may have been developed in response to socio-economic and political transformations. The construction of local and community identities are analysed in relation to wider identities, so as to explore the extent to which these identities might be seen as ethnic. In particular, I will examine the role of the past, and in doing so, review the evidence for ‘Celtic revival’, considering how this may be related to the construction of identity in opposition to the Roman State.

Chapter 4 outlines the political organisation of the late fourth to mid fifth century, and considers the threats and pressures placed upon the Imperial system, examining measures taken to counteract instability. This chapter incorporates an appraisal of military works and the prospective evidence for *foederati* activity, and explores local responses, such as the development of private armies.

Chapter 5 examines the settlement evidence from the mid fourth to mid fifth centuries, incorporating an exploration of the role of architecture and use of space and place in the
construction of identities, as well as an investigation of changes in portable material culture. This evidence is appraised in an attempt to recognise mechanisms of social organisation. The significance of inter-national and inter-regional socio-economic interaction will be considered, to determine the effect this may have had upon the construction of identities in the post-Roman period.

In Chapter 6, late- and post-Roman burial, ritual, and religion are analysed, to determine their role within the expression of ethnicity. In particular, the significance of the Romano-Christian burial rite, ‘special’ burials, and inscribed memorial stones, are appraised, alongside a consideration of the occurrence of ‘heirlooms’ within graves. Ritual landscapes are discussed in relation to the construction of ethnic and local identities.

Chapter 7 summarises interpretations made throughout the thesis regarding the significance of the material remains from Southwest Britain from the LPRIA to the mid fifth century in the construction of ethnic, cultural, and social identities. The development of regional identities from the late pre-Roman period until the mid fifth century is summarised, and the interrelationship of local and wider identities discussed. The effect of imperial and colonial pressure upon the construction of identities by the regional indigenous population, and role of religion within this process, is outlined. There follows an Appendix, which charts the archaeological data from Southwest Britain used to illustrate these arguments.

**THESIS PROPOSAL**

It will be argued that ethnic identity was constructed by a small number of elite during the LPRIA, and was sporadically significant and recreated during the Roman period, gaining wider prominence during the late- and post-Roman period, when it was restructured to suit changing political circumstances. During the later Roman period, in the restructuring of local and regional power, the elite constructed and consolidated ethnic communities via manipulation of the early Roman past (appropriating features within the prehistoric landscape). ‘National consciousness’ was developed by the elite into a concept of ‘Britishness’ that employed the Roman construct opposing ‘civilised’ and ‘barbarian’, perhaps asserting Mediterranean (and maybe even Hellenic) origins within this ethnic identity. By the mid fifth century, Romano-Christian culture, in conjunction with cultural elements seen as deriving from the Roman past, was appropriated in opposition to the Anglo-Saxon (and possibly Irish) ‘Other’, with the Church increasingly disseminating this identity. However, notwithstanding these developments, it is argued that local (and to a lesser extent regional) identities were more significant to most people, most of the time, throughout this period.
SECTION ONE:

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF SOUTHWEST BRITAIN, FROM THE LATE PRE-ROMAN IRON AGE TO C. AD 350
CHAPTER 2: THE LATE PRE-ROMAN IRON AGE

Changing culture and identities

INTRODUCTION

Research has indicated that ethnic consciousness was mobilised during the later fifth century, in the creation of a supra-regional community in opposition Anglo-Saxon settlement (Jarrett 2009). Claims have been made for a ‘return’ to the culture of the pre-Roman past within Western (and Southwestern) Britain during the later-Roman period (e.g. Reece 1989; see Rahtz 2009: 24), and for a return to the ‘tribal’ organisation of pre-Roman Britain after the removal of Roman control (e.g. Laycock 2008). It is therefore necessary to consider the nature of the region’s late pre-Roman culture, and the extent to which it survived through the Roman period, or alternatively the extent to which it was revived during and after the end of that period. To study processes of ethnogenesis (see Pohl 1998a), analysis of the longue durée is required alongside investigation of specific historic periods (see Armstrong 2004; Davies 2004).

This chapter will begin by analysing the role of material culture in the construction and assertion of social and cultural identities, paying particular attention to coinage and ceramics, bearing in mind that the LPRIA distribution of these finds has often been claimed to correlate with ‘tribal’ regions, which themselves seem later to have developed into civitates territories.

The following section will examine the regional archaeological evidence to provide the background for understanding transformations in social structure over the Roman period, and consider how this may have affected social identities. Firstly, the evidence for LPRIA activity at hillforts and major fortified sites will be outlined. Hillforts are often seen as synonymous with pre-Roman, as opposed to Roman, culture. Hillforts are of particular significance in the light of their reoccupation within the late- and post-Roman periods. The development of enclosed settlements (including oppida) will then be examined to consider the cultural significance of change in relation to central sites. This will be followed by an analysis of burial and ritual, to investigate parallel cultural transformations.

The final section will summarise the range of evidence, and discuss the interrelationship of material culture and changing identities.
The extent to which the identities ‘Dobunni’, ‘Durotriges’, or ‘Dumnonii’ (see figs. 1.2, 2.1) were meaningful before the Conquest is uncertain (see Moore 2007: 86). There are no instances of any of these names being found upon LPRIA coinage (as is witnessed in some regions of Britain). These labels (where found in texts) may instead represent external classifications, which it has been recognised do not necessarily coincide with self-identifying groups (Jenkins 1996: 167; Davies 1994: 8). Moreover, although a ‘people’ may consist of only those under the direct control of, or within a symbiotic relationship with, the nascent elite (see Harries 1989: 90), an identity may not be significant to all of those inhabiting a region previously thought to correspond to a particular ‘tribe’ (contra Cunliffe 1991).

Culture-historical interpretations seek to equate artefact groups with ‘peoples’ and ‘tribes’ named within early historic sources: it is assumed that these regional distributions indicate self-identifying groups. But it is now recognised that regional and ethnic identities often cut across such apparent cultural groups (Jones, S 1997). It is therefore necessary to examine the interrelationship of artefacts with practices in order to recover the construction and expression of regional, ethnic, and cultural identities. The putative ‘tribal’ regions of Southwest Britain will now be considered, in relation to material culture.
‘DOBUNNIA’

The distribution of certain aspects of common culture across southern Worcestershire, much of Gloucestershire, parts of west Wiltshire and west Oxfordshire, and perhaps North Somerset, arguably represent the extent of economic and social networks within the region. It is often proposed that these networks (commonly described as ‘tribes’) became segmented into two distinct cultural zones, which whilst remaining within ‘Dobunnic’ territory, had separate dynastic leadership (Cunliffe 1984: 11; Sellwood 1984: 192, 199; see Creighton 2004: 11).

Figure 2.2 Dobunnic coin region in the LPRIA: 1 = Bagendon, 2 = Barrow Wake [see below], 3 = Gloucester, 4 = Kenchester (Darvill 2003, fig. 3)

A late second-early third century reference of Dio Cassius (LX XX 2) that reads “part of the Bodunni…[were] subject to the Catuvellauni” has heavily influenced this interpretation (and the allocation of the name ‘Dobunni’ to the region) (Frere 1973: 50; Rivet and Smith 1979: 339). This group has been located within this region due to the later (second century) comments of Ptolemy (Cunliffe 2009: 12).
Coinage distribution has also suggested a division between the North and South ‘territories’ along the Stroud valley or Avon (Branigan 1973: 93; see Rivet and Smith 1979: 121; Sellwood 1984: 199; fig. 2.2). The distribution of ceramics has also been used to support the existence of a bipartite ‘tribal’ territory within this region (Cunliffe 1991; 2009). The lack of definite spatial and temporal correlation between the coinage and ceramic distributions used to define these territories is problematic (Reece and Moore 2001), but, nevertheless, the distribution of ceramics (and other objects, such as quern stones and briquetage) may represent a ‘web of relationships’ (Moore 2007: 95-6), through which group identity may have later been renegotiated.

There are notable changes to Middle Iron Age traditions in the LPRIA, with the production of Malvern ceramics perhaps becoming centralised at a small number of kiln sites (ibid. 86). Pre-Conquest wheel-made ceramics are recognised (with the additional development of Severn Valley wares, Timby 1990: 251; 2001: 78), indicating the integration of new technologies across the region. Low denomination coinage began to circulate within what became the Dobunnic civitas, with gold and silver staters principally distributed around potential territorial borders and at some distance from the territories in which they were minted. Possible evidence of minting has been found at Bagendon (see Sellwood 1984: 196).

The motifs adopted on Dobunnic staters imitate those of the adjacent Atrebatic region (see fig. 2.3, left), which were ultimately developed from a Mediterranean model (Creighton 2004: 115) - as seen in the reverse image of a triple-tailed horse (see Cunliffe 1991: 170; fig. 2.3, right). As with the coins of neighbouring polities, the Gallo-Belgic F proto-type and indigenous S series influenced ‘Dobunnic’ issues, although most ‘Dobunnic’ staters do not replicate the naturalistic style found on eastern and Southeastern British units, derived from Classical motifs.

However, staters of the Dobunnic ‘Bodvoc’ (suggested by some as dating c. 30 BC, Cunliffe 2009: 14), as with those of neighbouring regions, more closely emulate ‘Roman’ style, though the reverse retains the triple-tailed horse and wheel. Some units also carried more naturalistic horse motifs, perhaps indicating attempts by the elite to demonstrate ‘Roman’ style to intra-regional clients (or internal trading partners). Bodvoc’s portrait was placed on the reverse of his units (fig. 2.4, left), with his name on the obverse following the coins of Atrebates and Catuvellauni dynasts. The names of
other dynasts were integrated within and placed in close association with triple-tailed horse and wheel motifs upon staters (see fig. 2.4, right).

Some coins of Anted (suggested as perhaps dating c. AD 20 - 43, Cunliffe 2009: 14) bear the suffix ‘RIC’ - an abbreviation of RICON, the Brittonic equivalent of Rex, ‘friendly, ally king’ (fig. 2.3, above). This title suggests client-kingship under Rome (see Creighton 2004: 169, 170), or at least ‘Roman’ notions of kingship (see Jenkins 2004: 119, 126). The alloys adopted (which parallel southern and eastern issues) may indicate the use of bullion received as imperial subsidies (Creighton 2004: 55, 69-70).

The different coinage styles clustering around Salisbury Plain, around Marlborough, the vale of Pewsey, and possibly concentrated upon Forest Hill (on the edge of Savernake Forest), may demonstrate the presence of competing elites, although this has often been seen as a ‘sub-Dobunnic’ group (Corney 2001: 6; Sellwood 1984: 200, 242). The coins are comparable with ‘Dobunnic’ issues, but form a distinct group, perhaps developing from different proto-types (Sellwood 1984: 200). Again, the triple-tailed horse is adopted (arguably indicating Dobunnic affiliation), but the obverse imagery differs from elsewhere (fig. 2.5), and appears to represent modification of the typical head of Apollo. They occur in an area of ‘Atrebatic’ ceramics, and are not found in the same area as ‘Dobunnic’ coins and ceramics (i.e. ‘Glastonbury’ ware) (Sellwood 1984: 201).

4 The amalgamation of ‘RIC’ with the horse’s legs may be seen as an attempt to conceptually integrate ideas of ‘Roman’ kingship with those of ‘traditional’ sacral leadership, as has been argued for the incorporation of the name of the ‘leader’ with the lines and shapes used to represent the horse (Creighton 2004)

5 Within the Republic, a sponsored applicant would have the title conferred by the Senate, and subsequently the emperor, at a ceremony in Rome (ibid. 169, 170). As the title occurs on only a small number of coins, it was perhaps used to proclaim the ascription of such a status on ‘British’ leaders through such a mechanism.

6 The chronology of the ceramics may again differ to that of the coins; but we do see the development of Savernake ceramics in the pre-Conquest decades (Timby 1990: 251; 2001: 78).
The place name element *duro(t)*- may perhaps be translated as ‘fort’, and is commonly found in Northern Gaul (Thomas 1966: 84; Todd 1981: 30; Rivet and Smith 1979: 352). The second element *-riges* is feasibly the plural of *rig*, ‘king’, allowing the place name to be interpreted as some equivalent of ‘fort-kings’, although the correct meaning of this name is unresolved (Rivet and Smith 1979: 353). The name either may have originated as an internal self-identification, or may represent the subsequent internalisation of an external categorization (see Jenkins 2004: 82, 87, 103, 81, 83-4, 117). However, there is no reference to this name until the second century AD.

As with ‘Dobunnic’ coinage, the distribution of ‘Durotrigian’ coinage and pottery has been used to infer the presence of a unified Iron Age ‘tribe’ (e.g. Sellwood 1984: 200). It has been suggested that the pre-Roman territory reached north-west to the Mendip Hills (with the River Brue perhaps acting as a boundary), westwards to the Quantocks and Blackdown Hills, and with northern limits along the southern fringe of Salisbury Plain and the Wylye (Bidwell 1980: 8; Corney 2001: 6, 8; Cunliffe 1991: 159; Robinson 1991: 119; Sellwood 1984: 197). However, there are again problems with simply equating the distribution of ceramics and coinage with ‘tribal’ territories, and the use of ‘Durotrigian’ wares is insufficient evidence for the existence of a collective identity (see Moore 2007). Dispersed production (perhaps by a number of inter-linked kinship groups) of regional ceramics sharing a common visual code is evident in the Middle Iron Age (fig. 2.6). During the LPRIA ceramic production became confined to the area around Poole Harbour (with the adoption of new techniques such as wheel finishing), suggesting a change both in socio-political organisation and cultural frameworks.

The distribution pattern of ‘Durotrigian’ coins differs from that of other regions, with staters and quarter staters occurring almost as frequently within, as outside, the region as it has traditionally been defined (Sellwood 1984: 191, 193, 198). The vast majority of low denomination coins (though not found as frequently as staters) are conversely found outside the region, suggesting a different function for these units than in other territories (or that their distribution and manufacture was less under centralised control), most likely reflecting a different socio-political organisation to that of Dobunnia. It is suggested that these differences were due to the coexistence of several competing groups within the region (cf. Creighton 1995: 290; 2004: 54).

---

7 It has alternatively been proposed that the Somerset Levels, or the rivers Exe, Parrett, or Axe, may have formed the western border of the territory with the Dumnonii, with the eastern border possibly to the east of the Wiltshire Avon (Bidwell 1980: 8; Cunliffe 1991: 159; Sellwood 1984: 197).
8 Most units occur within a major ritual hoard at Hayling Island, but also as sporadic finds elsewhere in Hampshire, and within the region at Hengistbury Head, and a hoard at Holdenhurst.
There is an apparently limited adoption of Classical motifs and naturalistic styles, and a general absence of inscriptions and portraiture (again perhaps indicative of dispersed rather than centralised leadership – cf. Hingley 1984: 80, 82). As with most LPRIA coins, an equine motif horse decorates the reverse of the staters, with imagery developed from the British B and D series, derived from the Gallo-Belgic A, through Gallo-Belgic C (Creighton 2004: 27, 32, 33). Only one individual (‘Crab’) within the region (perhaps based in the Isle of Wight) imitated Classical imagery, with both a nominal inscription and ‘Roman’ eagle motif, perhaps copying Southeastern coins (fig. 2.7), and suggesting the location of another competitive kin group or individual (cf. Sellwood 1984: 200-01).

However, some quarter staters do seemingly imitate motifs found upon some Southeastern issues, and the obverse of the most common type of stater may derive from the head of Apollo (e.g. ibid. 33). The quarter stater, and arguably the image on the lower denomination coinage, perhaps abstracts this imagery (pers. comm. Dr Lloyd Laing; fig. 2.8). The motif on the quarter stater reverse is most reasonably that of a boat, imitating the motif found upon the coins of the Morini (centred on
the Calais region), and upon Cantii quarter staters (fig. 2.9). The latter is perhaps a more likely source for the 'Durotriges' issue, considering the comparable reverse image that indicates further devolution from the Morini boat and the already devolved head of Apollo (fig. 2.9).

It might be argued that this imagery aspired to convey control of maritime trade. Several of these coins occur in the 'Durotriges' region, suggesting their potential importance in asserting the power of those in control of their minting and distribution. The staters – which, as it was noted, were commonly found within the region - may have also attempted to disseminate the same message, in adopting what appears to be a pack-horse on their reverse (see fig. 2.8, top left), which closely compares with Atrebatic examples. Likewise, the copper alloy units (which again seem to be mainly found within the region), may represent a much devolved version of this imagery.

Whether there were those within this region who would have identified themselves as 'Dumnonian' or 'Cornovan' at this time is impossible to tell. It has been claimed that the name 'Dumnonia'
reflects a pronounced self-identity, meaning ‘we of the world’ or ‘we of (this) land’ (Thomas 1966: 77). Ptolemy later (during the second century) named the Lizard Peninsula as the ‘Damnonium promontory’ (Pearce 2004: 23), but this label is perhaps just as likely to represent an external categorisation (perhaps by traders), and may relate to political organisation of the civitas territory during the Roman period. It has also been suggested that the westernmost tip of the Peninsula corresponded to a ‘sub-tribal’ polity known as *Cornouuaia, with a ‘Cornovian’ ‘tribal’ centre located at The Rumps (ibid. 86-7), due to distinct cultural differences within this area. However, the centrality of this site (or any other in this area) during the LPRIA is debatable (see below), and there is no evidence to support use of this regional label before the seventh century AD (see Chapters 3 and 4). Its application before this date is therefore entirely conjectural.

‘Dumnonia’ had no indigenous coinage, and established systems of exchange are therefore likely to have continued during the LPRIA (Cunliffe 1991: 180). This has led some to deduce its territorial extents of this region through a process of elimination in relation to ‘Durotrigia’, arguing that either the Exe or the Parrett and the Axe formed the eastern frontier (ibid. 180). LPRIA Southwestern Decorated ware was distributed across the region (from Mendip and into Cornwall), with gabbroic fabrics restricted to Cornwall (Quinnell 1986: 113-14). During the later first century BC and into the Roman period, Cordonned ware was manufactured, again with gabbroic fabrics in Cornwall (ibid. 119, 120). This development of regionally distinct material culture has often been thought to demonstrate the existence of a distinct regional group, although (as outlined in Chapter 1), there is no necessary correlation between such patterns and ethnic groups (see Barth 1969: 13); moreover, the ‘bounded nature’ of ethnic groups must be questioned (Jones 1997: 110).

Until the later second century BC, contact between Britain and the Mediterranean, and with the Continent, was primarily via Dumnonia (Thomas 1966: 82). Arguably the tin trade stimulated contact (see Cunliffe 1982: 52; Todd 1987: 12), control of which may have facilitated the creation of social hierarchies. However, the axis of trade shifted eastwards during the first century BC, with

---

13 The name may alternatively be interpreted as ‘deep’, perhaps suggesting that it was externally imposed, perhaps due to long-distance trading links. Some take the name Cornovi to derive from ‘com ‘horn’, and thus as denoting the inhabitants of a promontory, although the landscapes relating to this name elsewhere in Britain do not support this interpretation (Rivet and Smith 1979: 325). As it has been noted that many ‘tribal’ names may derive from the names of deities, this name has alternatively been interpreted as “worshippers of a horned deity of the Cernunnos (stag god) type” (ibid., quoting Anne Ross). This name, at whatever date it became significant, may have therefore been an internal construct or an external categorisation.

14 Pers. comm. Dr Ken Dark

15 Nevertheless, ‘Cornovia’ will be used as a convenient label to denote the region in which distinctive rites and material culture is found, west of the Tamar. Its use within quotation marks is to indicate possible, but unproven, contemporaneous significance, with acknowledgement that use of this term for periods prior to the seventh century may be anachronistic.

16 Dumnonian trade routes were established during the sixth century BC, if not earlier (Todd 1981: 11-2). One of the earliest references to Britain concerns the circumnavigation of Britain by Pytheas of Massilia (possibly c. 325 BC) and his visit to Cornwall’s tin deposits (Todd 1981: 11).
economic contact between Britain and the Continent becoming increasingly focused through Dorset and Hampshire, and then later via the Thames (Cunliffe 1988: 39-40; 1982: 51).

**LPRIA MATERIAL CULTURE: DISCUSSION**

In summary, clearly defined cultural groupings are not evident, and there are no indications that material culture expressed widespread collective identities. It is argued that established social networks were manipulated by incipient elites who, in taking control of existing cultural frameworks, initiated the creation of ‘peoples’, embodying and legitimising their political power within this process (see James 1999: 97-8; Jenkins 2004: 144). It is therefore entirely possible that the act of political consolidation instigated the conception of any or all of the named ‘tribal’ groups post- or immediately pre-Conquest (see Chapter 3; see below). However, it is proposed that some prominent kinship groups were more successful than others in creating enduring political territories.

The centralised production of ceramics and coinage within the Southwest region during the LPRIA provided opportunities for the creation and control of symbolic objects and their ‘meaning’ - notwithstanding that meaning was open to subversion (see Creighton 1995: 289; Jenkins 2004: 151; Turner 1995). Consistency in motifs, styles, forms, and the introduction of new technologies, suggests the deliberate use of such material to convey specific messages.

Coinage provided a new medium for economic and ideological control (see below; see Walker and Schiffer 2006). In particular, the controlled distribution of some coinage enabled the construction of territory, for the emblematic nature of their imagery made coins potentially powerful devices with which to differentiate groups (Creighton 1995: 289; Sellwood 1984: 192-93, 201; Shennan 1989: 17-19). Coinage may have simultaneously articulated regional identity, and engendered common elite cultural identity with reference to a shared ‘symbolic universe’, thus playing a part in the negotiation of political territories (Jenkins 2004: 136; see Joyce and Winter 1996: 45-6; DeMarrais et al. 1996a: 25).

The material with which coins were made, as well as their designs, differentiated their role within society. Gold and silver staters may have been used by the Dobunnic elite to maintain alliances and express both regional identity and common elite identity between regional dynasts, bearing in mind their common distribution outside the region. The distribution of staters within the Durotrigian region may in part relate to the fragmented nature of social organisation within this region, with a consequent need to maintain inter-regional stability and alliance.
Low denomination coins, circulating within the Dobunnic territory, may have acted as tokens of belonging to the ‘Dobunni’ network, embodying collective identity (see Jenkins 2004: 138). The distribution of ‘Durotrigian’ low denomination coinage outside the region may conversely demonstrate their use within trade, conveying a message of regional control and cultural affiliation to adjacent territories.

Possible attempts by the Dobunnic elite to construct regional identity through control and distribution of regional industries by appropriating established social networks may be evident in the apparent division of the region into northern and southern sectors. This might indicate the varying cultural affiliations of the Dobunnic leaders. A similar situation may be indicated within the Durotrigian region, with the possible production of coins at Hengistbury and centralisation of ceramic production nearby Poole Harbour. The restricted distribution of ceramics manufactured from clay extracted from a limited area on the Lizard Peninsula suggests the potential of this ware in the expression of regional identity (e.g. see Quinnell 1993), but must be considered in combination with regionally distinctive practices to determine its significance (see below).

Coinage was an effective medium for propaganda, with the potential to communicate a multitude of messages, the ambiguity of imagery enabling the attachment of various meanings. Portraiture (not necessarily naturalistic representations of indigenous leaders, but more probably imitations of the images found on Classical coins) may have emphasised dynastic power – as, for example, seen on the Dobunnic issues. The absence of such imagery (as on the Durotrigian issues) may indicate an alternative socio-political structure, arguably of a fragmented nature. The development of inscribed issues by the Dobunnic elite suggests the adoption of new ideologies, perhaps signifying the possession of ‘secret knowledge’ that carried with it an aura of power and legitimacy, and symbolising elite cultural unity - as might the use of titles (Creighton 2004: 64, 158, 150, 165-66, 211). As with the adoption of coins per se, it shows Mediterranean influence upon the dissemination of power, although it is difficult to be certain whether this was seen as a Gallic, Mediterranean, or ‘Roman’ practice.

The use of symbolism taken from the coins of adjacent territories may have proclaimed alliances involved in the creation of elite identity groups (although emulation of imagery may also reflect attempts to appropriate their associated power). For those who commissioned the coinage, Gallo-

17 It is argued that copper-alloy units were used in trade or exchange (Creighton 2004: 10; Collis 1971: 76-9; Hill 1995b: 79; Sellwood 1984: 196-8)
18 The role of intellectualism in the construction of ethnic identities may be significant (see Shennan 1989: 10; Vail 1989b: 11). Such ‘secret knowledge’ may have engendered the trust of the populace surrounding the ‘truth’ of ethnic origins. This ‘knowledge’ need not necessarily have been imparted for it to have held power (see Rowlands 1993: 142).
the standing of particular dominant lineages in bids for power. Opposition to, or by, neighbouring
groups perhaps strengthened and motivated the salience of regional identity by creating a feeling of
unity against perceived threats; such insecurity may have encouraged conformity (see Brass 1996:
89; Cohen 1978: 396, 397; Jenkins 2004: 117, 126). The images used upon the coinage and the
style embodied in imported ceramics and their imitations, were both intrinsically linked with the
origin and identity of these elite groups, providing ‘cosmological authentication’ for their power
through horizontal cosmological acquisition (see Helms 1993; Moreland 2003: 147; Theuws 2003:
129). There were possibly attempts to create associations between the power symbolised by the
imagery of coins, and political centres from which they were distributed, facilitating the
institutionalisation and materialisation of regional (and ‘Dobunnic’) identities (Jenkins 2004: 139) by
a dominant kinship group.

Centralisation of ceramic production may have provided a medium through which collective
identities were (re)negotiated, with control over form, material, manufacturing techniques, and
decoration enabling the construction and dissemination of ideologies to a wide audience. New
forms, materials, and styles may have engendered a new worldview, notwithstanding the degree of
regional diversity noted within the imitation Gallo-Roman wares (James 1999: 99). Traditional,
hand-made, reduced wares containing coarse fillers contrast to the innovative wheel-made,
oxidised, pots (including beakers, cups, tankards, and platters) (Timby 1990: 249, 251). Handling
these objects, manufactured in novel shapes and materials, would have produced different
sensations for the user, acting as a tangible reminder of cultural change. These changes potentially
raised questions of appropriate usage. The concept of individual servings may have been related to
the ideology of civilised behaviour - knowledge of what was ‘correct’ usage being involved in the
creation of social difference. The existence of a new worldview was thus potentially propagated at a
local level, although access to this world was limited to a select few in their creation of regional
power.

The regional archaeology will now be examined, to consider the evidence for identity construction
within settlement, burial, and ritual contexts, in relation to the material culture groups discussed
above.

19 The concentration of ‘Dobunnic’ coins between the Thames and Cherwell (taken as indicative of the Eastern
boundary of the territory) (Sellwood 1984: 195, 197), may indicate attempts to affirm ‘Dobunnic’ affiliation by elites in the
area in acts of ethnic or regional boundary maintenance.
20 It is perhaps significant that the early Severn Valley Ware forms included tankards (Timby 1990: 249), perhaps
reflecting social drinking, conceivably in the development of patron-client relationships.
REGIONAL ANALYSES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE IN RELATION TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF LPRIA IDENTITIES IN SOUTHWEST BRITAIN

SETTLEMENT

HILLFORTS AND ENCLOSED SITES

Wide morphological variety is noticeable across the Southwest region, and this has led to the suggestion that the term ‘hillfort’ should be replaced by that of ‘major fortified sites’ (Pearce 1981: 112). The variety of sites within this category suggests a range of functions that probably in many cases changed over time. The role of these sites was not purely defensive: in particular, it is notable that few enclosures would have been entirely defendable, perhaps indicating the significance of display (Fitzpatrick 2007: 157).

Within the ‘Central Southern’ zone - incorporating Dorset, Wiltshire, Hampshire, and parts of Somerset, and Gloucestershire (Cunliffe 1984: 5-6) - large hillforts developed in the Middle Iron Age, often being enclosed by substantial (frequently multi-vallate) ramparts. Maiden Castle (Dorset), though often considered as typical, is larger than most sites, and mid-range sites, such as Cadbury Congresbury (North Somerset), as well as smaller sites - for example, the univallate promontory hillfort at Crickley Hill (Gloucestershire), are common. The distribution of hillforts in an area east of, but not beyond, the Exe has suggested a Middle Iron Age ‘frontier’ to some (Cunliffe 1991).

Hillforts across much of Southern Britain, including those within Wiltshire, were mostly abandoned during the first century BC (Cunliffe 1984: 8; Hill 1995a: 9), although many in Dorset and Somerset (and some in Gloucestershire), continued to be used after this time. Several hillforts in the Southwest were modified by the addition of shrines in the LPRIA, e.g. South Cadbury (Somerset), and Maiden Castle (Cunliffe 1991: 166). Some sites were reoccupied during the late first century BC after a period of abandonment, as at Crickley Hill (Dixon 1994), where there is possible evidence for metalworking (with apparently low status occupation), and a burial (Jarrett 1999; Green 1949; Staelen 1983, see below). Such activity may suggest attempts by the local elite to reappropriate these sites in the reconstruction of community identity through ritual, possibly in the assertion of power in relation to changing historical and material conditions. However, settlement was generally transferred to smaller sites within their hinterlands in the LPRIA (Creighton 2004: 17; Hill 1995a: 10).
It was often hillforts on or near accessible trade routes, or within coastal or estuarine locations, that were modified and reoccupied (e.g. Alcock 1973; Dunning 1976; Dixon 1994), perhaps indicating a desire to have access to exchange networks and control trade by elite or dominant kinship groups. Within the Central Southern region, trade was focused upon Hengistbury Head (Dorset) (a possible oppidum: see below) and Poole Harbour during the first and second centuries BC (Hill 1995a: 10; Sherratt 1986), with extensive multi-vallate ramparts being constructed at Hengistbury c. 150 BC (Fitzpatrick 2007: 159).

Although most see hillforts as ‘tribal’ centres, material culture at hillforts often derived from various ‘tribal’ regions, that from South Cadbury, for instance, being from both ‘Dobunnic’ and ‘Durotrigian’ regions (see above). We must therefore be cautious in applying external labels in a discussion of the earlier internal conception of these entities.

Although the frequent presence of fine metalwork at hillforts has led to the suggestion that the elite may have occupied such sites as Hod Hill (Dorset) and Maiden Castle (Creighton 2004: 7, 9, 16-7, 19), many of contexts are ritual in nature (see Hill 1995a).21 The manufacture of prestige goods at hillforts likewise does not necessarily demonstrate the occupation of these sites by the elite. Nevertheless, in a later (second century) reference, Ptolemy refers to Hod Hill as the ‘Durotrigian oppidum’ (Rivet and Smith 1979: 353), which may suggest elite associations for this [start 30] and other sites, and support the significance of this site with regard to the identity of a regional elite. (It has been argued above that several elite groups may have coexisted within the

---

21 Torcs (which perhaps acted as insignia) are found at a number of sites, such as South Cadbury (Somerset), Maiden Castle, Ham Hill, Spetisbury (all Dorset), and Worlebury (Avon) (Creighton 2004: 31, 109; Wait 1985: 35, 42-4, 311; Whimster 1981: 310-318), which may suggest associations with the elite.
‘Durotrigian’ region). Major fortified sites may have therefore functioned as communal foci (as refuges and ritual sites), rather than as elite residences during the LPRIA. It has been proposed by Richard Hingley that the scale of the enclosed settlement and size of the associated social group are directly proportional: thus, massive enclosures potentially represent large-scale groups (Hingley 1984: 81). The construction of such sites as Maiden Castle was perhaps an important mechanism within the construction of regional identities, and in the affirmation of kinship alliance.

Hillforts west of the river Exe (in common with other hillforts in the ‘Western’ zone of Devon and Cornwall) were generally smaller and simpler in form, with few major inland multi-vallate sites (Pearce 1981: 118). Chûn, Penwith (Cornwall) (consisting of concentric circular dry-stone ramparts), is one example (Thomas 1956). However, large enclosures, often on hillsides, ridges, or spurs, are more common than hilltop sites (Pearce 1981: 114). Most are found in Cornwall (ibid. 105), with a small number found in Devon, as at Holcombe (Hingley 1984: 73). These sites were established at the zenith of Continental trading contacts, with some continued use into the first century AD (Cunliffe 1991: 182), again suggesting links between trade and social status. Hill-slope enclosures are rarely in defensible positions, which again may suggest their role in prestige display. Characteristically, their ramparts were roughly circular and relatively small, enclosing less than 2 ha (5 acres) (Pearce 1981: 104). However, whilst some were perhaps settlements, others were possibly for stock enclosure (Fitzpatrick 2007: 158). As excavation is often limited, it is difficult to determine the status of most sites, although finds perhaps suggest a degree of social stratification, with the presence of ‘exotic’ goods at the centre of some sites suggesting their occupation by wealthier members of society (Pearce 1981: 104-5, 106). As elsewhere in the Southwest, most hillforts and large enclosures within the Peninsula were seemingly abandoned before the Conquest (Quinnell 1986: 121).

Coastal sites (‘cliff castles’), such as The Rumps and Trevelgue Head (both in North Cornwall), were perhaps established during the third or second century BC, and have Armorican parallels (see Wright 1940: 175). Many engaged in Atlantic, Continental, and Mediterranean trade. Although some were active into the early first century AD, their pre-eminent role in exchange was eclipsed in the later part of the first century BC by their counterparts to the east (e.g. Hengistbury). This may have had an effect upon social hierarchies. Temporary phases of occupation (as possibly seen at the Rumps) may indicate that fragmented communities sporadically came together at these sites, perhaps at seasonal festivals, or during times of conflict (Millett 1990: 28).
Oppida and large enclosed settlements

Although the term ‘oppidum’ is ambiguously used within Classical texts, providing difficulties when categorising sites, this label is here used to signify the LPRIA and early Roman period development of enclosed sites sharing a number of features. Morphology is nevertheless diverse (Woolf 1993: 223). The presence of mints and imported goods, and their location at river crossings, might point towards an economic function (Cunliffe 1994: 75). It has been suggested that they functioned as ‘entrepôts between tribal groups’ (Hingley and Miles 1984: 65), perhaps developing focal roles. However, as with hillforts, they might have fulfilled various functions.

Oppida in Britain are generally distinguished from hillforts by their location in ‘valley-ward positions’, making use of natural topography (such as marshland, woodland or the bends of rivers) for protection (Darvill 1987: 169; Appendix, Table 1; fig. 2.11). This defensive role is also often seen within the distinguishing feature of massive dyke-works, which frequently delineate vast tracts of land. Such sites (generally termed ‘territorial’, rather than ‘enclosed’, oppida, Hill 1995b: 70; Todd 1987: 40) developed within the British Central Southern zone during the first centuries BC-AD (Woolf 1993: 224, 228). Several sites, such The Ditches (Gloucestershire), have ‘antenna’ earthworks, interpreted as corrals (Fitzpatrick 2007: 160; see fig. 2.12). Numerous banjo enclosures were also scattered in the area around Gussage I, another proposed oppidum, although excavation is required to corroborate this claim (Hill 1995b: 70, 1995b: 92).

22 A collection of chariot fittings, moulds for the production of bits and terret-rings, and horse bones, was found at this site (Creighton 2004: 17; Wainwright and Spratling 1973).
Their morphology often suggests Continental influence, arguably developed within Roman concepts of urbanism. However, there is little evidence to support the suggestion that British oppida represent the emergence of primitive proto-urban communities, as on the Continent (e.g. Todd 1981: 39, 41; Woolf 1993). Furthermore, within the Southwest region only Bagendon (in the Upper Thames valley) directly compares to the oppida of Southeast Britain and the Continent (Cunliffe 1991: 173-4; Fitzpatrick 2007: 160; fig. 2.12). The massive dyke system (potentially incorporating The Ditches, probably established during the early second-first century BC) was occupied between the early to mid first century AD (Cunliffe 1991: 173-4; Fitzpatrick 2007: 160). There is evidence for minting (Salway 1981: 59), suggesting a centralising role for the site, and significant amounts of Gallo-Belgic ceramics and Samian ware were found (Cunliffe 1991: 173-4; Fitzpatrick 2007: 160). Bagendon lies within good agricultural land, enabling surplus production through interdependence with settlements on the hill slopes and limestone hills (Robinson 1984: 7).

Figure 2.12 The Ditches enclosed site, in relation to Bagendon territorial oppidum, during the first century AD (Trow 1988, fig. 1)
Hengistbury Head has been proposed as a possible enclosed oppidum (Fitzpatrick 2007: 159; fig. 2.13). As noted, there is significant evidence for trade and exchange, and a mint was perhaps located at the site (Cunliffe 1991: 487). A recently discovered earthwork in the area of Ilchester (Somerset) may turn out, after further investigation, to be another oppidum (Fitzpatrick 2007: 160). This has been suggested as the central site of a pre-Roman Durotrigian ‘sub-kingdom’ (Leach 1994: 3). Here, however, we may instead be witnessing the creation of a new identity by a marginal group in reaction to a longer-established group (perhaps centring upon Maiden Castle, which is also sometimes labelled as an oppidum), paralleling the behaviour seen within Northeast Dorset and Western Hampshire. No certain oppida have been identified in Dumnonia, although suggestions have been made that The Rumps may have had this role (Thomas 1966: 78, 83).

Whilst some enclosed sites may have been influenced by models derived from Southeast British regions, and ultimately the Continent, many may represent the internal development of settlement enclosures, seen across the Southwest in the LPRIA – a development that may have little to do with the adoption of ‘Roman’ ideologies and identities at this time. Numerous vast multiple ditch systems were established (or developed from earlier sites) at this time (with continued activity into the first century AD) in Wiltshire (along the southern fringe of Salisbury Plain and up to the River Wylye) and North Gloucestershire, often containing concentrations of prestige goods (Bidwell 1980: 8; Corney 2001: 8; Cunliffe 1994: 74-5; Hill 1995b: 72). However, it will be argued below (see Burial Practices) that these sites appear to be part of a pattern (that includes smaller enclosed settlements) in which Continental and Mediterranean cultural influence pervades a range of contexts, including settlement, burial, and ritual.

23 This has important implications for the later Roman period, considering the late date of the epigraphic evidence used in support of this claim (see Chapter 3).
As with hillforts, it is likely that the variety of enclosed sites fulfilled differing roles (Hingley 1984: 73). It is apparent that new types of enclosed settlement became associated with the elite during the first centuries BC - AD, perhaps indicating increased power due to control of trade and exchange. Arguably, this represents the development of new centres by nascent elites in the creation of social stratification (variously in opposition to or manipulating established social networks), considering the apparent coexistence of hillforts and oppida. However, elite settlements were not necessarily located at these larger enclosures, and elites may instead have occupied smaller enclosures: these sites will now be considered.

**Small enclosed settlements**

Enclosed settlements became more common during the first century BC across the Southwest (Darvill 1987: 162, 176). Throughout much of the Central Southern zone during the LPRIA, simple ditched enclosures and unenclosed settlements developed into ‘agglomerations’ of smaller enclosures, frequently rectilinear in form (Cunliffe 1994: 74-5; Hill 1995b: 72). This can be seen at Gussage I (Dorset) (Wainwright and Spratling 1973; see above; see fig. 2.14 below for site locations), for example, where the larger enclosure was divided into several ditched and banked enclosures (Hill 1995a: 70; 1995b: 92, 122; see above). Compounds of rectilinear and oval enclosures, sometimes with associated tracks and animal pens, occur on the limestone uplands and higher gravel terraces, as at Claydon Pike (Gloucestershire) (Hingley and Miles 1984: 57). The organisation of buildings within settlements sometimes changed, as at Fairford where huts were placed in a line, rather than around a compound, with some buildings being separately enclosed (ibid. 63). Clusters of small ‘household-sized’ enclosures of less than one ha are especially prevalent, as at Frocester, and Guiting Power (both Gloucestershire), with similar sites also occurring in the Avon and Severn Valleys (Fitzpatrick 2007: 154; Hill 1995b: 59).

Over 1500 smaller enclosures, known as ‘rounds’ (commonly circular, sub-circular or oval, sometimes sub-rectangular, or even triangular in form, Pearce 1981: 107), have also been located in the Western zone, primarily within Cornwall (Thomas 1976: 200), although some have also been identified in Somerset and Dorset (Pearce 2004: 30). These enclosures parallel (but arguably pre-date) the ráths and ring-forts of Wales, Ireland, and Armorica (Edwards 1996: 12-15, 17-18; Thomas 1966: 91). Most have univallate ramparts (sometimes constructed with sizeable stones) with a single entrance, and are generally less than one ha (mostly enclosing c. 0.5 ha), though they may range from 0.25 to 2 ha (Cunliffe 1991: 182; Pearce 1981: 107; 2004: 30; Thomas 1966: 88; Todd 1987: 224). Their size makes it likely that they housed small kin groups (Pearce 2004; Thomas 1966: 91).
Rounds were built on relatively low-lying slopes, and usually sited on good arable land (Thomas 1966: 88; Pearce 1981: 106-8; 2004: 39). Their construction was most common between 150-50 BC (Hill 1995b: 85), although many continued to be occupied well into the Roman period (see Chapter 3). Imports are found at some rounds, which often also have evidence for bronze, tin, and enamel working, with several sites located near to mineral veins (Pearce 1981: 111-12). By the later first century BC, imports were possibly obtained via Durotrigia: Cordoned ware was found at Castle Dore (Cornwall) (Cunliffe 1991: 182), as were glass beads, glass, and shale armlets (Pearce 1981: 105). However, regional ceramics predominate. Continental influence may be witnessed at Castle Dore, in the presence of a rectangular structure – if this is dated to the LPRIA, and not the post-Roman period (see Rahtz 1971).

The unenclosed settlement (perhaps representing the single family unit) was probably the predominant settlement form throughout the pre-Roman Iron Age in some areas (Hill 1995b: 54, 58), although many areas also saw a proliferation of open nucleated settlements of variable size, form, and function (Hingley 1984: 74; see Cunliffe 1984: 6; Dark and Dark 1997: 14). Within the Southwest, clusters prevail in the Thames Valley (Hill 1995b: 59). In many cases, unenclosed settlements were contemporaneous with enclosed sites (Webster 2004: 1), suggesting their differing functions (but perhaps reflecting the predominance of arable farming, with only low-levels of livestock husbandry, and thus no need for stock enclosure). However, the difference may be related to social status: although the unenclosed site was possibly of similar socio-economic standing to the farmstead within nucleated settlements (Fitzpatrick 2007: 154), it has been suggested that unenclosed hut groups of the Western zone were socially and economically dependent upon the rounds (Thomas 1966: 88, 91; Pearce 1978: 50). The occasional presence of relatively fine metalwork or imported ceramics perhaps suggests the inter-relationship between unenclosed settlements and the more wealthy enclosed sites (Pearce 1978: 50; Thomas 1966: 88, 91).
The nature of hillfort settlement changed within the Southwest region during the LPRIA: in some cases, industrial and economic activity and ritual activity continued (see below), but in other cases, hillforts were abandoned. After a period of abandonment, some sites were reoccupied during the later first century BC, with continued activity into the Roman period in some cases (see Chapter 3). Location in proximity to trade routes, facilitating economic exchange and access to resources, may have influenced activities at and occupation of hillforts and other enclosures. Modified activity perhaps perpetuated the focal role of hillforts in the LPRIA, as meeting places at which social networks and regional identities might be consolidated. However, this role was possibly transferred to oppida and other large enclosed sites in some areas.

Whilst the elite may have occupied or established oppida, some smaller enclosed sites perhaps housed members of the elite whose status was perhaps in part derived from control of trade and resources. A number of sites seemingly indicate cultural influence from and contact with the Continent or Southeast Britain. These factors (however transformed, manipulated, or subverted) were possibly integrated within the construction of regional identities by nascent elites. Thus, whilst the influence of ‘Roman’ culture within Southwest Britain during this time has perhaps been overstated, Continental and Mediterranean culture undoubtedly contributed to internal change within the region. An awareness of widespread transformations to symbols of power on the Continent led to the appropriation of new material culture and styles within the negotiation of social hierarchy, and the creation of regional identities.

Burial and ritual practices will now be examined: burial rites will first be considered separately, to discuss the development of specific regional practices, and their potential relationship to regional identities.

**BURIAL AND RITUAL PRACTICES**

Rituals are important arenas for the construction of social identities, and in particular, ethnicity. Rites of passage especially provide particularly powerful opportunities for the ‘practical participation in symbolisation of identity… [and] the affirmation and reaffirmation of *communitas*, providing a ‘visual embodiment of the abstraction of collective identity’ as well as the institutionalisation of material culture signifying that identity (Jenkins 2004: 151-52; see Turner 1995).

However, understanding of ritualised practice and religion has in the past derived mainly from Classical textual sources and later Irish mythology, separated in both time and space from LPRIA Southwest Britain, and therefore of questionable validity (Hill 1995a; Webster 1995: 452). Early
Classical authors were evidently writing to an agenda that incorporated stereotypical images of the 'barbarian', bound by Mediterranean and literary conventions, often integrating imaginary dialogue (Green 1997: 24, 40). Regional variation demonstrates the difficulty of generalising from documentary references (Hill 1995a). The relevance of the comments of Classical writers, such as Caesar, is debatable, considering that he was mainly concerned with Southeastern British societies, which had been in contact with the Roman world for some time (Wells 1990: 452). We must therefore rely on the archaeological evidence to determine the role of changing ritual practices at this time within the Southwest, comparing evidence from the Southeast to that of the Southwest, to determine when the texts are of use.

For much of the pre-Roman period there is little evidence for formal burial practices, and it is assumed that most human remains were disposed of in a manner that left no archaeological trace – perhaps excarnation or informal cremation (Fitzpatrick 2007: 164). However, burials occur sporadically at settlements across the region from the Early Iron Age, perhaps reflecting the use of human remains within ritual practice (see Wait 1985). Changes are apparent in the LPRIA, when formal burials are more common (although still rare). Two main rites have been identified within the Southwest, one predominant in the Cornish Peninsula, and the other in South Dorset.

**PENINSULAR RITE**

---

Figure 2.15 Peninsula cist grave, Bryher (Johns 2002-3, fig. 14)
The peninsular tradition probably developed during the third century BC, and continued into the Roman period (Cunliffe 1991: 505). Cemeteries typically contained approximately NS aligned crouched inhumations (mostly placed on the left side), within oval or rectangular cists (fig. 2.15), sometimes within NS rows (Whimster 1981: 60, 72, 192; Wait 1985: 121, 261; see fig. 2.20). Wealthy grave goods accompany some early burials within Peninsula cemeteries: including mirrors and personal ornaments, as at Trelan Bahow (where, unusually, a ceramic bowl was also found), and in one case, at Bryher, a sword and mirror (Johns 2002-3; Appendix I, Table 2; see fig. 2.16). These finds indicate extensive trading links, and suggest an emphasis upon the individual’s social role or status, and date to some time before the Conquest period.

24 Contracted burials are those where the knees of the corpse are drawn up towards the chest; crouched and flexed burials are those in which the knees are bent at varying degrees tending towards a ‘kneeling’ position.
Some large cemeteries have been discovered within Southwest Britain, as at Harlyn Bay (near Padstow), where at least 130 burials were found mostly within rectangular short-cist graves, and were mostly NS aligned (Darvill 1987: 158; Whimster 1981: 60, 62, 69; fig. 2.18, 2.19). Although a building at this site may represent a domestic structure with a foundation deposit, it might alternatively represent a mortuary structure (Aldhouse-Green 2001: 166; Whimster 1981: 180; fig. 2.18), arguably appropriating the Continental practice of enclosure graves (see Collis 1977), although if so, this grave exhibits a regional variance in its circular plan. Several barrows and barrow-enclosures on the south coast at Branscombe (near to Sidmouth) have been dated to the ‘late prehistoric’ (and in some cases, Roman) period, and although may again relate to control of trade by local elite barrow-enclosure burials, these are not certainly LPRIA in date.\(^{25}\)

---

25 NTSMR-ZB292; NTSMR-ZB293; NTSMR-ZB247; NMR_NATINV-448922 (Data: ADS). Barrows will be considered more fully below (see Durotrigian rite).
The cliff-side locations of many sites (see fig. 2.20), suggesting associations with cliff-castle communities (or at least with their elite), may account for the wealth of the goods in some cases. The broad similarities in burial rites throughout Atlantic Britain and Armorica perhaps indicate shared traditions (as noted over the longue durée). However, burials within Armorica are nearly all extended by the LPRIA (Whimster 1981: 72), perhaps reflecting Mediterranean influence.
Direct contact between the Peninsula and the Mediterranean, or with Continental Greek colonies (Laing 1968), may explain the introduction of these rites within the Southwest. Similar practices, including the placement of inhumations within (sometimes stone-lined) shafts or pits, with grave goods including ceramics, jewellery, mirrors, weapons, and tools, are found within the Mediterranean during the fourth – first century BC (see Souyoudyoglou-Haywood 2005: 135). Some grave goods are also paralleled in Iberia (Cunliffe 1991; see Lorrio and Ruiz Zapatero 2005). Ultimately, changing burial rites may indicate changing beliefs with regard to the after-life, requiring material provisions for the Otherworld, possibly accompanied by the adoption or creation of new origin myths.

‘Durotrigian’ Rite

The ‘Durotrigian’ rite (generally confined to Southern Dorset) represents a distinct regional tradition dating from the late first century BC to the second century AD (Whimster 1981; Wait 1985; fig. 2.21). Formal organised cemeteries (sometimes enclosed by dry-stone walls) were placed close to settlements, with oval shallow dug graves (at times stone-lined) containing flexed or contracted inhumations (Hill 1995a: 121; Whimster 1981: 37, 42-3, 181, 192; Wait 1985: 121, 260; 1995: 496). Several large cemeteries are concentrated in the area around Weymouth, Portland, and the Isle of Purbeck (excavated examples include Whitcombe and Maiden Castle), with smaller cemeteries excavated at Bridport and Portesham (Philpott 1991: 6, 61; O’Brien 1999). Most burials were of adults (some adolescents are found, but not small children), and some cemeteries may have contained family clusters (Whimster 1981: 42-3, 37; Wait 1985: 121). This suggests the expression of kinship ties within funerary contexts, and perhaps in some cases indicates the establishment of ‘dynastic’ cult centres (as has been suggested at Hayling Island, to the east, see Creighton 2004: 191; see below).
'Durotrigian' graves regularly contained a specific range of finds (Whimster 1981: 43, 181, 192; Wait 1985: 260; 1995: 496). Adults were commonly accompanied by ceramics (mainly Durotrigian ware: burnished reduced ware, commonly jar and bowl forms) and food offerings including joints of meat (pigs, sheep, ox, some horse and chicken), and very occasionally personal ornaments, such as regional brooches, and bracelets (Collis 1977: 9; Philpott 1991: 195-6; 106; Whimster 1981: 50). The latter may indicate the construction of identities by incorporating the creation of regional dress (see Joy 2009: 551), perhaps exhibiting Continental influence. Again, some graves contained mirrors and swords (Appendix, Table 2), which together with the incidence of cist and stone-lined graves may demonstrate Mediterranean cultural influence via Dumnonia (although see Whimster 1981: 43).

'Durotrigian' burials occur at major hillforts such as South Cadbury and Maiden Castle, where increasingly formalised ritual activity is also evident. The construction of shrines, usually at hillforts, became more common during the first century BC in Southern Britain (Fitzpatrick 1984: 182; see above; fig. 2.26). A late first century BC circular shrine (with an east facing entrance) was located near the summit of Maiden Castle hillfort (Wait 1985: 166, 172), with associated finds (dating first century BC – AD) including horse bones, harness fittings, iron weapons, brooches, coins, and infant burials (Piggott 1968: 58-9; Wait 1985: 166, 172, 389). Two rectilinear east-facing shrines, perhaps dating to second century BC and first century AD, were also placed on the summit at South Cadbury (Alcock 1973: 80, 163, 167). Similar ‘cella’ structures occur on the Continent (ibid. 95). These shrines are also comparable to contemporaneous ritual buildings in Southeastern England, and elsewhere in the Southwest, as at West Hill, Uley (Gloucestershire), suggesting cultural exchange between elites (Hill 1995b: 66; Wait 1985: 391). As was seen above, this seems to be confirmed by the evidence of burial rites.

John Creighton has proposed that some LPRIA shrines may represent mausolea or cult centres for the veneration of leading dynasties (Creighton 2004: 196), although the dearth of human remains within deposits perhaps makes the former unlikely. However, the preservation of a possible LPRIA or early Roman period timber shrine at Portesham (see Chapter 3, fig. 3.67) throughout the Roman period, which became the focus for ‘Durotrigian’ and later burials (Valentin n.d.: 24-5; see Chapter 3), may provide a candidate for a ‘dynastic’ shrine, in comparison with possible examples to the east (see ibid. 191).26

26 Deep occupation deposits (including much domestic ceramic and animal bone), and a small hearth, were associated with this feature (Valentin n.d.: 24). The suggestion by the excavator that this building may have had a ritual function was primarily on the grounds that ‘it would be extremely unusual for a domestic circular hut to be in use throughout the Roman period, as it is essentially an Iron Age tradition which continued into the early part of the Romano-British period, eventually being replaced by rectangular buildings as a result of increasing Romanisation’ (ibid. 24). However, a survey
The development of shrines, and a number of other ritual activities, was perhaps influenced by Continental practices. Some ritual enclosures in Britain resemble Continental examples: the enclosure at Winterborne Kingston (Dorset) contains a ritual shaft and has parallels with the site at Libenice (Kolin, Denmark), for example (Ross 1992: 85; Wait 1985: 56). Another possible LPRIA development is votive deposition at barrows, if the presence of Iron Age ceramics in association with these sites might be read as such (Appendix, Table 5; fig. 2.22), although more work is needed to clarify the date of this activity.

Though the development of shrines may suggest the existence of a priesthood (their size limiting ritual participation to a select few), there are few archaeological indicators to demonstrate the presence of individual ritual specialists. However, a possible (now lost) ritual ‘crown’ was found at Leckhampton, associated with a deposit of LPRIA religious bronzes (Green 1997: 60), and suggests Continental influence with the formalisation of priestly roles.27

of the Southwest region has demonstrated the occasional continuity of roundhouses (even within highly ‘Romanised’ areas), with no indication of ritual functions (see Chapter 3). The significance of the LPRIA Continental ceramic deposit (which is ritual in appearance – as acknowledged by Malcolm Lyne, the ceramics specialist for this site), and of the subsequent association of burials were, however, acknowledged within this interpretation (ibid. 30). The location of this site also supports such a role for the site, which further demonstrates that categories of ‘ritual’ and ‘domestic’ may not have been so easily differentiated in the past.

27 Although this find may alternatively date to the later Roman period (see Chapter 6), a parallel has been found in the Southeast, at Deal, Kent, dated to the later second century BC (Green 1997: 60; Ross 1995: 67, 69).
Divergent burial rites occur within the ‘Durotrigian’ region, including a small number of LPRIA cremations (Appendix, Table 3; fig. 2.23). At Ham Hill, a cremation within a flat grave was associated with a pit containing ‘Durotrigian’ pottery sherds (Whimster 1981: 35, 130). Although Irish influence is possible for the practice of cremation (see Chapter 3), the range of accompanying grave goods instead suggests the influence of Continental (Gaulish) practices (see Wells 1990: 456, 457).

On occasion, as at Handley Down, on the northern slope of Gussage Hill (Dorset), near an oppidum-type enclosure, cremations are covered by barrows - in this mid first century case, a round mound surrounded by a square-ditched enclosure (Whimster 1981: 34, 393).28 Several other barrow graves have been identified within the ‘Durotrigian’ region (Appendix, Table 4; fig. 2.23, above). A further possible LPRIA square enclosure-barrow is recognised at Winterborne Steepleton (ibid. 34, 393).29 Other possible LPRIA barrows are found at Crab Farm, Shapwick (Dorset) (with one square barrow, and one barrow containing crouched inhumations) near the LPRIA settlement and hillfort at Badbury Rings (Dorset).30 A small number of secondary burials within prehistoric barrows have also been suggested as belonging to the LPRIA (fig. 2.23; see Appendix Table 4).31

28 It is therefore uncertain whether this grave dates to before or after the Conquest (Whimster 1981: 34, 393): this region might not have been conquered until some time after the mid first century (see Chapter 3).
29 However, the embanked form of this grave differs from the example at Handley Down, and from Continental and Southeastern British barrows (Whimster 1981: 34, 393).
30 Mon. no. 209634 / NMR_NATINV 86832; EHNMR-1145333; NMR_NATINV 209568; NMR_NATINV 209634
31 However, more work is needed to clarify whether the ‘Iron Age’ artefacts deposited within earlier barrows are certainly of LPRIA date.
Barrow burial may again indicate outside influence, perhaps directly from the Continent, or via Southeast Britain, where ‘Aylesford-Swarling’ type burials were placed beneath small mounds or within square ditched enclosures (see Collis 1977; Hill 1995b: 80; Wait 1985: 121). The Irish practice of placing burials beneath mounds (which seems to end around the first century BC, see Chapter 4) provides a further possible source for this rite. However, although superficially similar in form to some Continental barrows (and to barrows of Southeast Britain), the Durotrigian barrows and enclosure graves perhaps occur several hundred years later than the Continental examples, making direct emulation unlikely, and there is little to support Irish influence within this region at this time. It is perhaps significant that many are associated with potential oppida (Hill 1995a: 122; see above; and with later, Roman, sites, see Chapter 3), with grave goods and practices emulating those witnessed within Gaul and the Mediterranean. Thus, the variability of these burial enclosures suggests the intermixing of regional and NE Gaulish traditions (Whimster 1981: 129, 141, 143; 193; Wells 1990: 456). Barrow burial is near contemporaneous with similar practices seen within Gaul, where Roman influence is evident (Dunning and Jessop 1936). Direct Mediterranean influence is also possible. Association of the possible LPRIA bowl barrow at Tyneham, Purbeck (near to Iron Age settlements) with Greek coins (see Appendix Table 4) arguably indicates direct Mediterranean influence upon this coastal community through trade. Other Mediterranean or Continental influences are evident in the accompaniment of burials with gaming pieces, swords, tools, and mirrors (see fig. 2.23; Appendix, Table 2). One possibility is that some barrows within Southwest Britain emulate tumuli found in Rome (Creighton 2004: 488; see Toynbee 1996; see below).

Votive activities are also noted at possible oppida, perhaps demonstrating the influence and creation of new cultural frameworks. Within the potential oppidum at Gussage Hill, votive deposits included both Durotrigian and imported pottery (including Gallo-Belgic and Arretine ware, and Italian amphorae) dating to the mid first century AD (Hill 1995a: 92; Wainwright and Spratling 1973: 112).

Although more work is needed to confirm the date of such activity, there are also possible cases of votive deposition at prehistoric barrows during the LPRIA (see Appendix Table 6; fig. 2.24), which may be related to the reuse of prehistoric barrows for burial - discussed above - by which the prehistoric monumental landscape was recreated to accommodate changing historical conditions. Within this process, the ancestral past was perhaps renegotiated within new mythological narratives.
There is no cohesive burial rite across the ‘Dobunnic’ region that might suggest the use of mortuary practices to mark widespread ethnic or cultural identities for the general populace. Nevertheless, common traits are evident in new rites that occur during the LPRIA. A group of cemeteries and isolated burials dating to the early first century AD has been recognised in Gloucestershire, concentrated along the Cotswold Ridge (see fig. 2.25), grave goods suggesting that some contained elite burials. Although cists occur (particularly within the Cotswolds and Avon), graves were mostly earth-dug. Most burials were of adults (or infrequently adolescents), with some possible family groups (Whimster 1981: 20-1). Burials were generally crouched, although extended at Birdlip and Hailes (perhaps representing Continental or Southeastern British influence), and orientation varied (ibid. Appendix, Table 7). Just under half of the new burial rites were accompanied (generally with ceramics), some with personal ornaments, such as beads (Whimster 1981: 20-4).
As in the Durotrigian territory, cremations occur (Appendix, Table 3; fig. 2.25), for example at Barnwood (Cunliffe 1991: 174), and within the hillfort ditches at Leckhampton (both Gloucestershire). At Leckhampton, a square-banked enclosure surrounding a round barrow was also found (Bird 1865: lxviii-lxix; Whimster 1981: 394; however, the LPRIA date is unconfirmed). Again, considering proximity to the Bristol Channel, Irish influence is possible (see Chapter 3), though other influences are more likely. Other probable LPRIA barrow and barrow-enclosure burials have been found within the region (see Appendix, Table 4, and fig. 2.25). Several limestone cists, covered by cairns, were excavated at the LPRIA – early Roman cemetery at Barrow Wake, Birdlip (Cunliffe 1991: 174-5, 509), which were possibly associated with a nearby LPRIA cluster of enclosures and roundhouses (Frere and Tomlin 1991: 275; Fitzpatrick 2007: 154). One east-aligned grave contained an extended inhumation accompanied by rich grave goods, including a mirror and jewellery, dating to the mid first century AD (Green 1949: 190). The placement of a vessel over the face of this rich burial may reflect Gallo-Mediterranean practices (Green 1949: 189; Appendix, Table 7), comparing with the LPRIA bucket containing cremated bones at St Margaret’s Mead (Marlborough, Wiltshire) (Collis 1977; Whimster 1981: 390). Another bucket that was perhaps associated with a burial has been found at Rodborough (Gloucestershire), which may have been an important enclosed site at this time (see Clark 1982: 213). Gallo-Mediterranean influence was perhaps transmitted via the Thames, and may again indicate the transformation of personal identities within new cultural frames of reference. Again, possible LPRIA activity at barrows is noted within this region, within the areas of oppidum-type sites (see above, fig. 2.24; Appendix, Table 6).

---

33 As elsewhere, there is evident local variation in the barrow-enclosure graves of this region (Whimster 1981: 34), with the adoption of inhumation rather than cremation in this case.
34 The possible find of a gold torc from the cemetery (dating to the first century AD) (Green 1949: 188-89; Wait 1985: 310), further suggests the elite associations of these graves.
Diverse burial practices are witnessed across the Southwest: alongside the votive burials recognised at many settlement across much of the region (though not in Dumnonia) (see Hill 1995a; Wait 1985), there were also ‘formal’ cemeteries (primarily containing inhumations). Two main regional rites are evident: within the Cornish Peninsula, and within South Dorset.

The development of ‘formal’ burial rites involving rich grave goods within the Peninsula may represent the negotiation of individual identity above that of the community. The common cliff-side location of cemeteries perhaps emphasised control over resources and their exchange networks (particularly tin) by the emergent elite, in the construction of regional identity. However, most graves containing high status goods date to well before the Conquest. By the Conquest period, there is no certain evidence for the construction of social hierarchies through burial rites (perhaps at least in part due to a decline in trade opportunities) within the Peninsular. There is little evidence for formal cemeteries in the Dumnonian region outside the Peninsula.

Burial rites within Southern Dorset have traditionally been seen as expressing ‘Durotrigian’ identity. Considering the presence of ‘Durotrigian’ burial practices at Maiden Castle, this group may be related in some way to this central site. Possibly the nebulous social networks noted across this geographical region via common material culture were here reinforced through ritual performance at the end of the Iron Age. However, bearing in mind the probable presence of competing groups within what is seen as the Durotrigian region, we cannot assume that this Southern group necessarily saw themselves as ‘Durotrigian’.
It is possible that such an identity was constructed by elites, but it seems more likely that the construction, or at least reification, of ‘Durotrigian’ elite identity was related to social control during or after Caesar’s invasions. In this case, the elite group(s) involved within relationship(s) with the Empire (whether willingly or not) may have attempted to define territories by appropriating and manipulating wider regional social networks. This process would have supported the creation of social hierarchies, and it is argued that status and authority were expressed through transformed Gallo-Mediterranean practices. The label ‘Durotriges’ is perhaps more likely to have been imposed upon those in contact with the Roman world (and perhaps later internalised), within a situation of territorial consolidation.

The ‘Durotrigian’ burial practice occurs at central sites, such as Maiden Castle and South Cadbury hillforts, which potentially links those using this rite with the development of shrines at several large hillforts during the LPRIA. These ritual foci are commonly located within border territories or at territorial centres (Hill 1995a: 66; Wait 1985: 173-76; fig. 2.26), facilitating inter-regional political alliances (Kolb 1996: 59). Ceremonies may have encouraged the coalition of previously disparate groups, enabling the formation of territories and consolidation of political power (Thomas 1997: 217). Repetitive ceremonial events at these sites would have maintained group identity by prompting and reinforcing the association of the group with that particular place (DeMarrais et al 1996a: 17, 18, 31). It is evident that sacred and secular elites often act within symbiotic relationships of power, interdependently perpetuating authority over non-elites. Control over activities at these sites by ritual specialists would moreover have encouraged the coalescence of elite groups and legitimised their power (ibid.; Chapa 1996: 50; DeMarrais et al 1996b: 68). Ethnographic studies demonstrate the control of ritual as a common strategy in the development of centralising polities (Chapa 1996: 50; DeMarrais et al. 1996a: 17-18, 31), and the development of priesthods by large centralised groups in the establishment of socio-political hierarchies is common (Wait 1985: 8, 10, 200-01).

Jane Webster has proposed that the priesthood – some of whom might correspond to the historically attested ‘Druids’ – constructed ‘Britishness’ in the development of inter-regional resistance to Roman control, and particularly, in opposition to the new, pro-Roman, elite that were developing in Southeast Britain (Webster 1999: 10; see Chapter 3). However, the Southeastern elite may in part owe their own successful development to their subsequent appropriation of ritual power from the ‘Druids’ (Creighton 1995: 297). Stigmatisation through institutional categorization by

35 This priesthood would most likely function in conjunction with other religious practitioners (as represented by the regular small depositions of animal remains at farmsteads, for example), fulfilling different, and perhaps more localised roles (Wait 1985: 8, 10, 153).
the State – initially within the Southeast, but perhaps elsewhere during the first century AD – may have ultimately led to Druidic decline (see Cohen 1993: 199-200; Webster 1999).

A contrast is seen in the practices of kinship groups located within East Dorset, perhaps centred upon such sites as Hod Hill, and within the Cotswolds, who seemingly manipulated Gallo-Mediterranean culture in the construction of new identities during the mid first centuries BC – AD. Members of the East Dorset group used alternative burial and ritual practices to those seen in Southern Dorset (and probably at associated central sites), perhaps to emphasise shared elite identity, in the legitimisation of power.

Several changes in mortuary performance occurred within these areas. Cremation is evident, and would have seemed a dramatic event, altering the sensory perceptions relating to bodily disposal, and thus cementing the process in collective memory, perhaps facilitating social cohesion and enabling social control (see Walker and Schiffer 2006: 75; Williams 2004: 419). The ceremony may have been visible over wide distances, thus communicating the inherent ‘propaganda’ of the event to a large population (DeMarrais et al. 1996a: 18-9). In this manner, cremations perhaps incorporated the public expression of new collective identities.

Practices perhaps related to this process (and to the construction of elite identities noted elsewhere within the Southwest) may have included the construction of barrows and enclosure-barrows, which may have been part of the renegotiation of regional rites within reactionary ‘alternative strategies’ to increasingly dominant identities (as represented by ‘Peninsular’ and ‘Durotrigian’ burial rites) in the contestation of power. The sudden construction of barrows often reflects social instability (Arnold 2001: 217), representing the restructuring and renegotiation of the landscape in the transformation of social conditions and cultural values (Barrett 1999: 257), and perhaps characterises the creation of alternative identities in the development of exclusionary strategies of power (see Blanton et al. 1996: 1). Barrow construction has also been seen as a mechanism for symbolising the presence of competing groups and lineages within the local landscape, and thus (in some circumstances) they had a role in the construction of ethnic identity during economic stress (see Hodder 1979: 450). Their material construction would have been a significant event, embedded within social memory as a cohesive collective experience, in which economic and ideological power were materialised in a discursive relationships between elites and non-elites (see DeMarrais et al. 1996a: 17, but see Hodder 1996: 58; Pollard 2001: 323). The prominent location of barrows may have led to their role as enduring ‘mnemonics’, institutionalising hereditary power and naturalising the status of the elite, and their interconnection with (and control over) the land and the community (see Arnold 2001: 213; Barrett 1999: 258; DeMarrais et al. 1996a: 18-20; Pollard 2001: 323). These sites
perhaps became locales through which elites might display their superior knowledge of landscape biographies, via myths that validated the authority of their own lineages (see Tilley 1994: 26-7, 32-3). However, the dating of these monuments is uncertain (and imprecise), due to their initial antiquarian investigation, and some may belong to a later – or indeed, much earlier – phase of activity.

LPRIA barrows and enclosure-barrows are found in Northeast Dorset. Their general distribution outside of the Southern Dorset burial group perhaps suggests the location of oppositional kinship groups, their construction an ‘alternative strategy’ to the dominant rites of this region (Hill 1995a: 122). However, considering subsequent developments (which indicate that this is the beginning of a long-term process, see Chapter 3), it is suggested that these practices were not only enacted in the creation of social hierarchy, but more closely related to the accommodation of new cultural forms within the recreation of elite society. Barrows may have engendered continuity and permanency, creating a tangible bond between dominant lineages and the land, naturalising the status of the descendents of the dead by appropriating the past.

John Creighton has suggested that after Caesar’s invasions, children of conquered elites may have been raised in Rome as hostages (the *obsides* of Classical texts), as a common mechanism to ensure co-operation, both facilitating and encouraging acculturation for themselves, and their families on their return home (2004: 85, 92). The superficial similarity between the ‘princely’ *tumuli* of Rome (see Toynbee 1996: 144) and the prehistoric barrows of the Southwest may thus have aided a process in which the significance of certain graves was reinvented within a Classical frame of reference. Narratives may have located the prehistoric barrow graves of ancestors in relation to the new regime (see Williams 1998c: 71), so that prehistoric ancestors might be brought within the sphere of Rome, and appropriated in legitimising the power of those who were now embedded within the Imperial superstructure through political domination. The prehistoric and new barrows possibly supported the authenticity of one another in a recursive relationship. Existing landscape features may have been ‘re-presenced’ - invested with new meanings to both enable inhabitation within changing social conditions, and to transform local frames of reference, in the creation of new networks of power (see Barrett 1999: 258-62). In this scenario, barrow graves would have created a conceptual link between the elite and autochthonous ‘ancestors’, who were integrated within a Classical cosmos to ‘make sense’ of the location of the nascent elite within this new order (see Parker Pearson 2003: 92). Mythologies, such as the *Aeneid*, may have been instrumental in this process, perhaps informing new perceptions of the afterlife. A relationship between barrows and

36 In this case, we might imagine the development of ‘bounded solidarity’, in which group cohesion “is an emergent product of a common fate”, with belonging ensuring benefits beyond those derived from kinship alliance - in particular prime positions within social hierarchies (Portes 1998: 7-8, 12-3). A similar situation is seen in modern China, where entrepreneurs described as ‘harbingers of modernity’ find ethnic unity above and beyond the clan group, demonstrating their affiliation through emphasis of modern capitalist symbols (Heberer 2005).
elite burial is seen as Aeneas is described in Book 6 as watching a funerary procession from the top of a barrow that may have been intended to reflect the Augustan tomb of Marcellus (Burke 1979: 225-26).

Secondary burials within prehistoric barrows may be part of the same process, although they seem to occur generally outside the distribution of primary barrow burials and cremations (though with some crossover activity). This either indicates a different function for these burials within the south of the region, or perhaps confirms the secondary nature of this activity, in the transformation of local identities in response to changing conditions. What they may confirm, however, is the role of the ancestors within this ongoing process of renegotiation and reinvention.

Whilst it might be argued that square burial enclosures may more likely emulate (earlier) Continental graves (and their earlier indigenous counterparts), it is proposed that burial (at least) within round barrows during the LPRIA was potentially related to the (re)creation of origin myths incorporating new ideologies imported from the Mediterranean. Appropriation of prehistoric burial mounds, alongside emulation of Mediterranean barrows, enabled the invention of ‘Mediterranean’ descent. The beginnings of this process might first be hinted at within the ethnographic content of Diodorus during the mid to late first century BC (5.21.2 and 5.21.5), who points to a similarity between the use of chariots by the British and the Greeks (Creighton 2004: 139). It seems to have been a common (even uniform) practice at this time across the West for elites (including ‘barbarians’) to appropriate Classical mythologies in the creation of origin myths (ibid. 135-37). To quote Creighton “it would be strange indeed if all other areas of the empire linked with classical myth, but Britain alone did not” (ibid. 139). The Classical use of the name ‘Albion’ for Britain may suggest attempts to link the Island with the Alban kings, descended from the Trojan Aeneas (ibid. 139), and contact between the Roman and British elites may have led to the internalisation of such belief.

In this way, sense was made of rapid cultural changes and political subservience (see Pohl 2006: 233). Social status (and self-esteem, see Freeman 2001) was validated through the creation of an ethnic discourse within which common culture and shared ancestry bound at least some of the elite. This enabled the elite gens to claim legitimacy in leading regional groups (see Pohl 2006: 234-35) in opposition to other regional groups. The occurrence of barrow burial within Classical literature, to which the elite may have become exposed in their contact with Gaul and the Mediterranean, possibly had further influence, and may have broadened practices to include other types of mound. It is further proposed that this process was incorporated within the construction of ‘British’ identity by the nascent elite, as external (Graeco-Roman) categorisations were internalised. The presence of similar behaviour within more than one region of the Southwest suggests the creation of a supra-regional elite identity in which selected elements of Gallo-Roman practices were
appropriated within the transformation of local traditions in order to distinguish themselves from others.\textsuperscript{37} In this way, we may compare the trajectory of change with the development of identity in colonised territories in the more recent past (Vail 1989a \textit{passim}).

As with a number of other new burial practices demonstrating Continental influence, barrow activity often took place close to \textit{oppida} or \textit{oppidum}-type sites, possibly indicating their introduction of this process via the same socio-cultural mechanisms, and perhaps by the same groups who established these enclosures. The concentration of barrow burial and cremations within East Dorset, and in the Cotswold region, perhaps further suggests their introduction via the cross-Channel trade route from Gaul, and possibly indicates a relationship between control of this trade by particular kinship groups or individuals, and appropriation of Gallo-Roman mechanisms of negotiating social hierarchy and identities. However, not all those who appropriated and transformed Gallo-Mediterranean culture did so within the same ideological framework. Many may have attempted to create social hierarchies through access to this exotic culture (which is perhaps seen in the Ilchester region, for instance, where a possible \textit{oppida} is located, and Gallo-Mediterranean finds are present at an early date, but where established burial practices continue). Some perhaps reconstructed established social identities by amalgamating this style with indigenous styles, and others created new cultural identities through its appropriation.

It appears that ultimately, any such attempts by ‘Durotrigian’ elites to construct a strong regional identity were unsuccessful (see Chapter 3), possibly due to the coexistence of two or more contesting groups within this region preventing the complete control of resources and social networks. The apparent presence of a powerful priest class may have also hindered such a development. Therefore, although it is possible that social networks were created through regional ceramic styles within both Dumnonian and Durotrigian areas, limited centralised power by the LPRIA (largely due to transferral of the trade route to the Channel, and subsequently Thames) may have prevented the reification of regional identity at this stage.

The Dobunnic elite were more successful in maintaining their cultural integrity and power, probably due to their ability to centralise at an early date (perhaps due to lack of competition at this time). There are no indications that cohesive burial or ritual practices were used to emphasise widespread ethnic or regional identity within this region. However, during the LPRIA and after the Conquest, sporadic cemeteries, with burial rites demonstrating Gallo-Mediterranean influence, were

\textsuperscript{37} Although it is rightly asserted that generalisations should be avoided regarding barrow use (Williams 1998c: 76), it is nevertheless proposed that these practices should be seen as part of the process described above, by which ancestry became significant in the construction of regional and elite identities.
concentrated in North Gloucestershire, North Somerset, and Avon. Although grave goods were generally uncommon, these formal burials were sometimes accompanied by wealthy finds.

At the centre of the ‘tribal’ region, and at the second highest point within the region (Darvill 2003: 9; see fig. 2.2, above), the Birdlip cairns (facing the Vale of Gloucester on the edge of a plateau between two promontories, see fig. 2.27) may have been visible for some distance (the more so for their construction in limestone). Such visibility potentially communicated power to an extensive populace, promulgating the acquisition of an extensive landscape (DeMarrais et al. 1996a: 18-9). Bearing in mind the possible use of certain burial rites to demarcate territorial boundaries or centres, and the close relationship between political organisation and elite identities, relationships with Gaul and the Mediterranean may have encouraged the reification of amorphous regional social networks into regional identity by the incipient elite within this and the East Dorset region. It has been suggested that these graves, extended burial, and in general the demonstration of personal wealth through the deposition of these grave goods, perhaps spread westwards from Trinovantes or Catuvellauni territories (Whimster 1981: 25). The Upper Thames may have acted as a cultural conduit as much as a trade route, although as we have seen, influence from Central Southern Britain is also probable. As in ‘Durotrigia’, such ‘reactionary’ burials may represent the adoption of ritual from groups seen as more successful (Hill 1995a: 116).

Possibly non-funerary ritual at barrows during the LPRIA may have been part of the same ‘reactionary’ process. The dating of activity at barrows is problematic, as antiquarian records are usually brief, and no systematic study of possible LPRIA secondary finds in association with earlier prehistoric monuments has been undertaken. Nevertheless, the possible votive deposition of

38 A further possible (but far from certain) LPRIA cist cairn burial was discovered on the postulated border of the northern sector of Dobunnic territory at Charlcombe, near Bath (Whimster 1981: 226).
objects at sites seen as portals to the Otherworld suggests that, in some cases, ritual practice became ‘incorporative’, appropriating enduring symbols within an exclusive ritual (Rowlands 1993: 142). These acts were again both in response to, and influenced, systemic rupture, and provided opportunity for the creation and contestation of alternative worldviews, in an attempt to assert status in the creation of new elite identities.

The ritual activity of competing elites may also be seen at potential oppida sites within the Southwest, such as Gussage, again indicating the significance of ritual in the construction and expression of regional identities. The deposition of a select range of votives may represent the (re)construction of regional identities through the development and control of established social networks, and perhaps in some cases demonstrates changing cultural and social identities. In all cases, such actions affirmed wider cultural contacts. The incorporation of imports within ritual practice may represent the adoption of new symbolic centres. Their origin from what may have been perceived as a Mediterranean cosmological centre possibly imbued these objects with sacred power (see Creighton 2004: 80, 127, 134-35, 137-43; Helms 1993). Secular ritual such as feasting and the redistribution of these goods would also have supported bids for power, consolidating links of fictive kinship (Bentley 1987: 42). The control of manufacture and distribution of symbolic objects may have enabled the integration of these ‘us’ and ‘them’ differences within strategies of power (see Cohen 1978: 386; Hingley 1984: 80, 82). The range of ritual deposits in general compares with the grave goods accompanying barrow burials within the Eastern Dorset region.


Archaeological evidence suggests that regional social networks developed from the Middle Iron Age onwards (see Hill 1995b: 87-8), negotiated through the exchange of symbolic artefacts, and the creation of sites emblematic of these social relationships. The maintenance and construction of hillforts, for example, would have required organisation of labour beyond the local community, perhaps itself encouraging (or, perhaps more likely, encouraged by) the construction of collective identities (Moore 2007: 93). Attendance of communal ceremonies at these focal sites – particularly rites of passage - may have further encouraged the reproduction of such identities, providing ‘check-points’ at which they might be affirmed, and opportunities for witnessing the tangibility of such collectives (see above; Jenkins 2004: 151, 132, 152). Such rites symbolise community, and

39 The ‘Dobunnic’ elite may have also adopted ‘Roman’ culture to enhance their standing in the face of imperial domination (see Brass 1996: 89, see Chapter 3). However, this does not negate the role of ethnicity within these processes (see Williams 1989: 421).
may thus have provided a resource within strategies of power for those claiming to act on behalf of that community in the construction of ethnic identities (ibid. 112). The location of shrines in possible border areas – evident during the beginning of the LPRIA within the ‘central southern’ zone - is characteristic of the process in which territories are ‘mapped’ by being ‘dramatis[ed] ritually’ - becoming more important with the consolidation of territories (ibid. 129, 163, 114; 162). These buildings were also the ‘public presence’ of ‘hierarchical networks of authority and power’ (ibid.). However, whilst internal influences are evident, dramatic transformations in social structure and identities are witnessed across the region in the century between the Conquests of Caesar and Claudius, and are more likely to be related to external forces. It is further proposed that such changes affected the reworking of certain established cultural elements within the construction of new identities.

Many hillforts were abandoned during the LPRIA; those with continued activity experienced changes of use (often of a religious, but sometimes of an industrial nature), with minimal evidence for high status occupation. High status settlements seemingly developed within the vicinity of these central sites. Their proximity to possible ritual centres may not only reflect attempts to draw upon the ideological power of these sites (see DeMarrais et al. 1996a), but also to manipulate regional or local identity and political power. This reorganisation of the landscape within the Southwest demonstrated by topographical studies was perhaps in response to the transformation of social hierarchies (Creighton 2004: 16-7, 19), and may be related to the finding of new ways of demonstrating individual status through innovative settlement forms. Transformation in social structure was perhaps encouraged by the establishment of alternative mechanisms of social control, with trade with the Roman world possibly playing a part in this change.

This is possibly the role for the oppida – vast tracts of land were often seemingly appropriated in the construction of local and regional centres, frequently associated with riverine routes. Control of land, which perhaps in turn led to control over local populations, is possibly seen through construction of this type of site (Hingley 1984: 80, 82), which materialised both the power (and perhaps the ethnic identity) of a dominant nascent elite (and probable kinship) group (see DeMarrais et al. 1996a: 18). Anthropological study demonstrates that communities able to organise exploitation of land have the capacity to become ‘political units’ (Hingley 1984: 76). This behaviour may therefore indicate the evolution of competing factions, employing militaristic strategies to secure or augment this power, a hypothesis supported by the increased symbolised presence of ‘warrior’ elites. Such control held the potential to signify regional identity - to neighbouring polities as much as to the local populace. Identity boundaries appear to be most intensely affirmed within this northern area against the neighbouring ‘Catuvellauni’ (see fig. 2.1).
Although little excavation has been undertaken, it is suspected that most enclosed settlements across the Southwest followed a similar pattern, with ancillary structures, storage facilities, and open workspaces supporting the main residential units: ethnographic parallels suggest that these units would have been representative of patrilinear and patrilocal kinship (Hingley and Miles 1984: 63). LPRIA developments include the clustering of small, enclosed sites, which may parallel Continental elite settlement patterns (Wells 1990: 457). These agglomerations potentially reflect settlement in kinship or other community groups, with the creation of smaller social units within these groups indicating attempts to differentiate family units. Nevertheless, they may also demonstrate ‘formal order and deliberate planning’ (Hingley and Miles 1984: 62), possibly by a centralised elite.

Production had perhaps been organised through kinship ties for much of the Iron Age (Hingley 1984: 76), though changes in settlement layout may indicate changes during the later Iron Age. The linear arrangement of huts, for instance, may reflect the expression of individualism, as might separate enclosure of individual buildings (Hingley and Miles 1984: 63). The placement of buildings around a central compound would have created a communal space through which communal identities might more easily be constructed through bodily movement and shared practices. Linear arrangements may have proscribed these developments, encouraging the creation of separate family space and identity. The enclosure of single household units may also indicate the rise of individual (or at least family) identity (Hingley 1984: 85; see Hill 1995a, 1995b). These changes, comparable within other contexts (see below), arguably represent the transformation of social systems, reflecting the creation of independent units of production and the definition of new social relationships. However, the integration of agricultural communities has also been noted (Hill 1995b: 84; Hingley 1984: 78, 84). Enclosure was thus also perhaps a product of expansion into hitherto marginal areas, requiring the renegotiation or establishment of social ties (defining those ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ the kinship group), and may indicate the rise of real or perceived threats (Woolf 1993: 232).

Whilst this behaviour reflects long-term internal change, the political and economic developments accompanying imperial expansion may have had a direct impact upon these identities, for it is in just these circumstances of expansionist power that local identities tend to assert themselves in ‘defensive reaction’ (Jenkins 2008: 43).

We may see the late first century BC as the period of territory formation in the Southwest. This is likely to be - at least in part - in response to the definition of Southeastern polities, a number of which perhaps indicated a desire to become integrated within the Roman world after Caesar’s effective Conquest of the region (see Creighton 2004: 64, 217). However, these cultural
transformations perhaps more often represent strategies to accommodate changing relationships, necessitating the incorporation of new symbols of power, and the creation of shared histories. The changes witnessed arguably denote an “epistemological break”, giving rise to, and arising from, power struggles in which opposing regimes collided, leading to social instability (Bentley 1987: 44; Foucault 1977). Rapid cultural and economic changes led to crises in leadership, and consequently, identity, prompting the consolidation of polities and ethnic groups (Bentley 1987: 43, 45), which may explain the emergence of distinct ritual and burial practices, and distinct material culture, during and after the mid first century BC. This provided opportunities for a new generation to usurp leadership through the political mobilization of ethnic groups, adapting to the evident political and economic transformations (ibid. 43-44). Elites often form ‘ethnic communities’ at times of social upheaval, during periods of conflict and competition for ‘political power, economic benefits, and social stratification...between leadership groups’ (Brass 1996: 89). Considering the transformation of groups to the South and East after Caesar’s ‘Conquest’ in the mid 50s BC, we may imagine just such a situation (Creighton 2004: 64, 217; see Cohen 1978: 400). After this event, it might be envisaged that territories under the auspices of the Roman State underwent construction and external ethnic categorisation in the consolidation of power – essentially implementing a ‘divide-and-rule’ colonial policy (see Reece and Moore 2001; Shennan 1989: 11).

Far from the established picture of contiguous LPRIA ‘tribal’ units passively defined by an integral range of ceramic and numismatic evidence, it seems that material culture was actively used to emphasise social ties across a defined territory within a restricted sector of the supposed ‘tribal’ zones. Moreover, although the negotiation of social networks might be witnessed at an early date, this is not the same as indicating the construction of continuous and unchanging regional identities. The supposed markers of regional identity often thought to represent a continuous thread of ‘tribal’ identity from the Middle Iron Age into the Roman period (and beyond) are clearly reworked in the LPRIA, within new cultural frames of reference. The construction of regional identities is a probable response to the socio-political transformations witnessed in polities to the Southeast, and it may plausibly be argued that the construction and expression of ethnicity is part of the process of socio-political identity and territorial consolidation. These identities were perhaps largely imposed from above: in other words, we are seeing kings creating ‘peoples’, rather than the reverse (James 1999: 78; 93). By creating ‘peoples’, the leaders of polities had at hand a human resource that might be called upon to further support that power-base, whether in military expansion or defence, or in the construction of central sites.
If we consider each ‘region’ in turn, the most certain contemporaneous evidence for external categorisation (by ‘Roman’ elites) is in the ‘Dobunnic’ region, where it might be reasonably construed that the construction of ethnic identity was influenced by externally imposed categorisation. The regional development of trading links with Northern Gaul and the Mediterranean, perhaps via Southeast Britain, and inter-regional social networks, enabled and influenced this process.

It is certainly unlikely that the Dobunni existed as a bounded, static, ‘tribe’ from the Middle Iron Age - as is often supposed (cf. Reece and Moore 2001; Moore 2007). The legitimisation and emphasis of elite power and consolidation of political territory in the LPRIA possibly led to the (re)creation and ‘institutionalisation’ of established social networks that did not hitherto represent a unified group (see Arnold 2001: 213; see Cohen, R 1978: 385-86). This strategy may have been presented by the incipient elite as necessary for creating political alliances against conflict (see Blanton et al. 1996: 59), bearing in mind the unstable political conditions. Indeed, the construction or consolidation of such regional networks was perhaps necessary, considering the transformations of neighbouring polities in the light of imperial intervention (see Shennan 1989: 9).

Developments in the material record perhaps reveal the link between political and cultural construction, with coinage in particular demonstrating the development of a powerful dynasty utilising new ways of expressing authority and unification. This correlates with the development of new enclosure types - and might be supported by the possible presence of a mint at Bagendon, and new burial and ritual practices, which it has been argued above indicates the construction of new identities by particular dynastic groups. In constructing regional identity, the elite incorporated existing social networks by controlling production of regional goods, introducing new materials and forms signifying and constructing cultural change. Bagendon had the capacity to function as a periodical meeting place, providing opportunities for the affirmation of collective identity, and enabling cohesion even for seemingly fragmented communities (Millett 1990: 25-6). To outsiders it may have represented the public face of the ‘Dobunni’ (Jenkins 2004: 162).

A separate coin group is recognised around Salisbury Plain, seen as sub-Dobunnic due to the stylistic similarities with, but variations from, the main Dobunnic coin series. This distribution corresponds to an area of new burial and ritual practices, which may confirm the presence of an identity group, although it is uncertain whether this group should be associated with the ‘Dobunnic’ dynasty. It is perhaps significant that both this region, and the Cotswold ridge area, incorporate barrow burials and possible votives, which it was proposed above may in some cases represent the construction of elite (perhaps ‘British’) identity, by manipulating ancestral identities – perhaps to accommodate supposed ‘Mediterranean’ origins.
Dobunnic identity was defined in relation to ‘Others’ within ‘Dobunnic’ and neighbouring territories, and to the Roman world, constructed in the contestation of territory and through interaction with other elites (see Jenkins 2004: 22), although there was an increasing significance of shared ideologies based within the wider cultural context, and increased political centralisation. The production of both coinage and ceramics may have been employed within ideological strategies of power by the nascent elite. But the centralised control and acquisition of Gallo-Roman imports, ‘Dobunnic’ wheel-made pottery and coinage may have been most significant in the construction of “imagined communities”, that is, in the construction of both regional, and shared elite, identities (see Brady and Kaplan 2000: 13; Jenkins 2004: 116; Moreland 1998: 5). Ritual and burial practices were likewise manipulated in the construction of elite ethnicity, incorporating the development of new ideologies (Arnold 2001: 215; see Walker and Schiffer 2006). Ethnicity may have legitimised authority, which in turn was legitimised by continued exclusive control of and access to these and other resources (see Jenkins 2004: 162).

It might be surmised that those under the control (or who were clients) of the elite ethnic group would have been categorised as ‘Dobunni’ by the Roman State, considering that there is only mention of their nominal identity within the texts at or after the Claudian Conquest. Nevertheless, external categorisations, however erroneous, are typically based upon existing perceptions, i.e. frequently have an element of ‘truth’ to them, notwithstanding that the ‘colonial administration told them (who) they were’ (Cohen 1978: 383; see Hingley 1984: 84; Williams 1989: 421). In due course, this identity gained meaning as the appellation ‘Dobunni’ came to embody certain consequences – such as improved trade relations, enabling access to cosmologically significant (i.e. imported) culture (with its status-enhancing effects) - and supported alliance with adjacent like-minded polities, facilitating the preservation of territorial integrity (see Jenkins 2004: 77). Legitimisation through both indigenous ritual and external (imperial) authority further enhanced the significance of this identity (see ibid. 77, 99). Whilst the Dobunnic elite may have derived many of its symbols from the Roman world, the meaning of this identity was very specific to that locale, and to that time, incorporating locally embedded cultural attributes – ‘traditions’ – within a particular “symbolic universe” (see ibid. 77, 136).

As with the Dobunni, there is no distinct regional rite witnessed across what became the Durotrigian civitas that might indicate the widespread expression of regional identity. Instead, it is proposed that the distinct regional burial rite recognised in the coastal region and around Dorchester need not

---

40 See Williams (1989: 412) ‘The boundaries that mark identity distinction also mark ownership of cultural products and the symbolic significance they have in civil society.’

41 The name ‘Dobunni’ is of unknown derivation, although it may be of a religious nature, with a possible parallel to the divine name *Alanto-duñi* (Rivet and Smith 1979: 340).
represent those that saw themselves as ‘Durotriges’, but rather one of several competing groups within the region.\textsuperscript{42} Distinctly ‘Roman’ features are generally absent from these graves, whereas influence from the neighbouring \textit{Dumnoii}, and perhaps to a certain extent from the Channel Isles, may be demonstrated. This South Coast group were possibly linked to the ritual elite practicing at what are commonly seen as core Durotrigian sites, such as Maiden Castle, who may have been involved in constructing regional identities, or at least in facilitating the consolidation of established socio-economic networks through ritual events at these central sites. The development of a prominent lineage associated with a possible regional shrine at Portesham might be postulated. It is argued that inter-regional contacts encouraged the emphasis of a strong regional identity, in opposition to the “core” polities of Southeast Britain (Hill 1995b: 87-8).

It is proposed that group(s) acting in competition to this developing power may be recognised in East Dorset. This behaviour was arguably related to expansionist strategies of the South coast elite, in reaction to the consolidation of established social networks by the religious elite within this region (if they are indeed not one and the same), or in response to the consolidation of territories to the East. The incorporation of groups resulting in the loss of their separate identities may provoke ‘countermovements to revive and revere cultural distinctiveness being lost’, particularly if ‘…stimulated by inequalities’ (Cohen 1978: 394). Whereas within the ‘tribal heartlands…ancestors and traditional authority opposed radical changes and or contested areas between tribal groups’, the marginality of these groups or individuals enabled the development of hierarchies and ‘formation of new social orders’ (Parker Pearson 2003: 127). Thus, attempts were made by some ‘Durotrigian’ elites to counteract established social networks by associating with the ‘new world order’ through appropriating ‘Roman’ symbols of power, in a similar manner to the ‘Dobunnic’ elite (and elites of Southeast Britain). However, it is suggested that due to competing regional group(s) within this region, this process was generally unsuccessful.

Local appropriations of Gallo-Mediterranean practices were incorporated within the construction of these new regional elite identities. Gallo-Mediterranean style barrow and enclosure-barrow burials, and cremations, arguably represent a rejection of the established order - an \textit{oppidum} was also built within this area. It has been argued that these sites represent a ‘deliberate act [of] breaking with the traditions of the past’ (Cunliffe 1994: 82). In addition, non-funerary ritual may have been significant within this process. We find the deposition of ‘… a range of decorated metalwork…in a context of local differentiation’ (Hill 1995b: 87-8). These groups, lineages, or individuals and their dependants seemingly appropriated material culture that symbolised

\textsuperscript{42} Socio-political organization of this territory has been interpreted as a ‘close-knit confederacy of smaller units’ (Cunliffe 1991: 159). However, on balance, the extent to which these ‘units’ were unified is to be questioned.
‘modernity’ and affiliation with the Roman world, in opposition to the ‘traditional’ culture created and naturalised in the Southern ‘Durotrigian’ region.

The possible centralisation of ceramic and coinage production may suggest the manipulation of this process by (a) dominant lineage(s), which may correspond to either the Northeast Dorset group(s) or the South Coast group (though another independent manufacturer is possible). ‘Durotrigian’ ceramic production was focused in the area of Purbeck. The transformation of regional ceramics by the introduction of wheel finishing may have further embedded the power involved in production control, and possibly provides an index of the way in which Gallo-Mediterranean practices were adopted in the creation of new identities, also seen in the burial, ritual, and settlement evidence. Coinage is manufactured within this zone, on the margins of the postulated ‘Durotrigian’ territory at Hengistbury Head. Adoption of boat, and possibly packhorse, imagery may indicate the emphasis of control over exchange networks (supported by association of these groups with the main route into the Britain at this time, the Avon).

However, although trade with Northwest France may be ‘considered to be a formative influence in the changing ceramic technologies of the Atrebates, Durotriges, and Western Dumnonii’ (Cunliffe 1982: 51) - considering the introduction of wheel-finished pottery - regional forms of this pottery continued to be manufactured until the Conquest period (Hill 1995b: 87-8). Thus, certain elements of Continental culture were appropriated, but were transformed and absorbed within regional culture. Coinage exhibits similar processes: the idea of coinage was appropriated in the development of patron-client relationships, although the direct emulation of ‘Roman’ style was limited within this region, demonstrating regional distinctiveness.

A further coin group (just outside the region of study, perhaps centred on the Isle of Wight) does more directly appropriate ‘Roman’ style, and may suggest the location of an additional competitive faction or ‘community of interest’ (see Jenkins 2004: 139, 115) – perhaps consisting of a group of ‘entrepreneur’ traders. Again, external trading links with Gaul may have been significant in the construction of identity, and certain aspects of the identity were perhaps externally conceived and subsequently internalised. In both cases, particular lineage groups may have used ethnic identity in the establishment and maintenance of power (Cohen 1978: 392).

It might be expected that the relative isolation of the Peninsula would lead to cultural differences to those of adjacent territories, considering that interaction with ‘Others’ often results in the differentiation of ethnic or regional identities in such circumstances (Cohen 1978: 395). However, as it has been seen, we must be cautious in assigning such an interpretation to the evidence. Furthermore, maritime communication surely played a major role for many communities of this region.
Material culture west of the Tamar, in the form of discrete ceramic groups, may reflect enduring socio-economic relationships within the region, although if a strong regional identity is seen, this is confined to a smaller region than that which is later labelled as ‘Dumnonian’, in the creation of the civitas. Bearing in mind the relatively small number of peninsular rite burials, it might be surmised that this practice was restricted to a small, probably elite, element of the population. Nevertheless, the potential exists that a ‘regional consciousness’ was created out of social networks, expressed through common culture, and that such sentiments might be mobilised as regional identity at times of stress. Cultural distinctiveness again (in common with the Southern Dorset group) incorporates Armorican styles and practices.

By the LPRIA, the evidence for the maintenance of strong social hierarchies is minimal (Pearce 1981: 106): there is less evidence for wealth in this region during the first centuries BC and AD, than during the third and second centuries BC. Large centralised sites decline, although (as elsewhere) continued activity is evident at certain cliff-side sites. As with the hillforts of the Dobunnic and Durotrigian regions, these sites had the potential to embody regional or local identities, considering their capacity to hold large gatherings. Coalitions of the numerous local kinship groups may have encouraged the emphasis on regional identity at these times, if no other. As elsewhere in the Southwest, elites may have occupied nearby enclosed sites in the form of some hill-slope sites and larger rounds, representing new ways of expressing power. Thus, localised forms of power (possibly related to the control of local resources – perhaps predominantly minerals, see Millett 1990: 16), may have been in operation, with minimal Gallo-Mediterranean contact limiting external categorisations that might otherwise encourage the construction of both ethnic and regional identities.

That there is no indication of permanent centralised leadership at this time suggests a situation of social fragmentation (ibid. 28). As access to territory is primarily determined by the kinship group in societies with no ‘strong’ elite (Hingley 1984: 76), this might account for the numerous ‘rounds’ established within the ‘Dumnonian’ landscape during the LPRIA, each signifying units of land under the tenure of different kinship groups.

Across the Southwest, there is no real indication of any widespread ‘notion of ethnic Britishness’ before the Roman Conquest (cf. Matthews, K J 1999) – there is no cohesive burial rite, or any other definite cultural marker. However, whilst this identity was unrecognised for the vast majority, some indigenous elites in contact with Gallo-Roman elite society may have been encouraged in the construction of this ethnic identity, through the internalisation of external categorisations. It is further proposed that this identity was related to concepts of autochthonism, developed in relation to external domination: Caesar makes clear that the British were aware of ‘themselves as indigenous’
(James 1999: 93, 38). Such a self-definition is unsurprising considering the evident cross-Channel contacts of the Southern and Eastern British groups. Furthermore, it is argued that Rome’s (apparent) support of certain Southern British leaders in their expansion into the political territories of their neighbours (particularly those with anti-Roman factions) in the later years of the first century BC may have done little to foster pro-Roman sympathies (see below; Darvill 1987: 161; James 1999: 78, 97). However, a British identity based upon claimed ‘cousin-ship’ with Romans may have enabled elites not only legitimise local and regional power, but also accommodate the significant socio-economic and political changes that occurred after Caesar’s conquests. These attacks possibly had a major impact upon their daily lives and sense of security, if (as Creighton argues – see 2004) hostages were taken from their close kinship groups within Southern Britain.

Whilst inter-regional interaction is evident (which, as seen above, may have encouraged the salience of regional identities – probably ‘…invoked in diverse situations’ (Hogg et al. 1995: 257) - unification was limited. Although we may possibly see cultural integration through the adoption of ‘new ideologies’ by certain groups in the south and east (perhaps including the Dobunni), there is no evidence of cultural amalgamation against the (Gallo-)Roman ‘Other’ with whom these groups were now involved. ‘Feelings of common opposition’ remained un-roused (James 1999: 42, 93; Matthews, K J 1999; though see Darvill 1987: 161) – which is again perhaps unsurprising if Creighton’s hypothesis is correct.

In sum, Gallo-Mediterranean material culture was appropriated and transformed according to local agendas, that in some cases enabled the creation of a sense of ontological security, and others facilitated the construction of strategies of power. Some regional elites accommodated this culture within ‘traditional’ regional identities, whilst other ‘reactionary’ elites manipulated this culture within the creation of new structures of control. This may have involved incorporating the construction of ‘British’ identity for some elites (creating mythologies that accommodated the ancestors in association with the new regime), as external categorisations provided a basis for superior status.43 This enabled the reformation and accumulation of cultural and social capital – thus restructuring notions of identity and power (see Bourdieu 1986: 241). Such a process was perhaps particularly effective after local authority was compromised through Roman control.44

The availability of new forms of material culture provided opportunity for the creation of social capital through negotiation and appropriation of cultural symbols, in response to (and further

---

43 “The establishment of frontiers along the of coast of northern France, Belgium and along the Rhine after Caesar conquered Gaul placed Britain at the periphery of the Roman world – a position she was to hold for centuries” (Darvill 1987: 162).

44 Social capital is defined as “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition.” (Bourdieu 1986: 248). Also as “a resource that actors derive from specific social structures and then use to pursue their interests; it is created by changes in the relationship among actors.” (WE Baker, in Portes 1998: 6).
facilitating) the imposition of alternative social structures (see Coleman 1988). In some cases, this was perhaps to counteract exclusion from established social networks (and their associated resources), due to peripheral location.

The developments of these regional identities, and of ‘Britishness’ during the Roman period will be discussed, in an appraisal of the archaeological evidence of Southwest Britain, within Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 3 ROMAN SOUTHWEST BRITAIN

Changing identities: first – third centuries AD

INTRODUCTION

It was argued in the previous chapter that Caesar’s Conquest of Southeastern (and possibly other) elites prompted the construction of new cultural identities, alongside the consolidation of existing regional identities, in the Southwest. The subsequent Claudian Conquest would have continued to provoke the renegotiation of identities. This chapter will analyse the regional archaeological evidence in an attempt to chart these transformations in social identities. Section 1 begins with an overview of the Claudian invasions, focusing upon the Conquest of the Southwest, and considers the subsequent socio-political organisation of the Province. Section 2 examines the regional archaeology, beginning with an appraisal of finds, followed by an analysis of settlement, and burial and ritual contexts across the Southwest. The final section summarises and discusses the range of evidence, region by region, to consider the significance of cultural changes and changing behaviour, in relation to changing identities. A discussion of late Roman and early post-Roman transformations follows in Chapters 4-7.

SECTION 1: MILITARY CONTROL AND POLITICAL ORGANISATION

INVASION AND CONQUEST

The protection of allies, and concerns that indigenous groups might unify, provided the pretext for Claudius’ invasion of AD 43 (Todd 1981: 35). However, there is little to suggest that the confederacy established during the Caesarian invasions had lasted any time. Responses to the subsequent presence of Claudius’ troops would have been variable and dependent upon the inclination of the local leadership, upon resources, and upon the behaviour of the Roman military. The number of Roman troops stationed within Britain was insufficient to rely upon the enforcement of military rule, making it likely that deployment was reserved for actively resistant areas (ibid. 64, 65, 68). Within the Southwest, in general, most early Roman military forts were located away from the LPRIA oppidum-type enclosures (Appendix, Table 8; fig. 3.1), some of which, it was proposed above, may have been under the control of local elites already under Roman domination.
According to Dio, the commander Aulus Plautius received the immediate surrender of one (perhaps the Northern) sector of the Dobunni on landing (Todd 1981: 68, 70; Webster 1978: 52; see Chapter 2). It is supposed that the subsequent surrender of the remaining Dobunni soon followed (Todd 1981: 71). Dio Cassius (LX, 20) mentions the establishment of a Dobunnic outpost immediately after the invasion – arguably the Durocornovio of the Itineraries, possibly the auxiliary fort at Wanborough (Griffiths 2001: 44).

The Roman army had perhaps moved along the Stour or Avon valley to occupy Wiltshire by AD 45, the dearth of Conquest-period forts from this county suggesting limited resistance (ibid. 39, 42, 44-5), which would be understandable if those already under Roman political domination were located in these areas (see Chapter 2). On the other hand, there is no certainty that any remaining (Southern) ‘Dobunni’ were quick to surrender: indeed, the military presence here may therefore indicate resistance in this region.

The early military occupation of this Southern ‘Dobunnic’ area may have been related to control of mineral resources (see Mattingly 2006, fig. 10). The settlement at Charterhouse-on-Mendip (North Somerset) was associated with lead mining, which may have been transferred to civilian control after the withdrawal of Legio II in AD 60 (Whittick 1982: 117ff). Whilst there was possibly

---

45 In the late 40s AD, according to Tacitus (Annales xii.33), the governor Ostorius Scapula led an attack on the Silures (South Wales), for harbouring the fugitive rebel Caratacus. This path appears to indicate that Siluria was the destination of the troops.

46 The site possibly corresponds to Iscalis (Rivet and Smith 1979).
initial opposition to the Roman military presence, this transfer of resource control conceivably led to enhanced wealth and power for some, with accompanying agricultural intensification and local growth. The evidence suggests that some appropriated the material culture of the dominant force, arguably in an attempt to project a comparable image of status and authority over the local community. This affiliation with the ‘Roman’ socio-political system may have radically transformed some social identities, and consolidated others.

Vespasian may have first entered what became Durotrigia through Cranborne Chase (Griffiths 2001: 41), although movement along the Avon, and particularly Stour, is also likely, considering the location of hillforts attacked and settled during the 40s and 50s within this region (cf. Branigan 1980: 30). It has been suggested that the twenty-plus captured oppida noted in the early Roman texts were Durotrigian hillforts (Griffiths 2001: 41), and evidence of early Roman military activity has been found at several hillforts in the area (see Appendix, Table 8), including Hod Hill (see fig. 3.2). Competition from religious authority and between contesting kinship groups within this region may have worked against unification in opposition to Roman forces.

Figure 3.2 Roman military occupation of Hod Hill (from Millett 1990, fig.15)

47 Somerset HER 23021, 23201, 15827, 15828, 15830; 23024.
Although the presence of ‘war cemeteries’ resulting from local responses to the Conquest have been proposed for several regional sites, closer examination of the remains often makes it doubtful that these sites do in fact represent Conquest-period resistance (see Fitzpatrick 2007: 159; but see Barrett et al. 2000). Roman forts were also sometimes placed close by other types of LPRIA enclosed (and potentially elite) settlement, such Crab Farm, Shapwick (Dorset), which was also nearby LPRIA barrows, Spetisbury hillfort, and Badbury Rings fort (see Corney 2001: 22; fig. 3.3).

48 Massacres at the hands of the Roman military supposedly occurred at South Cadbury, Ham Hill, Hod Hill, and Maiden Castle (Alcock 1973; Cunliffe 1988; Guibert 1981; Harding 1976; Hill and Jesson 1971; Manning 1976: 22), and at smaller sites, such as Pilsden Pen and Tollard Royal (Branigan 1980: 30-32). South Cadbury, Maiden Castle, Hod Hill, Spetisbury Rings, and Ham Hill appear to have received military occupation after supposedly early Roman attacks, arguably during AD 43 / 44-54 (Manning 1976: 22, 63-64; Barrett et al. 2000).
The Conquest of Dumnonia is evident during the 50s AD, with military occupation at Exeter perhaps beginning between AD 52-7, but declining after c. 67 (Todd 1987: 194, 196; Quinnell 1986: 121). However, part of Legio II Augusta may have been based at Exeter (fig. 3.4) during the late 60s and early 70s (ibid. 195), after which the Legion was removed to Caerleon, and the fort demolished (Bidwell 1980: 14). It has been argued that resistance to imperial control in the region may have continued after the first century (Quinnell 1986: 121), and retention of the legionary defences at Exeter into the late second century may reflect unrest, despite the possible pro-Roman sympathies of some local elite (see Bidwell 1980: 57). Two Dumnonian sites were occupied by the Roman military - Hawksdown Camp (Axmouth) and the unoccupied hillfort at Hembury (both in Devon), at which a reputed ‘battle cemetery’ was found (Quinnell 1986: 121; Todd 1987: 191; fig. 3.5). This may suggest early military domination, although the minimal evidence for centralisation within the region (see Chapter 2) suggests that the organisation of resistance may have been different to that seen elsewhere in the South.
Some sites, such as the recently discovered forts at Calstock (Devon), overlooking the River Tamar, Restormel, and Nanstallon, may have been placed to control both trade and movement into and within the region, and to control nearby mineral resources – in this case silver reserves (see Claughton and Smart 2008). Mineral extraction within Dumnonia was small scale, dispersed, and most likely came under the control of a large number of kinship groups after the transferral to the civilian sector.

Cornwall may have remained under military control throughout the Roman period, with Restormel fort (fig. 3.6), on the prospective border between ‘Comovian’ and Dumnonian territory, possibly occupied into the fourth century (Mattingly 2006; Thorpe 2007: 7, 29-30, 33; fig. 3.7). The fort at Nanstallon, located about 5 miles to the northwest overlooking the Camel (thus controlling passage into Cornovian territory, as well as along the two river sources, fig. 3.8) was abandoned c. AD 80 (Thorpe 2007: 31; fig. 3.9).

Once military Conquest of the indigenous population was complete, their continued submission to Roman rule may have been helped by symbols of military domination, as seen in the imagery found on coinage and sculpture. A regional example of the latter is the tombstone of the Roman cavalryman, Lucius Vitellius Tancinus at Bath (dating to the later first century), on which a Roman soldier on horseback tramples a conquered enemy (fig. 3.10).

---

49 Restormel, for example, lies close to an iron lode (Thorpe 2007). Nanstallon lies two miles from a source of silver-rich lead (with tin mines located two miles away at Carlanton and Treloy), one mile east of an iron vein, and in an area where small amounts of gold may have been panned from local streams (Fox and Ravenhill 1972: 90, 91). This was perhaps Ptolemy’s Voliba, or Nemetostatio of the Ravenna Cosmography (ibid.), occupied AD 55-60, and appears again in AD 75-80, by the Cohors quingenaria equitata (Quinnell 1986: 121; Todd 1987: 200-1). On-site metalworking is evident: within a barrack block, silver-rich slag was found alongside fragments of crucibles and a half-ounce weight, as well as a number of small pieces of ore and slag in occupation levels (Fox and Ravenhill 1972: 91).

50 Several other potential military sites have been identified, although few have been excavated (Bidwell 1980: 10; Quinnell 1986: 121; Thomas 1966: 115ff; Todd 1987: 224; Preston-Jones and Rose 1986: 145).
Figure 3.7 Restormel fort in relation to the River Fowey (Thorpe 2007, fig. 4)
Figure 3.8 Nanstallon fort in relation to the River Camel (Thorpe 2007, fig. 5)
Figure 3.9 Nanstallon fort (Todd 1987, fig. 7.4)

Figure 3.10 Tombstone of Lucinius Vitellius Tanclus, Bath (Cunliffe 1993, Pl. 6.3)
After stabilisation by the military, territories were reorganised into civitates (see fig. 1.2) by the new government (Millett 1990: 65, 68). These were developed, at least superficially, out of perceived pre-existing ‘tribal’ units. However, bearing in mind the Classical propensity for imposing categories upon ‘peoples’, there is a possibility that the State created bounded ‘tribes’ out of amorphous social networks (although it was seen Chapter 2 that in some cases regional elites may already have begun this process in the LPRIA) (see Millett 1990: 65, 68). The manipulation of regional identities in the imposition of boundaries for administrative purposes perhaps served as a weapon of political domination - networks may have been divided or amalgamated, with new ‘tribes’ created (see Salway 1981: 40). Nonetheless, in cases of more peaceful takeover, some existing identities do appear to have been perpetuated (Manning 1976: 13; Millett 1990: 65).

Cities were the principal locales through which political management was effected after the abandonment of these sites by the army (commonly in the later first century). Their relationship to communication networks facilitated their development as centres of taxation, and key consumers of rural products and resources, creating mutual dependence between urban and rural communities (see Lewit 2003: 267; Woolf 1998: 142-43). However, the role of munificence, enacted by local elites to enhance their own status, was also significant in constructing collective urban identities (see Woolf 1998: 1, 25, 40, 125; Zuiderhoek 2009: 73). As outlined by Tacitus (Mattingly 2006: 277-78), this system incorporated local leaders within the State machine, thus ensuring their control, and at the same time creating landscapes through which Roman ideologies were disseminated, providing models for emulation (Millett 1990).

During the later first century, Britain was initially a single Province, although it was subdivided by Severus (perhaps to diffuse the control of the army) in AD 197 into Britannia Superior, with a centre in London, and Britannia Inferior, centred on York (Millett 1990: 131; fig. 3.11). During the late third or early fourth century, the Province was further subdivided, with Britain subsequently becoming a diocese, governed by a vicarius. Britannia Prima and Britannia Secunda were created (centred upon Cirencester – or, it has been argued, perhaps Gloucester, considering its colonia status - and York, respectively), with Maxima Caesariensis centred upon London, and Flavia Caesariensis upon
the Colonia at Lincoln (Mattingly 2006: 227; White 2007: 36-9). Southwest Britain was therefore then incorporated within an administrative unit covering much of Western Britain (see fig. 3.12).  

Figure 3.11 Provincial organisation of Britannia (Millett 1990, fig. 55)

Figure 3.12 The provinces of the Diocese of Britannia during and after the early fourth century (from White 2007. fig. 11)

51 Not all accept Ptolemy’s ascription of Bath as a Belgic centre. It has been suggest that the Belgic territory was excluded from the Province (White 2007: 40).
Conquest was evidently a protracted process in some areas of the Southwest. Variety in the social organisation across the region would have significantly affected the mechanisms by which it came under Roman control. Military submission of Southwest Britain was perhaps preceded by the tributary status of some of the elite, with the subsequent acquiescence of others soon after Conquest. These individuals may have reaped both personal and social benefits from compliance. In some cases, changes may relate to the development of relationships with those in the Southeast, on the Continent, and in Rome (see Creighton 2004: 87). This submission would have brought all those under the control of elite within the new regime. However, it seems likely that by the mid first century AD, the only centralised leadership, that to some extent compared with those of Southeast, was that of the Dobunnic dynasty. This diversity of social organisation within the Southwest paved the way for capricious responses to Roman rule.

The move to self-governance (albeit enmeshed within the Imperial superstructure) for compliant elites (i.e. those who accepted State control), may have therefore been a gradual process. Where leadership covered smaller regions, where is was often perhaps kinship-based, only piecemeal subjugation may have been possible, as local leaders surrendered, were gradually won over, or were subdued by the Roman military. Strong social networks witnessed in common culture perhaps led to fewer changes to social structure and the continuation of communal ties. Therefore in areas in which centralised leadership was lacking, military control may have taken precedence over local mechanisms of political control for some time. A military presence was maintained in these predominantly rural regions (such as the Peninsula, and perhaps parts of Somerset, which may have ostensibly contained valuable resources, see Mattingly 2006). Nonetheless, as time progressed the local elite would probably have taken over some of the functions of the military and the management of resources reverted to civilians.

Across the Southwest, some may have therefore used the new order as an opportunity to develop individual status and power, and to restructure social relationships. This process perhaps included the construction of regional identity from pre-existing social networks. However, local mechanisms and levels of power varied: urban jurisdiction over rural territories depended on the status of the town, with the power of magistrates based at coloniae greater than that of those of the municipia, who in turn had greater control than those of the civitas centres (Mattingly 2006: 355). Administration was principally under the control of the Provincial governor during the first century, with financial responsibility partially delegated to the equestrian procurator (ibid. 255-56). Imperial
ascendancy was therefore enabled through the combined threat of military oppression, and the collaboration of local elites.

Regional cultural changes will now be examined, in an attempt to recognise varying responses to, and the negotiation with, imperial control – the aim being to consider how this may have affected the construction of local, regional, and wider identities.

SECTION 2: REGIONAL CHANGE

This section will concentrate upon transformations relating to the expression of identities, through the analysis of diachronic practices, where sufficiently detailed recording of data facilitates such an investigation. The apparent regional groups identified in Chapter 2 will be analysed in order to consider the effect of imperial administration upon cultural and social identities. Beginning with an analysis of changes in material culture, changes to settlements, and to burial and ritual practices, will be considered within each civitas. Firstly, the Dobunnic civitas (see fig. 1.2) - supposedly the ‘most Romanised’ part of the region – will be considered, followed by an appraisal of the material from the other civitates of the Southwest. with discussions at the end of each civitas section upon the extent to which ‘Roman’ culture affected local and regional culture, and consequently, identities.

MATERIAL CULTURE

Analysis of the range of finds at sites across the Southwest region demonstrates varied and localised responses to the adoption of imported culture. It was seen in Chapter 2 that coins were adopted across much of the region in the LPRIA, and in some cases were perhaps used for exchange. With the implementation of imperial socio-economic control, a higher incidence of coinage might be expected. However, coins are not commonly found within early levels at many rural sites, despite the proximity of many sites to markets, or the presence of Romano-British and imported ceramics. This suggests the continuity of other forms of exchange for some time (perhaps until the later Roman period, cf. Mattingly 2006: 497; see Chapters 4 and 5). In considering the identities of local communities, it is important to remember that many would not have much contact with imperial propaganda in the form of coinage.\(^\text{52}\) Unsurprisingly, however, coinage use was more prolific on urban sites (Clarke 1996: 72).

---
\(^{52}\) The production and distribution of coinage was perhaps primarily organised through the State (Randsborg 1989: 238), with a dearth of coins arguably indicating payment in kind - low-denomination coinage was perhaps principally made for taxation (Mattingly 2006: 496).
Imported material culture was used alongside locally manufactured material in most contexts, with imported ceramics increasingly imitated by local industries. Continental and Mediterranean imports are generally accompanied by large amounts of indigenous handmade pottery (even within the Dobunnic region), which perhaps continued to be used until after the end of the second century (e.g. as at Brockworth, and Charlton Kings (Gloucestershire), Rawes 1981: 53-4, 61; Rawes 1991: 79).

Changing ceramic forms were noted in some regions before the Conquest (see Timby 1990; Chapter 1), and beakers and tankards became common in most areas after the Conquest, especially within Dobunnia (e.g. as at Crickley Hill, Jarrett 1999, Brockworth, Rawes 1981: 64, and Charlton Kings, Rawes 1991: 79-80, all in Gloucestershire, fig. 3.13; see Timby 1990). This may indicate a shift to more solitary drinking practices (potentially suggesting the adoption of appropriate ‘civilised’ behaviour). However, conversely, the small number of these forms in comparison to locally made jars (e.g. at Birdlip Quarry, Mudd 1999: 234; see Rawes 1991: 79) suggests the continuity of communal drinking for most, as confirmed by textual references and the continued use of pre-Roman vessel forms (see Okun 1989: 47; Pearce 2004: 75). Glass was also occasionally present (e.g. at Brockworth, Price 1981: 69-70), and might again suggest a change to more individualistic drinking practices, but was also potentially a medium for prestigious display. *Amphorae* – which are relatively common from an early date across the Southwest (found for instance at The Ditches, Trow 1988, and unsurprisingly at entry points such as Poole Harbour,

---

53 Also at, for instance, Withington, and Standish (Gloucestershire) (Wessex Archaeology 2006: 9, and 2005: 16); Ham Hill villa (Beattie and Phythian-Adams 1913: 133); and Blacklands (both Somerset) (Wessex Archaeology 2007: 17).
Wessex Archaeology 2003: 4, 16, 23) - suggest the consumption of wine and oil (although in some cases, these vessels may have been used to transport and store other goods). Plates and bowls (for instance, at Charlton Kings, Rawes 1991: 77-8, The Ditches and Bagendon) suggest the introduction of individual dining portions (Pearce 2004: 75). Mortaria are a common find from the second century onwards within the central part of the Southwest region, and perhaps demonstrate changes in food technology. Whilst their presence ostensibly indicates that the occupants ate a Mediterranean-style diet (Meadows 1994: 136; Mudd 1999), the varied characteristics (including wear patterns) of mortaria, for instance, may suggest alternative uses such as cooking vessels (Cool 2006: 43).

Furthermore, although animal and plant remains and animal bones have been studied at few sites, preliminary analysis demonstrates minimal change in the locally available agricultural produce across the Southwest (Hawkes 2001). It is not until the mid third century that changes occur within the region (although generalisations are problematic: pers. comm. Dr. Hillary Cool). For much of the Roman period, there is a predominance of sheep over cattle and pig, and mixed crops of wheat and barley, with little change from the Iron Age (Meadows 1994: 136; e.g. see Hammon 2004: 158, 160, 161; Quinnell 2004). However, at some sites the predominance of cattle bones increases over time (Pearce 2004: 74; see Chapter 5), which has suggested to some a ‘Roman’ influence upon diet (see Gardner 2007).

Some differences are noted within Dumnonia. The range of ceramics from Exeter demonstrates the adoption of imported goods from the second century onwards - from Dorset (black burnished ware – BB1), Oxfordshire, the New Forest, the Nene Valley, and from central Gaul and the Rhineland (Todd: 1987: 212-13). These ceramics spread beyond the capital, although as in many other rural areas during the earlier Roman period, ceramic assemblages consist of predominantly local wares. These often imitated Gallo-Roman forms (including mortaria, bowls, and dishes), possibly indicating changing technological and food consumption practices, although more detailed work is needed to clarify the situation by examining the contexts in which these finds were used. South Devon ware may have developed in Dumnonia during the later first century to take advantage of the demand for new styles.

Brooches are less common than in other regions, perhaps indicating that few adopted new styles of dress in expressing individual and group identities (see Joy 2009: 551). Similar numbers of coins are often found upon rural Dumnonian sites, as on rural (non-villa) sites elsewhere in the Southwest. Again, the dearth of coinage may suggest distance from the State taxation system.

54 See also, e.g., Minchington, near Gussage Hill (Wessex Archaeology 2004: 16), Blacklands (Wessex Archaeology 2007: 16), and Ham Hill villa (Beattie and Phythian-Adams 1913: 133); Standish (Wessex Archaeology 2005: 15), and Withington (Wessex 2006: 12, 14), and Coberley villa (all in Gloucestershire) (Wessex Archaeology 2008b: 11).
(Millett 1990: 178-80). But, here and elsewhere in the Southwest, the absence of coins at sites close to urban centres may suggest that alternative mechanisms to tax collection and that other forms of exchange were in operation. However, the integration of local elites within this system during and after the third century (as possibly indicated by the influx of coinage during this period) may have been one mechanism through which power was developed.

The material culture of ‘Cornovia’ is commonly believed to differ greatly from that found elsewhere in Southwest Britain. Fewer coins are perhaps found upon ‘Cornovian’ sites (although again comparisons might be made with rural ‘military’ zones elsewhere in Britain, and the count regularly rises through metal detecting). Imported metal and glass were minimal, but widely spread, suggesting their permeation of society. Glass is found at Carvossa (Carlyon 1987; see Quinnell 1989: 126), perhaps suggesting the adoption of individual drinking practices, and the construction of ‘civilised’ behaviour. However, on a few sites – particularly those enclosed by rectangular earthworks – a larger quantity and wider range of imports (including fine tablewares, glass, and amphorae) were found, alongside local coarse-wares.55

Samian was found at sites such as Trethurgy, and amphorae continued to be imported to other sites (Quinnell 1986: 122, 126, 128, 129; 2004; Thomas 1966: 85), such as the probable trading site and cliff-side settlement at Lellizzick, near Padstow (Wessex Archaeology 2008c: 10). Again the quantities of imported ceramics were negligible in comparison to local wares (see Meadows 1994: 136; though see Willis 1994: 144), although Romano-British pottery (BB1 and Oxford wares, for example) becomes ever more common at a range of sites. This was used for storage (and thus perhaps to a certain extent, display), or for cooking, alongside locally made pots (Farrar 1973; Pearce 2004: 70; Quinnell 2004: 232). However, gabbroic and Cordoned wares continued through and beyond the Roman period (see Cunliffe 1991: 180-81; Quinnell 1986: 114, 119, 120; see Chapters 2 and 4).

New forms of handmade bowls and dishes were introduced during the first century AD, with flanged dishes being fully developed by the late third century (Quinnell 1986: 129; fig. 3.14). Mortaria occur during the third century and later. These changes are paralleled in the Central Southern region, where local and regional ceramics increasingly imitated Continental and Mediterranean forms (although this process began at a slightly earlier date, e.g. see Timby 1990).

55 At Carvossa, for example, these included a large amount of Samian, Dressel 20 amphora, stamped mortaria from Northeast France, several coins, a range of first century bronze brooches (including a penannular example) - atypical for the region - glass dating from c. AD 50-55, an intaglio, and a bronze-handled patera (Carlyon 1987: 105ff, 119, 123ff; Quinnell 1986: 122; Todd 1987: 222-3). The main assemblage was locally derived (including gabbroic and South Western decorated wares), although forms included an imitation Samian bowl. Ceramics were increasingly imported from neighbouring regions, and during the late third century, Black Burnished ware, local grey ware, and local coarseware were present, although 81% of the assemblage still consisted of gabbroic ware (Carlyon 1987: 112-3). Finds from Grambla are comparable.
As in most other regions, sheep bones predominate (with some cattle and pig bones), and wheat and barley were grown as well as (due to the often harsh environment) oats and rye (Meadows 1994: 136; e.g. see Hammon 2004: 158, 160, 161; Quinnell 2004). Again, the incidence of cattle gradually increases over the Roman period (Pearce 2004: 74), which may suggest the adoption of new practices in the transformation of social structures and identities, but not until the later Roman period (see Chapter 5). Thus, whilst ceramic forms changed, and there were possibly minor changes in the ways that food was cooked, there is little indication of comparable changes to the ways that food was eaten - suggesting that, at least for much of the Roman period, individuals appropriated various new cultural elements and adapted these to their own ends.

**Material Culture and Identity: Discussion**

Artefacts and practices were most likely given their ‘meaning’ in relation to the contexts in which they were used, which was possibly different for each social group – or even household unit (see Appadurai 1986: 14; Kopytoff 1986). Their significance may have changed, depending on the social relations through which their meanings were mediated (which in turn these objects negotiated). Furthermore, at a local level in particular, the ‘meaning’ and appropriation of imported culture and style was structured by the various socio-economic circumstances encountered. It has been contended that some vessels, for instance, were devoid of cultural meaning, and were used only for convenience - e.g. for storage (Cooper 1996). However, even if such a situation were possible, the contents may have been significant – for example, cosmetic or medical supplies were possible media for the construction of identities (see Carr 2005). No object can be fruitfully examined without consideration of its social context.
Objects were likely to have been used in different ways (Hawkes 2001, 2002; Meadows 1994: 137). The use of ‘Roman’ material culture was complex in a situation where multiple, dynamic and flexible identities coexisted (Hill 2001). Many may have selectively appropriated and adapted imported material culture for use within the performance of established practices, allowing the renegotiation of local and regional identities in response to changing historical conditions. Evidence does indeed suggest that some adapted new ceramic forms to alternative uses. But for some, this process enabled the integration of new, alongside traditional, practices.

These varied responses are unsurprising when we consider the variable adoption and adaptation of Mediterranean-style material culture within the Province, by a potentially wide range of people. Much material culture today seen as ‘Roman’ came from adjacent regions, or from the Continent, rather than the Roman Mediterranean centre, and there is no certainty of the extent to which imports were seen as ‘Roman’, or were directly associated with the Roman regime, bearing in mind their gradual introduction to the Southwest from the LPRIA onwards. Pre-Conquest importation may have led some to associate this culture with either indigenous Gaulish society, the Gallo-Roman elite, the Empire, or simply to have seen it as something ‘other’ and exotic, and thus perhaps prestigious. There is therefore no reason to believe that, post-Conquest, this material necessarily embodied the new regime to most, nor that it was associated with the new order.

It has been argued that ‘Roman’: ‘native’ dichotomies are neither sustainable nor useful (Barrett 1997; Hill 2001; Hingley 1997: 88), and such an interpretation rests upon a simplistic reading of material culture (see Jones, S 1997: 35-8). Yet, ‘Roman’ identity was defined in opposition to the ‘Other’ and depends upon cultural contrast in its construction; ‘becoming Roman’ required reflexivity, through which habitual daily performance was reassessed and reconstituted (see Gardner 2007: 19). ‘Being Roman’ required both the acceptance of and engagement within a symbolic system, which might be contrasted to that of the barbarian ‘other’. ‘Belonging’ and acceptance ‘within’ the group required the performance of this contrast. In some instances, this may have been achieved through archaeologically invisible practices (such as speech). But in others, this might leave archaeological traces, and often resulted in the creation of particular contexts (constructed through the arrangement of space to define a strict set of social relationships that defined the ideological framework of the system), within which these practices might be (re)enacted. This process was commonly aided by the production of a visual code (much of which was borrowed from the Hellenic world, alongside an, albeit transformed, ideological scheme), which might signal the various contexts through and within which ‘Roman-ness’ might be experienced. We are therefore left with an array of ‘Roman style’, which contrasts with that of the ‘barbarian’ world, in the way in which it was used.
Stylistic changes, divorced from their context of use, tell us little about their ‘meaning’ to the individual. Remains that have long been labelled as ‘Roman’ may only be seen as even prospectively related to the expression of ‘Roman’ identity if it can be shown that they were likely to have been used in the performance of this cultural identity through appropriate ‘Roman’ practices that epitomised this ideological framework. That is, changes to patterns of behaviour are likely to indicate the transformation of habitus (resulting from and in structural change), as well as the creation of appropriate spaces within which the new worldview might be mediated (see Bourdieu 1977: 72). Often, the evidence lacks the degree of detail by which we might recognise such systemic change, but sometimes the retention or transformation of pre-Roman social structures (as mediated through space) can be detected, suggesting change in worldview and perhaps cultural identity.

In some cases, the combination of style and practice do suggest the appropriation of ‘Roman’ culture to actively convey ‘Roman’ cultural identity (see e.g. Barrett 1997; Woolf, A. 1998). For some, ‘Roman’ identity and culture may have provided a discourse through (or against) which personal, local, or regional identity could be expressed and reconstructed in relation to changing circumstances. This required interaction with ‘Roman’ society so as to form the ‘correct’ associations between material and experience – and to discover their ‘meaning’ within an ideological system. Interaction with government officials or their representatives through the exchange of resources, services, or for administrative purposes, may thus have informed ‘appropriate’ practices within ‘private’ contexts. Models for ‘civilised’ behaviour (as might be expressed through dwelling, speech, dress, burial, and ritual practices) would also have been visible within many public contexts (such as fora, cemeteries, and to some extent, temples), and a Classical education might inform the wealthy of the ideologies of Roman power through mythology and narratives of political and military success. This mechanism for change perhaps gained strength as such meanings were seen to be effective through the endurance of Roman power. Being Roman may have been politic, for instance, primarily in political situations, but also perhaps within some trading relationships. ‘Correct’ behaviour may therefore have been one way by which social hierarchies were maintained, particularly after the grant of citizenship to freeborn residents. A degree of variability is evident, as ‘foreign’ culture was absorbed and accepted using local and regional materials, within a wide range of environments, and in relation to the existing social and historical conditions, but any such variety necessarily encompassed and embodied the symbolic system of Rome.
However, there is the strong possibility that many used new culture to signal personal wealth and status, without a major shift in their collective identities, and there may have been apparent contradictions with the negotiation of identities within public and private contexts. That is, we should anticipate that in many cases, changes were made to the public persona to facilitate self-advancement or preservation within or against the new socio-economic system, rather than reflecting a desire to become part of the Roman world (see Lucy 2005: 106, 108; Grahame 1998: 175). By affiliating with an “institution[s] that conferred valued credentials” – i.e. the Roman State – local elites (re)gained social capital within these new political conditions (Portes 1998: 4). ‘Reflected prestige’ was possibly attained through association with those in power (cf. Millett 1990). Gift giving of this material may have further enhanced its meaning, as well as the status of donor and recipient (see Coleman 1988). In other situations, ‘Roman’ goods may not have been seen in themselves as prestige items, but may rather have acquired value through their skilful transformation and manipulation within local and regional contexts (see Willis 1994: 142). ‘Roman’ material culture perhaps underwent ‘resistant adaptation’ by others (see Webster 1997b: 327). In many areas, the intervention of the Roman military was most likely seen as a threat to cultural integrity, thereby enhancing feelings of ethnic or local (and possibly regional) identity, encouraging the covert perpetuation of ‘tradition’ (Cohen 1993: 199). Above all, the situation is complex, and examination of later colonial situations demonstrates how resistance may coexist with both adaptation and *prima facie* acceptance of situations of dominance (Webster 1997a: 167).

There is the further difficulty that many will not have had access to (and were perhaps excluded from) ‘correct’ performance within private or restricted contexts (such as bathing and dining). Engagement within patron-client relationships perhaps provided some opportunities, and encouraged the development of Roman identity beyond the elite. But again, though not fully informed, it would have become immediately clear that ‘Roman-ness’ was expressed through particular (often ritualised) behaviour that differentiated ‘civilised’ from ‘barbarian’. This required the interaction of space and specific practices to demonstrate acceptance of (and engagement within) the Roman world (however inadequately this might be achieved within less wealthy contexts).

New Gallo-Mediterranean styles were increasingly integrated within the regional repertoire of material culture, demonstrating their impact upon indigenous society. Changing ceramic forms may suggest transformations in cooking, serving, and dining practices – contexts in which social relationships and identities are often negotiated (Pearce 2004: 75). These changes are evident across the Southwest, although in the Peninsula there were clearly fewer opportunities for social interaction with ‘Roman’ elite. However, within this region, the military - the primary interface with
the Roman world – may have been seen as representatives of Rome. Just as ‘Roman’ elite may have been emulated within the ‘civic zone’ in the construction of social hierarchies, so the military were perhaps emulated by some within this ‘military zone’. But again, limited social interaction with those who might materialise the Roman cultural framework through their behaviour suggests that the presence of these new styles cannot in themselves be assumed to have necessarily carried socio-cultural values indicative of ‘Roman’ cultural identity, and that few were aware of these meanings, or even of the concept of ‘being Roman’.

The range of finds within Dumnonia, and particularly ‘Cornovia’, demonstrates the complexity of issues surrounding ‘meanings’. The style of regional pottery changed to accommodate new forms, influenced by those found within ‘Roman’ contexts. This might at first suggest transformations in dining practices within attempts at ‘civilised’ behaviour, perhaps representing the construction of ‘Roman’ cultural identity within a regional milieu by some. However, it may alternatively represent the (re)construction of regional identity by nascent elites who were renegotiating power through new cultural symbols. Other objects were perhaps significant within this process. A regional sense of identity has been suggested on the basis of the local development of weights made of kaolinized granite during and after the late third century (Quinnell 1993: 134, 136-140, fig 63), which has been linked to the production of mortaria from local elvan stone, distributed across Penwith (Pearce 2004: 37).56 As both weights and mortaria appropriate Roman models, perhaps these new influences were again appropriated in the construction of regional identity. These weights may imitate those found on Roman sites, but at the same time represent regional developments (Todd 1987: 139). They may feasibly indicate control of local resources by the developing local elite, suggesting one mechanism by which local power and identity developed. Spatial transformations will be considered below in an attempt to recognise indicators of structural change within the domestic contexts in which this material was used (see below, Settlement), to see if we may come closer to differentiating between the various explanations for this change.

Notwithstanding these changes, the number of imports within the ‘Cornovian’ pagus is slight, and has been put down to regional inaccessibility. However, this argument seems insupportable given the long-term maritime contacts between this and other regions (see Chapter 2), enabling the importation of Romano-British wares from Dorset and beyond. Moreover, a basic road system may be detected in the Peninsula (Thomas 1976: 203, 84; see below), which is supported by several place names attesting to the presence of Roman roads (Jermy 1967: 81-3; Todd 1987: 219), and may be due to the development of inland transport through trade. Therefore, we might assume that

56 Although mainly distributed within Penwith, examples have been found outside the region at Lydney, London, and Richborough (Pearce 2004: 71-2).
cultural developments within the region were by and large down to the choices made by those in a position to take part in trade or exchange.

Differences are seen in the forms that regional ceramics take when compared with regions further east. The general absence of beakers within the Peninsula, for instance, may suggest continuity of communal drinking, and indicate attempts to maintain established practices in the emphasis of community identities. Changes in style perhaps suggest an awareness of transformations outside the region, but their selective appropriation may in part represent the renegotiation of local identities through the conscious acknowledgement and incorporation of these changes.

The role of fabric and manufacturing technique has until recently been largely neglected. Although artefact patterns cannot automatically be equated with regional social groupings, as social boundaries often cut across material culture boundaries (Barth 1969: 13; Hodder 1979), discrete ceramic distributions (particularly those utilising distinctive manufacturing techniques or materials) might be explored alongside social practices to consider the active use of material culture in marking social boundaries (Jones, S 1997: 114). In doing so, a case might be made for the use of gabbroic clays within ‘Cornovia’ in the expression of regional identities. Local clays, embodying the land, were arguably important within the construction of local identities (see *ibid.* 188). The role of local Dartmoor clays may go beyond issues of material accessibility. Similarly, with South Devon ware, its distribution beyond the possible Fowey – Camel border perhaps contributed to the development of Dumnonian identity within the possible ‘Cornovian’ military zone. The central position of Dartmoor, and the probable location of routes across the moor connecting the far west to the regional centre at Exeter (see Chapter 5), might support this interpretation. However, there are fewer indications that particular behaviour patterns correlated with social boundaries within this area (although the possibility remains that significant practices remain undetected, considering the relative dearth of archaeological investigation within this region; see also *ibid.* 115).

The Black Burnished industry of Dorset is frequently assigned a significant role in marking regional identity (considering its incorporation within possible regional practices, see Chapter 2 and below, *Burial*). Though this ceramic may have had regional significance during the LPRIA (see Chapter 2), its distribution beyond the area of regional groupings makes this unlikely during the Roman period.
Some late Iron Age settlements continued or their sites were reused, as at Claydon Pike (Gloucestershire), where large aisled buildings were built during the second century, next to round structures (Frere 1984: 312; fig. 3.16). Whilst it often thought that roundhouses were rapidly and systematically replaced by new, rectangular building forms - particularly within supposedly 'Romanised' areas - excavations have revealed the construction of circular houses at several sites during the Roman period, and often into the later Roman period. These are juxtaposed with rectangular buildings at other sites, including Birdlip Quarry (Gloucestershire) (Mudd 1999; fig. 3.17; see Chapter 5). Circular buildings are also found at Barnsley Park, which later developed as a villa (Webster 1981: 29-35, fig. 4; see below, Villas). Although these structures are seen as animal pens by the excavators (*ibid.* 34), the presence of a paved floor and of quernstone fragments suggests human activity, if not occupation (see Smith 1985: 343), and the later development of hearths in these buildings is perhaps significant (Webster 1981, fig. 6; see Chapter 5). Nevertheless, during the late third century phase at least, the evidence suggests an agricultural function, and therefore possibly a subsidiary role to that of the rectangular structure (Webster and Smith 1987: 79).

---

57 The Dobunnic civitas most probably incorporated the modern counties of Hereford and Worcester, Gloucestershire, eastern Oxfordshire, and perhaps parts of Wiltshire. Although it has been noted that the *colonia* and its *territorium* would have been considered as a separate entity (Fulford 2003: 18), in order to simplify analysis within this thesis, it will be included within the civitas.
Despite apparent continuity of the pre-Roman circular building form, new building technologies were adopted, with the modified plans of roundhouses demonstrating that we are not seeing simple cultural continuity in these structures. Many circular buildings had stone foundations (as at Bamsley Park, see Webster and Smith 1987: 73), and were sometimes polygonal (rather than circular) in form, to enable timber-frame construction (Rawes 1981: 244), perhaps emulating the new techniques applied in the construction of rectangular buildings. At some sites, such as Birdlip (situated next to Ermine Street), roundhouses were rebuilt to polygonal plans during later phases (figs. 3.18), demonstrating only gradual change.

Birdlip Quarry settlement, a site that was perhaps first occupied in the late second – early third century, with occupation continuing into the later Roman period (see Chapter 5), provides a useful case study for the consideration of cultural change, due to detailed recording of the recent excavations. Certain aspects of spatial organisation perpetuated Iron Age practices. The main domestic building was divided into eating and sleeping areas (as suggested by the distribution of ceramics), with south: north and left: right sectors, respectively, replicating earlier spatial organisation (Mudd 1999: 249, fig. 4.106; Fitzpatrick 1997).58 As with many rural sites, there was little change in building alignment, which continued to structure daily life in relation to the movement of the sun, perpetuating an east-facing entrance.

However, changes are seen during the second phase of occupation, when the position of the hearth was moved from the centre of the building and placed near to the wall, limiting its focal role in

58 Rubbish disposal also followed pre-Roman patterns, distributed to the left of the structure (as one faces the building, i.e. the west side) (Mudd 1999: 245; Fitzpatrick 1997).
communal gatherings (Mudd 1999, figs. 4.45, 4.49, 4.76). Similar spatial reorganisation is also arguably found at Claydon Pike, Marshfield (Gloucestershire), and Mingies Ditch (Oxfordshire) (ibid. 245; see fig. 3.16).

Rectangular buildings, found at most new early Roman period settlements (such as the aforementioned Barnsley Park, Webster 1981: 27), were frequently aligned upon roads (as at might be suggested at Portway, Rawes 1984, fig. 1). Building forms of rectangular plan were often initially of timber frame construction, resting directly on the ground surface (as at Brockworth, Rawes 1981: 48, and Portway, Rawes 1984 : 41), or on stone foundations (which may be the case at Haymes, see Rawes 1986: 74), and were usually only built of mortared stone during and after the second century. Within rectangular buildings, cooking often took place in a separate room, suggesting changes in the ways in which space was used to negotiate social relationships.

Figure 3.17 Birdlip Quarry settlement, Period 2A (c. 250-330 AD) (Mudd 1999, fig. 4.75)
Figure 3.18 Birdlip Quarry settlement, polygonal structure (late third century) (From Mudd 1999, fig. 4.7)

**Northwest sector of the Belgic civitas**

Figure 3.19 Overton Hill (Petts 1998b, fig. 6.3, Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine)
Figure 3.20 Chisenbury Warren (from Bowden and Fowler 1966, fig. 5)
Figure 3.21 Tollard Royal (Bowden and Fowler 1966, fig. 2)
A degree of settlement continuity from the LPRIA is also seen at Stockton Earthworks (overlooking the Wylye Valley) and Hamshill Ditches (Wiltshire), for example. This latter site was integrated within the new communications network by the construction of a nearby road soon after Conquest (Corney 2001: 141), linking it to urban centres, and providing economic links. At other significant locales, such as Overton (containing numerous prehistoric ritual monuments), Roman roads transected existing features, thus transforming the landscape, and unambiguously demonstrating control (Petts 1998b: 87-8; fig. 3.19). Silbury Hill also became the focus of a Roman period settlement, the mound used as a viewpoint for surveying ahead of road construction (Corney 2001:26-7).

Several new (primarily roadside) sites were also developed, frequently exhibiting apparent planning as ‘streets’ of rectangular buildings, as at Knook Down (Warminster) and Chisenbury Warren (Wiltshire) (Bowen and Fowler 1966: 51-3; fig. 3.20). Rectangular and circular buildings are again juxtaposed, as in the roadside settlement at Littlecote, although the latter are given an agricultural and subsidiary role, as at Barnsley Park (Frere 1984: 322; 1985: 308; Walters 1992: 146; see above).

**Durotrigian civitas**

Several sites (such as the settlement at Gussage) continued well into the Roman period, although as elsewhere, post-Conquest transformations are clear. Some settlements were modified with the addition of rectangular buildings (for example at Rotherley and Iwerne), and the construction of enclosures (as at Tollard Royal, Bowden and Fowler 1966: 46-8; fig. 3.21). Other sites, such as the LPRIA – early Roman phase at Bradley Hill (Somerset), went out of use by the second century, although at this site settlement was re-established in the early fourth century (see Leech 1981).

During the initial fourth century phase at Bradley Hill, rectangular stone buildings (dating as late as c. AD 335-45) essentially appear to replicate the same organisation of architectural space as seen in earlier timber roundhouses (fig. 3.22; Leech 1981). The central location of hearths within undivided buildings, entered through centrally placed doorways, may have enabled social identities to be negotiated essentially in the same ways as previously, suggesting the continuity of social structures. However, this phase was short-lived (see Chapter 5).

---

59 The Durotrigian *civitas* most probably incorporated the modern counties of Dorset, much of Somerset, and perhaps parts of Wiltshire and Hampshire.

60 However, it is possible that second – fourth century settlement lies outside the area of excavation (Leech 1981: 181)
Again, roads were built next to some enclosed oppidum-type sites, as seen at Gussage Hill (Petts 1998b: 86) (close to a LPRIA – early Roman barrow), suggesting attempts to incorporate these sites within the developing socio-economic network (fig. 3.23). New settlements were also developed near roads. Catsgore, established c. AD 100-120, comprised three farmsteads within their own enclosures, each with buildings (fig. 3.24) adjacent to the road (Leech 1982). Polygonal building forms were found at this site, as in other regions (fig. 3.25); again, this form transformed pre-Roman building practices, with timber-frame construction upon un-mortared stone foundations (see above). Ceramics during this phase included Samian of the Trajanic, Hadrianic, and Antonine periods (ibid. 7). When two further farms were established on this site in the later second century, the earlier buildings were replaced by numerous rectangular stone structures, often on the same sites as the earlier buildings (ibid. 10-12), suggesting the deliberate renegotiation of domestic and workspace.

Local pottery predominated at this site until the second century, when it was replaced by imports (including Samian, Dressel 20 amphorae, and Rhenish ceramics), and New Forest and Oxfordshire pottery during the late third century. Forms included mortaria (ibid. 36), suggesting changes to food preparation. Beef became more common than mutton (Everton 1982: 144), perhaps indicating some outside dietary influence within this particular locale (which, it was noted above, may indicate military influence, due to initial State control of nearby mineral resources). In common with many settlements, there were few coins until the later third century, perhaps indicating a lack of direct integration within the State fiscal system (see Millett 1990: 178-80). The range of metalwork, which
includes a number of penannular brooches, suggests the inhabitants were conservative, maintaining only regional and local trading networks (Besley 1982: 101; Butcher 1982: 109-110). During the early fourth century at Bradley Hill, the diet had changed little from the pre-Roman period, with a continuing predominance of mutton over beef (Everton 1981).

Figure 3.23 Gussage Hill, road system (Petts 1998b, fig. 6.2. After Barrett et al. 1991)
Figure 3.24 Catsgore, early fourth century (Frere 1984, fig. 22)
Dumnonian civitas and ‘Cornovian’ pagus

Small, enclosed, settlements continued to be occupied and constructed within Dumnonia, some with rectangular earthworks, including the enclosure at Clannacombe (near Thurlestone), which contained first - second century Romano-British ceramics (Fox and Ravenhill 1972: 96). Rectangular earthworks were also (perhaps primarily) found in Cornwall, as at Carvossa (see below). The occupation of some ‘rounds’ continued (see Chapter 2), with new sites built, including Trethurgy (see below). Some unenclosed hut groups were replaced by rounds during the Roman period, suggesting either transformations in local socio-political organisation, and possibly heightened insecurity (requiring enclosure), or simply a change in farming methods (Thomas 1966: 88, 91; Pearce 1978: 50).

A number of new sites - from the second century onwards, often enclosed by near-square earthworks (Todd 1987: 225) - demonstrate a greater enthusiasm for imported culture and style. It has been suggested, considering their possible appearance as poleis within the itineraries (see Rivet and Smith 1979), that these sites were military installations until after c. AD 75, when they may have developed as small quasi-urban settlements. However, they are more likely to represent the development of enclosed settlements by local prominenti, considering the lack of evidence for barrack buildings and the presence of oval buildings, and bearing in mind the range of material culture found at these sites (see below). It is possible that some acted as trading posts (Todd 1987: 202, 222-23), and gained prominence through control of trade, or tax collection.

---

61 The Dumnonia civitas most probably incorporated the modern counties of Devon and perhaps southwest Somerset. *Purocoronavis (deriving from Dorocornovium - perhaps ‘stronghold of the Cornovii’) occurs in the Antonine Itinerary (Frere 1973: 236; Pearce 2004: 23), Peutinger Table, and Ravenna Cosmography (Thomas 1966: 86), suggesting the existence of a distinct group - the Cornovii to the West. Therefore, Cornwall will be considered within a separate section below, for convenience labelled ‘Cornovia’, although the contemporaneous use of this term is far from certain.

62 However, it was seen in Chapter 2 that some rectangular enclosures may date to the pre-Roman period.
The 5.5 acre (2 ha) enclosure at Carvossa (fig. 3.26) was located c. 1 km from the west bank of the river Fal (South Cornwall), and had an additional enclosure that it has been suggested may represent the presence of an associated vicus-type settlement (Quinnell 1986: 122; Todd 1987: 202, 222). The earliest occupation perhaps dates to the Claudian period, with one circular building in use until the late first century (Carlyon 1987: 105; Todd 1987: 202) suggesting the indigenous domestic nature of this site. As elsewhere, location in relation to the road system was significant for the development of this site. Industrialisation (noted by metalworking) intensified during the early second century, when the road pattern also altered (Carlyon 1987: 123ff). In contrast to other sites in the area, numerous imports were found, although local wares, and increasingly ceramics from neighbouring regions, were more common. The numerous brooches (see Butcher 1980) suggest changes to dress, and the presence of an intaglio may suggest an official role for the occupant (see Henig 1971); only 14 Roman coins were found (Carlyon 1987: 123).

There were similar sites nearby. But, as with other ‘rounds’, few of the new rectilinear enclosures were continuously occupied throughout the Roman period. Most were abandoned in the first or second century. This would either suggest that attempts to appropriate symbols of military power by the local elite (to enhance individual prestige) were unsuccessful, or (more likely) reflect general transformations to settlement patterns at this time.

63 It has been suggested that Carvossa perhaps corresponds to Ptolemy’s Voliba (Thomas 1966: 86).
64 A similar, but larger, site was located nearby at Golden (alternatively Voliba) - although it has again been suggested that this may represent a fort rather than domestic settlement (Quinnell 1986: 122; Thomas 1966: 86; Todd 1987: 223). The smaller site at Grambla, near Wendron, is morphologically similar to Carvossa. Finds suggest that the site functioned as a civilian settlement, at least from the second century (Quinnell 1986: 122) – as suggested by an oval stone walled structure (Todd 1987: 225).
Most sites within ‘Cornovia’ exhibit changes in building styles and the adoption of new building technologies. Although rectangular buildings are rare, rectangular architecture perhaps influenced the adoption of oval plans (instead of the continuity of circular buildings), as seen in an example at the Trethurgy round (fig. 3.27), which was perhaps established c. AD 150 (Quinnell 2004: 166).\(^65\) Such sites commonly have evidence of tin working, or tin ingots (e.g. ibid. 27, 73).

Although building plans were transformed, interior space was little changed, with hearths remaining in near-central positions (Pearce 2004: 137). The common provision of cooking pits during the Roman period (Quinnell 1986: 126) may indicate the introduction of new cooking methods. They tended to be placed near hearths, rather than in the peripheral locations seen in other regions. However, in one instance (building T2, dating to c. AD 175-210) a hearth pit was placed near to the door (ibid. 185) (fig. 3.28), which may parallel the changes seen above, for instance at Birdlip.

---

65 Another potential Roman period rectangular building is suggested at Castle Gotha (Quinnell 2004: 203), although its date is uncertain.
New developments are also seen in the construction of the cellular courtyard house in West Penwith and Scilly (fig. 3.29). Although it has been claimed that the type may have its origins in the first century BC (Thomas 1966: 80), these structures are most probably post-Conquest developments of earlier occupied sites (Cunliffe 1991: 205; Pearce 2004: 33; Quinnell 1986: 120). Courtyard houses flourished during the second century AD – a time when ‘Roman’ culture spread throughout the Southwest (which may suggest ‘Roman’ influence in the sub-division of building plans), but when few rectangular enclosures were being constructed. However, these buildings are comparable to Northwest Iberian LPRIA structures (Lorrio and Ruiz Zapatero 2005), and are paralleled in Roman Wales (see Hogg 1966, fig. 3).
Within the courtyard structure, round buildings - which usually contained a central hearth for cooking food - commonly faced the entrance of each courtyard unit, and may represent community rooms (possibly equivalent to the single-roomed roundhouses of earlier settlements). However, this assumes that each cell around the courtyard functioned as a separate building, and it has alternatively been proposed that a single roof may have spanned the courtyard and cells to form a single building (Wood 1997; fig. 3.30). This would provide a hall-like space within the central courtyard, with separate rooms around the periphery, reflecting comparable spatial organisation to that seen within rectangular buildings further east. Artefact distribution analysis might shed further light on spatial usage – possibly the subsidiary rooms indicate social segregation. Finds from these sites parallel those at rounds, and include imported ceramics, glass, and metalwork but, at present, it is impossible to determine the relationship, if any, between these and other sites, such as rounds.
Rural settlement: discussion

Whilst a degree of LPRIA site continuity is evident, many settlements were abandoned during the first century AD. Numerous sites were also established during this time, often taking advantage of new communication networks. The decline of many settlements, and construction of others, suggests that the Conquest provided opportunities for some individuals or kinship groups, and disadvantaged others. The franchise of resources within the Imperial State system may have enabled a greater level of social distinction for individuals or collectives than previously. The greater numbers of coinage on domestic sites during and after the third century may indicate one mechanism by which imperial imagery influenced cultural development. Both economic involvement with the State system (whether via industrial franchisement, or taxation), and exposure to propaganda found on coinage, may have encouraged engagement within Roman discourses of power for some. This perhaps accounts for the perceptible changes during the second-third centuries, when social, economic, and political transformations were re-established, after the disruption caused by military intervention. This might furthermore relate to changes seen across the Western Empire during the later second century, arguably in response to the ‘…intentional renewal of Augustan ideology’ (Whittaker 1997: 158).

The pace and rate of change has perhaps been overestimated, and telescoped within a shorter period than might actually have been the case. Roundhouses were continually built at some sites, adopting the same alignment as witnessed during the LPRIA, and seasonal ceremonies, which may have maintained communal identities, perhaps remained embedded within architectural space through this alignment (see Oswald 1997; Fitzpatrick 1997; Chapter 2). Nevertheless, transformations to interior space in some cases may suggest changes in the way social relationships were mediated through bodily movement (Barrett 1994; Parker Pearson and Richards 1994). In particular, the relocation of the cooking hearth from a central to peripheral position suggests changes to the organisation of domestic labour - a process, which anthropological studies imply, may be closely related to wider changes in social structure (see Hendon 1996). Although changes in the use of space were commonly found within rectangular buildings, they were also noted in some roundhouses, suggesting complex mechanisms for negotiating social change.

Pre-Roman organisation of internal space within domestic buildings had possibly facilitated ‘private’ space around the edges of the structure, with ‘public’ space towards the centre, indicated by the central hearth (Hingley 1990). The central hearth perhaps acted as a community mnemonic.

66 The notion of separate ‘public’ and ‘private’ spheres in the past differs to modern conceptions of domestic space (e.g. see Barillie and Branson 2004, passim; Miller 2001). In the Roman world, and in particular in the ‘Roman’ house, the demarcation of restricted and accessible space influenced the negotiation of social relationships within performance of social and cultural identities (see Hales 2003).
- considering the likelihood of its role as a focus for communal eating, drinking, and perhaps the creation and dissemination of mythological 'knowledge'. The relegation of cooking hearths (indicated by ceramic and animal bone distribution) at some sites to more peripheral areas perhaps reinforced gender divisions, inherent within new social and political structures. Although more work is needed to confirm the function of hearths from a wider sample, preliminary analysis suggests that this may represent gradual structural changes, as women became excluded from social gatherings when preparing meals. Some households (or their heads) may have chosen to recreate the dominant, public, patriarchal social structure, through transformations to domestic space. To quote Hendon (1996: 56) ‘the household and the state engage in a dialogue…over how women’s labor [sic] is to be valued and controlled’. In ‘native’ buildings, the placement of hearths (and the location of dining) within the front of roundhouses (as at Birdlip, Mudd 1999) might further embody ideologies related to those witnessed within town house contexts, albeit on a very simplified scale, in which accessible and inaccessible space was created, and the community separated from the household.

Conversely, it has been suggested that spatial organisation within some rectangular buildings (including some villas, see below) may replicate that of pre-Roman circular dwellings, perhaps enabling the negotiation of social relationships and structures by using space in ‘traditional’ ways (Hodder 1978; Hingley 1989: 7, 22; although see Esmonde Cleary 1989: 114, and Webster and Smith 1982). Therefore, although the public face of the household was transformed by adopting new styles, interior practices suggest the perpetuation of *habitus*, perhaps representing divergent ‘public’ and ‘hidden transcripts’ (Mattingly 1997: 13-4; Scott 1992: 4). Examination of interior space often reveals little evidence for the transformation of ‘traditional’ practices - even within supposedly ‘Romanised’ regions. This may be contrasted with the relatively small number of buildings within the Southwest (primarily associated with urban and possibly rural administrative centres) in which changing practices permeated many aspects of daily life - and which may indeed represent extensive ideological transformations informing the re-creation of social structure and cultural identities. In some cases, the juxtaposition of roundhouses and rectangular buildings may have been one mechanism by which status was renegotiated.

The alignment of many rectangular buildings upon roads within new rural settlements (perhaps in some cases to take advantage of passing trade), often moving away from the previously common southeast or eastern orientation, may have affected the way in which architecture, ritual, and identity were mutually implicated. Proximity to urban and military sites that, like roads, possibly embodied the new order, may have also influenced the spatial organisation of buildings (Mattingly
Alignment in relation to these features possibly both expressed and facilitated the negotiation of changing social relationships. The road network again enabled direct contact with urban centres, at which models for new settlements might be found, and provided easy access to new material culture through trade, as well as providing opportunities to witness the enactment of dominant practices through economic and social interaction. It is perhaps significant that the settlement at Birdlip Quarry, where it is argued there are some indications of structural change (see above) may have functioned as a staging post on Ermine Street (see Mudd 1999).

However, in some (perhaps many) cases, these changes potentially reflect landscape transformations located outside the dominant cultural framework. The ideological embodiment of masonry construction, which prospectively engendered feelings of permanence for the social order, may have been lost upon those who merely imitated others in expressing new cultural identities, as opposed to representing direct engagement with them.

A number of apparently extreme changes are noted within the (Northwest) Belgic, and East Dorset, regions, which may have significantly affected the transformation of local identities during the first century. The placement of roads next to some established enclosed sites (notably those that had adopted a range of Gallo-Mediterranean practices pre-Conquest – such as Gussage Hill) suggests the possibility that some local landowners were taken into consideration in the creation of the road system, due to their collaboration with the new regime. However, in other cases (as at Overton), roads were possibly imposed upon landscapes, rather than located for the convenience of, or through negotiation with, the local community or elite. In particular, where roads dissect ritual landscapes, we may be witnessing over expressions of power and domination.

There are few detailed analyses of Roman settlements within Dumnonia, though there are evident differences to the rest of the Southwest region are noted within the Peninsula. It has been argued by many that the culture of Roman ‘Cornovia’ was conservative in nature, with an active rejection of ‘Roman’ culture and the maintenance of ‘indigenous’ lifestyles (e.g. Quinnell 2004: 236). However, it was seen in Chapter 2 that cultural transformations are witnessed from the LPRIA, and are comparable in some ways with other regions of the Southwest. Across Dumnonia, the development of enclosed sites (the ‘Rounds’) demonstrates similar social developments to those of the Central Southern region. The increased number of site enclosures may reflect the assertion of status for ‘individuals’ and kin groups, perhaps paralleling similar processes seen in the adoption of inhumation rites (see below, Burial and Ritual Practices and Chapter 2). As in the pre-Roman period, these earthworks usually contained several single-roomed buildings.
A number of rectilinear enclosures were constructed during the Roman period. Although this form may have originated in the pre-Roman period, it perhaps gained particular significance within the historic conditions of Roman Dumnonia, and particularly ‘Cornovia’, in the renegotiation of identity. Rectangular and square enclosures (if not initially Roman military sites) may have epitomised military rule, which became a focus for the construction of new mechanisms of power for the local elite, in the absence of urban sites and villas (see below). Changes in the region after the second century may indicate a degree of stabilisation, enabling the recreation of social hierarchies (perhaps due to control of trade and involvement within the taxation system). New influences were seemingly incorporated within the reconstruction of regional identity by nascent elites.

The development of oval buildings within ‘Cornovia’ might also be part of the same process of cultural change noted across the Southern Britain during the early Roman period - whether originating in the Iron Age (see Quinnell 2004: 188) or later, and perhaps reflects the practical adaptation of Gallo-Mediterranean building style to suit harsh climates.67 However, changes point to the general continuity of pre-Roman dwelling practices, rather than the idea of there having been any rapid transformation in worldview through the adoption of ‘Roman’ cultural identity. Previous negotiation of social (in particular, gender) relationships through internal space may have been continued, with established patterns of food preparation and consumption enabling continued emphasis on community (being enacted within central rather than peripheral areas). However, the addition of cooking pits within buildings may indicate changes to earlier dwelling practices, as new technologies were perhaps adopted.

As with rounds, the courtyard house seemingly represented an independent ‘unit’, conceivably housing extended families. In comparison with the introduction of oval buildings within rounds, they may represent a local variation of Gallo-Mediterranean or Romano-British building types if each courtyard unit was roofed. If each cell was individually roofed, this building type may reflect adoption of the courtyard plan as seen throughout the Western Empire - arguably the defining feature of the ‘Roman’ house (see Grahame 1998: 166). Although building forms may have changed in line with those across the Empire, changes to interior space may again point towards continuity of pre-Roman social structures and identities for some time.

The evident change in style and behaviour opposes the view that external culture was wholeheartedly rejected within Dumnonia. Instead, we are more likely to see the active manipulation

67 It is noted that the Southwest corner of the rectangular timber-framed ‘hall’ on Crickley Hill (situated facing the prevailing wind) was rounded, and constructed of dry-stone, perhaps to protect the building from the elements (see Chapter 4). This may provide a parallel for the development of oval drystone buildings within ‘Cornovia’ during the Roman period.
of material culture in the renegotiation of existing identities, in order to accommodate and reinterpret changing historical conditions in the stabilisation of local existence. As elsewhere, Gallo-Mediterranean style wares were thus not necessarily used in ‘Roman’ ways by most - their meaning was open to reinterpretation as their use was accommodated in the construction of perhaps a range of social identities, generally perpetuating social structures established in the LPRIA. Preliminary examination of practices at sites where ‘Roman’ material culture (such as *amphorae* and Samian) was found suggests that if social structures were changing, they were changing only slowly as compared to other regions. This trajectory of change, alongside continuation of many traditional patterns of behaviour, may indicate the initial adoption of new forms for display purposes (arguably largely related to prestige). There was possibly a gradual change in practices, which potentially indicates the transformation of identities (at least by some) as the Roman period progressed. This change would have yielded greater social benefits with the loosening of Roman military control.

A number of generalisations have previously been made, that may affect the way we see changing identities through the transformation of practices. One is change in diet, which has been considered with regard to the evidence from across the Southwest. A change towards a greater incidence of cattle is noted, as elsewhere, which has suggested to some the influence of a ‘Roman’ diet (Pearce 2004: 74). But for much of the Southwest, there is little apparent change in the range of agricultural provisions until the later Roman period (see Chapter 5), with only gradual change within most contexts. This perhaps contradicts assumptions that new ceramic forms indicate the widespread adoption of a ‘Roman’ diet within the expression of Roman identity.

In general, across the Southwest, changes represent adoption and adaptation of Mediterranean models, alongside perpetuation of many traditions, rather than the complete abandonment or the completely unchanged continuity of existing practices in the simple embrace or rejection of Roman cultural identity.

**Villas**

**Dobunnic civitas**

Whilst most villas within the Southwest date to the later Roman period, some earlier examples have been recognised, including a small number within the Dobunnic civitas. The earliest villa-type building (dated to c. AD 70-80) was constructed (in stone) within the northern part of The Ditches, North Cerney (Gloucestershire) (Corney 1997: 339; fig. 3.32), an oppidum-type enclosure near

---

68 The possible socio-economic and environmental factors that may have instigated this change must also be taken into consideration (Gardner 2007: 94-5, 160-61), although the change is seen across the region, within different environments. In addition, it is argued that the incidence of cattle may have been overestimated, with initial analyses demonstrating an urban bias, and not reflecting rural finds (Noddle 1985: 84). However (where the data is provided), animal remains have been considered within this thesis from a range of sites from across the region.
Bagendon (see Chapter 2). A path from the villa leading to a probable late Iron Age roundhouse within the centre of the settlement suggests continuity of the latter building into the Roman period (Catling 2008). The earliest phase of the villa at Woodchester (located less than 1km from the earthworks at Minchinhampton, which some feel may belong to an oppidum) dates to the later first century (Clarke 1996: 76). Even at this stage, the building was ‘palatial in scale and appointment’ (*ibid.*), and continued to be so throughout the Roman period (fig. 3.33). During the early fourth century (c. AD 325), the construction of a mosaic containing Orphic imagery (see Clark 1982) ostensibly demonstrates the status and Classical knowledge (and perhaps education) and status of the villa owners.

However, most villas (excluding the Ditches and Woodchester) were not built until after the mid third century, although several were built over Iron Age sites, as at Great Witcombe (Gloucestershire) (Leach 1998: 123) and Frocester (RCHME 1976: xxxviii, xlv, 13-4, 60). Many villa-type buildings gradually developed from farmsteads, as at Claydon Pike (see Frere 1984: 312-14; fig. 3.15, above). The villa at Great Witcombe developed gradually into a large Mediterranean style building after the early third century, yet some features appear to show the continuing influence of pre-Roman practices. It has been suggested that an extension to the SE range of the East Wing was built during the late third to early fourth century (Period 3) to house estate workers – as might be denoted by its ‘utilitarian use’, which included evidence for lead smelting (Leach 1998: 40, 130; fig. 3.34). A hearth pit / oven (F57, marked red on plan) and heath (F77, marked orange on plan) had

---

69 It has also been noted that these early villas are enclosed by Grim’s Ditch, perhaps further suggestive of their association with the pre-Roman elite and suggesting minimal change in social organisation (Clarke 1996: 76).
been placed centrally within Rooms 27 and 44, respectively (ibid. 34) - perhaps suggesting 'non-Roman' practices. However, other peripheral hearths (F56, F88, and F62) were recognised in Room 27 - close to the door to Room 44, next to a buttress, and near to the entrance (marked blue, green, and purple, respectively, on plan) (ibid.), with F62 possibly showing similar practices to those seen at nearby Birdlip (see above).
Northwest sector of the Belgic civitas

There is again some continuity from pre-Roman settlements, as seen, for example, in the placement of a villa-type building at Netheravon (Wiltshire) within a pre-Roman enclosure (Johnson and Walters 1988: 82). As in Dobunnia, there is a wide range of villas, with perhaps the most prestigious villa in the area (with more than forty rooms) at Box (Wiltshire), as well as a number of simple villas located on the fringes of roadside settlements (see Millett 1990: 186). Whilst the location of Box on poor farming land (Walters 2001: 141) may suggest that it fulfilled a primarily administrative function (and an early construction date – probably in the later first century - may support this interpretation), simpler buildings arguably represent the dwellings of bailiffs or other local officials, as in other regions. Between these two extremes are villas such as Littlecote, where a

70 Commonly called ‘cottage’ villas, these simple subdivided rectangular buildings gradually became more sophisticated, with the additions of mosaic pavements, painted plaster-walls, and hypocausts (see Dark and Dark 1997: 44). They often form the core of later, more substantial buildings.
flint building (dating to c. AD 170) next to the villa overlay a south-facing circular building (Frere 1984: 322; Walters 1992: 142; fig. 3.35). Although the villa was of Mediterranean plan (fig. 3.36), an oven had been placed outside the flint building (which had become used for metalworking), and a separate kitchen had been built, suggesting segregation of tasks (ibid. 322-23) - fourth century buildings at this site contained central hearths.
Durotrigian civitas

Early villa-type structures have recently been revealed within the Durotrigian region. At Blacklands, Laverton (Somerset), a stone corridor villa replaced a large roundhouse, perhaps during the first century AD - after the intermediate construction of a timber rectangular building (Wessex Archaeology 2007: 6-7; fig. 3.37). Although the traditional use of space did not immediately change, cooking practices may have changed at the end of the first century, with the placement of a hearth adjacent to the dividing wall, instead of in the customary central location (ibid. 7). There is a possible indication of a slight change in diet, with a relatively high number of cattle bones (though the assemblage continued to be dominated by sheep / goat) (ibid. 20). The finds demonstrate the predominance of local wares, with only a small number of imports (ibid. iii, 15-6).

Several early Roman villas within the region developed from pre-Roman sites: a building located c. 1 km from the suburbs at Ilchester Mead (Somerset) may date to before the second century; buildings at Dinnington (Somerset) date to the late first century.  

Figure 3.37 Blacklands Late Iron Age building (IV in Area D) and Roman ‘villa’ (in Area A) (after Wessex Archaeology 2007, fig. 3). ©Wessex Archaeology
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At Bucknowle Farm, Corfe Castle (Dorset), a small second century villa was gradually enlarged: control (or at least processing) of shale resources may have led to the accumulation of wealth (Frere 1984: 318; fig. 3.38). This again suggests the early adoption of new styles of architecture through which status might be demonstrated by some of the landowning elite. But notwithstanding these examples, as elsewhere in the Southwest, most wealthy villas were built during or after the later third century (Cunliffe 1993: 225) – a phenomenon perhaps related to integration of local elites within the State taxation system (see Millett 1990: 133, 178-80).

Dumnonian civitas

Villas and Mediterranean-style buildings were rare within Dumnonia, even within the Exeter hinterland, with only a handful known from the entire Peninsula (Miles 1977: 147). However, at the Roman port at Topsham (near Exeter), a substantial rectangular timber building of three rooms with an eastern veranda (similar in plan to the early villas of southern Britain) formed the nucleus of a farm during the first century AD (Todd 1987: 228; Miles 1977: 113, 117). The site may have had military links, and certainly had contact with other regions. The first century native farmstead (dated by ‘Durotrigian’ ceramics) at Seaton (Devon) - potentially on the Dumnonian / Durotrigian border - possibly developed into a ‘villa complex’ (arguably an ‘embryo courtyard-villa’) during the second - early fourth century; a detached stone bathhouse, with painted plaster and glass windows, was added in the third century (Todd 1987: 220; Miles 1977).

73 Seaton has been identified with Moridunum, although this is contested, considering the incongruity of Roman place name and site topography, and that the settlement does not lie on or near a recognised Roman road (see above; ibid.; Miles 1977: 147-48).
from this site, and backfilled ‘barrack-like’ buildings again suggest links with the military (Todd 1987: 228; see Miles 1977). A roundhouse, probably of post-Conquest date, identified underneath the complex (Miles 1977: 146), may also (or instead) indicate that the later changes represent the adoption of new styles by a local landowner. The villa-type building at Holcombe (Devon), perhaps dating to c. AD 70 (Todd 1987: 220), also developed from a late Iron Age site, where roundhouses were enclosed within a rectilinear earthwork in the LPRIA – early Roman period (Fox 1972). Only two other potential villas have been identified within Devon: at Chardstock and Membury, on or near the putative Dumnonian civitas border (Miles 1977: 147). A primary cremation barrow burial and probable barrow votive activity have been located in the vicinity of these latter villas (see below).

**Cornovian pagus**

The only potential villa-type building west of the Tamar dates to the mid-late second century and was found at Magor, Illogan, near Crambourne (fig. 3.39) – it is a ‘cottage-type’ villa consisting of a small portico with a tessellated floor, and projecting wings containing painted rooms (Todd 1987: 222). Given its rarity, it was arguably an officer’s retirement home, a procurator’s staff office, or a beneficiarius consularis (ibid.), although the possibility that it belonged to a local landowner cannot be excluded (cf. O’Neil 1931: 495). Pottery of any type was rare (but included local wares); no Samian or mortaria were found (ibid.).

---

74 However, the ‘barracks’ have been alternatively interpreted as civilian buildings constructed to a military plan, due to the absence of a surrounding military ditch, although sub-rectangular stock enclosures were identified (Miles 1977: 117).
Villas: discussion

The earliest villas seem to be associated with regional oppidum-type sites, suggesting the rapid adoption of new traditions by regional elites. Masonry construction and new architectural styles demonstrated wealth, status, and awareness of dominant cultural models. Where sites replicate contexts within which ‘Roman’ practices might be mediated (see Hales 2003: 1-2), they may also (though do not necessarily) point towards transformations in cultural identities, with sites such as Woodchester, and Box indicating a clear statement of cultural change. In some cases, as at The Ditches (see fig. 3.32, above), there are apparent attempts to spatially link old and new buildings, perhaps in an expression of leadership rooted in the past, but also possibly representing attempts by the new elite to come to terms with new ways of living, as they gradually transformed their worldviews. Alternative building forms would have required the reconstruction of social space, both structuring new social relationships and cultural identities, and being structured by existing identities.

However, most villas were not constructed until after the mid third century, which suggests only gradual changes in the ways that many of the elite displayed power and negotiated patron-client relationships (see Chapter 5). Mediterranean-style buildings frequently developed from simpler farmsteads, often going through a series of (potentially generational) stages of partial remodelling, usually incorporating the transformation of villa façades. Bearing in mind that such transformations were likely to have been embedded within social relationships, particularly those embodying power differentials (Appadurai 1986: 31-2, 57), it is possible that they facilitated the same negotiation of patron-client relationships through bodily performance seen within private urban domestic space (Grahame 1998; see Hales 2003). Private spaces within urban houses (and villas) were partitioned and restricted, and the movement of clients controlled, by regulating access to space according to social status (Woolf 1999: 37). Visitors were taken through a range of ‘public’ spaces, not only in an overt display of prestige, but also in the demonstration of hospitality (embodying patronage, and thus power), and the exhibition of appropriate ‘civilised’ behaviour (D’Ambra 1998: 41; Graheme 1999: 60). The dining room in particular became a locale for the creation and maintenance of patronage (Grahame 1999: 49; Millett 1990: 201). These evident transformations were again likely influenced by (and were possibly involved within) changing social structures.

Most proto-villas (or ‘cottage-type’ villas) were simple, partitioned rectangular buildings, sometimes with plastered and painted walls. The development of these buildings suggests the imitation and adaptation of Mediterranean style within local milieux (in contrast to the probable import of Mediterranean ‘blueprints’ by immigrant elites) - for this type of villa (such as at Yeovil, White 2007:
216, and at Magor, O’Neil 1931) is not found on the Continent (Hingley 1990). It has been suggested that these villas (which commonly develop during the third century) represent lower status aspirations towards Romanitas (Millett 1990: 186), but the situation may be more complex, with buildings used to emphasise a range of identities. It was argued above (Rural Settlements) that, although a household may appear to ‘become Roman’ through the apparent adoption of ‘alien’ architecture, the absence of other changing practices may indicate the reconstruction of local identities in response to widespread cultural changes at a subordinate socio-economic level, and be more related to personal status, than to transformations in cultural identity. Architecture was an arena in which identities were renegotiated in response to changing historical conditions, rather than reflecting the passive adoption of new styles in response to widening exchange networks. The possibility that conventional use of space in structuring familial relationships continued in some cases has led to the suggestion that these buildings represent the residences of extended families, in which indigenous perceptions of ‘public’ and ‘private’ space were perpetuated (Hingley 1990).

By the early fourth century, a number of regional mosaics display Orphic imagery, possibly alluding to the Roman (and Trojan) origin myths of Ovid’s Metamorphoses (see Simpson 2001: 359-60). This may indicate attempts to create difference in a society where all freeborn were now citizens, and could potentially transform their social standing through the accumulation of wealth. Knowledge of the Classics displayed education, which to some extent legitimised the landowner’s place within the Roman world, demonstrating a degree of ‘civilisation’ above that of the ‘ordinary’ citizen. However, misunderstanding of these cultural symbols is perhaps apparent in some contexts (see Chapter 5, Villas). Belonging within this world could only be demonstrated through appropriate behaviour, within a range of contexts, by enacting social knowledge through ‘correct’ performance.

Not enough is known of local economies to determine the relationships between villas and their hinterlands (see e.g. Clarke 1996: 72). However, villas have been seen as operating in association with, as extensions of, and as dependent upon, centres of urban control (Hodder and Millett 1980: 69; Scull 1992: 14). This may explain their rarity within the Peninsula, although this situation might also indicate that few saw the benefits of adopting new styles in the (re)construction of identities. It has often been argued that those few villas found within this region should be seen as representing accommodation for those associated with the State or military. However, the dearth of ceramics at Magor (with no Samian or mortaria) may suggest otherwise. Considering the site’s probable access to trade and exchange networks, this assemblage is more likely to represent the choice not to accumulate imported wares (in contrast to other sites in the area). It seems in this case as though
the occupants may have adopted Mediterranean style in the expression of status, but did without the expression of ‘correct’ and ‘civilised’ behaviour behind closed doors.

As with any other artefact, we cannot assume the same ‘meaning’ for these buildings in all contexts, to all people. If ‘Roman’ villas do represent emulation of Continental and Mediterranean practices, the discursive appropriation of such cultural attributes in the emphasis of Roman cultural identity may have been situationally contingent. The contexts in which this identity was emphasised (or concealed) would have been dependent upon the consequences of affiliation with the Roman regime in particular local circumstances (Jenkins 2008: 43). Whilst large villas may seem wholeheartedly ‘Roman’, there were often subtle references to locally significant symbols, such as alignment to east or southeast (as at Great Witcombe).

DEFENDED AND URBAN SITES

Figure 3.40 Roman period activity at hillforts (red square; confirmed early activity, including Roman military sites: blue square), in relation to Roman military sites (open rounded rectangular), and oppidum-type enclosures (black square) (Map: author)

Dobunnic civitas

Continued activity at a number of hillforts across the Southwest, including several within the Dobunnic region, is suggested by the presence of Romano-British finds (see Klein 1981; Appendix, Table 9; fig. 3.40). It is noteworthy that such activity was especially prevalent within areas in which engagement with Gallo-Mediterranean material culture and practices was evident during the LPRIA
(see Chapter 2). However, occupation was both limited and erratic (Harding 1976: 42, 44). For example, at Crickley Hill, sporadic occupation of first-second century date is likely, although intermittent ritual activity may have continued at this site throughout the period (Dixon 1994; Jarrett 1999).

It was also noted in Chapter 2 that new types of elite site developed during the Conquest period. The *oppidum* at Bagendon was probably established post-Conquest, most likely due to its strategic location, facilitating control of the major trade route between the Southeast and the West (Catling 2008: 37). Whilst later eclipsed by the probable *civitas* centre (*Corinium Dobunnorum*) at Cirencester, Bagendon perhaps retained a symbolic role for regional or dynastic identity for some time into the Roman period (Millett 1990: 23ff, 87; however, see Hurst 2005: 298).

As elsewhere, civilian urban centres developed at some military sites (fig. 3.41) after the withdrawal of the army, as at *Corinium* (Cirencester), and with the Colony *Nervia Glevesium* (‘Glevum’) at Gloucester (Millett 1990: 75, 87). Both were located at the convergence of several major road networks (fig. 3.42). Mediterranean influence and urban planning is evident at both sites during and after the second century (Laing 1997: 130). *Corinium* was newly organised upon a street grid (fig. 3.43): the Mediterranean urban model informed the town’s development from an early stage. However, the earlier military site influenced the layout of the *colonia* (Hurst 2005: 296ff; McWhirr 1981: 213).
Wealthy urban courtyard houses were built within Cirencester during the second half of the second century (conceivably reflecting the promotion of the town to municipal status, also symbolised in the construction of defences), whilst this practice was witnessed at a slightly earlier date within the *colonia* (Walthew 1983). Both sites were enclosed in the later second century (Hebditch and Grinsell 1968: 12; Hurst 2005: 294). Changes at Gloucester are evident in the third century, during which time the function of some buildings perhaps changed from public to private use (Heighway and Garrod 1980: 84).
Probable small towns, such as that at Bourton-on-the-Water (Gloucestershire), may have developed early in the Roman period, considering their location close to pre-Roman sites (in this case, Salmonsbury hillfort) and the presence of LPRIA ceramics (O’Neil 1986: 37). This particular site had no grid layout (fig. 3.44), although this may have been due to the topography (requiring ribbon development along the Fosse Way, ibid. 31), rather than necessarily indicating the absence of Classical ideologies. Building features included a hypocaust, with the presence of a villa (Donovan 1935: 240, 241) indicating the adoption of Gallo-Mediterranean architectural technologies (fig. 3.45). The material from this site was comparable with that from urban settlements (demonstrating extensive market contacts), with several hundred coins recovered (Burge 1968: 50; O’Neil 1935: 247-8, 252-53).
Figure 3.44 Bourton Bridge Romano-British settlement (after O'Neil 1968, fig. 1)

Figure 3.45 Bourton-on-the-Water Romano-British settlement (from Donovan 1935, f. 240)
Northwest sector of the Belgic civitas

Ptolemy refers (during the second century) to Bath as "a polis of the Belgae" (Rivet and Smith 1979: 255). The possible incorporation of this site (which was perhaps a ritual centre during the LPRIA, see Cunliffe 1969: 1) within the Belgic civitas may be related to the renegotiation of 'tribal' territories during the later first century.75 Development of the town from a military site is suggested by the presence of legionary tombstones (ibid. 3).

The presence of an apparently sub-Dobunnic group located within the Kennet region (possibly centred upon at Mildenhall) is perhaps significant. We saw in Chapter 2 that during the LPRIA, this group appropriated a number of cultural referents indicative of changing identities, which may have enabled expropriation of this territory within the creation of new political units by the State.76 It is noted that there were few Roman military sites within this region (see Appendix, Table 8; see above, fig. 3.1).

75 However, pre-Conquest 'Belgic' territory was centred upon Winchester, with no indication that it extended so far Northwest during this time (Rivet and Smith 1979: 255). Ptolemy's assertion might therefore either indicate a misunderstanding of territorial organisation (which is certainly possible), or suggest post-Conquest administrative changes (Burrow 1981: 14), arguably representing State annexation and redistribution of land (Jones and Mattingly 2002: 44). The evidence for this possible extension of Belgic territory into or up to Southern Dobunnic territory is therefore contentious (Corney 2001: 6; see Griffiths 2001: 48).

76 It has been argued that this was due to opposition to Rome in this area (Dark 1994: 89), but it is alternatively suggested that the Dobunni 'coalesced as a Belgicized group' in South Gloucestershire and North Wiltshire during the first century, expanding into Northeast Somerset (and possibly Hereford) at a later date (Salway 1981: 59). The difficulty in assigning Wiltshire 'to a meaningful tribal region or civitas in Roman Britain' is recognised (Moorhead 2001: 86).
As within the Dobunnic region, some hillforts (particularly those within valley locations, and in proximity to towns) exhibit signs of Roman period activity (see Appendix, Table 9; see above, fig. 3.40), suggesting their continued significance as focal sites. Few towns are noted within the Northwest sector of the Belgic civitas that possibly lay within the region of study (see Appendix, Table 10). The small town of Cunetio developed next to the probable later Iron Age oppidum at Forest Hill, Mildenhall (fig. 3.47). The LPRIA enclosure contained a NS aligned villa-type building (Corney 1997: 339; fig. 3.48). This site was perhaps the only military site within the civitas (Appendix, Table 8), possibly suggesting minimal resistance to State control within this area. As with many other ‘small towns’, Cunetio may have developed from a fort (linked by a road to Bath). 77 The town was laid out on an irregular grid system (perhaps suggesting attempts to emulate Gallo-Mediterranean models), although there were few signs of munificence (ibid. 348).

Early (late first century) activity at Wanborough (Durocomovium) may indicate industrial origins for the settlement (which at this date consisted only of simple timber buildings) - its location next to

77 ADS Record ID - NMR_NATINV-224765, EHNMR-1128369
Ermine Street suggesting the significance of communication networks in site development. Should a fort be subsequently found, this activity would indicate that of a vicus settlement (Anderson and Watcher 1980: 117). However, the major construction phase of rectangular buildings is not noted until the second or third century, and although disturbance makes dating difficult, it appears that a circular timber building with cobble and plaster floor was placed next to a late first–early second century rectangular building (ibid.).

Figure 3.48 Forest Hill villa (after Comey 1997, fig. 1)

Bath (Aquae Sulis), like Cunetio, may have developed as a small town from a military site during the late second century (Bidwell 1980: 12; Millett 1990: 152, 155; see below), but has atypical development, perhaps due to the ritual nature of the site. Location and development of a fort here perhaps demonstrates appropriation of a site that was highly significant in the negotiation of local (and possibly regional) identity. Epigraphy indicates a high percentage of military and immigrant administrative elite residents, which perhaps stimulated the spatial organisation of the town upon a regular grid system, and influenced the early adoption of Classical-style architecture (Millett 1990: 107; see below).

78 It should be noted that early military buildings often had clay floors, as at Gloucester (McWhirr 1981: 38-9).
Parallel developments to those seen within Dobunnic territory at possible small towns such as Camerton (Avon) are recognised, as roundhouses were rebuilt upon stone foundations, and replaced by rectangular buildings during the late second century, with the Fosse Way influencing settlement planning (Wedlake 1958: 55, 58-9). Although perhaps primarily agricultural, Classical pretentions are possibly seen in the development of a corridor villa on the edge of the town (ibid. 48; fig. 3.49). Industrial intensification during the third century is suggested by an inscription indicating official control (ibid. 5, 58-9). The range of imported ceramics at this site (and their local imitations in Romano-British wares) parallels developments on similar sites in the Dobunnian civitas, with finds including Samian, New Forest Wares, and the locally made Savenake Wares (see Bowden and Fowler 1966).

Durotrigian civitas

The significance of some pre-Conquest centres, such as Hengistbury Head, apparently declined as these sites became spatially dislocated from post-Conquest urban sites (Cunliffe 1993: 224-25). Few hillforts within the Durotrigian civitas have yielded evidence of post-Conquest activity (Appendix, Table 9; see above, fig. 3.40), perhaps supporting suggestions of early hostility to Roman rule within this region and subsequent Roman military control of these sites. Conflict is possibly noted in the location of military sites within abandoned hillforts (Appendix, Table 8), some of which have signs of violence (although this does not necessarily date to the Conquest).79

The hillfort at Poundbury, situated on the outskirts of Dorchester (fig. 3.50), was unusual in being occupied from the LPRIA and through the Roman period. However, as elsewhere, roundhouses were replaced by rectangular structures in the later first century (Green 1987: 40ff, 66), utilising new

79 It might be speculated that the early military occupation of Hod Hill represents a breakdown in local diplomatic relations and subsequent resistance on the part of the local elite (see Chapter 2).
building technologies and materials alongside pre-Roman technologies.\(^80\) Imported finds and forms were adopted, including Samian and mortaria (ibid. 52, 66). Part of the site was abandoned by the early third century, but a new settlement of three, more substantial, buildings (with concrete floors) arranged around a courtyard was established by the end of that century, the enclosures mostly laid out to Roman measurements. A rectangular building (R16) replaced a large circular building with a circular hearth during the fourth century (Green 1996: 59-62, 149, fig. 44). This new building was subdivided (fig. 3.51), although practices such as cooking seemingly continued to be undertaken within a communal room (with central oven), the second room arguably fulfilling the purpose of the space around the perimeter of the roundhouse (ibid. 59-62, 149).\(^81\) The pre-Roman subsistence economy (and thus perhaps to a large extent diet) continued, consisting predominantly of wheat, and comparable to other sites in Wessex. However, the interior painted plaster walls perhaps represent Mediterranean influence, and the amphorae fragments and pig bones (ibid.) may suggest changes in diet, and in dining practices. South Cadbury hillfort was occupied after the Conquest for a short time, although the date of this activity is imprecise (see Woodward 2000: 116).\(^82\) Thus, the hillfort perhaps retained its focal role for some time (see below: Burial and Ritual).

---

80 These included the introduction of mortar or chalk flooring, drystone footings, and post-in-trench construction (Green 1987: 66).

81 This structure was comparable to buildings recognised by crop-marks at Maiden Castle (Green 1996), suggesting possible fourth century occupation at the site. Other finds included BB1 and New Forest ware (ibid. 56, 66).

82 Whilst there is evidence for military reoccupation and activity into the early third century, no roundhouses of post-Conquest date have been found, although storage pits do suggest domestic activity on the hill during the early first century AD (Barrett et al. 2000: 169).
Figure 3.51 Structure R16, Poundbury (Green 1987, fig. 44)
Early military domination of this area is perhaps confirmed by the probable origin of Dorchester as a military base, which may have housed *Legio II Augusta* soon after the Conquest. However, the military presence was apparently short lived, with a civic centre possibly established at Dorchester c. AD 70. The urban grid (with timber sill-beam structures fronting the roads) cut earlier boundaries, and arguments have been made for the ritual foundation of the town after the army had vacated the site, according to Roman traditions (Woodward and Woodward 2004). The nearby Neolithic henge of Maumbury Rings was adapted for use as an amphitheatre (Cunliffe 1993: 227). Following a familiar trajectory, urban defences were constructed at Dorchester during the second century.

Although the town was situated on good communication routes and was located only five miles from the coast, it has been described as having “relatively 'poor’” material culture (see Holbrook 2004: 130). Stone structures did not replace timber buildings until the third century (Williams 1971: 169-70), which perhaps suggests a widespread lack of enthusiasm for the adoption of new material culture. As elsewhere, third century transformations are possibly related to the development of the taxation system, which may have provided opportunities for local elites, and instigated a system through which changing styles might be communicated (see above). However, some buildings did show Classical influence at an early date, as witnessed by the second century mosaic pavements at Fordington High Street (Cosh 2008: 3).

The development of smaller towns within the region was also limited (Appendix, Table 10; see above, fig. 3.41). Some developed from military bases, such as Ilchester (near to South Cadbury), which may have replaced an *oppidum*-type settlement (Leach 1982: 3, 5, 8; see Chapter 2). Although a street grid system was in place by the second century, timber buildings were not replaced by local stone structures until the late second - early third century (Leach 1982: 4, 5, 8; Millett 1990: 63), demonstrating only gradual change, and paralleling developments at Dorchester. A possible bastion relating to the later town wall at Ilchester is interpreted as being constructed in c. late third – early fourth century, due to its stratigraphic relationship with the earlier defences (Leach 1984: 50-2).

Urban centres became foci for sub-urban settlements (which perhaps developed to take economic advantage of these sites, reflecting the earlier association between military sites and *vici*), as at Little Spittle (Ilchester), where field boundaries enclosed agricultural plots on which spelt, barley, and oats were grown (Leech 1982: 10). Urban expansion during the later third and early fourth century might be demonstrated by the construction of mortared domestic buildings with courtyards in Kingshams (outside Ilchester), in the area of the partially levelled clay rampart that had been built in the late second or early third century to enclose the town (Leach 1984: 41-3; fig. 3.52).
Copyright image

Figure 3.52 Kingsham, Ilchester (Leach 1982, fig. 6)
A possible small town (probably Vindocladia of the Antonine Itinerary) was perhaps developed during the first century at Shapwick, from the LPRIA settlement (Papworth 1997: 358; fig. 3.53).\(^{83}\) The site lies near to the Iron Age settlement of Badbury Rings (and not far from Spettsbury hillfort), and next to LPRIA enclosure barrows (see Chapter 2), as well as a mid first century Roman fort (see Field 1976; see fig. 3.3).

**Dumnonian civitas**

There is some evidence for activity at hillforts within the Dumnonian region during the Roman period (Appendix, Table 9; see above, fig. 3.40), which may relate to resistance to Roman control, but it is more likely that the evidence simply indicates changes in LPRIA settlement patterns, during which new types of sites were developed (see Chapter 2). The numerous military sites recognised within the region (see Appendix, Table 8; see above, fig. 3.1) may suggest the presence of multiple oppositional groups, but this presence might just relate to defence against Irish raiding. The continued occupation of larger enclosures is common.

---

\(^{83}\) Earthen defences were built during the second century, perhaps to enclose a mansio (Corney 2001: 22; Papwick 1997: 358).
The Fosse Way terminated at Exeter, although an active communication network west of Exeter is suggested by the appearance of the region within the Itineraries (Thomas 1976: 203, 84), and a road network has been proposed (fig. 3.54). The civitas capital (Isca Dumnoniorum) at Exeter (Devon) – the only major urban centre in Dumnonia – continued to develop after the removal of the legionary force (Millett 1990: 75). The town retained the layout of the fort for its streets, with continuity of the military defences into the late second century (when new defences enclosed a much larger area), and is thus more like the development of the colonia at Gloucester than the civic developments noted at Cirencester and Dorchester (Bidwell 1980: 46-7, 56).

Although reduced in size, the impressive legionary baths were converted for civic use after c. AD 75, and the late first century basilica incorporated features from the earlier baths within its fabric (ibid. 46, 49, 51; fig. 3.55). Changes to the basilica and forum are noted at the end of the second century, when part of the courtyard was roofed to form a chamber with several rooms; and at the end of the third century, when the partitions of this room were removed, and a hypocaust fitted (ibid. 76). Early rectangular buildings within the town were of timber, with both timber and masonry structures built after the later second century. Some of these later buildings incorporated mosaics (ibid. 67). The town was prosperous and densely occupied (ibid.). Whilst several poleis occur within the records, the potential corresponding sites have few signs of urbanisation, but may instead demonstrate military influence.

84 However, the defences were allowed to deteriorate until the Antonine period, with the ditches siltling, being cut by pits, and filled with domestic refuse, and clay in places (Bidwell 1980: 46-7).
As in most other areas of the Southwest, sporadic activity at defended sites is evident at least into the second century. The dearth of Roman military sites within this region (in contrast to that of the Dumnonian civitas, see above, fig. 3.1) – notwithstanding its putative role as a military zone (see Mattingly 2006) - indicates either early submission to Roman power, or a lack of Roman interest in the region. However, recent research suggests significant Roman interest in mineral resources (Hammersen 2007). Command of cliff-castles may have sustained the development of local power through control of local resources and exchange. Trevelgue Head (Newquay) continued to be occupied until c. AD 120, with the addition of further fortification during the second – third century AD (Wright 1940: 175; see Chapter 2) perhaps suggesting the significance of this site as a trading post (fig. 3.56). Activity included iron and bronze working. Continued occupation within round huts (ibid.) may indicate deliberate rejection of new stylistic influences by a small few, considering the widespread adoption of oval house plans by others in the region (see above).

There is no urban centre within this region, although a presumably central site ‘Purocoronavis’ (probably *Durocomovium, ‘fort of the Cornovii’) is recorded within the seventh century Ravenna Cosmography, and was perhaps located within the region (Rivet and Smith 1979: 350). Several milestones around Tintagel (Rib 2230, 2231) may suggest the presence of a road leading to the Island (at Trethevy, an inscription dating to AD 251-253 records road mending, and the stone in
Tintagel churchyard records Licinius, dating the inscription to AD 308-24, Todd 1987: 218). This may imply an official role for the Island, perhaps as an administration centre, possibly for tax-collection – potentially a statio (or commercial trading site) (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 329; Thomas 1988a: 8; 1993: 82; 1994: 209). *Durocornovium might therefore have reasonably been located at Tintagel (and Roman finds have been found nearby), though there is little evidence for activity at the site for much of the Roman period.

![Figure 3.56 Trevelgue cliff-castle (Photograph: author)](image)

However, an administrative site was perhaps more probably located near to Carn Brea hillfort (where Roman finds have been found), considering the nearby villa at Illogan (see above, Villas) and the milestone (RIB 2234, dated to AD 238-244). In any case, considering the probable military control of the region, the development of a central site was perhaps related to the removal of military power (although such as site might feasibly have developed with the devolution of certain powers from the elite to local leaders after the mid third century). The development of a focal point, at which administrative and economic practices (such as tax collection), that required the regular presence of the surrounding population (or at least, of their local representatives), may have supported the construction of regional identity – particularly if such a locale appropriated a regional label by which such a population might be categorised.

**Defended and urban sites: discussion**

Where there is no evidence of violence (particularly in regions submitting to Roman rule at an early date, such as Dobunnia), sporadic activity at hillforts may have expressed a cooperative relationship between State authorities and local landowners. However, considering its limited extent, in some cases this activity may have been covert. Continued or revived early Roman occupation does not indicate a high status presence at most hillforts for any time, although such activity may perhaps indicate the continued focal role of these sites in the reconstruction of communal identities.

85 Milestones (RIB 2232, 2233) have also been found at Breage, Helston (dated AD 258-268) and St Hilary (dated AD 306-307).
86 However, even if this reference does indeed record a central role for Tintagel (which is far from certain), some feel that it should be dated to before the development of the sixth century ‘citadel’ (Harry and Morris 1997: 82).
Attempts may have been made by those of the elite who had appropriated Gallo-Mediterranean symbols of power in the creation of social hierarchies and identities during the LPRIA to perpetuate links between pre-Roman and Roman urban sites. In some cases, urban sites were established close to LPRIA elite sites, as is perhaps evident in the location of Vindocladia at Badbury, and Cunetio at Mildenhall, which may demonstrate the continuity of locales that were seen as significant power bases during the LPRIA (see Chapter 2).

However, although oppida and oppidum-type sites established during the Conquest period seemingly influenced the location of many new seats of power (Millett 1990: 65, 74, 87, 92ff) within the Dobunnic, Belgic (Northwest sector), and parts of the Durotrigian region, urban centres did not develop directly from these centres. The relocation of sites may represent an important mechanism of power and control, dislocating old, and requiring the development of new, social memories in the creation of urban (and possibly civitas) identities (van Dyke and Alcock 2003). Nevertheless, urban space was created through and within a Roman discourse, presented as timeless and universal (see de Certeau 1984: 95). In some cases, the development of new social memories was perhaps facilitated by rituals associated with the founding of new towns, as is argued for the founding of Dorchester (Creighton 2004: 209-10, especially p. 213; Woodward and Woodward 2004; Appendix, Table 10). Enclosure of urban sites may have also provided opportunities for the inhabitants to emphasise their urban identity (Gardner 2007).

Although evidence of violence may sometimes represent attacks upon anti-State occupants of hillforts by the Roman army - as is usually assumed (such as at Maiden Castle, where a Roman ballista bolt – or spear-head – was embedded within one body, see Wheeler 1943: 352) – this might alternatively represent internecine conflict in the early Roman reorganisation of land and power. The presence of Roman military equipment also sometimes represents the later use of these sites for military training, and the location of Roman military installations at these sites may have in part made a statement of control over local land and regional centres of power and identity.

Deliberate attempts were perhaps made to appropriate or dominate established social ties within the new regime, for instance by placing the civitas capital of Durotrigia at Dorchester, near to the major centre at Maiden Castle. Other signs of Roman domination within the area surrounding Dorchester may include early Roman modification of the nearby Neolithic henge of Maumbury Rings for use as an amphitheatre, perhaps again representing attempts to recreate the local landscape as an expression of State power (Cunliffe 1993: 227). It is perhaps significant that Dumovaria was not accompanied by a ‘tribal’ suffix. The apparent dearth of munificence may suggest a poor response to Roman systems of acculturation (see Rivet and Smith 1979), and may be linked to the high level of military control noted in the region. Antipathy towards symbols of power
associated with the State and military was also perhaps related to the strength of established group identities, which may have continued to legitimise local authority.

The rare continuity of occupation at Poundbury is curious, considering the other developments noted within the area, but is possibly related to the proximity of the site to the urban centre. Dwelling practices noted at this site may indicate a desire to maintain forms of settlement seen as traditional in the face of change, although again, activity does not seem to be of high status.

Whilst it is often assumed that urban development represents replication according to a common cultural blueprint, there is evident heterogeneity. Of the major towns in Southwest Britain, only Cirencester and Dorchester demonstrate deliberate planning to the Mediterranean model, whereas earlier military sites influenced the layout of Exeter and Gloucester. As might be expected, military identity was central to the identity of the colonia’s occupants (Hurst 2005: 296ff; McWhirr 1981: 213), which suggests the construction and embedding of strong links between the military identity of the colony and their locale, as might be indicated by inscriptions found outside the region. Nevertheless, a new civilian identity was constructed for the town in relation to its new occupants drawn from the surrounding indigenous population, perhaps to encourage engagement in, and adoption of, the new world view. It should therefore be questioned to what extent a military model influenced the reconstruction of identity at and around Exeter. An examination of rural developments (see above, Rural Settlements) suggests that such a military model was drawn upon in the reconstruction of identity within the Dumnonian region, and it might therefore be tentatively proposed that this is also reflected in, and partly explains minimal, urban developments elsewhere within the civitas.

In contrast to other civitas capitals, no pre-existing major pre-Roman centre has yet been identified at Exeter. This may indicate that, following the Conquest, there was an attempt to impose centralisation upon an essentially fragmented socio-political structure. However, developments at Exeter and Dorchester demonstrate that this strategy was not entirely successful. Although it has been argued that development of the civic centre at Exeter indicates the pro-Roman sentiments of local elite (Bidwell 1980: 57), the extent to which changes at this site influenced the cultural development of aspirational elites further west is debatable, considering its inaccessibility to much of the population (Bidwell 1980: 8; Todd 1987: 192, 196, 205).

87 The tombstone found in Rome (ILS 2365) records a legionary soldier of VI Victrix, describing him both as Nervian, and linking him with Gloucester, suggesting the development of the colonia during the reign of Nerva (AD 96-8), or perhaps its earlier foundation and later renaming (Dessau 1892: 475). A tombstone at Bath (RIB 161) records ...DEC COLONIAE GLEV... ...VIXIT AN LXXX Q VI, a dec(urio) coloniae Glevensis (Collingwood and Wright 1965).
At some sites (such as Cirencester), there is evident munificence, and it might be thought that this represents local engagement within the Roman cultural system. However, the earlier munificence in towns may to a certain extent reflect a desire for promotion to municipal status and the associated rights that this bestowed - as much as a genuine desire to affiliate culturally with the Roman world (Hurst 2005: 293, n.1). As there is little munificence evident in small towns, it might be inferred that there was little interest in expressing power within a ‘Roman’ cultural framework for all but a few core individuals.

Although it is usually assumed that civitas centres formed foci for regional groups (see Mattingly 2006: 260-61), the demarcation of particular territories may have created categories that bore little relation to actual situations. It was argued in Chapter 2 that, in most cases, cultural groupings are more likely to have defined amorphous social networks, rather than delineating self-identifying regional groups. Furthermore, where possible regional groups did exist, they were confined to much smaller areas than those subsequently represented by civitas territories. Thus, the identities of regional elite kinship groups were possibly imposed upon the populations occupying associated territories, whose members had hitherto no perception of regional unification. Moreover, the development of some ‘tribal’ units into civitates was possibly suppressed (perhaps due to military, rather than civic, control, in the case of ‘Cornovia’). ‘Tribal’ suffixes were commonly applied to (often geographically derived) place names of urban centres, perhaps representing attempts to reify ‘peoples’ in order to facilitate control, and create (or reposition) loci at which regional identity might be constructed through, for instance, regular assemblies (see Millett 1990: 142).

---

88 Only four towns in Britain, St Albans, and possibly York, London, and perhaps Cirencester, are considered to have actually gained municipal status (Mattingly 2006: 261, 263).
It is often difficult to date early burials to either side of the Conquest, as many within the region exhibit continuing traditions, such as crouched or flexed positions (Holbrook 2004: 135), and sporadic cist graves (see Chapter 2). Some pre-Roman cemeteries continued in use (although there is no evidence to suggest how long the cemeteries at Birdlip, for instance, and elsewhere, continued, see Green 1949; Staelens 1982: 28-9), but many seemingly went out of use during the first century AD. Extra-mural cemeteries defined the urban limits at Cirencester and Gloucester (Hurst 2005: 294). Following Roman laws (MacDonald 1977: 36; Toynbee 1996: 43, 49; Watts 1989: 372), these locales were separate from the settlements lest they pollute the urban ideal through which society might be organised and thus controlled (see de Certeau 1984: 94-6).

Over one hundred graves, associated with numerous grave goods (many of which were dated to the early fourth century), were found at Gambier Parry Gardens, Kingsholm, next to the legionary fort (fig. 3.58). Whilst most contained inhumations, cremations were also found. The tombstone of a legionary soldier may indicate the demographic of the site (see Frere 1984: 315). There are no inscriptions attesting regional identity from within the civitas (and it would not be expected that they should be found within this context, bearing in mind the negotiation of identities in opposition to the ‘Other’, see Jenkins 2004, 2008). However, the expression of Dobunnic regional identity is found on a second or third century tombstone at Templeborough (Rotherham, South Yorkshire) recording the Dobunnic citizenship of one woman (Fulford 2003: 18).89

89 The Templeborough stone (RIB 621) reads: DIS M VERECVD RVFI LIA CIVES DOBVNNA ANNOR XXXV
EXCINGVS CONIVX CONIVGI KARISSIMAE POSIT DE SVO - "To the spirits of the departed and to Verecunda Rufilia,
Whilst the local rite of inhumation generally continued after the Conquest, early Roman period cremations are known (see Chapter 2; Appendix, Table 11; fig. 3.59). Early Roman period cremations are generally associated with urban centres, examples next to roads leading into towns are found within rural locations, and include grave enclosures (as at Duntisbourne Abbotts, Lawrence and Mudd 1999; Appendix, Table 11; fig. 3.60), perhaps indicating Continental influence (see Chapter 2).90 Many cremations also occur close to oppidum-type enclosures, and to hillforts. It has been argued that the Gloucestershire examples represent a break with the earlier enclosure cremations found in the Southeast, being individual burials rather than family groups, with the use of imported ceramics as cinerary urns, arguably displaying ‘Roman’ affinity (Lawrence and Mudd 1999: 99ff, 112-13).

Figure 3.59 Roman period cremations within the Dobunnic region: (black triangle; early Roman = red triangle) enclosure-barrow burials (blue triangles), in association with towns (black hexagons), hillfort activity (green square), and LPRIA oppidum-type enclosures (black squares) (Map: author)

Similar cultural significance (and Gallo-Mediterranean influence) may also be seen in the probable early Roman tumuli graves appearing in the Southwest, mainly to the east of the Fosse Way (Toynbee 1996: 181, 182; Appendix, Table 12; see fig. 3.61), which, post-Conquest, become much more common than enclosure burial. Barrows contained both cremations and inhumations, continuing earlier elite traditions.

---

90 See Williams (2004) for a discussion of the significance of urned cremations in relation to other forms.
Numerous secondary burials were also inserted into prehistoric barrows (Appendix, Table 12; fig. 3.61). Whilst most are of uncertain date, many appear to be late Roman, and may represent a separate activity (see Chapter 6). Nevertheless, ceramics and metalwork of the earlier Roman period (usually of Mediterranean and Continental style, often including Samian) also occur as probable votive offerings within prehistoric barrows and other monuments, as in the Neolithic enclosure and late Neolithic - early Bronze Age Long Mound at Crickley Hill (Hollos 1999; Jarrett 1999; fig. 3.62). At Crickley, the deliberate nature of this behaviour is seen in the use of an implement to place finds within the monument.\textsuperscript{91}

This practice may be paralleled by the reuse of prehistoric barrows on the Continent, which is noted from the first century and later (e.g. see Bradley 2000; Dark 1993). However, Continental activity differs from that at British sites, in that finds from similar sites in Brittany often include deposits such as altars and figurines, suggesting their use as shrines during the Roman period, or an association with fertility cults (\textit{ibid.}).\textsuperscript{92}

\textsuperscript{91} Howard Williams (1998c) claims distinctions between the deposition of human remains and artefacts, and further suggests that some barrow activity might be related to temple activity. However, it will be argued below that the former distinction may be more apparent than real, with Continental comparisons demonstrating the latter to be unlikely within Britain (Dark 1993).

\textsuperscript{92} The only (Roman period) artefact within a British barrow similar to Continental ‘temple’ barrow deposits – a ‘Venus’ statuette found within a barrow at Crickley Hill – has had thermoluminescence dating to the nineteenth century AD (pers. comm. Dr. Philip Dixon). It has been suggested that Continental activity, such as at the Neolithic barrow at Tressé
Votive activity at temples perhaps fulfilled different functions to that at prehistoric mounds. Direct continuity into the Roman period is evident at some temple sites, including Uley (Henig 1984: 38; Woodward 1992). LPRIA shrines were frequently replaced by stone temples, suggesting changes in the way in which it was thought appropriate to express relationships with deities – it is even possible that the perceived cultural identities or origins of these deities were transformed. The only instance of a truly Classical temple within the Dobunnic region is at Lydney (a site perhaps connected with a naval base at Gloucester), although another possible example was constructed within the *colonia* at Gloucester (Hurst 2005: 300), perhaps suggesting a relationship between the development of these sites by the military. Most temples demonstrate the amalgamation of new building technologies within native traditions, with the development of ‘Romano-Celtic’ style buildings - as at Brean Down and Henley Wood (Bell 1990: 82; Watts and Leach 1996). The temple at Brean was also placed next to a prehistoric barrow, which may indicate an attempt to appropriate an earlier ‘ritual’ site (fig. 3.63).

However, some sites move away from even semi-Classical models before the end of the Roman period. At Claydon Pike, a rectangular shrine associated with the rural settlement was replaced by a circular timber shrine during or after the third – fourth century, placed near to a villa-type building (Frere 1984: 312; fig. 3.64).

(Brittany), which contained a crouched burial associated with beads, ceramics, a possible fibula, pieces of iron (initially interpreted as a knife, and sword tip), and a coin of Domitian, might be due to the resemblance between souterrains and megalithic tombs (Bradley 2000: 39, 41-2, 43). This forms a contrast with the British activity, in that the many round barrows chosen for deposition in Britain bear no resemblance to chambered tombs (although this suggestion might be valid for the activity at Kennis Veain (Cornwall) (see below).

93 ‘Romano-Celtic’ temples are generally square with a cella and ambulatory (Woodward 1992).
Figure 3.62 Long Mound, Crickley Hill, towards the Western tip of the hill (Photograph: author)

Figure 3.63 Brean Down temple and barrow (ApSimon 1965, fig. 42)
By contrast to Dobunni, many LPRIA cemeteries seem to have gone out of use during the first century AD (e.g. *Cunetio*, Corney 1997: 347), with the development of extra-mural urban cemeteries, such as that at Bath. However, changes in burial rites are in general similar to those in other regions, with pre-Roman rites gradually being supplanted by extended inhumations. Cist and stone-lined graves continued sporadically into the third century, for example at Highworth (Wiltshire) (Philpott 1991: 223, 54). A similar range of grave goods to those seen elsewhere in the Southwest is evident (with the exception of the Peninsula), although few ceramics were placed within Wiltshire graves before the third century. Nevertheless, several cremations have been found (Appendix, Table 11; fig. 3.65), for instance, within the rural cemetery at Winterbourne Down (Bowen and Fowler 1966: 48). Some LPRIA rites continued, with sporadic crouched burials (see Philpott 1991: 223, 54).
Other parallels within this sector of the Belgic region include the construction of a small number of barrows during the Roman period, although secondary burials within prehistoric barrows are perhaps less common than in the Dobunnic region (fig. 3.66). In some cases, direct Continental or Mediterranean influence is indicated in the construction methods of the mounds, as in the truncated second - third century tumulus at Overton Down (Wiltshire) although the integral wooden posts have suggested to some the influence of indigenous building traditions (Toynbee 1996: 183; Smith and Simpson 1964). The sporadic, but relatively frequent, reuse of prehistoric monuments for ritual activity is also seen (Appendix, Table 13; fig. 3.66).

A small number of Classical style temples were also constructed in the region, as at Nettleton Scrubb and Bath, and temples were frequently dedicated to paired indigenous and Classical deities (in this case to Apollo Cunomaglos, and Sulis Minerva, respectively) (Cunliffe 2000; Wedlake 1982).

**Durotrigian Civitas**

‘Durotrigian’ burial practices (see Chapter 2) continued into the second century (Whimster 1981). Ceramics are more commonly found within graves in Somerset than Wiltshire, perhaps reflecting the influence of the ‘Durotrigian’ rite. Adult burials continued to be mainly accompanied by Durotrigian wares, although grave goods often came to include Samian and Gallo-Belgic wares and their imitations (Philpott 1991: 195-6; 106; Whimster 1981: 50). Crouched pit burials often continued into the first or second century, but later examples have been found within some parts of Dorset. Crouched and flexed burials are accompanied by third century jars at Wyke Regis (near Weymouth, Dorset) (Philpott 1991: 54), at Weymouth, and at Westonzoyland (Somerset) (O’Brien 1999: 5), where third century cist and stone-lined graves were also found (Philpott 1991: 223, 54). Some earlier cemeteries continued in use, as at Poundbury (see above; Green 1987: 52, 66; Farwell and Molleson 1993: 6-13).
A possible correlation between the Durotrigian burials and the development of shrines within the Southern Dorset region was suggested in Chapter 2, and may be seen in the creation of a ritual focus at Portesham. This probable LPRIA – early Roman period shrine (fig. 3.67) may have continued to act as a focus for ‘Durotrigian’ burials (see Chapter 2, fig. 2.21), and apparently remained a significant site beyond the Conquest period. Maintenance of the circular timber building throughout the Roman period (Valentin n.d.; see Chapter 6) suggests its ritual significance.
A settlement, incorporating a rectangular structure, developed at this site (fig. 3.68), and there are indications of ceramic manufacture nearby (see fig. 3.69). The Portesham ‘shrine’ is located amidst a concentration of ‘Durotrigian’ burials, and close to a mid first century mirror burial that included brooches, a toilet set, and an imported ‘Roman’ wine strainer (see Joy 2009). The presence of brooches, and the location of this burial on or near a ridge, makes it similar to the example at Birdlip (see Chapter 2).

LPRIA burial practices potentially representing a contestation of the ‘Durotrigian’ rite continued into the Roman period in the Northeast Dorset region, with wider adoption of certain practices in other areas during the Roman period. The incidence of cremations and secondary barrow burial around the civitas capital may confirm their association with the Roman world. Several Roman period cremations have been identified within the territory (although it is uncertain whether these belong to the early or later Roman period), and their presence within the Northeast Dorset region possibly suggests a degree of cultural continuity (see Appendix, Table 11; fig. 3.70). As in the LPRIA, some are contained within square enclosure graves, at times covered by barrows. The round mound surrounded by a square ditched enclosure at Handley Down, on Gussage Hill (Dorset), covering a spread of ash, charcoal and human bone, first century AD ceramics, and a sheep's mandible (Darvill 1987: 158; Whimster 1981: 34, 393), dates to the Conquest period (see Chapter 2). This burial was perhaps associated with a multi-ditch enclosure interpreted as an oppidum (Petts 1998b: 82-3, 86-7; see fig. 3.23, above). A ditched enclosure grave, probably dating from between the mid-late third and fourth centuries (but perhaps influenced by earlier regional traditions), seems to have formed a focus for the later Roman cemetery at Little Keep, on the northwest edge of Dorchester near Poundbury (Dinwiddy and McKinley 2009: 40, 47). Other early Roman period tumuli (see Appendix, Table 12; fig. 3.71) include those at Woodlands and Witchampton, which are comparable to examples in Rome - the example at Witchampton being a possible ‘drum-and-cone’ tumulus (Toynbee 1996: 181, 18). Both inhumations and cremations occur as primary and secondary barrow burials within the region (Appendix, Table 12).

94 Another early Roman mirror burial has been found nearby very recently. See http://www.thisisdorset.co.uk/news/Metal-detector-finds-Iron-Age-body/article-2149325-detail/article.html
Secondary burials within prehistoric barrows are again concentrated within these areas, particularly in Northeast Dorset (and on Purbeck, where possible LPRIA secondary burials were also noted). Roman period votives were sometimes placed within barrows containing Iron Age finds (Appendix, Tables 6 and 13; fig. 3.71). Secondary barrow burials and votives are also now found around Dorchester, where there is little evidence of similar LPRIA activity (although one possible LPRIA secondary barrow burial is noted). On the ridge close to, but not adjoining, the Portesham ‘shrine’ are a number of burials, where Bronze Age barrows were reused for cremation and inhumation. Nearby a possible Roman period linear earthwork cut through another Bronze Age barrow (RCHME 1970a: 519).
Developments within the Northeast Dorset region include the presence of a distinct group of first-early second century burials (generally males and children) accompanied by personal ornaments within the Cranborne Chase area, where at least one possibly elite group was seen to have adopted Gallo-Mediterranean material culture and practices during the LPRIA (see Chapter 2). Brooches were placed at the right hip and shoulder of one burial at Rotherley, and at the left hip of a burial at Woodyates, accompanied by a pot and coins of the first-second century (Philpott 1991: 223, 178, 225). At Litton Cheyney, a first century brooch and bracelet had been placed on the chest of a child, whilst a second-third century brooch had been placed on the shoulder or neck of an adult burial (RCHME 1976: 55; Philpott 1991: 137). However, despite the sporadic continuity of local LPRIA traditions, in general, extended inhumation became the normative rite within the civitas by the third century.

Continuity of ritual practice into the Roman period is noted also at South Cadbury, where Shepton Mallett ware and terra rubra were found in the top of the bedding trench of the summit shrine, perhaps dating activity to the first century AD and post-dating the massacre on the site (see above, Defended and urban contexts; Barrett et al. 2000: 173). Furthermore, it has been speculated that another temple, comparable to an example at Sanxay (Gaul), may have been built on the hilltop during the second century (ibid. 178), which may suggest continuing Continental influences, as suggested for some elites within this area during the LPRIA (see Chapter 2). Although most temples were Romano-Celtic in style, as at Brean Down (see fig. 3.63, above), the temple at Lamyatt Beacon adopted a Classical model (Bell 1990: 82; Woodward 1993), suggesting Continental or Mediterranean influence. A votive shaft has been located at Jordan Hill (near Weymouth), where a deposit of ritually bent iron weapons (Frere 1973: 330) perhaps demonstrates military ritual activity, but may also suggest Gallo-Mediterranean influence. Some villas within the region, such as Lufton, may also have had a ritual role (but see Cosh 2001: 230; Ellis 1995; Polci 2003; see Chapters 5 and 6).

D U M N O N I A N C I V I T A S

Few burials, and even fewer cemeteries, have been identified within the Dumnonian region, although sporadic finds in the area of Exeter indicate the occasional adoption of practices found elsewhere. It is therefore possible that, for most, pre-Roman rites continued into the Roman period, although the general absence of grave goods makes dating burials difficult. However, a major cemetery has been excavated at Cannington (see Chapter 5). If this site was indeed located within the Dumnonian (and not Durotrigian) civitas, its uniqueness may indicate attempts by Dumnonian elite to mark the boundaries of this territory through burial practices that demonstrated the cultural incorporation of some within the Roman world, alongside regional difference.
Figure 3.72 Cannington cemetery, with barrow-enclosure grave 424, top (Rahtz, Hirst and Wright 2000: 30)

Copyright image
The site was possibly established in the second century, and some have argued that it was within the Northeast boundary of the civitas (see Rahtz 1977: 59). Most graves were typical of other Roman period burials associated with both rural and urban sites across the Southwest (see Rahtz, Hirst and Wright: 2000: 49).

A special grave (Burial 424, radiocarbon dated to AD 210-440), containing a WE aligned burial (of a young adult, perhaps male) and located on the hill summit of the cemetery, formed a focus for subsequent burials (ibid.; fig. 3.72). It been suggested that the trench surrounding the grave might represent a structure such as a Romano-Celtic shrine or temple (although no votive deposits have been found), and that it is therefore comparable to sites such as Portesham (see above, Durotrigia). Alternatively, it has been suggested that it represents a regional form of ‘mausoleum’ (ibid.). If this is the case, Irish influence is just possible (see Thomas 1971: 60; Chapter 6). However, this example more likely corresponds with examples found elsewhere in the Southwest, during the LPRIA and Roman period, and demonstrates Gallo-Mediterranean influence (see Chapter 2).

Occasional Roman period cremations occur within the civitas, mainly around Exeter, but also possibly near the putative civitas border zone (see Appendix, Table 11; fig. 3.73), demonstrating appropriation of new ideologies and beliefs. A small number of primary barrow burials have been found, although unlike in other regions, secondary burials within prehistoric barrows have not been found. However, occasional votive activity within prehistoric barrows (often close to sites of cremation burial), have been found within the civitas. In one case, Romano-British (and probably votive) ceramics occur within a barrow also containing Iron Age ceramics (see Appendix, Tables 6 and 13). The barrow burial at Chardstock, and votive activity at Membury, both lay close to villas. The possible Roman period barrow near Sidmouth may indicate continuity from the LPRIA, although the date of barrows within this region is uncertain (see Chapter 2).
Otherwise, there is little clear evidence for ritual within the region (though certain activities, such as the deliberate placement of a decorated mirror within a fire-reddened pit at Holcombe, see Fox 1972: 293, may represent ritual deposition, potentially a foundation deposit). There is no certain evidence for the presence of shrines, although the place name Nemetostatio, occurring within the later *Ravenna Cosmography*, perhaps at North Tawton (Rivet and Smith 1979), hints at the location of a ritual site within the region. In parallel with developments in the Central-Southern region, a ritual shaft (and possible shrine), containing similar votives to temple deposits (Todd 1981: 161-2), was created within the Cadbury Castle hillfort (Devon) during the third century, and may suggest Gallo-Mediterranean influence. Finds included possible material from a nearby Bronze Age barrow.95

Again, several tombstones found from outside of the region assert the Dumnonian origins of the deceased. An inscription at Cologne (*AE* 1956.249) records Aemilius, *civis Dumnonius*, as having served with *classis Germanica*; two stones from Hadrian’s Wall (*RIB* 1843, 1844) name *civitas Dum(no)nk(orum)*; and an inscription from Dorchester (*RIB* 188) records a ‘citizen of the Dumnonii’ - [*...*] Carinus, *civ[...]* (Collingwood and Wright 1965).

**‘CORNOVIAN’ PAGUS**

In general, it is likely that LPRIA burial practices and cemeteries continued, as in other areas. The peninsular tradition was perpetuated at least into the early second century AD (Cunliffe 1991: 505), although in the general absence of grave goods – a factor that differentiates these burials from those elsewhere within the Southwest - leaves the possibility open that these remains may be later in some cases. The placement of cremation cists within small circular enclosures may also have continued into the first or second century, for example at Harlyn Bay (Thomas 1971: 60). It is noticeable that grave goods are found in association with burials in coastal areas, where the local elite may have been in contact with those from the Bristol Channel region.96

Possible primary Romano-British inhumation barrows (at Kerris Vean) and cremation barrows (at Lambourne Downs, and on Morvah Hill), and secondary cremations inserted within prehistoric barrows (or apparent cairns) during the Roman period (Appendix, Table 12; fig. 3.74), are also found.97 These examples are similar to those found elsewhere in the Southwest, which might therefore suggest a spread of ideas into the Peninsula. The placement of votives within barrows during the Roman period, which is also likely at a number of sites (Appendix, Table 13), may

95 A hoard of coins was also discovered in the area (NMR_NATINV-36328).
96 At St. Enodoc, continuity through the Roman period is indicated by ceramics (Thomas 1971: 58). A later phase above Iron Age burials is likely at Crantock and at Harlyn Bay (Thomas 1971: 60; Olson 1982: 181).
97 However, these practices may date to the later, rather than earlier, Roman period.
suggest the same. At Goldvadnek barrow (Wendron), covering a vault containing Roman coins, a cinerary urn, and a brass instrument set in ivory, as well as a possible tessellated pavement, more likely suggests the presence of migrants (whether or not from outside the Southwest).98

Occasional votive objects are recorded, such as the miniature axe found at St Minver, perhaps hinting at the location of a temple within the region, and possibly suggesting the presence of migrants (due to the very localised appearance of this find). Otherwise, limited evidence for votive activity may suggest the continuity of pre-Roman perceptions of the supernatural. The only temple within the region is at Nor’nour (off St. Martin's, Scilly Isles), which bears a closer resemblance to local cellular buildings than to Classical temples (fig. 3.75), although finds are similar to those from Gaulish sites (Todd 1987: 229).

98 However, doubt has been cast over this monument. It was discovered during the eighteenth century, but the primary remains are more likely to be Bronze Age, with secondary Roman activity (NMR_NATINV-425887).
Across the Southwest, regional burial practices established in the LPRIA (such as the ‘peninsular’ and ‘Durotrigian’ rites – confined to relatively small areas that did not spread across the full extent of subsequent civitas territories) - continued well into the Roman period. This was perhaps because they had a highly significant role in the expression of group identities. Elsewhere, ‘Gallo-Mediterranean’ rites seen in some areas during the LPRIA spread during the Roman period, particularly to the area around towns (see Chapter 2).

The continuity of ‘Durotrigian’ burial practices may represent the continued emphasis of collective identity (and perhaps attempts to create regional power from established social networks) by a kinship group in the South of the region, in opposition to those adopting new ways of expressing power, imported from the Continent and Mediterranean. Nevertheless, new forms of material culture were absorbed within the expression of this regional identity during the early Roman period, as Gallo-Roman ceramics became incorporated within funerary assemblages, alongside local wares (the forms of which were also transformed).

It is argued that Portesham may have been a significant locale to this Southern group (see Chapter 2). A timber building was in use over a long period of time and the presence of associated burials (with an additional female Conquest period ‘mirror’ burial nearby) – most likely the graves of important local or regional personages – would have provided the potential to create ancestral cults (pers. comm. Dr. Ken Dark). Ritual behaviour at this site may represent the creation of a continuous ‘symbolic community’ – such as often accompanies attempts to establish a mythological relationship with the land (Bloch 1982: 211, 213; Langdon 1985: 110; see Chapter 6).

It has been suggested that hillforts shrines, such as those at South Cadbury and Maiden Castle, acted as foci for ritual performance by an increasingly structured priesthood within this area, who were potentially in a position to instigate resistance to Roman rule, with shrines indicating a degree of centralised ritual practice in the LPRIA – early Roman period (see Chapter 2). Such ritual foci might reasonably be seen as the centres at which the historically attested ‘Druidic’ priesthood performed ceremonies with the potential to unite large groups in opposition to imperial expansion (which it is seen was primarily counterproductive to the survival of ‘pro-Roman’ elite). The shared practices noted across the Southern area and at these two sites, and the social network noted within this area in the distribution of ceramics, may suggest a relationship between the hillfort communities, and those of the Portesham area. In this instance, a kinship group may have been involved within an anti-imperial interest group. However, there are few shrines in the Dobunnic area,

99 Similar suggestions have been made for other regions, such as the shrine on Hayling Island perhaps representing a dynastic cult of Commius (see Creighton 2004: 191).
and no indications that Dumnonia participated within this religious network in the LPRIA – early Roman period.

Perhaps because religion was an arena through which resistance may have been most keenly enacted (Webster 1995b), there were attempts to control indigenous deities through interpretatio Romana, as with the twinning of indigenous and Classical deities, for example, Sulis Minerva at Bath. The superimposition of Roman deities upon non-Classical deities (often with misrepresentation) by military and administrative elites compromised the native gods (Webster 1995b). (Re)naming these deities within an asymmetrical colonial discourse in itself created an imbalance of power (ibid. 158, 160-61). As part of this process, new ideologies were produced and reproduced, transcending differences within created communities (see Webster 1997b).

It has been suggested that the religious elite of some areas perhaps influenced the development of opposition to State control through the advocacy of inter-regional identities during the early Roman period. However, although Jane Webster suggests that the ‘Druidic’ movement (as a supra-regional organisation with extensive political power) may have been a focus for the creation of ‘national’ consciousness (see Webster 1999), there is no evidence for any widespread expression of ‘national’ identity within the material record at this time. Any such faction is more likely to have been mobilised locally and regionally, and any construction of ‘British’ identity would have been primarily among the elite, and linked to the internalisation of Graeco-Roman ethnographic constructs. It was argued in Chapter 2 that such a process, as a mechanism for the creation of social hierarchies, drew upon Gallo-Mediterranean symbols of authority, in an attempt to come to terms with the imbalance of power created after the Caesarian Conquest. As Creighton has suggested, due to possible diplomatic links with Gaul and Rome (see Creighton 2004), this group is more likely to have contested the power of the priesthood and its accompanying opposition to Roman rule. If not due to ideological support of the Imperial regime, then to protect their own interests (including kin held as hostages by the State), affiliation with Rome was more likely to have been expressed - at least openly – rather than opposition. Chapter 2 suggested the location of potentially ethnic groups during the LPRIA (such as in the Cotswolds and Northeast Dorset), although with regard to the appropriation of Gallo-Mediterranean material culture and practices within this process, a simplistic correlation with pro-Roman sentiments is hard to sustain. This is perhaps no more evident than in the domination of some central sites by the Roman army, within areas in which elites had appropriated such culture during the LPRIA. However, we must of course take into consideration that attitudes and behaviour towards Rome may have changed after the Conquest. Conversely, continued occupation of some Durotrigian hillforts for decades after the ‘official’ Conquest is noted at sites potentially associated with the priesthood, and may suggest a
negotiated peace – or alternatively it may indicate the protracted nature of Conquest within South Dorset. Whether the subsequent abandonment of these sites (followed by the presence of Roman military equipment) represents cultural or coercive change is open to debate. Attempts by either the State or its supporters to control regional factions may have resulted in domination of the ancestral landscape (both destroying and appropriating prehistoric monuments), in the assertion of new ideologies, and in the metaphorical realignment of ancestors within a Roman discourse.

It was argued in Chapter 2 that the Cranborne Chase region (Northeast Dorset) was one region in which Gallo-Mediterranean practices were appropriated in the construction of group identity during the LPRIA, perhaps in response to the embryonic regional identity developing in the South of the region. During the Roman period, similar activity is again concentrated within this region (see fig. 3.76). Secondary barrow burial and votive deposition spreads during the Roman period to urban hinterlands. A common distribution of LPRIA and Roman-period barrow activity is also seen within the ‘Dobunnic’ region. The possible LPRIA primary barrows on the south coast of Dumnonia did not form a focus for subsequent barrow activity, although a small number of primary barrows are noted elsewhere within the civitas during the Roman period. The enclosure-barrow on the summit at Cannington cemetery may demonstrate Irish influence, though bearing in mind the other burial practices witnessed within this cemetery, this grave is more likely to represent regional transformations of ‘Roman’ practices in the creation of social hierarchies and construction of a regional identity by nascent elite.

The distribution of this activity may indicate both long-term practices, and their Gallo-Mediterranean influence, as well as supporting the suggestion that this behaviour reflects attempts to restructure the ancestral past within a Graeco-Roman cultural framework (see Chapter 2; see Creighton 2004: 138-43). Roman period artefacts associated with prehistoric monuments (and with both primary and secondary burials within barrows) in many ways parallel votive depositions at some LPRIA central sites (see Chapter 2), and to some extent, at temples. However, figurines are not associated with barrows, in contrast to activity in Gaul (Dark 1993; see Woodward 1993: 60), and a more restricted range of finds are associated with barrows than with temples (Appendix, Tables 12 and 13). The evident selection of particular objects demonstrates the improbability that most deposits were accidental or domestic in nature, and points to their position within a specific ideological framework. The range of votive artefacts and grave goods appears to represent ‘civilised’ practices.
Figure 3.76 Probable and possible Roman period barrow burial (red semi-circle = primary, arc = secondary) and votive activity (red circle), in relation to LPRIA barrow and enclosure (blue square) burial, and votive activity (black circle) (Map: author)
Gallo-Roman ceramics are most common, personal or namentation often occurs, and architectural fragments are sometimes found (perhaps indicating the deposition of *spolia*). This behaviour may represent attempts to link the deceased and ancestors with new forms of architecture, incorporating the ancestors within the new identities of the landowning elite, in attempts to naturalise cultural transformations.

These practices demonstrate the post-Conquest spread of new ideologies of power, in which some of the landowning elite may have increasingly appropriated the landscape in the construction of shared histories, and in the reconstruction of ancestral narratives - behaviour that in some cases was linked to the expression of identities within a Gallo-Mediterranean cultural framework. The combined emphasis upon ancestors (perhaps with attempts to transform the ancestral past), and upon common elite culture, may point towards the ethnic nature of these practices. Mythologies may have further supported the creation of shared history for the ancestors and elites. The use of ancestral mounds again implies the invocation of a distant mythic past associated with the dead, and perhaps encouraged the development of hero-cults, associated with dominant lineages (Parker Pearson 2003: 129, 156-7, 167). The possible placement of both Iron Age and Romano-British finds within some barrows may demonstrate the perpetuation of narratives over long periods of time that connected the community and local elite within ritual landscapes.

In many societies, the ancient and the recently dead - by evoking concepts of permanence - are used as a tool of legitimisation of traditional authority (Bloch 1982: 11). This practice would have reinforced the status identities of landowners and the kin of those interred (if they indeed differed). The construction and validation of communal identities through such rituals perhaps counteracted tensions arising from the development, or upholding, of socio-political hierarchies and supporting claims to landownership (Cohen 1985; Harris 1982: 46, 48; Jenkins 2004: 151).

The construction of mounds may have helped present an image of constancy within unstable historical conditions, enabling the creation of groups by tying them to a specific locale (Petts 1998b: 32-3). Secondary barrow burials also created mnemonics for community identities through commemoration of ancestors in part ‘belonging’ to the community. Such activity creates a continuum with the past, in which community biographies are created by the formation of narratives by dominant individuals. In this way, meaning is metaphorically inscribed upon these monuments.

---

100 The term ‘*spolia*’ is translated from Latin as ‘spoils’ (Kinney 2001: 138), but is commonly taken to mean the ‘appropriation of objects from past and foreign cultures’ (Matthews, K. R. 1999: 168). These finds are sometimes seen as indicating the presence of nearby villas (Scott 1993, *passim*), although the long term and selective nature of these finds makes this less likely.

101 This practice was perhaps in part to a form of communication with the ancestors or deities, who might be induced to act on behalf of the local community in times of trouble (Parker Pearson 2003: 26, 27; Wait 1996: 506, 508). The deposition of human remains within prehistoric barrows may have been to some extent votive in nature (part of the same tradition as ceramics, coins, and other metalwork. This is perhaps indicated by the usually crouched or contracted position of the body, arguably undertaken “for the community as symbols of community” (Jenkins 2004: 77, 99, 111-12).
through ritual performances (see Barrett 1994: 237; also Connerton 1989). This behaviour may have spread the idea of a 'national consciousness', notwithstanding the exclusion of all but an elite few from this collective identity, and at the same time, legitimised the power of the elite due to their 'superior' (ethnic) status. As seen in Chapter 2, such rites belong within a process of transformation that may have taken several generations, and might represent local reactions to wider transformations (cf. Hill 1995b: 66, 80), in which identities were renegotiated in relation to both internal and external historical transformation.

Burial was also used as a way of perpetuating and renegotiating identities. Inhumation became the dominant rite (replacing the presumed predominant practice of excarnation, see Chapter 2), although cremations occurred more frequently, primarily around towns (though rarely in comparison to other parts of Britain, and the Continent). Where cremation occurs (and where there is no continuing tradition from the LPRIA), this might suggest either the presence of immigrants, or the transformation of worldviews, and perhaps cultural identities, of some local residents. It is impossible to be more certain without, for instance, DNA analysis (the reliability of which is debatable, see Killgrove 2005: 52; Schurr et al. 2008: 96). Cremations cluster around urban centres, such as Gloucester and Exeter, which may indicate a military aspect to this rite, although there is no general correlation with military sites. As in the LPRIA, this practice seemingly reflects Gallo-Mediterranean influence, when elite identity may have been expressed through the medium of 'foreign' culture. Other practices, such as extended burial, witnessed on the Continent and Mediterranean during first century AD (and in parts of the Southwest, such as Avon) become more common.

A number of LPRIA cemeteries across the region continued in use, and were perhaps significant locales in which communal identity might be emphasised in opposition to external control. However, new cemeteries were often established in association with urban sites. Although it is difficult to be certain of the extent to which these burial grounds served rural communities, the apparent absence of cemeteries in association with most rural settlements suggests that this may have been common. If so, this may indicate the desire to adopt 'correct' burial practices by these communities, perhaps in some cases representing the transformation of cultural identities, or in others, the adoption of new ways of creating social hierarchy. Burial practices within cemeteries suggest transformations to religious belief systems, and (or) new mechanisms for communicating with the supernatural. The internal organisation of these cemeteries offered new ways of negotiating social relationships,

---

102 However, subsequent different readings of these monuments were perhaps evoked through alternative oral traditions, as successive generations rewrote their histories in an ongoing *bricolage* incorporating landscape and local traditions.
status and group identities (Toynbee 1996: 55, 113; Whittaker 1997: 146). For instance, graves of prominenti and their families often influenced the positions of subsequent graves (Toynbee 1996: 73, 76), as is evident in the case of focal graves at Cannington (see fig. 3.72).

The development of new cemeteries may indicate divisive attempts to create focality for the civitas and colonia (Millett 1990: 142), reflecting a degree of political control or influence. Such acts were perhaps incorporated within the deliberate construction of regional identity by those holding regional power, encouraging the development of urban centres as communal foci for the rural population. This process was perhaps encouraged by appropriation of ‘tribal’ names for urban centres (such as the association of Dobunnorum with Corinium), with civitates acting as loci through which the social network might be constructed within a regional framework, possibly unified through centralised assembly (ibid.). The location of Cannington on the possible border of the Dumnonian civitas may possibly be related to the construction of regional identity through burial rites, within a region in which urban foci were insignificant to most, with the development of this site possibly indicating attempts to redefine regional identities by incorporating new practices and ideologies.

The architecture of ritual was transformed with the reconstruction of temples in stone at many sites, as at Maiden castle and Uley (perhaps in part to reconstruct the identities of deities). This material transformation paralleled changes to domestic architecture. However, prehistoric ritual sites often retained their significance, as at Bath. These practices again indicate transformations in both the material forms by which social relationships were expressed, and the absorption of new traditions within established rites. The replication of Mediterranean style at some temples at an early date (more commonly seen within the Dobunic and Northwest Belgic regions) would have transformed the local landscape and may have encouraged modifications to regional and local identities. Dedication of temples to paired indigenous and Classical deities perhaps aided this process, although alternatively this phenomenon may indicate attempts to ‘control’ indigenous deities by the resident military and State elite (Webster 1995b; see above).

Mediterranean influence may also be seen in the development of votive shafts, with the incorporation of prehistoric material in the example at Cadbury Castle (Devon) perhaps suggesting attempts to appropriate the prehistoric ancestors within a Mediterranean ideological framework. This is possibly comparable with the process of burial and votive deposition at barrows, and the incorporation of spolia within these contexts, and in some graves. This practice might alternatively represent attempts to control the local landscape and its ancestors by a newly resident State elite or military.
It has been seen above that there is rarely a neat correlation between political and cultural boundaries, although distinct traditions are noted within each civitas, which may have influenced the subsequent development of Roman political units, superficially based upon existing ‘tribal’ identities. This may demonstrate State expropriation of LPRIA elite regional constructs in the creation of the civitates, and the submission of other, oppositional, regions by both force and cultural domination.

A number of themes relating to the construction of identity during the earlier Roman period become apparent. Firstly, the regional identities developed at the end of the Iron Age continued to resonate throughout the Roman period, but these identities were renegotiated over this time in response to changing conditions, in the course of which new cultural influences were appropriated and transformed. Secondly, it seems that some may have manipulated symbols of power adopted by the administrative elite (or in some areas, the military), in the creation of social hierarchies at a local level, even though their daily lives may have changed very little. Thirdly, that as greater opportunities were developed through association with the State, some may have altered their identities to accommodate the notion of ‘being Roman’, though to most this identity was insignificant (and possibly meaningless). Fourthly, that notions of ‘Britishness’, which may have been developed by some members of the elite in the LPRIA due to contact with the Roman world - internalising and appropriating Classical ethnographic constructs - may possibly be seen in particular forms of burial and ritual.

The next section will examine cultural changes during the later Roman period, and consider how this may have affected the transformation of social identities, beginning with an analysis of military control and social organisation in Chapter 4.
SECTION 2: LATE- AND EARLY POST-ROMAN SOUTHWEST BRITAIN
CHAPTER 4: THE IMPACT OF POLITICAL AND MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS UPON SOUTHWEST BRITAIN, C. AD 350-450

INTRODUCTION

Widespread socio-political and economic changes are recognised across the Empire during the later Roman period (see Wickham 2003; Wickham 2005). Parallel transformations to material culture and social practices to those seen on the Continent are witnessed throughout Southwest Britain. Similar changes are seen in rural (Chavarría 2004, 2005; Chavarría and Lewit 2004: 17, 24, 26-8, 30-6; Hirschfield 2001: 264-70; Lewit 2003; Liebeschuetz 2001: 376, 382; Sarris 2004; Schachner 2006: 48, 66; Sfameni 2004; Van Ossel 2006: 537, 540, 554) and urban (Arce, Chavarría and Ripoll 2007: 306-8, 312, 317, 319-20, 322-23; Halsall 1995a; Hirschfield 2001: 260-64; Lavan 2003a, 2003b; Lavan 2006a: 196, 202-03, 204, 213, 226; Lavan 2006b: 14, 29; Lewit 2003; Liebeschuetz 2001: 30, 369-70, 373, 378; Schachner 2006: 60, 78) landscapes. Transformations evident in burial contexts (Bullough 1983; Halsall 1995b; Handley 2001; Härke 2001; Lewit 2003; Liebeschuetz 2001: 373; Schachner 2006: 68; Toynbee 1996; Van Ossel 2006: 543) and in the ritual landscape (Caseau 2001; 2004: 118, 129; Chavarría and Lewit 2004: 41; see Theuws, De Jong, and van Rhijn 2001) may also be compared. The changes noted in a range of contexts suggests that comparisons may be made with regard to the mechanisms by which social and political relationships were mediated and organised (Alkemade 1997; Arce 1997; Drinkwater 1992; Kelly 2001: 183, 186; Lavan 2006b; Maguire 2001; Schachner 2006; Shaw 2001: 163; Sodini 2003) and, for the beginning of the period at least (and during and after the later fifth century), in technology and production, economic systems, and exchange (Bowman 1996; Campbell 2007; Chavarría 2004, 2005; Chavarría and Lewit 2004: 13-5; Harris 2003; Reece 2003: 145; Sarris 2004; Wooding 1996).

Nonetheless, change was no more uniform within Britain, than it was for other regions, such as Gaul (Esmonde Cleary 1989: 16), or Hispania (Chavarría 2005: 522), with regional topographical variations affecting settlement form and change (ibid.). There is evidently a need for regional and local analyses to better understand potential variation (e.g. see Liebeschuetz 2001: 30; Reece 2003: 147-49; Wickham 2003: 400-01), which may enable regional diversity to be recognised. On the Continent, regionalisation can be seen to increase during the fifth century (Chavarría and Lewit 2004: 12; Liebeschuetz 2001: 30, 124).
It will be argued that similar developments are seen in Southwest Britain. As it will be seen below, and in Chapters 5 and 6, the regional variation noted in Chapters 2 and 3 developed during and after the later Roman period, with political and economic changes encouraging regionalisation, affecting the mechanisms by which material culture was inculcated in the construction of notions of similarity and difference. Continental studies have suggested that collapse of the State system facilitated a closer inter-relationship between land control and political power, and may have led to regional fragmentation across the Empire (Wickham 1984; 2005: 58-9). Again, similar processes may be seen at work in Southwest Britain. The withdrawal of centralised control during the early fifth century – as perhaps indicated by the State advice to the regional elites of Britain that they should take charge of their own defences (see Thompson 1982: 449) - may have likewise encouraged rapid fragmentation into regional (or possibly Provincial) polities. The effects of such political and economic changes within Southwest Britain are examined - in particular, the development of localised and regionalised mechanisms of control, encouraging regional and local fragmentation.

Although not the only force influencing socio-political reorganisation during and after the later Roman period, ethnic discourse became increasingly significant in the development of alternative structures of power to those of the Roman State across the West (Geary 2001; Pohl 1998b: 1-2, 9; Pohl 1998c: 39; see Liebeschuetz 2001: 104, 124, 280). The incorporation of local and regional groups within wider political expressions was a common (though not universal, and certainly diverse) process in the creation of social hierarchy (in particular, the organisation of differential access to resources), and in the construction of regional polities (Pohl 1998b: 6-7, 9).

The political turmoil attested by the texts might be expected to have encouraged the redefinition of identities, considering that periods of social or economic stress commonly coincide with increased competition for resources, which often results in the playing down of internal divisions and the exaggeration of external differences in relation to competing societies (see Chapman 1980: 65). This section of the thesis covers the evidence for such change from c AD 350 – 450, primarily to avoid the limitations of a culture-historical interpretation that is committed to the traditional ‘end’ of Roman Britain in AD 410. The terminal date adopted for this thesis also more easily accommodates visible changes within material remains across both the Southwest, and Britain as a whole (changes that by the mid fifth century are more complete and widespread). In examining

103 The exact date of the end of Roman rule is often contested, although a date early in the fifth century is perhaps supported by the texts. It has, however, been argued that the reference within Zosimus to the Honorian Rescript of AD 410, from which the traditional end to Roman rule in Britain has been taken, in fact refers to Brettia within Italy, rather than Britain (e.g. Bartholemew 1982: 261-62). However, Thompson (1982: 449) points out the reference by Gildas to the Rescript, and argues that the likelihood that both Zosimus and Gildas should have been misinformed on the matter is minimal.

104 See footnote 103.
cultural transformations, I shall consider how they may have affected the construction of local, regional, communal, ethnic, and cultural identities within Southwest Britain.

This chapter begins with a general summary of systems of government control, and with a brief introduction to the evidence for these within Southwest Britain. This is followed by an examination of pressures upon the Imperial system during this time, with regional archaeology and texts examined for evidence of raids upon the region, and for rebellion and usurpation. This includes a survey of the textual evidence for the external ethnographic categorisation of people in Britain during the later fourth century, to consider how this might have effected opposition against imperial control. Responses to these threats are then considered, beginning with an appraisal of the evidence for foederati settlement, and followed by evidence for local responses – for example, the development of indigenous armies. The textual and archaeological evidence is analysed in conjunction, in an attempt to re-examine traditional views regarding identity within late-Roman Britain.

POLITICAL AND MILITARY CONTROL: LATER ROMAN PERIOD TRANSFORMATIONS

As outlined in Chapter 3, imperial rule required the co-operation of local elites, who governed the civitates through a system of councils, based at urban centres. The latter mechanism essentially appropriated and reorganised pre-Roman social networks, and the identity groups created from these social networks in the LPRIA by regional elite (Millett 1990: 65, 68; see Chapter 2). The collaboration of local elites (in some cases, perhaps initiated before the Claudian conquest) may have influenced the early military departure from areas such as the Cotswolds. However, the role of towns was paramount in effecting civic mechanisms of political management, once the army had vacated these sites during the later first century. Location in relation to communication networks supported their development during the initial military phase, as they became major consumers of rural products and resources, and centres of taxation, which created an immediate interdependence between town and country (see Lewit 2003: 267; Woolf 1998: 142-43). But, the role of the elite, enhancing the prestige of civic centres through urban munificence, was also of prime importance in constructing collective civitas-based identities within these areas, as across the Empire (Woolf 1998: 1, 25, 40, 125; Zuiderhoek 2009: 73). This process acted as an effective but subtle mechanism of control, as elites invested in a system that advanced their standing in the local community, but which also disseminated Roman ideologies through public works.

Conversely, authority over predominantly rural regions (such as Dumnonia) continued to rely upon a continuous military presence (see Mattingly 2006), although alternative mechanisms of control gradually developed in some areas - as perhaps seen in, and after, the abandonment of
military sites from areas such as the Peninsula (see Thorpe 2007). It was argued in Chapter 3 that even within distant ‘military zones’, in appropriating Roman symbols of power to develop social hierarchies within local communities (perhaps related to the devolution of control over mineral resources to local procurators), some elites ensured the efficacy of Roman authority, by embedding imperial structures of authority within the political and cultural landscape. Although urban models were inaccessible to most, Roman models of military dominance remained effective in ensuring local compliance, albeit reinterpreted within regional cultural frameworks by local elite.

Once imperial rule over the province was assured (with the extension of citizenship during the early third century to all freeborn inhabitants of the Empire), the role of the military perhaps changed for the subject populations. Although in reality acting in support of imperial political power, from now on the Army was possibly better presented as a protector against external threat, although its actual potential to quash internal unrest remained undiminished. This role as defender of the populace may have been expressed in the construction of town defences, as at Cirencester (see Hurst 2005: 294; see below, Responses), although that is not to deny any real or perceived threat to urban occupants.

Political organisation had changed during the late third or early fourth century, with Maxima Caesariensis centred upon London, Flavia Caesariensis upon Lincoln, Britannia Prima upon Cirencester (or perhaps Gloucester, due to its colonia status), and Britannia Secunda upon York - with Britain becoming a diocese, governed by a vicarius (Mattingly 2006: 227; White 2007: 36-9). Thus, the Southwest became incorporated within an administrative unit covering much of Western Britain (see fig. 3.11).105 These bureaucratic developments, expanding the number of administrative elites and providing further tiers of control, may have affected the ways in which regional power was distributed, essentially limiting the authority of local elites.

Epigraphy to some extent helps us locate the Provincial centre, the civitates, and other units such as pagi. The role of Cirencester has been determined by the probable fourth century inscription upon a ‘Jupiter column’ from the town that reads ‘signum et erectum prisca religione renovat’, recording that the pillar was set up by prot - the ‘provincial governor’ Lucius Septimus (Esmonde Cleary 1989: 47; Henig 1984: 141). The administrative role of the town is probably seen in the presence of administrative offices within the basilica, which may have continued in use for some time (Gardner 2007: 171, 226; see Chapter 5). The Belgic civitas continued to be administered from Venta Belgarum at Winchester, although Cunetio (Mildenhall) may have acted as a regional administrative centre within the Northwest sector (see Corney 2001: 18; Griffiths 2001:

105 Not everyone accepts Ptolemy’s ascription of Bath as a Belgic centre – and some argue against the inclusion of the Northern Belgic territory within the Province (White 2007: 40)
53; see below, Military Programmes). However, this town may have otherwise been located within the Atrebatic, or Dobunnic Civitas (which is perhaps more likely, considering the LPRIA coinage from the area (see Chapter 2; Cunliffe 1991).

Inscriptions from Hadrian’s Wall demonstrate the complexity of political organisation during the later Roman period. These texts have been used to argue for the existence of a second Durotrigian civitas centre at Ilchester (most likely Lindinis) during the late fourth century (Pearce 1978: 42). However, the appellation Durotrigum to Lindinis might rather reflect the need to reconstruct the civitas during a period of instability. There is no certain evidence for Durnovaria receiving the ‘tribal’ suffix ‘Durotrigium’. It might be argued that this reflects a certain lack of munificence within the town, and a degree of antipathy to the State within this region, following earlier (LPRIA and early Roman) attitudes (see Chapter 3). It was also suggested in Chapter 3 that what was a potentially compliant group focused in Northeast Dorset (or at least a group that exhibited strong Gaulish contacts and influence) suffered at the hands of the Roman military after the Claudian Conquest.

Considering the long-term historical conditions within this region, it might be anticipated that a weakening position of the State would have encouraged the development of oppositional regional identities sustained through the Roman period, drawing upon long-standing social networks. It may therefore be suggested that these inscriptions reflect an official policy to renegotiate and reify some civitates, or to reconstruct regional identities centred upon the civitas, in part deconstructing LPRIA affiliations, and drawing upon those loyal to the Empire. Although Ilchester was peripheral to the ‘Durotrigian’ territory during the LPRIA (see Chapter 2), it was located centrally within the Durotrigian civitas during the Roman period. With a general lack of enthusiasm for Roman mechanisms of acculturation in the South of the region, Ilchester was perhaps seen as a centre from which regional identity might more successfully be developed within a Roman framework.

It is likely that Exeter continued to act as a civitas centre into the fourth century (Bidwell 1980: 16). We know comparatively little about socio-political organisation within the Peninsula, although settlement archaeology (which will be discussed below and in Chapters 5) may aid understanding. The extension of a military presence, and absence of civic centre, suggest that the area should be seen as a military zone, arguably a pagus unit (Mattingly 2006: 402-08), perhaps administered from the military base at Restormel fort (Thorpe 2007: 7, 29-30, 33). Over the course of the Roman period, social hierarchies were developed and consolidated by appropriating structures of power seen in regions to the east (and across the Empire), utilising common cultural markers (although within this region especially, within a regional milieu). Political structure evidently drew upon

---

106 C(IVITAS) DUR(O)TR(I)G(UM) [L]ENDIN(I)ESIS (RIB 1672); CI(VITAS) DUROTR(A)G(UM) LENDINIESI[S] (RIB 1673)
established socio-economic and cultural ties, with subsequent changes influenced by and influencing these networks. ‘Cornovian’ territory was possibly reified during this (later) Roman period, as perhaps were other regions in the Southwest.

By the late fourth century, changes in both civic and military organisation are evident across the Southwest. The numbers of troops stationed within Britain at this time is disputed, with suggestions ranging from 10,000 to 35,000 (see Jones 1996: 166; Millett 1990: 215). However, most units were now based in the North and East of Britain (Dark 2000: 17), in anticipation of ‘barbarian’ raids (from Picts and Saxons, respectively), with a minimal army presence within the Southwest region. It is further supposed by many that most of these troops were removed at various points during the early fifth century in defence of the Continent. Later texts (such as De Excidio Britanniae, see Ch. 13) record a belief that the usurper Magnus Maximus (c. AD 383-88) removed much of the army, although there is no supporting evidence to corroborate such claims. Claudian records (in De Bello Gothico) the removal of a legion from Britain in AD 401 – 402 to defend Italy, though not all accept the reliability of this poetic work (Millett 1990: 216). However, it is generally accepted that the usurper Constantine III removed much of the garrison to Gaul, and there is no evidence to suggest that the troops returned, nor is there evidence for sufficient coinage to pay them (ibid. 217; Esmonde Cleary 1989: 138-40).

Although public offices and amenities (such as baths) were maintained up to (and perhaps beyond) the later fourth century at many towns (including Cirencester, Gloucester, Dorchester, and Exeter, Esmonde Cleary 1989: 71-2), these seemingly contract during the second half of the century, and no new public works are evident (Jones 1987: 53; see Chapter 5, Urban Settlement). Rather, there is a move towards increased expenditure upon private residences, in both urban and rural contexts, though most noticeably in the countryside (ibid.; see Chapter 5, Villas). The patronage of urban development by local elites was now failing as a mechanism of imperial control; this failure (and the increased privatisation of expenditure) might be inferred from legislation to prevent an exodus of elites to the countryside (Salway 1981: 598). Therefore, emphasis upon external threat may have placed major stress upon imperial power, as well as justifying an imperial presence in and control over the diocese as a whole, but particularly Britannia Prima (considering the possibility of ‘barbarian’ raids via the Channel, and the Atlantic coast).

Attempts to control the population are also seen in political reforms of the fourth century. These gave more fiscal responsibilities to local elites, coupled with heavier taxes (Evans 1990; see Liebeschuetz 2001: 104; Wickham 1984: 12 n. 14; but see Van Ossel 2006). Legislation against
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107 Codex Theodosius XII.xviii.2, AD 367, AD 396-97 (Salway 1981: 598)
social and economic mobility is also apparently seen within the early fifth century *Codex Theodosianus* - which codified contemporaneous and fourth century laws - tying men to their professions. However, it has recently been argued that such readings are far too simplistic, and that recent interpretations of a wider range of texts, such as hagiographies and legal codes, suggests a more varied picture (but see Schachner 2006: 44, 50-2; Van Ossel 2006: 535-36). Consequently, previous arguments that suggested a tendency towards feudalism during and after the fifth century (e.g. Wickham 1984: 12-3) have been challenged (see MacMullen 1964; Schachner 2006: 44, 50-2), and subsequently modified, to incorporate more gradual and diverse mechanisms of social and economic control (Wickham 2005: 60-1). Thus, attempts were made from above to counteract any breakdown of the Imperial system from within. However, more directly, external threats placed pressure upon the system.

The written evidence for political organisation after the early fifth century is slender, with potentially contemporaneous indigenous relevant sources limited to the *Epistola* of Patrick, which indicates the existence of regional leaders (such as Coroticus) (see Thompson 1985: 131-2, 139, 140). The near contemporary Continental *Life* of Saint Germanus attests local or regional leadership in the Southeast c. AD 429, as Constantius records the presence of a *tribune ac notarius, uir tribunicae potestatis*, and *regius illius primus*, and suggests some continuity of urban life (Salway 1981: 466; Thompson 1984: 11, 12). It is uncertain for how long provincial administration was sustained into the fifth century within Britain (Scull 1992: 17), but some suggest that this might be reflected in the presence of provincially controlled militia (see below, *Auxiliaries and Foederati*).

This dearth of contemporaneous texts has led to the use of later commentaries to create a narrative history of fifth century political organisation (e.g. Ward 1972: 278-79). Gildas’ mid sixth century *De Excidio Britanniae* (hereafter ‘DEB’), and even Bede’s early eighth century *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (which draws heavily upon the latter), are commonly used in this way. Within these works, it appears that early post-Roman leadership followed aspects of the Roman political model, with a number of regional councils under the leadership (or influence) of a central character – the *superbus tyrannus* of Gildas, recorded as ‘Vortigern’ within later narratives – responsible for inviting the rebellious Saxon *foederati* to these shores (e.g. see *ibid.*). Their distance in time from the fifth century, and the authors’ own admitted lack of evidence, makes these narratives largely conjectural (e.g. *DEB* Ch. 4). Indeed, certain misunderstandings are well known (e.g. *DEB* Chs. 4, 15; and see Ward 1972: 277-78). One other possibly early (though by no means contemporaneous) insular source - the Llandaff Charters – records the occupation of a series of centres by local ‘kings’ (landowning nobles), although again, at the earliest this text refers to sixth
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108 ‘Tribunus’ has been translated as ‘man of military rank’ (Salway 1981: 466).
century socio-political organisation (Davies 1978; although see Dark 1994: 140). However, the situation it describes may correlate in broad terms with the few inferences that may be drawn from Patrick.

Some were perhaps able to retain control over their lands (and possibly, in some cases, to expand at the expense of others), which may have led to the development of ‘great-estates’ during the fifth century (Arce 1997: 19; Devroey 2001: 113; Heighway 1987: 10). Ownership of vast tracts of land by local ‘kings’ potentially provided the opportunity to create (armed) retinues through land alienation (Davies 1978: 50, 63; Faulkner 2000: 117; Woolf 2003: 365). This possibly led to the expansion of power by so-called ‘super-thugs’, who took advantage of the vacuum left by the State system, by taking control of the hereditarius – essentially tenants tied to surviving estates (Faulkner 2000: 115, 130, 134, 135; Reece 2000: 4; see also Davies 1978: 46; Drinkwater 1992: 212). These suggestions might further be considered through the archaeological examination of the material remains, which will be undertaken below, and in the following chapters.

The evidence for military attacks upon Southwest Britain in particular will first be considered, followed by an appraisal of the political instabilities of this period.

PRESSURES UPON THE IMPERIAL SYSTEM

EXTERNAL THREATS

The myriad transformations noted at the end of the Roman period may have significantly destabilized society. ‘Barbarian’ attacks upon Southwest Britain would have further enhanced feelings of insecurity. References to ‘barbarian’ attacks upon Britain during the later Roman period are well known. They first appear in the entry for AD 360 in Ammianus’ Res Gestae (Book XX, Chapter 1), which records attacks by Scots and Picts, and in AD 364, by Scots, Picts, Attacotti and Saxons (Book XXVI, Chapter 4).\footnote{109 There is no mention of Saxon attacks upon Southern Britain during the later fourth century, though Franks and Saxons are recorded as harassing Gaul.} Contemporaneous, or near-contemporaneous, records – such as the Confession and Epistola of Patrick, perhaps dating to the second half of the fifth century (Dumville 1977: 179) - also refer to raids in the early fifth century. Although it is often argued that Patrick was from the area of Carlisle, a location around the Bristol Channel is also possible (see Thompson 1985: 10), potentially making his comments of direct relevance to the Southwest region.

Bearing in mind the continued involvement of the Scotti in these attacks (and perhaps the...
Attacotti, Rance 2001),^110 raids of some sort upon the Southwest are at least possible. Furthermore, although not necessarily a direct threat to all but the most eastern areas of the Southwest, raids upon East and Southeast Britain may have further heightened insecurity in the Southwest (though provided also providing opportunities for many).

Saxon attacks upon Britain are recorded in AD 408, in the Gallic Chronicle of AD 452, with the entry for AD 441 (within the AD 551 Chronicle), stating that ‘Britain…up to this time had suffered various defeats and misfortunes, is reduced to Saxon rule’ (Jones and Casey 1988: 379-80). Whilst these claims may reflect a generalisation of the situation from a Gallic perspective, it does suggest serious troubles for at least the Eastern regions of Britain.

There is little evidence to demonstrate violence within the Southwest at this time. But, attempts have been made to connect this with the comparatively modest archaeological evidence for destruction at villas (see Evans 1990: 91) – as seen in the few skeletal remains that show evidence of violence (e.g. see fig. 4.1) - with ‘barbarian’ raids. The most commonly referenced evidence are the possible attacks upon North Wraxall villa, revealed by early investigations of the site (when three bodies were found within a well), and an oft-cited fire at Box (Cunliffe 1993: 269; 2000: 149). A small number of burials have also been found within villa contexts, some of which show signs of violence, such as the skeleton with evident sword (or axe) cuts placed in the hypocaust at Kings
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^110 However, at this time the Attacotti receive no mention by Ammianus (Thompson 1990: 1; Rance 2001)
Weston (Boon 1950: 18; fig. 4.1). Other types of site have also been seen as subject to ‘barbarian’ attack. The Nettleton Scrubb temple was demolished and subsequently occupied during the later fourth century (see below). Skeletons from the accompanying cemetery had sword and cut wounds; a building containing 500 coins (dating between AD 333 and 402) had been burnt; and a plumbata or martiobarbalu (Roman military throwing dart) - similar to the early fifth century example from Wroxeter - was found in association with the coins (Snyder 1998: 206). The presence of ‘Saxon’ glass beads on the site (ibid.) might suggest ‘barbarian’ occupation following this apparent raid. However, it is of course impossible to determine the perpetrators of these acts, or be certain of the date(s) at which they occurred (cf. Chavarría and Lewit 2004: 25, regarding similar Continental activity). Local acts of violence cannot be discounted (see below, Rebellion), and such events can rarely be tied to the dates noted in the texts.

The same might be said of violence noted in urban contexts. The location of a human jaw above clay and rough mortar floors in one building on the New Market Hall site (Gloucester) perhaps indicates violence (Hassall and Rhodes 1974: 30). A spearhead was also found in another building that had continued in use into the fifth century, although this house was subsequently destroyed by fire (a late Roman hoard dating this event to after Honorius) (ibid.).

The evidence for political opposition to imperial power will now be examined.

**Political Instability: Rebellion, Resistance, and Usurpation**

Later historical sources record that the British took up arms in response to Saxon raids - behaviour often linked to a British revolt against the State in AD 408-409 (Jones and Casey 1988: 383, 392). However, these texts cannot be relied upon as accurate accounts of fifth century history (ibid.), and shall therefore not be considered here.\(^{111}\) Even if these events occurred elsewhere, there is no reason to suppose that the Southwest was similarly affected. Nonetheless, fourth century political changes (see above, Political and Military Control) may have provoked reactions against the inequalities inherent within the State regime, particularly if raids upon the region continued with impunity (Evans 1990; see Wickham 1984: 12 n. 14). It has been argued that the pressure of fourth century tax reforms forced some landowners to abandon their estates and seek the patronage of landowners in stronger financial circumstances, leading to a subsequent relegation in their status to

\(^{111}\) The establishment of unified opposition, leading to revolt, has been seen by some as linked to ‘bacaudae’ rebels in Gaul – as mentioned within texts such as Salvian’s De Grub. Dei. (5, 5.21). Whether bacaudae consisted of members of the elite, peasants or a combination of both is difficult to ascertain, though it is argued that minor landowners had the most to lose (Arce 1997: 28; Drinkwater 1992: 208-214; Faulkner 2000: 111; Halsall 1992: 205, 206). However, whilst this was evidently a significant event in early fifth century Gaul, the term was never applied in relation to Britain, and therefore any construction of identity in opposition to the State should not necessarily be linked to the bacaudae.
that of the frequently oppressed *coloni* (see Esmonde Cleary 1989: 6, 10, 13, 29; Liebeschuetz 2001: 104). Tighter controls on social mobility may have further stimulated unrest (but see MacMullen 1964). However, more recent readings of the texts challenge these views (see Schachner 2006: 50-52; Van Ossel 2006: 535). Some see the Imperial structure imploding during the later Roman period, due to over-exploitation of resources, although others suggest the changes seen in towns may relate to a contraction in their role as markets (Esmonde Cleary 1989; Randsborg 1989: 234-36). The removal of imperial markets would have resulted in the transformation of new socio-economic forces (Hodges 1982: 6), thus explaining the decline of sites dependent upon the Imperial State system (see Chapter 5). The demise of the Imperial system, and thus taxation, is likely to have had a major impact upon the survival of the towns (Millett 1990: 129).

Continental perceptions, transmitted through poetic literature, were perhaps influential in the construction of late- and post-Roman identity in Britain, since the ethnographic constructs and cultural categorisations adopted by Gaulish or Mediterranean elites may have had a major affect upon how elites (in particular) within Britain saw themselves. It is therefore important to evaluate attitudes towards the British held by those in power outside Britain (see Jenkins 2008: 74; also Chapters 1-3).

During the earlier Roman period, the letters of auxiliary soldiers posted on Hadrian’s Wall show that the population of Britain was categorised as a ‘wretched’ people by members of the Roman army (Bowman 1994: 97). Although evidence is limited, such negative attitudes were seemingly widespread and long lasting. Derision is openly expressed in the fourth century poem *On Silvius Bonus*, for instance, by the Continental writer Ausonius, in which the notion of a ‘good’ Briton is an oxymoron (Snyder 1998: 71). It has already been seen (see Chapters 2 and 3) that the Empire or its representatives, as the dominant culture, operated within a system of exclusion that depended upon the imposition of inferiority in order to maintain power (see Jenkins 2008: 23). For example, it is clear in the work of the panegyrist Claudian (in AD 400) that Britons were still regarded as ‘barbarian’: the latter describes Britannia as “…dressed in the skin of some Caledonian beast, her cheeks tattooed…” (Jones 1996: 141). This attitude may explain why Britons were excluded from high-level imperial politics, with no British senator on record (de la Bèdoyère 2003: 145). Such marginalisation would likely have provoked feelings of injustice among the British aristocracy (*ibid.* 208-09), prompting some to react against, and reject, the Imperial system. A general sense of ‘Otherness’ (and thus unity in opposition) may have evolved in response to these Continental feelings towards the Romano-British.
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112 At Vindolanda, writing tablets of the late first - early second century record the attitudes of the auxiliaries to the *brittuncii*, the ‘little Britons’ (Laing 1997: 141).
Although awareness of prejudice may have been to some extent restricted due to limited literacy, contact with town dwellers, and the military, was perhaps one way in which these ideas were transmitted. The creation of social networks through trade and the Church during and after this period may have also provided media through which such messages were conveyed. Furthermore, movement by dispossessed landowners arguably provided greater opportunity for communication across wider areas, and the spread of political ideals.

There was therefore ample opportunity for the elite to come into contact with the disdainful Continental and Mediterranean opinion that those inhabiting Britannia were (collectively as ‘Britons’) inferior, ‘barbarian’, and located (in a physical sense, at least initially) outside the Roman world. Given a situation in which the Empire now had little to offer the British elite, this ‘Otherness’ might have been converted into a source of strength, and internalised in the construction of a new post-Roman society (whether before or after the withdrawal of Roman intervention in Britain), by regional and local elite.

When examining the archaeology of resistance to Roman rule, we seem to have little evidence with which to consider the question. There is no obvious sign of destruction of symbols of authority. What we see instead is the gradual demise and transformation of such symbols. Even if we were to find such evidence, it would be impossible to attribute this with certainty to rebellious activity. We are therefore left with circumstantial evidence and conjecture, drawn primarily from potential responses to rebellion (see below, Responses).

Considering the latent power of even a skeleton army within Britain in the later Roman period, opposition to State control might have been more effective if pursued ideologically, than if attempted through physical resistance. As with other situations of resistance to imperial power, we might expect an erosion of compliance to coincide with the construction of unified community identities. It will be argued below that we do indeed witness this process within the archaeology of later Roman Southwest Britain – as seen elsewhere within the Empire (see Chapters 5 and 6).

Zosimus (6.2, 6.1, using Olympiodorus) confirms the rejection of established imperial leadership by the military (Thompson 1956: 163), but the aim was not to topple the Empire (which supposedly kept the army in pay), or even remove that power from Britain, but merely to replace those whom the army saw as inefficient leaders with more suitable candidates. Nonetheless, considering the number of usurpations within Britain, coupled with the erosion of the distinction between military and civilian during the later empire, this may have had an effect upon the construction of identity.

113 Britain was located within a mythical geography in which barbaroi reside beyond the Pillars of Heracles; such ethnographic categorisation within Classical texts evidently both supported, and was part of, the process of domination (Webster 1994: 3).
Several instances of usurpation are recorded in Britain during the late fourth and early fifth century (Esmonde Cleary 1989: 1, 17-18). This behaviour became incorporated within negative imagery of Britons, when in AD 415 Jerome declared the province as “fertile in tyrants” (Jones 1996: 140). The ambition was apparently not to achieve political autonomy, but rather to gain control of the Western Empire. In AD 383, the General Magnus Maximus was raised to power in Britain, but was assassinated in Gaul during his attempt to topple Gratian (Faulkner 2000: 93, 96). The soldier Marcus was subsequently raised to power by the army in Britain in AD 406, but was murdered in AD 407, following his apparent military incompetence (Snyder 1998: 19; Faulkner 2000: 172, 407). Although usurpers were more commonly soldiers during this period, the ‘civil servant’ Gratian seized power after the death of Marcus, though he was again was supported by the army. He was soon in turn assassinated due to his military ineptitude (ibid.). Usurpation by the General Constantine III (Flavius Claudius Constantinus) followed in the same year (AD 407). Constantine was again backed by the military in his attempt to take control of the Western Empire (Archibald et al. 1997: 3). But, as with Magnus Maximus, the legitimate leaders of the Western and Eastern Empire suppressed Constantine, and he was subsequently executed by Honorius in AD 411 (Snyder 1998: 22).

Notwithstanding these numerous attempts at claiming imperial power, Magnus Maximus was later credited (within post-Roman mythologies) with freeing Britain from Roman control (see DEB ch. 13, Winterbottom 1978). However, it is uncertain at what point he became significant within the creation of social memories. Such narratives were most likely an important part of elite culture, and as such were integrated within the construction of a unified identity that was seemingly well established (though still in flux) during the early-mid sixth century.

Responses to these varying pressures upon both the Imperial system, and the security of the Southwest region, will now be considered, beginning with an analysis of military works.

**RESPONSES TO THREATS UPON AND CHANGES TO THE IMPERIAL SYSTEM**

**IMPERIAL AND DIOCESAN RESPONSES**

**Military programmes**

Much of Dumnonia seemingly remained a military zone throughout the Roman period, despite the removal of troops from most military sites at a relatively early date (see Chapter 3). Recent excavation of the probable fort at Lostwithiel (Restormel) has revealed continuity of occupation into at least the fourth century, the material culture (different to that found at local sites) suggesting the
presence of a military community (Thorpe 2007: 7). As seen in Chapter 3, this site lies at the tidal limit of the river Fowey, probably to control passage along the river - forming a frontier between the Dumnonian civitas to the east, and the Cornovian military zone to the west - and perhaps to control mineral resources, particularly iron (ibid. 7-8). This military base would both have controlled the local population, and offered protection against raids.

The continued presence of this military community may account for the apparent dearth of later Roman defensive programmes within the Dumnonian civitas, and the limited military control elsewhere within the region (within the ‘Cornovian’ pagus). Although no late Roman defences are noted at Exeter, the massive defences that were constructed after the end of the second century (and extended to incorporate a larger urban area) sufficed into the medieval period (Bidwell 1980: 59, 66). However, a possibly defensive ditch system may date to the fourth century (ibid. 64-5). The presence of occasional fourth century coin hoards, as at Okehampton (Devon) (dating to c. AD 320-30, Isaac 1976: 56), may indicate a sense of insecurity for some. The regional landscape (with high ground between the Peninsula and the rest of the Southwest perhaps encouraging a degree of isolation) resulted in low crop yield - and was arguably of little agricultural interest to the State. However, the potential for mineral extraction did make the area of probable interest (seen in the location of military sites in the far West, close to mineral sources, see Chapter 3). As argued above, the long coastline enabled trade and exchange, even if travel across land was limited, as might be indicated by the apparent absence of roads. Nevertheless, various route markers within the region suggest the development of a communication system during the later Roman period. The situation in the Peninsula suggests alternative methods of social control, and it may be proposed that this was facilitated through the development of social hierarchies among, at this time, a largely compliant elite.

Some sites, such as Oldaport (fig. 4.2), share similar features with Roman defensive sites (in this case, with mortared masonry walls of late Roman appearance, see Todd 1987: 262), perhaps suggesting the local assumption of military responsibilities (possibly on behalf of the State).\textsuperscript{114} Oldaport overlooks the eastern bank of the Erme estuary, perhaps enabling control of trade routes into the interior. Considering the general absence of Romano-British material, and the presence of a very abraded sherd of Samian, comparisons with sites further East may point towards post-Roman activity (Pearce 2004: 231; see Chapter 5). This site may arguably be related to the control and exchange of mineral resources, considering the find of a collection of tin ingots at the mouth of the

\textsuperscript{114} Although such sites might instead indicate the development of military opposition to State control. But, if this were so, we would expect an extended military presence within this area.
Erme (Turner 2006: 75). A trading site dating to the post- and possibly late-Roman period has also been found nearby at Mothercombe (Pearce 2004).  

There is little evidence for military activity elsewhere in the Southwest, although it is argued that part of the British fleet was stationed in the Bristol Channel (Bennett 1985: 28). Therefore, new programmes of military protection might be expected if, as the texts suggest, raids upon Britain were becoming a problem, and local unrest may have required military management. Although Ammianus records (Res Gestae, Book XXVIII, Chapter 3, and again in AD 369) that a program of fortification was instigated within Britain during the later fourth century by General Theodosius, military works in Britain cannot necessarily be tied to this date. Nevertheless, urban defences were constructed and consolidated within the Southwest region during the later Roman period, as elsewhere in Britain (but contrasting with Gaul, Jones 1987: 52-3), which arguably indicates an accompanying sense of insecurity during the later fourth century. As noted above, this may have been seen by some as an opportunity to exercise greater social control: for a feeling of insecurity perhaps provoked the need for imperial military protection in the minds of the populace.

The colonia at Gloucester was well fortified by the beginning of the fourth century (Heighway 1987: 5), and parts of the earlier legionary stonewall circuit were replaced during this century, at which time external stone towers were constructed each side of the gates: both re-used stone from

115 Recent studies suggest that the extent of tin working within Cornwall during the early Roman period has been underestimated, and that the combined evidence suggests the significance of this activity from the Iron Age and throughout the Roman period (Hammersen 2007).
elsewhere (McWhirr 1981: 25, 28). External towers were also added to the defences at Cirencester during the mid fourth century (ibid. 35, 167). Renovation to the town circuit near to the Verulamium Gate during the late fourth or early fifth century was possibly to prevent flooding (Heighway 1984: 228; fig. 4.3). At both towns, these modifications suggest consolidation rather than aggrandisement of the defences, though emphasis was placed upon the gates and towers - both highly visible features with, as much as having defensive roles, a potential for the display of power and prestige. This parallels activity elsewhere in the West, as at Caerwent (Ashby 1904: 102), and may demonstrate control of movement in and out of the towns, possibly accompanying attempts to socially distance urban communities from those outside, or indicating designs towards urban autonomy.

There is no evidence to suggest strengthening of the defences at Exeter, and excavation within Dorchester is too limited to determine fourth century military activity. It is suggested that the defences that were perhaps begun during the late second or third century at Wanborough (Durocomovium) were not finished, or else the circuit was in action for a short time only, although footings for a stone gateway and possible curtain wall and ditch are apparent (Corney 2001: 12). Also surprising, considering its proximity to the River Severn and Bristol Channel, is that the small town of Abonae (Sea Mills) has no certain evidence for fortification (Bennett 1985: 4, 28).

---

116 Intensification of the fortifications by the fourth century has led to the proposal that this may have been a base for the Roman fleet (Heighway 1987: 2).
Some small towns have more definite evidence for fortification during the later Roman period. Similar developments to those seen at civitas and other significant urban centres are evident at Bath, although the walled enclosure only surrounded the principle buildings around the sanctuary (Cunliffe 1993: 270; see above, fig. 3.46). Cunetio (Mildenhall), like many other similar settlements, was enclosed by massive stone defences (the extensive nature of which perhaps suggests State, rather than purely civic, involvement) some time after AD 360 (Corney 2001: 18). As elsewhere, the Western gate was narrowed to allow only pedestrian passage, and crop-marks suggest that the new circuit had no Eastern gate, although an entrance may be recognised within the Northeast corner (ibid.; see above, fig. 3.47). This change to the layout may indicate a change in the function of the town during the late fourth century when it possibly became a regional administration centre, arguably controlled by local comitatenses (ibid.), and perhaps a collection point for tax (Griffiths 2001: 53).

**Rural defensive works and hillfort reoccupation**

Hillfort reoccupation was noted in Britain, as on the Continent (see Chavarria and Lewit 2004: 32-4; Liebescheutz 2001: 376; Schachner 2006: 67; Wickham 2005). Re-use of hillforts during the later fourth century in parts of Gaul was initially mainly of a civilian nature, although some military activity
is also evident (Esmonde Cleary 1989: 22). Considering the possibility that Britain remained within the sphere of the Empire until the 440’s – as indicated by the probable appeal to the commander Aëtius (Wood 1984: 21) – some hillfort reoccupation during the early fifth century may have been part of an imperial military defence strategy (Esmonde Cleary 1989: 22). Although in Western Britain there is little evidence from hillforts for an official military presence in the late Roman period (Burrow 1981: 20), defences may have been rebuilt during this time at some sites, such as Cadbury Congresbury, where an internal rampart was constructed (Rahtz et al. 1992). The Honorian coin beneath Rampart E at South Cadbury may indicate an early fifth century date for the first phase of refortification – a timber-framed, stone-faced rampart, although a date closer AD 500 has been suggested, based on the subsequent developments (Alcock 1973: 174, 176). The rampart design paralleled pre-Roman defensive works, whereas the gateway followed a Roman military model (ibid. 176-77), showing the amalgamation of various influences. However, at most hillforts in the Southwest there is little refortification evidence. These sites were primarily reoccupied as settlements (albeit defensible and within strategic locations), and as such will be considered in Chapter 5.

Nonetheless, some hillforts in Southwest Britain were provided with what appear to be defensive earthworks. These monuments, which date to during or after the late Roman period, and might be argued to relate to State programmes of fortification, will now be discussed below.

**Earthwork Defences**

**Wansdyke**

Wansdyke is a prominent monument, composed of two parts divided by chalk Downs: West Wansdyke, cutting across North Somerset (fig. 4.4), within the Dobunnic region, and East Wansdyke, on the chalk uplands of North Wessex, perhaps within the Northwest part of the Belgic territory (see below). Whilst often seen as a post-Roman monument (and this is certainly

---

117 Salway gives the examples of Montana Castella in Central Gaul, belonging to Aper, friend of Sidonius Apollinaris (1981: 453). This activity may correspond to advice given in Végétius ‘military manual’ during the period AD 425-55. However, this text suggests that legionnaires built hillforts, so that civilians might evacuate urban centres and inhabit defensible sites (Wood 1984: 21). We may therefore see a pattern by which military sites developed alongside the retreat of civilians to defensible hill top sites in times of trouble (ibid.).

118 A further model for hillfort use - the Burh - was suggested by Burrow, who compared activity at British sites to sites along the Rhine / Danube frontier – the fleiburgen refuges - which were possibly permanently occupied at other times (Burrow 1981: 156).

119 However, no dating materials have come from the Western section, so it is not clear that both sections belong to the same scheme of works (Fox and Fox 1958: 10, 39). However, there is a close resemblance between the two sections.
possible),\(^{120}\) ceramics beneath one part of the Eastern section provide a late Roman \textit{terminus post quem} (Cunliffe 1993: 294).\(^ {121}\)

The hillforts at Stantonbury and Maes Knoll were both incorporated within the line of the monument. The western end of Wansdyke terminated at the latter (Green 1971: 145; Rahtz and Fowler 1972: 198; figs. 4.4-4.6). Neither hillfort was definitely refurbished or reoccupied during the late- or post-Roman periods, although the name Dundry Hill, on which Maes Knoll stands, possibly originates from the Neo-Brittonic name for 'fort of refuge' (\textit{ibid}. 54).\(^ {122}\)

\(^{120}\) Many interpretations are distinctly culture-historical. For example, as the dyke lies south of Bath, this has been taken to imply that its construction was after the traditional loss of the city in AD 577, as recorded by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (e.g. Clark 1958). There are features in common with the scheme of the Wat's Dyke (Fox and Fox 1958: 32).

\(^{121}\) Samian was found in the upper levels, with a \textit{TPQ} of the third century indicated by ceramics, at Brown's Barn (Green 1971: 135, 143).

\(^{122}\) A recent reconnaissance to Maes Knoll revealed surface finds of abraded Oxford Colour Coated ware – a typical find on reoccupied hillforts within this region (see Jarrett 1999). Others have found abraded late Roman pottery, near the Dyke at Maes Knoll (Burrow 1981; Rahtz \textit{et al}. 1992).
The sites may have been used for their strategic views across wide areas – particularly of the Bristol Channel and the Northeast. Although this section of Wansdyke perhaps acted primarily as a territorial boundary, its function may have changed over time, and at times it quite probably acted as a military earthwork, considering its potential use in controlling passage along the Jurassic Way and Roman roads (including the Fosse Way), both of which were crossed by the dyke (Green 1971: 36, 142-3),

East Wansdyke (fig. 4.7) runs for 12 miles across the Marlborough Downs, from Morgan's Hill, 4 miles NNE of Devizes, to New Buildings, 2 miles south of Marlborough, on the edge of the Savenake Forest (Bonney 1972: 173-4; Green 1971: 129). In contrast to West Wansdyke (see above, fig. 4.4), late Roman ceramics beneath one section of East Wansdyke provides a terminus post quem for this monument (Cunliffe 1993: 294), with third century Samian also found within the upper levels of the section at Brown's Barn (Green 1971: 135, 143) perhaps indicating a later Roman date for the Dyke.

It has been suggested that the Eastern section (at Morgan's Hill) marked the civitas boundary between the Dobunni and Belgae (Eagles 2007: 176), although the situation at the end of the Iron Age suggests that Belgic territory during the early Roman period may have spread both north and south of the earthwork (see Chapter 2).

123 A charter of AD 963 for Bath Abbey calls this route the ‘herepath’ (Fox and Fox 1958: 32), suggesting its military significance. However, this probably relates to its later use.
124 To the east of Savenake its course is intermittent, but it cannot be considered to include the Bedwyn Dyke, a local defensive earthwork facing north east and running for 1.5m, known as vallum in Harandene in a charter of 778 (Fox and Fox 1958: 18-19).
The definition of regional territories may be related to political fragmentation, which perhaps led to the severance of Roman roads within the region. East Wansdyke cuts the Silchester-Bath road at Morgan’s Hill (ibid.), and the roads running north to Cunetio and south to Soriodunum and Venta at New Buildings are also severed by the Dyke (Fox and Fox 1958: 17). However, the construction of this boundary might also relate to civitas-based defensive programmes, in an attempt to control passage between territories. This seems likely, considering the possible provision of gateways (Fowler 2001: 193). The Dyke appears to bar North-South movement across the Ridgeway that runs south from Marlborough – which was perhaps developed during the later Roman period (ibid. 195).

The ditches silted up after only a few years, suggesting that if Wansdyke did act as a regional boundary, it was only maintained as such for a short time (Green 1971: 134, 142). This monument was perhaps constructed in response to a particular event (of probable military nature), and its commissioning by a particular individual as an expression of political power must be considered a possibility (Fowler 2001: 179, 195). This hypothesis is supported by the suggestion that the Dyke remained unfinished (ibid. 179). The environmental evidence suggests construction during spring or summer (Green 1971: 134, 142) – a season in which heightened conflict might be expected (see Shaw 2001: 139), possibly suggesting that it was built as a protection against a real or threatened attack or against an expected population movement from the North. The construction of similar monuments within the Southwest (see below) is a reminder that Wansdyke is just as likely to represent antagonism towards British, as Anglo-Saxon, opponents.

125 However, track-ways through the monument are evident in some sections, and may feasibly belong to the phase of construction, rather than a later date (Fowler 2001: 180, fig. 10.1; 187-91).
126 This route crosses the river Kennett at East Kennett, meeting the Berkshire Ridgeway at Barbury hillfort. It then runs east to the Thames, after crossing the Pewsey Vale and the River Avon at Wilsford, continuing south to the Salisbury Plain (Fox and Fox 1958: 3, 4, 14).
Figure 4.8 Bedwyn Dyke (Hostetter and Noble 1997, fig. 2)
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Elsewhere, more local defensive earthworks are known. East of Savenake, Bedwyn Dyke faces Northeast and runs for 1.5 miles (Fox and Fox 1958: 18-19; fig. 4.8). The earthwork links the hilltop villa at Castle Copse (see Chapter 5) with the possibly reoccupied hillfort at Chisbury Castle (Walters 2001: 144), demonstrating parallels with nearby Wansdyke. Many would date the monument to after the mid fifth century, on the basis of the ‘barbarian’ rebellions noted within later texts (e.g. *DEB* Ch. 24). But if Bedwyn Dyke were shown to date after the mid fifth century, the incorporation of Castle Copse villa would provide an interesting demonstration of the longevity of such sites.
A large earthwork, for which we have certain evidence of late further century modifications - Bokerley Dyke - also occurs within and possibly delineates the Durotrigian territory (figs. 4.9-4.11), and may therefore again reflect the existence of a civitas (or even Provincial, see White 2007) defensive programme. Although this monument is prehistoric in origin, excavation has revealed Roman and possibly later activity. Sections were constructed in the late Roman period, and earlier constructions were modified at the end of the fourth century (Rahtz 1961: 66). The ‘Fore Dyke’ - a length of defensive ditch (the ‘C’ work) - has a terminus post quem of c. AD 393. However, it is commonly dated to the fifth century, as it severed the Soviodorum to Durovarium road (RCHME 1970b: 55; Rahtz 1961: 65, 67; fig. 4.10). By cutting the road, this monument is similar to Wansdyke - ostensibly constructed as a military defence, but also displaying authority by delineating a political territory.

Figure 4.11 Bokerley Dyke Plan (Bowen 1990: 18). (Red arrow shows location of figure 4.9)
A possible late- or post-Roman defensive earthwork has also been recognised within the ‘Cornovian’ pagus. Giant's Hedge (fig. 4.12) encloses a large area of c. 65 sq kms between a tributary of the Fowey, and the West Looe River. Its form is similar to other late- and post-Roman earthworks in the Southwest (Todd 1987: 259). If dated to this period, it probably points to influence from territories to the East, where earthworks were developed within a more ‘Roman’ milieu. However, considering the continued military presence within this region (see above) - which seemingly bears no relationship to this monument - a later date may be more likely (but see below, Local responses). It is suggested that with the (possibly gradual) demise of Roman rule, certain prominent elites ultimately created ‘kingdoms’ with central leadership out of the Roman State structure (Scull 1992: 17), although it is probable that this process took several generations (see Pearce 2004).

127 Bolster Bank is 3.3 km and long defines an area of c. 50 ha (1,200 ac) around St Agnes Head in North Cornwall; however, its relatively small size has suggested a prehistoric rather than later date (Preston-Jones and Rose 1986: 139; Todd 1987: 259).
Auxiliaries and Foederati

‘Germanic’ settlement

Texts, such as the Gallic Chronicle, De Excidio Britanniae, and Ecclesiastical History of the English People (see above), have long led scholars to see the presence of Continental material in post-Roman Britain as evidence of Anglo-Saxon settlement. Both Bede and Gildas record the invitation of foederati during the early fifth century to counteract Saxon raids, encouraging the earliest ‘Germanic’-style material to be interpreted as the remains of these communities.

A particular building type commonly associated with Germanic settlers – the sunken-featured building (‘SFB’) - occurs within the fringes of the Southwest region during and after the later Roman period. Potentially early examples are found on late Roman sites in and around Dorchester, at Alington Avenue, Poundbury, and Colliton Park (Green 1987: 79, 91). However, there has long been a tendency to assign Germanic associations to any building of Late Antique date in Britain with a subterranean floor, whereas closer examination demonstrates the existence of distinctive indigenous ‘scooped’ buildings at this time, with little resemblance to Continental Grubenhäuser (e.g. at Crickley Hill, see Jarrett 1999; fig. 4.14).128

Figure 4.14 Sunken featured building, Eastern settlement, Crickley Hill (© Crickley Hill Trust). Green = wall foundations (Plan: author / © Crickley Hill Archaeological Trust)

128 Buildings with ‘scooped’ floors at Crickley Hill that have been claimed to correlate with ‘Germanic’ SFB’s (Eagles 2001: 201) have more in common with prehistoric structures (Jarrett 1999). One building has been compared with an example at the hilltop site of Tre’r Ceiri, on the north Welsh coast (pers. comm. to Philip Dixon by the late Christopher Hawkes), perhaps suggesting an alternative source of influence for these new building forms during the later Roman period. Finds also suggest a later Roman or early fifth century date (Jarrett 1999). Local building techniques (such as stone slab foundations, and sub-circular or sub-rectangular forms) are adopted, suggesting continuous tradition, and no regular post settings are found.
The Poundbury examples are also only superficially similar to Continental buildings in their plan and construction (see Green 1987: 79, 91; 1996: 150-53; 152), and as at most sites (including Alington Avenue), associated finds suggest a sixth century date (see Green 1987: 112). Building 4 at Colliton Park (comparable to buildings at Fordington Bottom and Maiden Castle Road, both on the outskirts of Dorchester), dates to the early Roman period (Trevarthen 2008: 1). Care must therefore be taken to consider each SFB on its own merits, before assuming the presence of ‘Saxons’. Within the Southwest, no definite fifth century example has been identified.

More commonly, evidence from graves has been taken to demonstrate the presence of early Germanic settlers – in particular, *foederati*. Numerous cemeteries in Southeast and Eastern Britain contain the definitive weapon burial, as well as many graves incorporating Continental-style material culture. However, few such graves are recognised within the Southwest before the later fifth century (e.g. see Dark 2000, fig. 4.15). Later fifth century Anglo-Saxon graves found on the periphery of the Southwest region might suggest the foundation of settlements several decades earlier. But, of course, burial with ‘Germanic’ grave goods does not necessarily indicate the presence of immigrants – let alone *foederati* - but may instead demonstrate the adoption of artefacts in ‘Germanic’ style within the region by some.

---

129 SFBs on the late Roman site at Alington Avenue show Germanic cultural influence in the construction methods employed, although as with Poundbury, associated finds include annular loom-weights, which suggest a date after the sixth century (Dark 2000: 108; see Green 1996, fig. 79.8-9; 150-53).
Certain finds have suggested a Germanic presence to some. At Colliton Park, a pattern-welded knife found beneath a late Roman mosaic has been used to support the proposal that these buildings indicate early ‘Germanic’ activity (Green 1996: 138, 140). However, when such technology and typologies are found within indigenous contexts, the situation becomes more complicated.\(^\text{130}\)

Grass-tempered pottery occurs within the final phase of occupation at a late Roman house in Trinity Street (Dark 2000: 106), which may again indicate Continental influence, and suggest an early origin for this ware. However, local development of this ceramic from later Roman handmade sherds (as at Crickley Hill, see Jarrett 1999) demonstrates the problem of categorising this ceramic technology either culturally or ethnically.

Particular stray finds that have previously been associated with foederati in Eastern Britain also occur along the periphery of the Southwest region (see Hawkes 1961, especially p. 9-10). Zoomorphic buckles (see fig. 4.16) and belt fittings regularly found in the Rhineland during the later Roman period (some of which metallurgical analysis has demonstrated as having derived from Continental workshops, see Jarrett 1999), are also noted on several later Roman sites in the Southwest (primarily towns, villas, occasionally hillforts, and next to roads). However, it is now recognised that these finds are likely to have been components of regular army (or, more probably, auxiliary) uniform (Millett 1990: 216). If this is indeed the case, their presence suggests changes to defensive strategies, in which the army became a visible feature of both the rural and urban landscape. By this time, the army was perhaps also involved in supporting civic tasks such as tax collection (White 2007: 66, 71), as well as protecting local populations (or preventing civil unrest). This might account for the dearth of these finds within the Western military zone, where garrisons remained in place throughout the Roman period and may have fulfilled this role. Nevertheless, the occurrence of zoomorphic buckles at villas (and indeed in towns and hillforts) may indicate a complex role, perhaps as symbols of civic authority, as well as insignia for local militia (Esmonde Cleary 1989: 34; though see Swift 2000: 50-52).

\[\text{Figure 4.16 Late Roman ‘military’ belt buckle from Crickley Hill hillfort reoccupation phase (©Jarrett 1999)}\]

\(^{130}\) In the case of Colliton Park, it should be noted that manufacturing technique of this type of knife, commonly seen as ‘Germanic’, is potentially also found within pre-Roman Southwest Britain (see Rahtz, Hirst, and Wright 2000), which arguably weakens this supposition.
It is difficult to be sure of even approximate numbers of Continental buckles within the region as, without further metallurgical analysis, it is uncertain whether derivatives of the Continental dolphin design (Hawkes and Dunning type IIB) were British-made (Hawkes 1961), or if these were Continental imports (Böhme 1986). More definite Continental buckles (types III and IV, see Hawkes and Dunning 1961) are found in the Cotswolds (at Crickley Hill, see fig. 4.16), with several of the more ambiguously derived type IIB clustering around Cirencester (Böhme 1986), and around the putative periphery of the civitas (fig. 4.17, Appendix, Table 14). No definite Continental examples, and only one type IIB buckles, are found within Durotrigian territory, at Dorchester (see Green 1984: 262). However, Continental buckles, and several type IIB, are found in the Northwest Belgic region, along the eastern and southern fringes of the civitas, around Cunetio, Soviodorum, and Durocornovium. It has been argued that clusters of late Roman military fittings may indicate the location of military forces at towns in the region of Cunetio (Mildenhall) (Corney 1997: 349), and the same might be said of other sites within the region, such as Cirencester and Gloucester.

Potentially more significant - if considering the possible presence of foreign troops within the Southwest during the early post-Roman period - are the early-mid fifth century silver buckles of ‘Gothic’ military style in and around Cirencester and Gloucester. In the cemetery close to the Roman fort at Kingsholm (Gloucester), grave B1 contained the burial of a 25-30-year-old male.

---

131 This distribution represents the general pattern. It should be borne in mind that many more examples have been unearthed by metal detectorists, which do not appear within PAS or SMR records.
oriented WE, cut through the *opus signinum* floor of a subterranean *mausoleum* R11-13 (Brown 1975; Hurst 1975: 272, 274; fig. 4.18). Alongside the belt buckle, grave goods included a late fourth century silver inlaid knife,\(^{132}\) and shoe buckles and strap ends, similar to early-mid fifth century examples from Eastern Europe (Brown 1975: 292-93).\(^{133}\)

![Copyright image](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/gloucestershire/8298825.stm)

Recent collagen and stable isotope tests have shown that this man came from an area east of the Danube.\(^{134}\) A variety of interpretations might be drawn from this grave. The use of silver for the grave goods and grave placement (within a *mausoleum*) suggest high status (with the appropriation of Roman status symbols), the military type buckles, the combination of grave goods and location of the cemetery (on the edge of the *colonia*) possibly point towards military associations. Dating of the finds allows either a late- or post-Roman date, making it impossible to determine whether, if he was a soldier, a member of the regular army, or a *foederatus*. However, no similar burials have been found in association with this grave, suggesting that, if this man was a relatively high status member of the military, and buried alongside members of his military community, the latter would have been accorded similar burial rites as locals.

---

132 Paralleling examples from Lankhills, Frilford (where it was found with late Roman beads) and on the Continent at Audenberg (Hurst 1975: 274; Brown 1975: 293).
133 From Krefeld, Haillot, and examples from Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in Britain, at Reading, Bifrons, Alfriston, Lyminge, Alveston (Brown in Hurst et al. 1975: 292-3).
134 (http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/gloucestershire/8298825.stm).
Sporadic early ‘Germanic’ finds from the region might also indicate changing cultural influences. A mid fourth - mid sixth century spearhead and mid fifth century equal-armed brooch were found at Hod Hill (Dorset) (Eagles 1994: 13, 18, 27), and a mid fifth century accessory vessel was identified from the cemetery at Fairford (Gloucestershire) (Laing 1975: 142).

Significant changes are seen at villas, including at several sites in the Southwest, during or after the late fourth century, which compares with changes seen at villa and urban sites across the Western Empire (Chavarría 2004, 2005: 548, 550; Lewit 2003). In the past, some saw this as evidence for foederati (billeted upon deserted lands), or as ‘barbarian’ settlement – particularly where destruction was noted (as on the Continent - see Arce, Chavarría and Ripoll 2007: 325-26; Chavarría 2004: 85; Chavarría 2005: 544-45; Chavarría and Lewit 2004: 24-5, 37).135 ‘Post-villa’ activity is makeshift and erratic, and often includes the construction of post-built and timber-framed buildings within the shells of villa buildings in a state of collapse, commonly with occupation deposits laid upon rubble. Mosaic floors were frequently destroyed in the construction of hearths and other features, such as corn-dryers.

Figure 4.19 ‘Camping floor’, Room 34a, Great Witcombe (Clifford 1954, Plate V)

135 The settlement of Goths within Gaul in AD 418 was said to have likely taken advantage of the land made available through agri deserti (Drinkwater and Elton 1992: 70; Esmonde Cleary 1989: 29; see below).
Such activity is noted at Great Witcombe, in the form of roughly paved floors (fig. 4.19), settings for timber posts within the villa (Clifford 1954: 26-7), and cooking platforms (Leach 1998), which are also seen at Kings Weston and Keynsham (Boon 1950; Branigan 1977: 100). Early fifth century activity is noted in the shell of apparently abandoned villa buildings at Frocester Court (Heighway 1987: 3, 5; fig. 4.20). A drip-gully in the courtyard of the demolished and razed villa defined the location of a timber-framed building (with structural similarities to those of probable fifth century date found in Gloucester), which sealed grass-tempered pottery and coins of Valentinian (Gracie and Price 1979: 14, 16, 19). The location of another timber building 18m from the villa, close to the road and cutting the courtyard wall, was indicated by a beam-slot (ibid.). Informal burial within villa contexts has also been associated by some with the occupation of immigrants (see Boon 1993: 79-80). However, again such activity is paralleled on the Continent (Chavarría 2004, 2005; Lewit 2003; see Chapter 6). (The supposed evidence for ‘barbarian’ attacks upon villas has been briefly considered above, see External Threats.)
'Post-villa' occupation also occurs within Durotrigia at Lufton villa, where an organic deposit containing finds and bone overlaid the floors of rooms 2 and 3, a metalworking hearth was placed in room 2, and a further hearth in room 4; rooms were also sub-divided by small walls (Dark 2000: 115). There is relatively little comparable activity within the Northwest sector of the Belgic civitas, but it is uncertain whether this reflects the true situation, or the poor (antiquarian) and limited investigation of sites. A com-drying kiln was placed within the recently discovered bathhouse at Truckle Hill, North Wraxall (near Chippenham), although a probable late replacement bathhouse was excavated nearby during the nineteenth century (Wessex Archaeology 2008a: v, 7, 24). Villas were perhaps abandoned more readily within this area, which may in part be due to ownership of these sites by administrative elites, rather than local landowners whose families had farmed the land for generations (see Chapter 3). The lack of comparable activity within Dumnonia (e.g. see O’Neil 1931: 495) is understandable, bearing in mind the dearth of villas in this area.

The assumption that this evidence demonstrates the presence of foederati seems to rest on the ‘natural’ assumption that only ‘barbarians’ – the antithesis of ‘civilized’ classicism - would have been driven to such destruction. The belief that villa owners were unlikely to have destroyed their own property in such a manner was initially made from an imperialist position, in which classicism dictated archaeological investigation and interpretation (Hingley 2000).

More recent opinion sees this activity as that of ‘refugees’, with no previous attachment to these places (Laycock 2008: 164). However, a closer investigation of the technologies employed within some contexts demonstrates a need for a more nuanced interpretation. A degree of continuity in local building traditions is implied: for example, the post-villa oven at Great Witcombe replicates structural features found within slightly earlier local buildings (see Leach 1998). Local building technologies are also commonly seen within other building contexts commonly labelled as ‘squatter’ occupation, perhaps demonstrating the desire by local residents to remain upon and within villa estates – as is the case argued for similar practices on the Continent (Lewit 2003; but see Lewit 2006, for a more cautionary approach regarding the likelihood of population continuity).

Nevertheless, this behaviour represents cultural rupture, necessitating the renegotiation of social identities. It is certainly possible that in some cases, ‘Others’ from outside the local community may

---

137 Possible symbols of officialdom include a gold buckle from the Corsham area, and a silver ring from the eastern empire engraved with ‘victory’ (Henig 2001: 122). The lead seal from Coombe Down may attest the presence of an Imperial estate in the area (Cunliffe 1993: 257).
138 This assumption also incorporates a belief that the Continental practice of hospitalitas - in which landowners were forced to yield land for the support of barbarians after AD 418 (MacMullen 1963: 139; Amory 1997: 27, 57) - or the practice of billeting (Wood 1984: 21), was adopted within Britain.
have taken advantage of the benefits afforded by abandoned sites, but it is perhaps more probable that local tenant farmers, with experience of farming the surrounding land and ties with local landowners, occupied these sites after their vacation by local elites. The relocation of landowners and their retinues at hillforts during the fifth century (see Chapter 5) may have provided such an opportunity. It might therefore be argued that ‘post-villa’ occupation had, in part, a class dimension, representing the renegotiation of cultural contexts associated with former socio-political superiors by lower status individuals in their appropriation of abandoned villa estates (see Faulkner 2000). However, we should note that, in the construction of new identities, similar changes on the Continent demonstrate that some of the surviving elite were also possibly abandoning the ‘Roman’ way of life (Amory 1997: 63; Lewit 2003).

These changes may initially related to a concentration in rural ownership, followed by ideological, political, and social transformations, suggesting new patterns of ownerships for villas (Chavarría and Lewit 2003: 32; Lewit 2006; Liebeschuetz 2001: 379, 382; Sarris 2004: 59-60; Schachner 2006: 60). The range of changes accompanied broad socio-cultural transformations, in which Classical frameworks became less meaningful (Bowes and Gutteridge 2005; Lewit 2003: 261, 267, 268, 270, 271; 2006). Some elites may have continued to occupy villa sites, with clear changes to the ways in which villa space was used in the recreation of post-Roman social relationships and identities – demonstrating comparable changes to those seen within urban environments (Chavarría 2005: 548; Lewit 2003: 266). But others are likely to have increasingly asserted status within alternative locales (Bowes and Gutteridge 2005; Chavarría and Lewit 2003: 32; Lewit 2006). The potential high-status nature of timber buildings has been recognised (Chavarría and Lewit 2004: 36; Lewit 2003: 269), and it will be seen below that such buildings were juxtaposed with buildings constructed from other materials in the assertion of status at post-Roman hillfort settlements (see: Hillforts).

The possibility then remains that, in some cases, this activity may represent a desire by the villa owners or their descendants to remain within, or at least retain links with, this highly symbolic context. Construction in timber within the walls may demonstrate the desire to perpetuate an established sense of place, as might burial within hypocaust vaults, for example, representing attempts to appropriate the power of place in the recreation of landscape and identities. Such behaviour may indicate attempts both to maintain and transform the Roman discourse in the construction of post-Roman society. This is not to deny that such activity may have ultimately succeeded in recreating a sense of ‘place’, giving it different meanings through transforming its use, particularly if we consider the effects of generational change (see Hebdige 1979). In this situation, the ‘ancestral’ home may have remained significant, although the descendents of the landowner would have been more willing to break with tradition in order to establish their sense of place.
Irish settlement

The possibility of Irish *foederati* (or auxiliaries) within Southwest Britain is in need of consideration, as it has been argued that more Westerly areas may have used Irish *fiana* as mercenaries to protect their territories from ‘barbarian’ raids (Woolf 1991: 76). Early interpretations of Irish settlement within Western Britain were primarily influenced by genealogical and mythological sources (see Collingwood and Myres 1936: 283). The ninth century *Sanas Cormaic* (Cormac’s Glossary) locates members of the Co. Cork based Uí Liatháin within Cornwall in the late- or post-Roman period (Charles-Edwards 2000: 163). However, the evidence for Irish settlement within both the West and Southwest is scant. An additional problem in detecting such activity is the degree of shared culture across Western Britain and Ireland. Two-way cultural exchange between Southwestern Britain and Ireland is clear, with evident similarities in settlement, ritual, and burial practices between Southwestern Britain and Ireland (Charles-Edwards 2000: 149, 162-63; Edwards 1996: 129; O'Brien 1999: 132; Rance 2001: 250) causing great difficulties in recognising Irish settlement within the West. We might anticipate similar behaviour by both Continental and Irish ‘barbarian’ elites, in the probable appropriation of Roman military symbols to legitimate military power and authority. Furthermore, it is highly likely that auxiliaries would have drawn upon Roman military identity in order to provide group cohesion (see Gardner 2007), further complicating the recognition of either Irish mercenary soldiers (who it is suggested were drawn from the elite, see Woolf 1991), or regular army members, based within Britain.

In areas outside the Southwest, the potentially early presence of inscribed stones has suggested the presence of Irish *foederati*, or Roman auxiliaries (e.g. see Thomas 1994: 29, 42-3). The *ogham* inscriptions within the Southwest (see Okasha 1993) may suggest the same, perhaps dating from as early as the late fourth century (see Handley 2001). However, although material culture of the type found across the Western seaboard occasionally occurs within the region (such as the Type G penannular brooch, see below), this is mainly restricted to harbour contexts. No material culture that

---

139 However, Charles-Edwards (2000: 164) argues this is an ‘old but muddled tradition, not propaganda newly devised on behalf of an intrusive dynasty’.

140 Military titles occur upon Demetian memorials, suggesting that the Irish who settled in south Wales were perhaps veteran auxiliaries (see Woolf 1991). However, it has alternatively been suggested that these titles were appropriated by local elite in the creation of new structures of power.

141 These transformations in Irish society have been seen as due to kinship ties between the two regions, alongside religious conversion (ibid. 161).

142 However, it has been argued that those expressing ‘Irish’ affiliation were perhaps descendants of early fifth century Demetian settlers, rather than emigrants coming directly from Ireland (see Thomas 1994). If so, this would perhaps support a later date for the inscriptions. Charles Thomas has noted possible kinship between Dumnonia and Demetia indicated by the repetition of family names in both regions (ibid. 237). Memorials to sons of Vortipor occur at St. Breoke, where a stone has been dated to c. AD 500, commemorating VLCAGNI FILI / SEVERI, whilst at Newchurch, Carmarthenshire, a stone bearing comparable epigraphy reads SEVERINI / FILI / SEVERI. Thomas concluded that *Romanitas* was devolved upon the elder son through his hereditary status, whereas the younger son had to achieve his future elsewhere (ibid. 241, 242).
is more specifically associated with Irish cultural development at this time (such as the Type H brooch, and particular crucible types, see Alcock 1971; Fowler 1963) is found in this area. The Southwestern ogham inscriptions, and the inscriptions containing Goidelic names (Appendix, Table 15, fig. 4.21), therefore again represent the influence of Irish culture and language upon the region, but cannot be used to support the presence of Irish foederati with any confidence.\textsuperscript{143} Again, it might be argued that these stones instead represent the presence of Irish auxiliaries, appropriating Mediterranean mechanisms for commemorating the dead as adopted by regular army members elsewhere in the Empire. However, no clear inference can be drawn from the distribution of these stones, and there are no military buckles found within this region (as might be expected, if comparisons are made with Germanic auxiliaries to the East, see above). Furthermore, the practice of funerary memorial commemoration had anyway declined by the later fourth century (Handley 2001: 181-82).

As is more commonly argued, these stones perhaps date to or after the second half of the fifth century, although they still cannot certainly be correlated with the later Irish ceramic types that are occasionally found within the region (see Thomas 1973). More certain dating of either of these pieces of evidence is needed, alongside a detailed analysis of practices found within both Ireland and the Peninsula at this time, before we can draw any firmer conclusions. In summary, there is no certain archaeological evidence for anything but occasional and sporadic Irish settlement within the region at this date (or later).\textsuperscript{144}

\textsuperscript{143} Place names have also been used to demonstrate Irish settlement (see Charles-Edwards 2000: 159; Thomas 1994) - although these are notoriously difficult to date, and it may be that these stones represent the construction or emulation of Irish identity by indigenous groups.

\textsuperscript{144} Some finds have been used to suggest an Irish presence within Late Antique Southwest Britain, such as grass-marked pottery, although the date of this ware is more likely to be after the sixth, and possibly eighth, century (Thomas 1973)
Summary and discussion: auxiliary and foederati settlement within Southwest Britain

A number of features found in Eastern Britain, that are also found in the Southwest, including sporadic buildings of apparently Germanic design, so-called ‘squatter’ occupation, and Continental military belt sets, have been interpreted as indicating early ‘barbarian’ – in particular, ‘Germanic’ - settlement. Furthermore, ogham inscriptions, and inscriptions bearing Goidelic names, have been interpreted as indicating the presence of Irish militia within the Southwest during the late- to post-Roman period. However, with the exception of belt sets, this evidence is minimal within this region, and none supports either the settlement of large immigrant groups before or during the mid fifth century, or substantial ‘barbarian’ attacks upon the region (as might be believed by reading the later documentary sources).

One explanation for the presence of Continental ‘military’ buckles is that they formed part of the uniforms of auxiliaries in the Roman army. Alternative explanations also exist for the other potential indicators of ‘barbarian’ settlement. It has been argued that the so-called ‘squatter’ occupation may as likely represent the continued occupation of villas by landowners, reoccupation by those relocating from other estates, or that this activity represents occupation by local farmers. One critical factor is that changes in settlement (and especially burial) practices do not accompany such activity. It has been seen that indigenous SFBs (of an early date) are known, demonstrating that there is no easy correlation between this building technology and ‘Germanic’ settlement. The strongest potential evidence for the presence of foederati within the region is the ‘Gothic’ buckles found in Gloucestershire, although these too may be interpreted differently (as there is nothing definitely military about the ‘Gothic’ buckles found in the Kingsholm burial, for instance). Moreover, if such buckles are exclusively military, they may represent the presence of regular army members. Furthermore, if indeed these buckles do belong to early fifth century foederati, this would go to show how these troops adopted local material culture and practices, and appropriated Roman mores and Classical culture in the assertion of personal identity. The same argument may be made of ogham inscriptions. It should also be borne in mind that long-term cross-cultural exchange between Britain and Ireland (even if in this case influence is via South Wales, see Thomas 1994), may make Irish settlers undetectable.

This new cultural repertoire does nevertheless indicate new cultural influences, and perhaps the expression of new cultural or ethnic identities, albeit initially only by a very small number. (In

---

146 Ogham text, whilst not directly imitating Latin script, is probably influenced by it (Charles-Edwards 2000: 165-66; Edwards 1996: 5; Thomas 1994: 30-33).
general, this practice was probably not widespread until after the late fifth century). The presence of ‘Others’ (in the form of raiding parties), alongside general political and economic instability, is more likely to have had an impact upon the construction of opposition within the local population, perhaps making a wider number of people susceptible to ethnic constructs developed within elite processes of ethnogenesis.

LOCAL RESPONSES: INDIGENOUS ARMIES

It is suggested that raids upon Britain created an atmosphere of fear within the Southwest, perhaps influencing the construction of ethnic and communal identities during this time. Some were perhaps coming to understand the value of establishing different forms of power, which had until now been politically untenable. It is possible that any withdrawal of troops from Britain during the later fourth century (see Millett 1990: 229), coupled with this sense of insecurity, would have led those with sufficient power and wealth to create private armies for the protection of their estates, or other (including human) recourses (Drinkwater 1992: 214-15; but see Wickham 2005: 330-31). War bands were perhaps formed from colonii and retainers, and possibly ex-army veterans (Faulkner 2000: 174; Salway 1981: 440). These armies are recorded elsewhere in the Empire, where they enabled the development of military patronage by local magnates (MacMullen 1963: 139; see also Wickham 2005: 257, for a slightly later period). The mechanisms of power may also compare with those adopted by ‘barbarian’ war-bands on the Continent, who were supported by gifts of land and feasting, encouraging reciprocal loyalty (Pohl 1997b: 44).

In Gaul, local elites took advantage of the turmoil caused by the removal of State control (and protection) and vied for power (Halsall 1992: 207). I will argue that elites across much of Southwest Britain might have followed a similar trajectory. This activity, if not in direct opposition to the State, may have indirectly encouraged its erosion - potentially leading to revolts within other social arenas (see Wickham 1984: 8).

147 The impact of military withdrawal has perhaps been overplayed, bearing in mind evidence for continued activity on Hadrians Wall, at Birdoswald, for instance (see Newman 2006: 96-7) http://www.dur.ac.uk/resources/archaeological.services/research_training/hadrianswall_research_framework/project_documents/PostRoman.pdf).
148 In the Code of Theodosianus, at the end of the fourth century, private armies were forbidden (7.1.15), but they were later allowed (15.12.5). This perhaps reflects a formal recognition of de facto local power (Wickham 2001: 67), and probably indicates retrospective diplomatic tolerance of burgeoning local power structures (see Halsall 1992: 206; Drinkwater 1992).
149 Such armies were known as buccellari in the East (Esmonde Cleary 1989: 10; Pohl 1997: 34). For example, Sidonius’ brother-in-law Ecdicius maintained a military retinue in Gaul (Wickham 2005: 63).
Brooches and ‘military’ identity

Identification of local armies via the archaeological evidence is not easy, considering the lack of weapons found on later Roman sites. In Eastern Britain, on the Continent, and in the Mediterranean, members of the military displayed their power and position by wearing particular insignia, such as the crossbow brooch. However, this find is relatively uncommon in later Roman Western Britain (see Swift 2000). Considering the primarily elite associations of penannular brooches (see e.g. fig. 4.22), often occurring at sites where ‘military’ buckles were also found (see above, Auxiliaries and Foederati), and the probable role of these objects in patronage, it might be suggested that this type of brooch was developed as an alternative to the crossbow brooch.

Figure 4.22 Penannular brooches: Type C: 1. Barnsley Park (after Webster and Smith 1982, fig. 30.86). Types F & E: 2. & 3. Great Witcombe (after Clifford 1954, figs. 13.2, 14.1); type E: 4. Kingsweston (after Boon 1967, fig. 1). Type G: 5. Camerton, 6. & 7. Cannington, 8. Worlebury, 9. Goss Moor (after Dickinson 1982, fig. 3.8, fig. 3.9, fig. 5.31, 4.15). Not to scale

The use of brooches to display status within military contexts is seen within later (possibly Early Medieval) texts, at a time when the penannular was the prevailing form. It is suggested that this symbolism began to develop in the breakdown of Roman socio-political structures during the later Roman period, when the construction of new groups required some form of material demarcation (such mechanisms are advantageous within situations of conflict in which dress is otherwise very similar). That is, these objects were not necessarily part of any official uniform, per se, but rather they potentially demonstrated membership of military networks, with subtle variations in style perhaps signifying association with particular leaders or local areas. As on the Continent, militaristic symbolism became incorporated within dress in the development of elite identities (see Schachner 2006: 60). Social relationships and identities may have been constructed through the exchange of these brooches as gifts, and recognition with others wearing similar brooches. Thus, wearing these

151 Although written later (at the earliest, during the seventh century), Y Gododdin emphasises the role of brooches as display of client-ship and status, within a military context (Jarman 1990).
brooches perhaps both symbolised belonging to these groups, and helped create communities largely structured by military obligation to local or regional leaders. These communities were possibly perpetuated by shared histories relating to military performance (remembered in oral tradition).

In many ways, rural Western British and Irish societies seem to exhibit parallel developments, with the penannular brooch becoming significant across these areas, as Irish elites adopted symbols of power and status found within later Roman Western Britain. The endurance of this brooch form from the pre-Roman period and through the Roman period perhaps influenced its appropriation and manipulation in the late- and post-Roman period as a legitimising symbol. The shared zoomorphic symbolism found on both military buckles (see below) and on some penannular brooches may have been significant in their possible use as military insignia. Likewise, it might be speculated that the red enamel sometimes employed upon penannular brooches during this time was relevant to military identities – with red perhaps symbolising blood (see Perring 2003: 108, with regard to red symbolism within funerary contexts).

These brooches cannot be seen as directly representing regional identities, nor as defining the continuity of prehistoric ‘tribes’, as is sometimes implied. Their distributions cut across political (civitas) and putative ‘tribal’ boundaries, and rarely coincide with other discrete distributions of artefacts or practices (fig. 4.23). Nevertheless, regional groupings of these brooches are evident in the Southwest (see Fowler 1963: 113; see below), perhaps reflecting the creation of social networks.152

---

152 On the Continent, there were similar distributions of penannular brooches and ‘military’ belt buckles (often occurring in graves with buckles), during the late fourth century, along the limes, possibly reflecting use of this brooch type by some as a fastener for the chlamys, or military cloak (White 1990: 127).
Within the Dobunnic area, there are two regional types. The Type G (fig. 4.22.5-8) is found predominantly within the Southern Dobunnic / Avon area (though spreading across the Bristol Channel). However, one example comes from a ritual context at Lydney, and two examples come from an Anglo-Saxon grave at Fairford, and an atypical example was dredged from the Thames at Kempsford (Dickinson 1982: 48, 49, 52, 56; Appendix, Table 16; see fig. 4.23). There is also a higher incidence of re-use (or possible manufacture) of the Type C (and perhaps type D), found in the North of the civitas (see fig. 4.22.1). 153

Type G is again only generally found within the Northwest sector of the Belgic territory, though one worn example came from an early – mid sixth century Anglo-Saxon grave at Harham Hill (Wiltshire) (ibid. 48). However, a number of finds come from what had been Southern Dobunnic territory (which may have lain either within the Belgic, Dobunnic, or Durotrigian civitas, see Chapter 3), and an unstratified brooch came from Camerton (ibid. 47). It is also a type not found within Southern Durotrigian, or Dumnonian (excluding ‘Cornovia’), territory, although two examples have been found at Cannington, and the only silver example was found near to Worlebury (ibid. 48, 50). A cluster of brooches is found as far southwest as the putative Cornovian border - along the Fowey-Camel ‘frontier’ – including an example from Goss Moor (near Restormel fort) (ibid. 49; fig. 4.23.8). This indicates contact between the areas of the Southwest region (with the Bristol Channel perhaps playing an important role in communication, trade, and military movements). Several coastal trading ports have been recognised in the area where such finds may have originated (Bennett 1985; Rippon 2008; see Dickinson 1982). There is also a degree of correlation between the distribution of these brooches and that of mineral ingots (and Romano-British mines) (see fig. 4.23).

These finds may indicate attempts to signify authority and status within the creation of autonomous (possibly military) authorities, and may suggest the employment of similar military insignia by militia placed along territorial frontiers within the Southwest (though more likely relate to resource control). The adoption of similar styles across a relatively wide territory may demonstrate a degree of coalition between independent late- and post-Roman territories within a common cultural framework, possibly even military co-operation between civitas territories during the fifth century. In the virtual absence of the crossbow brooch – the established imperial symbol of military and civic power found across much of the Empire – Southwestern elites adopted and adapted established local and regional symbols within a Classical idiom. This parallels activity in Gaul, in which ‘Romanised’ elites appropriated imperial symbols and systems of power in restructuring society after socio-political rupture (Halsall 1992: 206). Their Atlantic / Bristol Channel distribution may explain selection of the penannular form - the process of cultural ‘barbarisation’ being Hibernian

153 For example, see Mackreth, in Smith and Webster 1992: 144-45; Leach 1998.
cultural influence and exchange during this time - instead of reflecting deliberate reversion to symbols derived from the pre-Roman past within a process of 'Celtic revival' (see below).

**Buckles and ‘military’ identity**

Continental buckles have been discussed above in relation to a possible Germanic presence within Southwest Britain during the later Roman period. Certain types of ‘military’ belt buckles (Hawkes types I and II, but with regard to the Southwest, Type IB in particular) may have been manufactured within Britain during the early fifth century (see Hawkes 1961: 21ff; fig. 4.24). They were arguably manufactured to provide a uniform for local soldiers, of similar form to that adopted during the late fourth century by Roman auxiliaries on the Rhineland. Studies such as that of Mark Corney have recognized distinctive regional groupings of particular motifs, and have again noted their location within towns and at villas, rather than at military sites (see also Laycock 2008). Finds of unfinished, and relatively poor quality, buckles in Cirencester and at Farringdon may indicate production centres concentrated around the Cotswolds, supplying the surrounding Dobunnic civitas region, with a distribution into the Upper Thames valley (Wiltshire), and Somerset (figs. 4.25, 4.26). Bearing in mind the possible late Roman date of these objects, their occurrence at Gloucester and Cirencester perhaps suggests the presence of garrisons, or at least confirms the continued administrative role of the city, in the later Roman period (Hurst 1986: 122, 124; RCHME 1976: xxxviii). However, a possible (early) post-Roman date might indicate that these buckles were potentially used as insignia for local armies, perhaps within the display of local and regional (or even provincial) authority and identity.

---

154 Although it is suggested that British buckles seem individually made (Laycock 2008), urban industrialisation might indicate the presence of State-owned military workshops (Faulkner 2000: 128), and it is possible that ‘military’ buckles were produced in urban workshops, and distributed within an imperial framework.

155 Mark Corney, Early Medieval Burial, conference UCL, 24 April 1999.


157 A late Roman date is possible, given the records of unrest within cities during this time (see above; Salway 1981: 410; Esmond Cleary 1989: 5, 34, 50; Hurst 1986: 122; Millett 1990: 216; Petts 2003a: 110).
British-made buckles are not as common within Durotrigian territory (figs. 4.25, 4.26, Appendix, Table 14), although a ‘British’ buckle and a similar strap-end have been found at Dorchester, and a similar strap end found at the Maiden Castle temple (Green 1984: 262), suggesting the location of militia in this area, perhaps during the early fifth century. In contrast to Continental ‘military’ buckles, British made examples are less common in the Northwest Belgic region (although small numbers are found around the eastern and southern fringes of the civitas, see Corney 2001, fig. 3.1; Laycock 2008). This may suggest that alternative forms of social and military organisation operated within both the Belgic (Northwest sector) and Durotrigian territories during the late- and early post-Roman period, perhaps confirming the restriction of paramilitary organisation to the Dobunnic civitas.

Figure 4.25 Distribution of type IB buckles within the ‘Dobunnic’ region (after Laycock 2008, fig. 51)

Motifs employed upon the ‘Dobunnic’ buckles consist of opposed horse’s heads (developing from the more typical Dolphin motif). It might be conjectured that this motif related to the nature of military force, which it has been suggested was largely dependent upon (or at least heavily supported by) comitatenses (cavalry) troops, billeted in town during the late fourth – early fifth century (Esmonde Cleary 1989: 54-5). ‘Dobunnic’ buckle plates are incised with distinctive geometric designs and punched with circular motifs (see fig. 4.24), which are also found on strap-ends and nail-cleaners from the region (as from Torthworth and Barnsley Park, Eckardt and Crummy 2006: 90).
Local production of Germanic auxiliary buckles at Rhineland factories had enabled the reinterpretation of Classical Late Antique motifs (such as Eastern Mediterranean confronted animals and birds), by incorporating elements of ‘barbarised’ style (Laing 1997: 25, 145). This was part of a broader process noted during and after the fourth century in Gaul, in which ‘Roman’ style came to incorporate aspects of ‘barbarian’ culture. It has been argued that the Roman aristocracy developed a taste for ‘Germanic’ fashions during this time (Reece 1989: 235), although this must be placed within the context of numerous individuals from ‘barbarian’ backgrounds reaching high-ranking positions within the Roman State and army. On the Continent, the boundary between Roman and ‘barbarian’ was necessarily blurred as Roman elites coexisted with ‘barbarian’ leaders, who appropriated Roman symbols and structures of power within the construction of identity (see Greene 1987). A parallel explanation may therefore lie behind the reintroduction of La Tène style into later Roman Britain (possibly due to the presence of Irish soldiers within Western regions, see above, or more likely due to trade links with Ireland). This is perhaps part of the same process by which some types of penannular brooch became significant in legitimating authority (see above).

---

158 The collection of military buckles within the Southwest is constantly expanding due to the activities of metal detectorists, and this data therefore provides only a general guide. Data obtained from PAS; Hawkes and Dunning 1961; Hawkes 1961; and Green 1984. Stuart Laycock also very kindly provided maps of his own creation, and from Kevin Leahey.

159 Similar developments are evident in the East, which it is argued represents a reinterpretation of Romanitas (Turner 1998).

160 The adoption of ‘barbarian’ fashion is witnessed at the Coronation of Julian: Julian was recorded as wearing a torc - a Northern European symbol of rank - and was lifted on a shield in imitation of Germanic custom (MacMullen 1963: 170).
Thus, although such designs, reflecting LPRIA decorative schemes and techniques, arguably demonstrate the appropriation of pre-Roman symbols (Laycock 2008: 122-23) in the construction of late- to post-Roman elite (militaristic) society, considering the distribution of these finds, this need not indicate a process of ‘Celtic revival’, as might be argued by some interpretations (see MacMullen 1965). Instead, it might indicate cross-cultural exchange between Southwestern British and Irish elites within a military milieu, and far from indicating a rejection of ‘Roman’ style, may demonstrate the continuing significance of certain Roman symbols of power.\footnote{It has been suggested that horse symbolism, as used upon regional LPRIA coins, was particularly significant with regard to regional identity, as evidenced by Roman period cult activity (see Chapter 2; Yeates 2008: 134-36). However, there are several problems with this hypothesis, not least the occurrence of comparable activity across the Southwest, and negligible later Roman equine ritual, with no indication of local continuity of practices. Whether this supposition indicates such a connection (see Laycock 2008: 122) must remain for now undecided.} The possible ambiguity of these styles might have enabled the signification of multiple identities, considering the juxtaposition of motifs witnessed within earlier insular designs (albeit themselves influenced by Mediterranean style) and the Roman period developments of these motifs (see Fowler 1963: 132).

**Summary and discussion: internal and external threats to security, and their responses**

Political transformations are evident within both the archaeological remains and historical texts. However, there is very little evidence relating to fifth century political organisation within the texts, although later (sixth century) historical narratives have often been super-imposed upon the early post-Roman period. It is possible that this practice reflects a desire to incorporate the eighth, ninth, and twelfth century ethno-historical narratives of writers such as Bede, ‘Nennius’, and Geoffrey of Monmouth within English and Welsh origin myths of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The circularity of this process, as each ‘history’ successively relied upon and incorporates earlier fabrications, is often ignored, and the point is often missed that all of these earlier authors (including Gildas) were themselves involved in the creation of ethnic mythologies. But, notwithstanding the silence of the texts, transformations to socio-political organisation during this time are perceptible within the archaeological record.

Nevertheless, there is no certain evidence for the complete rejection and replacement of administrative elites at the beginning of the fifth century, as supposed by later writers (see DEB 14.1; Zosimus 6.5.3; Procopius *De Bello Vandalico* 1.2.31, 38). However, the physical space in which State administration was enacted was reduced and ultimately transformed for alternative uses, and it seems likely that at least some administrative elites departed from Britain once imperial financial support was withdrawn.
There were possible attempts at the end of the Roman period to assert and reify political territories. State fragility and then collapse may have readily brought long-standing oppositions to the fore, in attempts to (re)claim land - as also seen in the recent past (e.g. see Laycock 2008; Vail 1989). Regional elites perhaps drew upon identities constructed during the LPRIA (and maintained through social networks) to renegotiate identities in the light of the withdrawal of the Roman State, despite the probable role of the State during the mid first centuries BC – AD in influencing the construction of these identities through external categorisation (see Chapter 2).

The changing political situation, alongside threats to security during and after the later fourth century and after, is likely to have prompted a variety of reactions, affecting the construction of ethnic, regional, and local identities within Southwest Britain. These stresses and transformations are seen in the archaeological record in the form of military works potentially dating to the fourth or early fifth century (such as the strengthening of urban defences - evident at most towns, and construction of defensive earthworks). The construction of defensive works in particular may be seen as having embodied (and even exaggerated) feelings of insecurity for rural populations.

Earthworks such as Wansdyke and Bokerley Dyke have a quasi-military appearance (Green 1971: 142-3). However, alongside a defensive role, major earthworks may have also been significant in territorial definition, and were thus perhaps important in constructing local and regional identities through the creation of regional locales (cf. Petts 1998b: 90). The act of constructing these monuments may itself have acted as a binding mechanism, encouraging a sense of instability and dependence, and enhancing the construction of identity in opposition to the ‘Other’ – who were seen as located across the boundary. They may also have consolidated the political power of certain individuals and groups. Although primarily used as a mechanism to control access (perhaps due to fears of conflict during the political fragmentation of the early fifth century, or fear of immigrant settlers during and after the mid fifth century), the liminality generated in border crossings may have further emphasised a sense of ‘us’ and ‘them’ through performative action.

These monuments defined areas containing diverse populations, although the very act of definition held the potential to unite these populations under a regional leadership (or within a confederation of smaller polities), by drawing upon common aspects of culture and providing the opportunity to emphasise selective characteristics, such as ‘Roman’ or ethnic identity, within the construction of a supra-regional identity. Cultural, political, or military interaction might be seen in the construction of smaller boundaries such as Bedwyn Dyke, employing a similar defensive strategy to that of Wansdyke, with hillforts being incorporated at the terminal of both boundaries.

The construction of defensive boundaries suggests organisation beyond the local community, possibly correlating with civitates, or even provincial units (see White 2007: 175). It might therefore
be argued that these earthworks functioned to emphasise the extent of civitas or larger political territories within the later Roman process of territorial reorganisation. The location of West Wansdyke in North Somerset might relate to the consolidation or re-creation, and reification, of Dobunnic territory. Therefore, in the light of this theory and the evidence presented above, this monument might best be dated either to the later fourth, before political fragmentation was complete, or after the later fifth century, when political unification was in a state of redevelopment.

Although defensive works and the possible presence of army and militia in and around towns point to a general sense of insecurity, there are few signs within the archaeological record of unrest in the form of physical devastation. There is only occasional destruction of settlement features, and limited incidence of violence (this is mainly seen at villas, but includes the burning of Crickley Hill hillfort settlement twice, see Chapter 5). There is no definite indication of who may have been responsible for such action. It cannot necessarily be seen as the consequence of ‘barbarian’ raids, but may as likely relate to sporadic local conflict. Nevertheless, the threat of raids upon, and close to, the region may have been sufficient to instil feelings of ‘us’ and ‘them’, thereby encouraging the construction of community (and possibly wider ethnic) identities.

A number of traits have been taken to indicate the presence of either foederati soldiers employed in defence of Britain against ‘barbarian’ raids, or to demonstrate early Germanic settlement in Southeast and Eastern Britain, and some of these traits occur within the Southwest. So-called ‘squatter occupation’ has often been seen as the ‘barbarian’ occupation of abandoned Romano-British sites. It was noted that similar activity occurs across the Western Empire in Late Antiquity (Dark 2000: 146; Woolf 2003: 362). However, closer investigation of regional sites has revealed that this activity does not necessarily indicate discontinuity, and it might be argued that these changes reflect local migration, rather immigration from outside of Britain. Nor is this activity necessarily incompatible with continued occupation by villa owners. Post-villa occupation was possibly integrated within a widespread process whereby the cultural landscape was redefined through the renegotiation of these sites within transformed cultural frameworks. Social memories were recreated within the construction of more localised identities that were nonetheless defined by common experiences of the Empire. The previously proscribed close association between burials and villa buildings again perhaps asserted the adoption of alternative media of power within the reconstitution of social memory, but also suggests significant changes to systems of belief.

162 Religious intolerance has been suggested as a motive behind the damage of mosaics at Frampton, for example (Perring 2003: 122-23).
The presence of Continental style military buckles within later Roman contexts has also suggested to some the presence of foederati. However, it has been argued that these finds more likely represent the location of auxiliary soldiers within a wider range of civilian contexts during the later fourth century. Their presence must surely have affected urban and rural identities, transforming the ways in which imperial control was renegotiated, and Roman identity was perceived.

Later regional military buckles may indicate the development and presence of militia in the Southwest region (particularly around Cirencester), perhaps during the early fifth century. It is likely that the creation of such units (possibly in part made up of resident veterans of the Roman army) would have encouraged the construction or consolidation of local military identities. However, the issue is confused by increasing military involvement within civilian government, a decline in the willingness of local landowners to govern, and attempts to fortify towns against barbarian raids (Millet 1990: 128-9).

Local and regional elites appear to have adopted Roman symbols of authority in using these buckles, as part of the process of reconstructing local structures of power. This scenario is plausible in the context of the reduced power of the State (as on the Continent, see Halsall 1992); it is possible that in some cases, these symbols were adopted in opposition to that power. The likelihood that these locally manufactured buckles signified both military and regional identities centred upon civic centres is therefore strong. However, this practice cannot automatically be extended to denote the expression of regional identity within and by the rest of the population.

The extent to which measures such as urban defences, linear earthworks, and the presence of auxiliary military support, or local armies, were in response to external or internal threats against the Empire is uncertain. It has been argued that excessive taxation (placing pressure upon landowners), alongside lack of opportunities for advancement within the political sphere, and restrictions upon socio-economic mobility, arguably instigated rebellion (as recorded in later texts). This situation may have provoked a highly unstable and discontented population, for which a distant empire was providing minimal return for maximum input, although more recent studies challenge these interpretations, and suggest variation in the impact of, and reactions to legal reforms. Under such pressures (but more so, in relation to the widespread transformations to political structures) we might expect to find the renegotiation of social identities by an elite seeking alternative mechanisms through which it might justify its control over land, and consequently over the local populace.

Ultimately, instability may have encouraged the construction of collective identities in attempts to achieve both ontological and physical security (see Freeman 2001), as well as in the creation or maintenance of social hierarchy and status. The regional archaeology will be considered within the
following chapter, to explore later Roman transformations at the local level, and determine how these changes may have affected identities.
This chapter will examine changes in regional archaeology during the period c. AD 350-450, with regard to the construction of ethnic identities. Although, it is often difficult to date the remains with any precision, and the extended use of material commonly seen as later Roman into, and often beyond, the later fifth century is acknowledged (see Cool 2000), any material that might reasonably be placed within this time frame will be considered, and included within this survey. This chapter begins with a brief discussion of changes to the material culture of the Southwest region. Regional analysis then considers each category of site, beginning with an examination of urban sites, followed by an appraisal of rural settlements (villas and farmsteads), and then hillforts. This will be achieved by investigating the settlement evidence from the Dobunnic, (Northwest) Belgic, Durotrigian, and Dumnonian civitates, and ‘Cornovian’ pagus within each respective section, as in previous chapters, to determine any potential relationship between these political units and regional identities. These surveys will analyse the changing use of finds (paying particular attention to their contexts). The evidence will be summarized at the end of each section, and considered in relation to the evidence for political change and military defence outlined in Chapter 4.

Two core narratives have gained currency in the attempt to account for developments during this period. The traditional narrative is one in which Romanitas is rejected, and ‘Celtic’ or ‘barbarian’ culture ‘revived’ (e.g. Collingwood and Myres 1936; Faulkner 2000; Reece 1989). Other interpretations see the period as ‘Late Antique’, and claim that much of the Roman State system and culture remained intact, but was transformed into essentially urban-based regional polities (e.g. Dark 1994, 2000). The extent to which either account truly reflects the situation can only be determined through detailed archaeological investigation of changing practices at the micro- and macro-scale, which will be attempted below. This investigation will concentrate upon the changing relationship between material culture and archaeological contexts, paying attention to the transformation of style, and will question how these changes relate to notions of ‘Celtic’ revival and continuity of Roman cultural identity, bearing in mind the role played by the past in the construction of identities.
MATERIAL CULTURE: LATE ROMAN TRANSFORMATIONS

The range of finds encountered at urban sites is similar to that found on rural settlements, suggesting the continuation of common exchange networks into the late fourth century. However, the increased industrialisation noted within urban contexts may relate both changes to the road system (and the consequent reduction in the availability of goods manufactured within rural areas), and, through increasing self-sufficiency, may have had an effect upon the demand for such goods. The development of a restricted range of finds that continues in use from the late Roman period and into the fifth century - and perhaps beyond (which of course makes its use in dating sites problematic), has been suggested by Hilary Cool, with a preference for particular colours – red and black, and perhaps white (Cool 2000). This correlates with the evidence from the Southwest. Metalwork included particular penannular brooches (Fowler types G, D, and E, some type F, the ‘Irish’ type H, and perhaps the simple type C in some areas), and certain pins (particularly early hand pins and zoomorphic-head and round-head stick pins) (Alcock 1971; Dickinson 1982; Fowler 1963; Laing 1975: 322-26). Shale and jet beads and bracelets are also often encountered, showing a preference for black accessories (see Dark 2000: 135). Some types of glassware date to this period and beyond (e.g. see Alcock et al. 1995; Rahtz et al. 1992). Particular ceramics include certain types of Dorset BB1 (Gerrard 2004) and its imitations (e.g. Gloucester types TF5 and late Roman shell-tempered ware, see e.g. Heighway and Garrod 1980: 95-6). Small fragments of ‘curated’ Samian and its Oxford colour coated ware imitations also commonly occur within fifth century or later contexts in Western Britain (e.g. see Rahtz et al. 1992). Samian and Oxford colour coated wares, and perhaps others, may suggest the significance of wares associated with ‘civilised’ dining practices, possibly connected within notions of cultural or ethnic identity. Nevertheless, the change of habitat experienced by most of the population would surely have affected, and been effected by, cultural identities. It is very likely that it was deeply influential in the reconstruction of community identities.

Certain items of personal ornamentation evidently gained prominence, and these have often been considered signifiers of ‘Celtic revival’ or ‘nativism’. Penannular brooches, for example, are seen as indicative of a ‘return’ to pre-Roman culture, although such interpretations ignore the socio-economic, political, and cultural, contexts of these objects’ manufacture (see Chapter 4). However, these objects should rather be seen as part of a changing ‘Roman’ cultural repertoire – as indicated across the Empire in the apparent ‘barbarisation’ of culture significant to elites. Thus, what we see in Southwest Britain might represent a degree of ‘Hibernisation’, in contrast to the ‘Germanisation’ witnessed on the Continent, and perhaps Southeast Britain during the late fourth and fifth centuries. Cross-cultural exchange between Britain and Ireland (and the possible presence of Irish auxiliaries
or even *foederati* within the Southwest) may have encouraged the incorporation of Irish culture within a reworking of *Romanitas* for some, or a wide range of identities for most, mirroring the incorporation of Germanic culture on the Continent, particularly within militaristic contexts. Thus, instead of indicating ‘Celtic revival’, we may be witnessing the (re)negotiation of a shared cultural agenda, in which power and status were developed through cultural, trading (and perhaps militaristic) links across the West. The use of La Tène decoration may have signified the creation of new identities shared by elites along the Western seaboard. Within an ever-changing present, they may have embodied a continuous thread with a past that signified stability and authority, providing a framework within which alternative structures of power might be developed.

Although it is sometimes assumed that these brooches signified ‘tribal’ identities, there is no evidence to support the argument that they played any part in the construction of regional identities.

**URBAN SITES**

**DOBUNNIA**

Although the fourth century was a time of small town development, and there was growth of rural localised industries, many small towns deteriorated after c. AD 420 (Millet 1990: 133-135). The evidence for the development or demise of small towns within the Dobunnic region is limited (perhaps due to construction work focusing archaeological investigations on present day larger urban sites). However, sporadic finds, such as the issue of Arcadius (dating to AD 408) found at Abonae, demonstrate continued activity at some small towns into the fifth century (Bennett 1985: 4). Finds also suggest the possibility of continued activity into the fifth century at Bourton-on-the-Water (see Chapter 3, fig. 3.44-3.45), which perhaps served passing trade along the Fosse Way (with a worn Theodosian coin and late ceramics, O’Neil 1986: 31, 40; see also Donovan 1934: 106-07, 113). The trajectory of change evident at small towns is similar to that noted within the *civitas* centres, and is characterised by decline and transformation in the early fifth century (Donovan 1934: 104-07). However, there is a need to consider a wide range of contexts at both local and regional levels. It was seen in Chapter 4 that severance of the road system by large earthworks in the south of the study region at the end of the Roman period would have affected the development of some rural sites. However, the absence of similar activity in this region may have formed a contrast in the development of rural sites into the fifth century.

Chapter 3 outlined the influence of the former military settlement at Gloucester (*Glevum*) upon the layout of the subsequent *colonia*, in contrast to development of Cirencester (*Corinium*) from a typical Mediterranean civic model. Both sites show evidence of urban planning, rather than organic
growth, with Mediterranean-style buildings constructed within each settlement. These sites continued to thrive as administrative and cultural centres well into the fourth century, though public buildings were transformed. The discovery of North African and Gaza amphorae sherds, from Westgate Street, New Market Hall, St Oswald’s Priory, and Gloucester Castle, suggest the continuation of long-distance exchange into the later Roman period, and possibly beyond – particularly considering the presence of indigenous hand-made pottery at the latter site (see Williams and Carreras 1995: 240; Darvill 1988; 11; Hassall and Rhodes 1974, figs. 32, 33, 34; Heighway and Garrod 1980: 92, 96).

Although some argue for an end to towns in the mid fourth century (or even earlier), and link this with the end of Romanitas (Reece 1980: 85), the picture may be more complex. Urban transformations are certainly witnessed within the Southwest region, although changes seem more gradual until an evident rupture during the early fifth century (perhaps at the end of the second quarter of the century, although precise dating is not possible). Changes seen at Cirencester and Gloucester compare well with activity elsewhere in Britain and across much of the Western Empire (Caseau 2001; Faulkner 2000: 127), suggesting the full economic and political integration of the diocese within the Roman world.

Modern urban development has revealed a number of later Roman transformations to the town at Gloucester. It was seen in Chapter 4 that, although there were signs of continuing (albeit reduced) administration, there is little evidence of municipal development during the late fourth century. Change in the use of urban space is demonstrated by the discovery of dark earth, which may be interpreted in a variety of ways, including the agricultural use of urban land, the dumping of refuse, or construction in organic materials (Macphail, Galinié and Verhaeghe 2003). The industrial and private reuse of public buildings is manifest during the later fourth and early fifth century, with change particularly clear within the northern area of the forum (Heighway 1984: 361). It is possible that industrial activity in this area led to the burning of buildings within insula VIII (Heighway and Garrod 1980: 78).\footnote{Potential fifth century metalworking has been recognised form the town (Laing 1995: 103).}

Urban private residences continued to be built or modified, sometimes encroaching onto the streets (Hassall and Rhodes 1974: 32). In Gloucester, Classical style remained significant to some into the later fourth century: a coin of Valens (AD 364-378) was sealed by a mosaic in Southgate Street (Heighway and Garrod 1980: 84, n. 18). However, there was a general change in construction techniques, mirroring developments seen at other sites. Activity into the early fifth century is possible at 1 Westgate Street (within the forum), where masonry buildings were demolished c. AD
370 (Heighway and Garrod 1980: 78). A timber building (Building 2, a possible butcher’s shop) was constructed over the rubble (ibid.). After this building went out of use, the main street of the town was re-laid; metalling and building debris covered the stylobates of the Roman street, Building 2, and put the street drains out of use, although pits were soon dug into the road, with loam filling in the area of the buildings (ibid.). All of this activity might easily fall before c. AD 400, despite the radiocarbon dates from timbers from the building centring on AD 430 (ibid. 78, 85).

Similar signs of change are noted elsewhere in Gloucester. Buildings on the north side of the New Market Hall site were demolished by c. AD 370, and levelled with building rubble (Hassall and Rhodes 1974: 27). However, continued activity into the fifth century is evident on the south side of the street, where the floors of earlier buildings were cut by posts, and re-laid, with hearths were placed upon the pre-existing mortar floors (ibid. 27, 30; fig. 5.1). Burning was noted within some rooms during the early fifth century (ibid. 30; see Chapter 4). A British made ‘military’ buckle, and a triangular plate buckle (a type commonly found along the Imperial limes during the late fourth century – and therefore probably military issue) came from this site (ibid., fig. 26.35, 37; Laycock 2008: 125-28).

The relatively small amount of excavation in Cirencester has revealed a similar pattern of change during the later fourth and early fifth centuries. Again, the suburbs were contracting by the fourth century (Heighway 1987: 5). Industrial activity (particularly metalworking) is noted within the administrative and public sectors, such including the basilica and forum (Heighway 1984: 361, 362; Millett 1990: 143-4, 180). Furthermore, some public buildings had been demolished and levelled by the fourth century (Heighway 1984: 228; 1987: 5). The forum was kept clean to c. AD 430 (RCHME 1976: xxxvi), suggesting some degree of civic maintenance into the fifth century.

Some urban buildings in Britain have been interpreted as official residences (Salway 1981: 398), and the development of a number of wealthy houses at Cirencester during this time might be explained as belonging to the new administrative elite. A prestigious town house was constructed

---

164 Elements of earlier architectural masonry were occasionally re-used, such as the column base possibly used as a table at Westgate Street (Heighway and Garrod 1980: 78).
165 Coins from the site suggest that the building went out of use c. AD 390 (ibid. 78). Nevertheless, a building from this site was similar to a structure at Frocester (Heighway 1987: 5), perhaps suggesting a post-Roman date.
166 The excavators interpreted these various forms of floors as different phases of occupation, although the absence of stratigraphy may rather suggest continuity of use (Hallsall and Rhodes 1974: 30).
167 However, early fourth century developments within the forum, followed by a possible late fourth century extension to the basilica, may be related to the development of the city as a the provincial centre of Britannia Prima (Esmonde Cleary 1989: 47; Dr Peter Heather (Oxford), ‘Frontier provincials and the Roman state c.375-500: the testimony of the texts’, Late Antique Archaeological Conference, Oxford, March 2003). An inscription possibly dated to the fourth century upon the ‘Jupiter Column’ found within the town records ‘signum et erectum prisca religione renovat’, indicating that the column had been set up by the provincial governor (’prof’) Lucius Septimus (Henig 1984: 141; Esmonde Cleary 1989: 47).
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during the later Roman period at Beeches Road, just outside the eastern ramparts of the city (red arrow, figs. 5.2; and 5.3). This villa-type structure contained a hypocaust and late mosaics, one of which has been compared to early fifth century examples from Antioch, and Byzacena (Tunisia), with another mosaic post-dating this feature (McWhirr 1986). Another town house, within Insula VI.3, dates to the early fifth century, and was subsequently twice re-floored (ibid.). Other town houses (within Insula IV and XIV) post-date later fourth century coins; timber-framed and post-built buildings in Insula V and VI perhaps also date to the early fifth century (ibid.).

Notwithstanding these developments, an apparent contraction in the civic use of urban space is again accompanied by intramural agricultural production, which arguably indicates increasing urban autonomy in response to a heightened sense of insecurity, and may be indicative of the fragmentation of later Roman society (see Chapter 4). Farmhouses, barns, and possibly a smithy, were built upon unoccupied land within the walls of the city (Heighway 1987: 5). Dark earth has again been recognised across the city above later Roman levels, but this is difficult to date, owing to widespread post-Roman turbation. However, despite these changes, it seems that a distinctively
urban (and arguably, ‘Roman’) sense of place continued to remain significant into the fifth century. Activity at Cirencester may parallel the development of a small number of ‘urban villas’ noted in many towns during the fourth century, with the construction of prestigious town houses with gardens, and with sectors of towns perhaps functioning as estate centres (Faulkner 2000: 132).

Perhaps the most notable change witnessed during or after the later Roman period at Cirencester is the occupation of the amphitheatre - an arena seating 6000 located outside the Western city limits (McWhirr 1981: 32; Wacher 1964; see fig. 5.2, blue circle). Although the site has had only limited (less than 10%) excavation, later structures are probable – postholes (associated with late Roman pot and a scatter of late Roman coins) suggest the presence of timber-framed buildings, although
these features are ambiguous (RCHME 1976; Wacher 1964). The amphitheatre enclosure was repaired during the late fourth century, with the road resurfaced in the northeast area (; fig. 5.4), and the entrance in this area, which lay close to the Bath Gate of the city walls, possibly blocked to restrict or control access into and through the arena (Heighway 1984: 228; Wacher 1964). Amphitheatres were also transformed on the Continent (Liebeschuetz 2001: 30).

This change is significant. It amounts to the loss of a major mechanism for social control – the provision of entertainment for the urban population – and of a prime context through which Roman cultural values were transmitted. It was suggested above that the narrative of State control was changing to accommodate its role as protector against external threat. Use of this site as a refuge may therefore represent the replacement of one method of control by another, whilst yet evoking memories of civic patronage (due to the previous provision of entertainments provided at this site), and therefore encouraging continued support of ‘State’ leadership. Alternatively, such a change may demonstrate the adoption of local power by local leaders (possibly after the removal of State control during the early fifth century), who were less inclined to communicate cultural values that perpetuated imperial power at the expense of local autonomy. The form of this site perhaps paralleled that of nearby reoccupied hillforts, which were themselves being incorporated within new narratives (see below). Again, this sense of insecurity (whether or not justifiable) was potentially exploited so as to control the local population, and may have fostered a strong sense of community identity. However, the size of this site limits the numbers that the amphitheatre arena might have sheltered, and it is possible that it enclosed the settlement of a prominent individual and his kin and retinue.
The categorisation and inclusion of possible Belgic sites within this study has been difficult, due to the uncertainty of whether the Belgic civitas extended as far as Bath. However, Ptolemy’s claims have been accepted (see Chapter 3), and so the triangle between the Kennett, Fosse Way, and perhaps Avon or Thames representing the Northwest sector of the civitas are included in this survey. Salisbury Plain has provided a focus for this region (due to the common recognition of a probable different settlement pattern within this area), along with the area east of Bath. The distribution of pre-Roman coinage was seen in Chapter 2 to distinguish Northern and Southern Dobunnic territories, and this has informed this territorial delineation. In summary, archaeological evidence suggests the existence of a distinct cultural zone, particularly at the end of the period (see below). However, few towns within the region have detailed archaeological evidence from this date.

The initial development of Cunetio on an irregular grid system may suggest attempts to emulate Gallo-Mediterranean models, although this desire was perhaps short-lived or limited, considering the few signs of munificence noted during the Roman period (Corney 1997: 348). It was seen in Chapter 4 that the defences were strengthened during the fourth century, and that the blocking of gates may have limited access to the town. Mark Corney has suggested that these changes may be linked to development of the town as a regional administrative centre after the middle of the fourth century, perhaps with military support (Corney 2001: 18). Other later Roman developments, similar to those seen in other towns, are evident, such as the encroachment of buildings upon the road (ibid. 345; Griffiths 2001: 53).

The convergence of roads at Soriodunum (Old Sarum) suggests that this small town probably functioned as a local administration centre, although archaeological evidence is fragmentary (Corney 2001: 18-9). Continued activity into the fifth century in the area of the town is possibly indicated by the presence of several coins dating to AD 388-402 (James 2002: 16).

While the temple and baths at Bath has had some excavation under modern conditions (with a possible fifth century brooch from the spring suggesting late- or post-Roman activity in the town, Dark 2000: 111; fig.5.5), evidence from the surrounding town is limited. Periodic flooding of the River Avon, particularly during and after the fourth century, resulted in the deposition of mud within the precinct courtyard at Bath (raising the floor level) and the collapse of the drainage system (Cunliffe 2000: 143, 144). Attempts to counteract flooding can be seen in the raising of the floors of the baths so as to allow the hypocausts to function, although the fight against flooding ended at some point during the fifth century, when the Baths were closed (ibid. 208-09). Whether this was

168 Radiocarbon dates suggest that the temple was demolished during the later fifth century (Gerrard 2007: 158-59).
related to financial constraints, breakdown in civic control, or demise in custom due to changing cultural values is difficult to ascertain, due to inadequate excavation outside of the temple.

Figure 5.5 Late fourth – fifth century penannular brooch from Bath (Cunliffe 2000, pl. 12)

However, the rest of the town was seemingly unaffected. The floor of the precinct was consolidated by the deposition of urban refuse (and it was repaved using architectural and sculptural fragments) (ibid. 144, 146; see Chapter 6). Later Roman activity has been revealed in Abbeygate Street, with the collapse and possible levelling of houses in this area during the late fourth century, and new buildings constructed on a different alignment to the east perhaps occupied into the post-Roman period (ibid. 119; fig. 5.6).

Figure 5.6 Abbeygate Street: late Roman transformations (Cunliffe 2000, fig. 86)

---

169 Although the use of pagan sculpture has suggested Christian Saxon (i.e. seventh century) activity (Cunliffe 2000: 144), this not necessarily the case - a later Roman (or at least early fifth century) date is also feasible.
By the second century, the small town at Ilchester had adopted rectangular architecture and a street grid system, although timber buildings were not replaced by stone structures until the late second - early third century (Millett 1990: 63; Leach 1982: 4, 5, 8), demonstrating only a gradual adoption of Mediterranean style. There is some degree of stratigraphic continuity after c. AD 400, although it is uncertain for how long. Demolition and abandonment levels in the suburb at Kingshams compare with levels at other urban sites, such as Gloucester, that date to the first quarter of the fifth century (Leach 1984: 31). The ceramic and coin sequence suggests occupation in this area of the town into the fifth century, with (as noted elsewhere) indications of changes from purely domestic to industrial activity (ibid. 52). However, in other suburbs, such as Little Spittle and Townsend Close, many domestic buildings were dismantled, and their plots abandoned and subsequently used for burial by the end of the fourth century (Leach 1982, 1994; see Chapter 6).
The Roman town at Dorchester was also laid out upon a street grid system, suggesting a deliberate act of urban planning (see Woodward and Woodward 2004; fig. 5.7). However, a lack of enthusiasm for the adoption of new material culture is again suggested by late and limited adoption of Mediterranean style buildings and material culture (see Holbrook 2004: 130). For example, there is little evidence for such features as hypocausts (Brown 2008: 2) - although fine mosaics were constructed on the County Hospital site (near the centre of the town), and at Colliton Park (on the northern edge of the town), at least until the mid fourth century (Cosh 2008: 1-2).

Figure 5.8 Colliton Park County Hall Site (Corney and Cox 2007, figure 1, after RCHME). Buildings I and W247 circled (red and purple, respectively)

Modifications to Building I (a 15-room stone building constructed during the early fourth century) at Colliton Park (fig. 5.8, circled) continued during and after the later fourth century (phases 2 and 3) - amounting to ‘expansion and aggrandisement’ (Green 1996: 147, 119; Corney and Cox 2007: 2, 6-7, 33; see figs. 5.8-5.10). This suggests the growing prosperity of the owners (possibly accompanying socio-political advancement), and may indicate a sense of stability at this time, at least for some (or it might indicate an attempt to encourage this feeling in the surrounding population).

However, changes in the urban landscape are also evident in this area during the later Roman period, in the (re)alignment of several town houses within this complex upon the defences (rather than the street grid) (Corney and Cox 2007: 2, 4). As in other towns, there is evidence for metalworking and other forms of industrialisation, and agriculturalisation (in Buildings III and VII).
during this period (*ibid.* 12). Building VI incorporated an oven similar to an example at Poundbury (Green 1996: 144-5), and the upper storey of Room 15 in Building I (above a probable *triclinium*) was perhaps used as a granary (Corney and Cox 2007: 12). The final building phase (4) also saw the construction of crude hearths, and rough paved drystone surfaces in or above levels containing late BB1 and an early fifth century coin (Green 1996: 140). This phase overlay mosaic floors, which were also cut by stakeholes and pits (and possibly a well) (Corney and Cox 2007: 13; fig. 5.10).

Partial demolition (possibly involving the deliberate destruction of mosaics) and abandonment is also evident, and may date to the fifth century or later. The placement of architectural material within a well arguably represents a termination deposit (*ibid.* 12-14, 24). There is an unexpectedly high number of late coins, which suggests continued use of this site into the fifth century (*ibid.* 5). A timber post-built structure, located 50m to the SE of the town house and on the same alignment, is likely to date to the fifth century (Corney and Cox 2007: 13; W247, purple circle, fig. 5.8, above). Analysis of animal bones from the inter-mural Greyhound Yard and County Hospital sites (respectively in the central and at southwest areas of Dorchester) indicate a higher incidence of cattle bones during the later Roman period, demonstrating change from the LPRIA and early

170 A hearth associated with farrier’s tools and unfinished projectile heads were found within building VII (Green 1996: 142), one of the few buildings investigated (along with II and V) to be aligned upon the street (Corney and Cox 2007: 2). It is tempting to see this as an indication of local conflict. However, it should be remembered that hunting became a popular past time during the later Roman period, being used as an arena for status display and for the creation of patronage ties.

171 Building VI – most probably domestic - was laid out around a courtyard, with mosaic floors (*ibid.* 2). It was not aligned upon the street (*ibid.*).
Roman period (Grimm 2008: 12). The remains indicate the increasing significance of beef at the end of the Roman period – although pigs were also kept (ibid. 2). Considering the relationship between diet and identity, this change is significant (see Hawkes 2001, 2002), and indicates transformations to *habitus* that may be linked to structural changes, if found to correlate with other changing practices. In conjunction with transformations to dwelling, serving, cooking, and dining practices as evidenced by the other remains from this context, this modification to the diet may relate to shifting notions of cultural identity, possibly to the expression of ‘Roman-ness’ (see Chapter 3).

By contrast, the faunal remains from the (north-west) peripheral site at Colliton Park (County Hall Site) have more in common with pre-Roman assemblages. Predominantly sheep or goat bones were found, and with fewer pig, bird, and cattle bones than at urban sites (Grimm 2008: 2-3, 12-3). The ‘more rural character’ of the Colliton Park site has been used to account for these differences (ibid. 3). However, it has been seen that town houses in this area are ‘Roman’ in style, which may suggest a discrepancy between public persona and personal identity as defined by practice, i.e. that these building styles may signify status and possibly professional identities, rather than a sense of ‘being Roman’.

**D U M N O N I A**

Exeter (the only urban site within Dumnonia) had developed from a military base, although it differed to other *civitas* centres in retaining the military street pattern and defensive circuit, thus having more in common with development of the *colonia* at Gloucester (Bidwell 1980: 46). By the
third century (when the town was clearly prosperous, and densely occupied), Mediterranean influence is evident in building styles (see *ibid.* 67). In many respects, there are similar changes to those seen at other civitates within the Southwest during the later Roman period. Wealthy private town houses were constructed during the fourth century in Trickhay Street (Pearce 1978: 42), and a midden lying adjacent to one town house built after the mid fourth century contained a coin of Maximus (AD 387-88) (Snyder 1998: 152). However, decay, destruction, and demolition were a general feature of the later Roman period. For instance, shops on the northeast side of the basilica were demolished and replaced by a narrower range (Bidwell 1980: 79). The suburbs had contracted by the end of the century, and apparent inter-mural decline after the mid fourth century included the abandonment and levelling of many buildings, and the contraction of urban settlement to the central areas (enabling inter-mural agriculture) (Esmonde Cleary 1989: 153). An agricultural building has probably been identified in Trickhay Street (Todd 1981: 155), and land in the area of St Pancras church was used for grazing, with rough timber buildings constructed (Pearce 2004: 127). The accumulation of dark earth (including in the area of the forum) may also suggest the likelihood of agricultural activity within the town centre (*ibid.*). Although the baths continued in use until the late fourth century, grass and weeds rapidly grew in the baths’ palaestra (Snyder 1998: 152). The basilica and forum were partially rebuilt in the mid fourth century (Bidwell 1980: 67), although these modifications were of poor quality. The worn coin of Valens (AD 364-78) embedded within the re-laid northeast floor of the basilica (Snyder 1998: 128, 152) suggests that the area continued in use for some time. The south end next to the street was extended, the curia enlarged, and a tribunal or magistrate’s rostrum added (Todd 1981: 155). However, buildings were cleared after c. AD 370, with demolition of the south end of the basilica occurring during the early fifth century (*ibid.*).

Change of use is generally indicated, with pits dug in the basilica and forum. One clay quarry pit was subsequently cut into the curia floor, with evidence for bronze working in this area (*ibid.* 152).

Although the coin series at Exeter ends c. AD 420 (Todd 1981: 155), possible fifth century BBI sherds have been recognised (Gerrard 2004). Trade links with southern Dorset may also be seen in the presence of many shale items (Quinnell 2004: 145), and contact with the South Midlands is possibly indicated by Oxfordshire ware (dating to after AD 325). However, South Devon ware is also common (Pearce 2004: 68-9). Although it is argued that activity continued in the town in a very ‘un-Roman manner’ (*ibid.*), Exeter may be the only civitas centre within the Southwest at which a monastic centre or church developed (see below), and it therefore perhaps retained its symbolic focus for some time.

---

Urban change is noted across the Southwest, in common with changes witnessed across the Empire, demonstrating that this region was entrenched within the Imperial system. The apparent decline in activity suggests migration of the urban population into rural areas, which may relate to the changing significance of the city during the later Roman period. However, some continuation of urban occupation is evident in the occasional construction of wealthy town houses into the fifth century at several sites within the region, and may suggest that a small number of the elite attempted to perpetuate Roman *mores*.

Certain transformations may be related to economic changes, such as the development of 'garden cities', which arguably represent an intensification in agriculture in response to a need to expand production, or an attempt to achieve urban self-sufficiency to counter feelings of insecurity. Changes in building alignment, and in building materials, again reveal attempts to adjust to the socio-economic developments of the day. Private buildings developed, though in some cases encroached upon public space (as in Spain, for instance, Liebeschuetz 2001: 90). The physical transformation of space would have required major renegotiation of identities constructed within these contexts. Political reforms may also have effected urban transformations, particularly considering the changes seen to public buildings, including the contraction of administrative offices, and change in the function of public spaces (such as increased industrialisation). Whilst centralised power seemingly continued into the fifth century at Cirencester, this was now exercised only from small offices, with parts of the *basilica* appropriated for industry (Gardner 2007). Socio-political reforms perhaps altered the importance of towns for members of local aristocracies, who may have attempted to legitimise local power in other ways than urban munificence (see Chapter 4). Increased centralisation of political and financial control removed the opportunity or desire for urban conspicuous consumption (Evans 1990: 95; Millett 1990: 130; Ward-Perkins 1984: 4, 5, 10; Wickham 2001: 60; see Chapter 4). Whereas *civitas* centres had served as nodes in the administrative and economic chain, central provincial administration became pivotal in the reorganisation of the *diocese* of Britain during the fourth century (thus perhaps removing some of the power from local elites). Consequently, after the mid fourth century, elite families increasingly withdrew from municipal government. The possible presence of the military (whether regular army auxiliaries, or local militia) may have also affected the way people perceived and used urban sites. These changes are likely to have had a profound affect upon a range of identities – including those affiliated with the State and military, urban and hinterland communities, professional identities, status, and possibly gender, as the scope for the renegotiation of masculinity became increasingly transferred to the private sector.
However, after the removal of State control, it is possible that elites saw the *civitas* as a focal point in the development of city-based polities (see above; Chrysos 1997: 199), which might be related to the probable continued use of *fora* (as at Cirencester) after the breakdown of imperial rule. Cities no longer formed nuclei for imperial administration, although it has been argued that the *civitas* centres retained a focal role after the withdrawal of imperial political structure (Woolf 1999: 38), perhaps remaining significant in the construction of regional identities, for some time into the fifth century, after the removal of Roman control.

The possible appropriation of the *basilica* by the church at Exeter possibly maintained or encouraged the perpetuation of Roman symbolic domination (or even Roman identity for some), which increasingly incorporated Christian ideologies. This may have been one mechanism by which, for some time, the *civitas* centre retained symbolic, if not political, centrality, enhancing the possible development of *poleis*-based identity (see Woolf 1999). However, comparable evidence is rare within Southwest Britain. Most evidence for Christian belief within Western Britain comes from elite rural contexts. The relatively small number of Christians within the region are more likely to have practiced their religion at villa locations, perhaps even eschewing formal church structures in favour of Gnostic forms of worship, during the reign of Julian at least (Perring 2003: 121; see Chapter 6). It will be seen in the following chapter that Christian communities were concentrated within small enclaves in Southwest Britain at this time, and for many individuals, adherence to Christian practices may have been brief.

**RURAL SITES**

**DOBUNNIC CIVITAS**

Few non-villa rural sites have been excavated in the Dobunnic region, although aerial photography suggests the presence of many settlements (see Chapter 3). Without dateable finds or contexts, it is of course difficult to gauge the extent to which rural settlements continued into the fifth century. However, those sites for which we have detailed excavation records demonstrate interesting and promising results with regard to identity. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the continued construction of roundhouses into the fourth century is evident – a factor that is also increasingly witnessed in the areas of Southeast Wales that show extensive Classical influence (pers. comm. Andrew Seaman). This has implications when considering the prospect of cultural identity, although where an analysis of changing practices within roundhouses is possible, this demonstrates that the picture is not as straightforward as might be anticipated, for social practices more associated with

---

Mediterranean mores, than with local ‘Iron Age’ traditions, are adopted within some circular buildings (see Chapter 3).  

It was seen in Chapter 3 that the detailed publication of data from Birdlip, for example, allowed the tentative conclusion that changing practices in some roundhouses during the Roman period may parallel those seen within more obviously Classically styled buildings. It was proposed that practices within the roundhouses at Birdlip, which were in use until the mid fourth century, suggest the adoption of Roman values, demonstrating a complex admixture of Mediterranean and ‘native’ culture in the construction of local (or at least personal) identities, and may represent the permeation of Roman symbolic domination beyond the elite. This might be confirmed by the apparent replacement of circular structures at this site by at least one rectangular building after the middle of the century (Mudd 1999). This trajectory of change was arguably related to contact with sites at which Classical influence was more effusive, such as nearby Gloucester, considering the location of this site next to Ermine Street. A similar pattern of change is evident at other rural sites, for example at Barnsley Park. Although roundhouses probably continued in use on the site, these buildings apparently had come to adopt a subsidiary and primarily agricultural role by the late fourth century (fig. 5.11; see Smith 1985: 344-47; but see Webster and Smith 1985; see below, Villas).

174 However, the picture is unrepresentative, as few sites are published in sufficient detail to enable the analysis of practices.
Commercial archaeology during the past decade has increasingly revealed the construction of earthworks that may have redefined the boundaries of estates during and after the later fourth century in the Southwest (see below, Durotrigia). The enclosures at Short Wood, if indeed of Roman or post-Roman date (Clifford 1964; Darvill 1981; RCHME 1976: 34), for instance, might represent a tendency towards autonomy by delineating rural sites during the later Roman period (see Scull 1992: 15).

Changes to the production of ceramics, with increasing local and domestic manufacture replacing regional industries, may have led to greater self-sufficiency. This change may also have been a product of transformations to cooking, serving, or eating practices, effecting the expression of cultural and other identities. A decline or cessation in access to imported fine-ware is also likely to have affected such changes in practices, and thus the expression of identities. Considering the social conditions of food consumption, these various changes would have required the renegotiation of a wide range of social identities and relationships, including gender, status, kinship, probably community, and possibly local and regional, identities. Finds demonstrate changes. The grass-tempered ceramics found on some sites, such as Cleveland Farm, Ashton Keynes, and Crickley Hill, may belong to a later period. However, in these cases, metalwork suggesting fifth century activity is also found (Coe, Jenkins, and Richards 1991: 47; Jarrett 1999), perhaps after all suggesting an earlier date for the ware. Fragments of ‘antique’ vessels (or even complete pots) also occur, mainly within ritual contexts (see Chapter 6). Penannular brooches are sometimes found on rural sites, with some suggestions of on-site production (ibid.).

NORTHWEST SECTOR OF THE BELGIC CIVITAS

Some sites, such as Stockton Earthworks and Hanging Langford Camp, probable had continuous occupation from the LPRIA to the end of the Roman period (Corney and Payne 2006: 141) – and possibly beyond, but without further excavation, it is difficult to know how atypical this situation was for enclosed sites. It was seen in Chapter 3 that change and development are evident throughout the Roman period on rural sites. Although environmental analyses have suggested climatic decline during the later Roman period in some areas, with possible consequences for crop yield at this time (Jones 1996: 187, 198), agricultural activity intensified during the later Roman period on Salisbury Plain and the Marlborough Downs (Corney 2001: 18). However, although continuity into the post-Roman period is possible at some rural sites on or near the periphery of the area, such as Catsgore and Camerton, with building modifications dating to the late Roman period or after, activity at these sites evidently declined during the late fourth century (Leech 1980: 13; Wedlake 1958: 57, 67). In

175 Pers. comm. John Valentin, Director, AC Archaeology Devon.
other areas, where economic opportunities may have supported development, some sites, such as the settlement at Lansdown, near Bath (where pewter production is evident) demonstrate a late period of growth (Collingwood and Taylor 1931: 240-41).

**Durotrigian civitas**

Changes are evident within the rural areas of Durotrigia during and after the later fourth century, with settlement redistribution and the reduction or desertion of marginal land. In some cases, as in the Somerset Levels, this almost certainly relates to environmental changes. Extensive flooding continued to result in a number of sites being lost under alluvium during the fourth century (Jones 1996: 200). In the North Somerset Levels, drainage ditches and flood banks perhaps limited this problem from the later third century onwards, but sites were still seemingly abandoned before the end of the fourth century (Rippon 2000: 190-92, 194-95).

In other cases, changes in the economy may again have been responsible for transformations to the settlement pattern, with intensification, or at least continuation, of industrial activity into (and perhaps beyond) the fourth century at some sites. As may also have been the case for some sites on the western fringes of the Belgic civitas (see above), this was perhaps driven – at least in part - by a heightened demand for pewter (see Beagrie 1989: 175). The possible construction of a late Roman amphitheatre at Charterhouse-on-Mendip may represent continued State intervention in attempts to control the local population through symbolic domination (Ellis 1992: 24, 33).

Modifications to the road infrastructure will have again affected many sites in the region. For example, although the settlement near Woodyates (which lay close to Bokerley Dyke earthwork) was already in decline at the end of the Roman period (Rahtz 1961), the extension of Bokerley Dyke across the road (and dissection of the settlement) (as noted in Chapter 4) may have completed this process. Woodyates may have lain within a villa estate, which feasibly used the earthwork to define its bounds. As with other pronounced boundaries, the role of Bokerley Dyke may have changed over time, and an initially local function does not preclude a later appropriation as a boundary to define the larger (possible civitas) territory (see above). Sites and industries relied upon roads for their survival, with the presence of a nearby road system arguably encouraging and influencing the construction of particular identities. Although alternative routes linking rural sites and urban centres would no doubt have existed, changes to the road system may

---

176 The presence of settlements may often only be inferred by the discovery of occasional Romano-British finds. Later sites include Chilton Polden, where vast quantities of coarse ware and briquetage imply salt production and fourth century occupation, with third - fourth century pottery being found under the alluvium at Witchley Bridge and Puriton Drove (Cunliffe 1966: 68-70, 71). The location of sites on the alluvium during the fourth century suggests reoccupation of some areas (ibid. 70).

177 This feature is alternatively a prehistoric henge: Somerset HER 23025.

178 That Bokerley Dyke today forms the county boundary between Dorset and Hampshire is perhaps relevant.
have gone some way to enhancing divisions between urban and rural social groups, and perhaps to transforming the expression of ‘Roman’ identity within rural areas.

Figure 5.12 Possible late Roman estate boundary, Cranborne Chase (Map: author)

Aside from the capacity of larger boundaries to transform local identities, smaller earthwork boundaries may have been used in similar ways during or after the later fourth century. Later Roman pottery dates several earthworks in the Durotrigian region to this period (fig. 5.12), their size perhaps indicating their role in delineating estates, rather than larger, political, territories. This may indicate moves towards the autonomy of estates.

It was noted in Chapter 3 that at some sites, such as Bradley Hill, the use of domestic space was little changed for some time, not withstanding the ‘rectangularisation’ of buildings. However, as in other areas, later Roman changes are evident. Building 1, belonging to the second late Roman phase at Bradley Hill (see Leech 1981), and probably dating to after the middle of the fourth, and into the fifth, century (see Chapter 3), demonstrated distinct change (ibid.; see fig. 3.22). This building was subdivided and extended in the later Roman period (fig. 5.13), and peripheral hearths were constructed, which may have required the renegotiation of social relationships and identities (particularly in regard to gender) (see Hendon 1996).179

However, some locales (primarily within the Northeast sector of the civitas) already demonstrated signs of Classical influence during the LPRIA (see Chapter 2). For example, a high status rural settlement was located at Myncen Farm (Sixpenny Handley), near Gussage (Dorset), associated with an enclosure of probable early Roman date (Green 2000: 2). However, in other areas (primarily in the South of the region), a ‘traditional’ discourse seemingly framed elite power. For instance, as was seen in Chapter 3, a small settlement developed in association with the potentially ritual site at Portesham, with the construction of a square or rectangular post-pad structure, as well as many pits

179 However, the additional rooms could only be accessed from outside the building (Leach 1981: 183).
and postholes. Development of this site in the later Roman period is recognised from the evidence of ceramics (Valentin n.d. 23-30) - meanwhile the timber circular ('shrine') building established during the Conquest period continued in use (ibid. 24; see Chapters 2, 3, and 6).

Ceramics suggest continuity of both local and regional industries within Durotrigia into the fifth century. A cluster of Type 18 BB1 (thought to continue into the fifth century) is concentrated in the South coast region of the Durotrigian civitas (Gerrard 2004, fig. 8.4). It was argued in Chapter 3 that these ceramics (which were manufactured within what has traditionally been seen as the core of the ‘Durotrigian’ region) are unlikely to have held any significance in the construction of regional identities during much of the Roman period. However, their development during and after the later Roman period may suggest their significance in the renegotiation of social networks during political deconstruction at the end of the Roman period.

Ceramics recovered from several sites in Chew Valley (Somerset) – for example from Butcombe and Star Villa - demonstrate changes in pottery form and fabric during the late Roman period, with the possible continuity of some fabrics into the fifth century, when the production of coarser, thicker walled wares became more common (Rahtz 1974: 97). This may indicate transformations to cooking, dining, and serving practices, requiring the renegotiation of identities. Few sites have detailed reports on animal remains, although that for Bradley Hill demonstrates that in general, mutton predominated over beef and pork, although beef may have been more important during the later phase (Everton 1981). But in general, there was no dramatic change from the diet of the pre-Roman period (see Chapter 3).

180 It is acknowledged that these ceramics do not necessarily date to after c. AD 400. They may date to after the mid fourth century, or earlier (Rahtz 1974: 97).
Although few late Roman farmsteads within the region have been located and fully excavated, it is evident that some settlements spanned the end of Roman rule, with little sign of change. The settlement at Hayes Farm (Clyst Honiton, Devon) continued into the fifth century (see Dark 2000: 168). At Beacon Hill (Lundy), stone walled huts were associated with third and fourth century ceramics and a fragment of an unidentified early post-Roman red wheel-made slipware bowl (Snyder 1998: 204; fig. 5.14; see Chapter 6, fig. 6.54). Unlike the buildings of Cornwall, these buildings were round, rather than oval.

Finds from the settlement at Stoke Gabriel, near Totnes, including coins and local wheel-made coarse wares in late Romano-British forms, as well as Oxfordshire ware and BBI, also demonstrate occupation to the later fourth century at least (Pearce 2004: 68-9; Todd 1981: 165). The range of material culture is similar to that from other rural sites across the Southwest, consisting predominantly of local wares, some ceramics imported from other regions (mainly BBI and Oxfordshire ware), and occasional sherds from outside Britain. Typical South Devon ware forms (probably made in the Dart Valley) include hand-thrown rimmed dishes, bowls, cooking pots, storage jars, bowls, double-strap-handled beakers, and plates (Pearce 2004: 68-70). The latter two categories may indicate the adoption of ‘Roman’ style dining practices, although of course the extent to which non-elites imitated, or were even aware of, accompanying rituals and their social significance is unknown. There is currently insufficient evidence to determine associated diets.

---

181 BBI was found at Hayes Farm, Otterton Point, Seaton, Woodbury, Holcombe, and Membury (Pearce 2004: 68-9).
182 Imitation BBI was also made in the Brue Valley (ibid. 68-9).
The frequent abandonment, adaptation, or contraction, of sites at the end of the fourth century, in common with other regions, indicates that, however culturally distinct and geographically isolated, the ‘Cornovian’ region was to some degree politically, economically, and socially integrated within the Roman world (Arnold 1984: 33; Pearce 1978: 61; Woolf 2003: 362).

Nevertheless, several settlements on the Lizard continued into the post-Roman period. Few courtyard settlements survive, although Chysauster (west of Hayle) and Porthmeor were occupied into the fifth century (Pearce 2004: 33-5; Todd 1987: 225-6). Some enclosed sites, such as the square enclosure at Grambla (fig. 5.15) have evidence for occupation in the fifth century or later (Quinnell 1986: 122), but this represents reoccupation, rather than continued occupation through the Roman period (Todd 1987: 224; 226). The square enclosure at Goldherring (which was possibly defended by a strong wall), was also occupied into the fifth century (Guthrie 1967). The presence of storage facilities (such as granaries) on some sites arguably represents a centralising system. Few sites have undergone sufficient investigation to detect such features, but extensive excavation at Trethurgy has revealed a probable granary (Quinnell 1986: 117; Todd 1987: 225).
There are some signs in the settlement pattern of the continued development of a stratified social system, with certain sites having a wider range of material culture, obtained from wider sources, as at Trethurgy (located near the south Cornish coast). Several later Roman phases of activity are indicated at this site. During ‘Stage 5’ (dating to c. AD 325-375), structures were rebuilt, the rampart and entrance were remodelled, and an oval byre was constructed, implying the presence of cattle (Quinnell 2004: 227). This development may be related to changes in climate, or in dietary practices (paralleling the possible adoption of a more ‘Mediterranean’ diet seen within urban contexts), and perhaps represents a transformation to the ‘image’ of the site presented to visitors. During Stage 6 (AD 375-400), existing oval houses continued in use - five houses were now occupied - and another house was built; the byre went out use; and a midden built up within the building (perhaps confirming that the construction of this building was due to short-lived changes in practice, rather than climate change). Stage 7, dating to c. AD 400-450, saw occupation reduced to three houses, although a new house was constructed (which continued in use for several generations), and another structure was built over the midden (ibid. 9).

A tin ingot came from the base of the midden, although (as with some of the other finds from this context) this find may have been inserted into the deposit at a later date (possibly for security), and perhaps suggests on-site tin working during the late fourth century (Pearce 2004: 66; Quinnell 2004: 74). This may demonstrate the control or distribution of mineral resources (indicating the accumulation or redistribution of wealth in mineral form). The midden also contained late Roman BBI, Oxfordshire ware, and Samian sherds (Quinnell 2004: 98-9, 176) - typical finds for late- or post-Roman sites across the Southwest. Other late Roman finds from the site include a finger ring and four beads, a possible late Roman to early post-Roman unguent bottle, and nine fragments of shale bracelets (generally uncommon finds for Cornwall) (ibid. 85, 144), possibly suggesting the adoption of ‘Roman’ dress and toilet practices. As expected, the majority of ceramics from the site were local gabbroic wares (although numerous vessels from adjacent regions were found, as well as a number of Continental and Mediterranean imports) (ibid. 96). Many of the local wares (probably made in the St Keverne area of the Lizard peninsula, Pearce 2004: 70) were in Romano-British forms. This may suggest the adoption of ‘Mediterranean’ dining and cooking practices. This

183 Samian from the midden included an abraded sherd from a Dragendorff (DR) 37 bowl, and a Dr 45 mortarium sherd, both Gaulish, and of Antonine period (AD 140-200) (Quinnell 2004: 98).
184 The presence of a post-Roman amphora sherd has been assumed to be intrusive, considering the radiocarbon date from the base of the midden as cal AD 250-440 (with 95% confidence), or cal AD 340-420 (with 68% confidence) (Quinnell 2004: 177).
185 Similar finds occur at Carvossa, Grambla, Chysauster, Tregilders, and Penhale Round (ibid. 85, 144).
186 The MNV of Continental and Mediterranean imports is 31 (including post-Roman wares); 9 Oxford Colour-coated wares; 60 Romano-British vessels (including 23 SEDBBI; 1 SWDORBBI; 1 BBI copy; 1 Exeter flagon; 1 Exeter gritty greyware; Exeter mica greyware; 1 Southwest greyware storage jar; 30 South Devon ware); 450 Gabbroic 9 (ibid. 96).
is perhaps confirmed by the presence of rotary querns (mostly of Roman types), commonly made of local elvan stone, and by several locally made - probably on-site - elvan mortaria (Quinnell 2004: 130, 146-50). Other sites in the region, such as Porth Godrevy and Gwithian, have a similar range of local wheel-made coarse ware in late Romano-British forms (Todd 1981: 165). Stone bowls replicate the form of the tin bowl found at Treloy, St Columb Minor, associated with a third – fourth century fibula (Quinnell 2004: 138; Pearce 2004: 72), which appears to be a crude form of a fourth century pewter or silver vessel (Quinnell 2004: 138). Manufacture of these vessels may parallel developments witnessed across much of the Southwest, where pewter vessels may have been used in lieu of silverware.

It appears that a number of ‘Roman’ practices were adopted, although the continued central location of hearth pits may suggest continuation of established domestic social structures – perhaps involved in the negotiation of gender relationships - in the organisation of architectural space and domestic labour (Hendon 1996). It might be argued that this contrast with other regions in the Southwest was due to minimal social interaction within the domestic contexts of those asserting ‘Roman’ identity, providing limited opportunity for emulation (particularly with regard to constructing gender relationships) – as might be expected in a probable military zone. However, it might be also argued that this difference relates to the deliberate maintenance of ‘traditional’ mores within a new cultural framework, in the construction of a regional identity (which was itself involved in the creation of social hierarchies).

The development of wealthy sites within the region may to some extent relate to control of mineral resources. Gwithian, located on a sand spit projecting into a tidal creek, has late fourth and early fifth century (and later) activity; pottery forms again derive from late Roman types (Todd 1987: 265), including jars and platters (Preston-Jones and Rose 1986: 175). The latter perhaps suggests the adoption of new dining practices. This is highlighted by the presence of possible mid-fifth century amphorae in the area (ibid. 175; however, see Campbell 2007: 19). That several hoards have been found in association with the tin mines of western Cornwall (Isaac 1976: 62) perhaps points to one role for tin as exchange for coinage in order to pay tax, though it may also show engagement of the elite of tin mining communities with the Roman world. Type G brooches occur in proximity to possible trading sites (see Dickinson 1982): at Padstow, on the North coast, a natural harbour possibly corresponding to portus alaunae, and nearby at St Enodoc. Late- or post-Roman amphorae sherds were found at both sites (Dark 2000: 167, White

187 An unfinished example was found (ibid. 135, fig. 64). The wear and finish on these ‘Trethurgy bowls’, and on the smaller elvan ‘Cornish mortars’ also found on the site, indicates regular grinding from the preparation of food (ibid. 139). 188 Pewter production within the region is also indicated by the presence of a Greissen dish mould in the St Just area (Todd 1987: 231), possibly using local mineral resources, although alternatively indicating that exchange with Durotrigia was two-way.
2007: 146). This distribution correlates with the distribution of ingots, and concentrations of inscribed stones (see Appendix, Tables 15 and 18; see above, figs. 4.21, 4.23).

**RURAL SETTLEMENT: DISCUSSION**

Across the Southwest, comparable trajectories of change are evident during and after the mid fourth century within rural landscapes. Some sites (particularly within the Northwest Belgic territory) had continuous occupation from the pre- to post-Roman period, whereas in other areas (particularly ‘Cornovia’), occupation was continuous from the early Roman period, or else sites abandoned earlier in the Roman period were reoccupied at the end of the period. However, site abandonment in the late Roman period was common across the Southwest, suggesting their previous socio-economic dependency upon the State system. The development of individual sites depended upon whether they might take advantage of, or fall victim to, changing local conditions – including, for instance, climate change, severance of the road system, or access (or control of) valuable resources (such as tin within Dumnonia).

Local responses to political transformations can be seen the landscape of Southwest Britain. The construction of small earthworks (see fig. 5.12) may indicate attempts at territorial definition and physical exclusion. Whilst it is acknowledged that territorial boundaries are often in flux (Hodder 1978: 231, 254), permanent boundaries might also be actively used to reinforce or create ethnic, regional, or community identities. They may have functioned to place local communities within particular landscapes, creating or reifying the bond between landowners and tenants, highlighting the responsibilities derived from these relationships. Chapter 4 discussed the possibility of private armies and tied tenancies; it is perhaps with these in mind that such earthworks should be interpreted. The provision of these earthwork boundaries may have reified the incorporation of some non-villa settlements (that might reasonably be considered to represent the homes of tenant farmers) within estates at the end of the Roman period. This was arguably a statement of ownership, in relation to political reforms during this time that defined the fiscal responsibilities of landowners, and which limited social mobility. This behaviour may reflect a general need to assert local social attachments, and ties to the land, in response to socio-economic change, as communities themselves tended towards fragmentation within this state of instability (Wiessner 1983: 259).

This type of control might also be seen in the abandonment of sites that may have been on the fringes of villa estates, and in a possible corresponding increase in the occupation of villa complexes, as tenants were perhaps brought under closer control by local elites. At a number of
sites, the enclosure of buildings perhaps also suggests the need to differentiate kinship groups (or even smaller family units) within wider communities (Mudd 1999: 259-60; Smith 1985: 342).

For many, established rural building practices continued as they had since the pre-Roman period, and a variety of local styles and construction methods can be seen in use. However, at some sites, changes to architectural style are noted after the mid fourth century. These changes not only reflect the restructuring of later Roman society in relation to wider changes, but may also have played an active role in transforming local social identities. Across much of the region, the construction of roundhouses into the fourth century is noted, although in some cases, such as Birdlip, this building form seemingly gave way to rectangular buildings in the late fourth century; in other cases, roundhouses may have become peripheralised and defined as inferior through their deliberate juxtaposition with rectangular buildings (as at Bamsley Park). The location of Birdlip on the road system, and its possible function as a staging post (see Mudd 1999), would have brought its occupants into regular contact with travellers between Cirencester and Gloucester. This factor possibly influenced the transformation of practices from those seen within the area during the pre-Roman period at an early date, and this arguably led to the reconstruction of social structures and identities at this site (see Chapter 3). The increased appropriation of Mediterranean styles by some non-elites, in demonstrating the permeation of ‘official’ architectural idioms, may also represent attempts by rural populations to appropriate enduring symbols of stability and power to provide a degree of ontological security (see Freeman 2001). Changes in local elite architecture (see below) may have further transformed the landscape, so as to influence both public and private expressions of identity.

It is often difficult to determine the status of sites within the Peninsula, as there is commonly a similar range of material culture found at all categories of site, and enclosed sites across the region (and further east in Dumnonia) are frequent similar in size. However, the presence of such features as storage facilities (as at Trethurgy, for example) may indicate social hierarchy. Some sites (including Trethurgy) had an unusually wide range of ‘exotic’ goods, that included objects (such as brooches or shale bracelets) rarely found on other sites.

In general, LPRIA practices continued throughout the Roman period, but finds such as those from Trethurgy may represent the adoption of different practices of dressing, or dining, and thus the possible expression of alternative identities, or the renegotiation of existing identities. This may suggest the increasing adoption of a ‘Roman’ cultural framework (appropriating notions such as ‘civilised’ behaviour) by some local elites in the creation of social hierarchies.
The control of valuable resources, enabled through the franchise of tin mines after their release from direct military control, is likely to have influenced the development of social hierarchies within the region (see Edmondson 1989: 97-8). The decline of and limited access to the Iberian tin industry after the third century may have encouraged greater exploitation of the Peninsula ores, particularly during the fourth century to support demands from the developing pewter industry in southern Britain (Quinnell 1986: 129, 130; Todd 1987: 231; but see Edmondson 1989: 91, and Taylor 1982). The presence of tin ingots at many sites (and their location close to mineral veins) may indicate that control over mineral resources was one mechanism by which power was achieved and maintained. The occupation of enclosures that often resembled Roman military sites perhaps suggests that the military that provided a model for elite power and prestige, rather than the less accessible ‘civic’ elites. (However, other resources were also probably significant (see Fulford 1978), and mono-causal developments are unlikely.)

A discrete assemblage developed across much of Britain, including the Southwest, during the later Roman period (ensuring the continued significance of certain Romano-British artefacts into the fifth century). Ceramics associated with ‘civilised’ activities remained culturally symbolic. Penannular brooches, symbolising status, authority, and stability through links with the past (as well as, perhaps, in some cases ‘belonging’ to military communities), were resurgent, acting as alternatives to symbols of power. In particular, type G penannular brooches appear in concentrated distributions across the region (particularly in Avon and to a lesser extent in Cornwall) - perhaps as insignia within a discourse of elite military authority. Hand-made pottery used traditional methods of manufacture, which continued throughout the Roman period in rural areas (see Chapter 3). It is possible that local, domestically produced ceramics (which incorporated culturally specific materials) were used to reinforce local networks through exchange, and contributed to the construction of community identities.

Villas

Dobunnic civitas

Investigation of the changing settlement pattern of Southwest Britain demonstrates an upsurge in villa building during this time, and by the fourth century, around one thousand villas were concentrated along the Jurassic Ridge, from Cirencester to Bath and south to Ilchester (Esmonde Cleary 1989: 108). Examination of villa style during and after the mid fourth century suggests that a number of buildings across the Southwest were inspired by Mediterranean and North African models (Laing 1997: 99), paralleling changes on the Continent (see Chavarría 2005: 551; Chavarría and Lewit 2004: 26-8). Nevertheless, some pre-Roman practices, such as building alignment
ranging from southeast to east, often continued, as at Great Witcombe (Leach 1998; see above, fig. 3.34), and phases of overt Classical influence were often short lived. Although nineteenth century excavations destroyed much evidence, some evidence for the final phase of occupation (Period 4) at Great Witcombe survives (particularly from the SE range of the East Wing). Activity after c. AD 380 (see Chapter 4) is marked by the filling of hypocausts and the reuse of stone (including quern and millstones) for paving and for building corn driers and new ovens, and by the presence of postholes (Leach 1998: 33-34, 129; fig. 5.16). Coins associated with this activity go up to AD 388-92 (ibid. 34). It is perhaps significant that this area represented a Period 3 extension (in which several central hearths were found), suggested as being built for and occupied by estate workers (see Chapter 3) - and that here is evidence of continuity. However, although the rectangular sandstone hearth was covered by rough flooring, later hearths are in peripheral, rather than central, positions, suggesting the influence of ‘Mediterranean’ spatial organisation.
The changes at Barnsley Park, for example (see above), are very similar. During phase 4 (AD 340-60), the timber-framed building (fig. 5.17.1) was accompanied by a stone structure and bathhouse (Webster 1981: 27). This building is replaced by a winged corridor villa, with a veranda c. AD 360 (phase 5, with alterations and enlargements 6-7; fig. 5.17.2), but by AD 380 (phase 8), was turned over to agricultural use, and the colonnaded façade removed (Webster and Smith 1982: 68, 69, 73, 80; fig. 5.17.3). After the end of the fourth century, the site was slowly demolished, though the presence of grass-tempered pottery in nearby fields indicates continuity of agricultural activity (ibid. 97-103).

Parallel changes are witnessed in both urban and rural contexts (as would perhaps be expected, given the close economic inter-relationship between sites), supporting a picture of widespread systemic change. As in towns, industrialisation is increasingly noticeable within villa complexes during the later fourth century across the Western Empire (Arce 1997: 27), with the domestic element of some sites becoming significantly reduced. Industrialisation is characterised by debris, and the probable lead or pewter moulds, at Great Witcombe (Beagrie 1989: 186; Leach 1998); and at Chedworth by 67lb of melted lead (RCHME 1976: 27), which may represent an attempt to be more self-sufficient in drastically changing political and economic circumstances. Ceramics at both sites suggest continuity into the fifth century.

Suggestions that, as the market-based economic system declined during the final quarter of the fourth century, rural production also declined (Faulkner 2000: 112, 113), are perhaps too generalised. Palaeobotany indicates, on the contrary, increased agricultural activity in the lowland areas of the South (Dark 1996: 32, 34). This may, for instance, explain the changes seen during phase 8 at Barnsley Park villa, where part of the villa was converted into a barn and the threshold subsequently raised to facilitate direct access for a cart (Webster and Smith 1982). By the end of the century, all buildings were put to industrial or agricultural use (ibid.). Agricultural activity is also indicated archaeologically by the presence of grain-driers, which are relatively common features at later Roman villas in Southern Britain. For instance, a grain-drier was perhaps constructed during the early fifth century (radiocarbon dated to ad 420 + / - 60) at Frocester (RCHME 1976: xl, 57). Corn-driers were also recognised at Barnsley Park (Webster and Smith 1992: 95), and Great Witcombe, for example, in the latter case dated to after AD 375 (in-filling of the hypocaust is of the same date) (Clifford 1954: 9, 19; Leach 1998).
Figure 5.17 Barnsley Park: 1. c. AD 350 (top), 2. AD 360-70 (centre), and 3. AD 380-400 (bottom) (after Webster and Smith 1982 figs. 11 and 12)
There are various explanations for this evidence. Such features perhaps represent a response to a decline in climatic conditions AD 350 – 450, with a rise in rainfall necessitating the drying of harvested wet crops prior to storage (Jones 1996: 187, 198). However, ‘corn-driers’ may have instead been used for malting, to enable the production of ale throughout the year (Millett 1990: 205). These features may therefore possibly represent the increased ‘self-sufficiency’ of villas (Salway 1981: 454). However, it is likely that these sites had multiple functions. Administrative roles might be indicated by the discovery of, for instance, a money chest within a floor at Frocester Court, and a stylus at Chedworth (RCHME 1976: 27). In some areas (particularly when urban sites were less easily accessible), it is possible that villas acted as tax collection points, and perhaps even adopted a market role. Large quantities of ceramics suggest the continuity of Frocester (perhaps into the sixth century), possibly with a role as a centre for exchange (Gracie and Price 1979: 9-64; Heighway 1984: 227; Heighway 1987: 4, 12). The numerous ‘military’ or civic administrative insignia in the form of buckles from the later Roman levels of many villa sites might also suggest an increasingly administrative role for villas (perhaps after the removal of Roman power and troops, supported by local or private armies, see Chapter 4). An attempt to assert increased power over tenant farmers associated with the estate at Great Witcombe might be suggested by the provision of a simple building (but with painted plaster walls) close to the villa (Clifford 1958: 14; Leach 1998: 132-33; fig. 5.18).

The moment when villas ceased to be central to elite control during the fifth century is difficult to determine. Coinage often suggests the abandonment of villas during the late fourth century, with most coin series ending c. AD 420 (Salway 1981: 425). This pattern is evident at Barnsley Park, for example, where the changes suggest possible continuity of the estate into the fifth century, but not elite occupation of the villa itself (Esmonde Cleary 1989: 134). It has been suggested that Barnsley Park was perhaps assimilated with the villa at Bibury during the late fourth century (Webster and Smith 1982: 68). However, activity at other villas suggests continued occupational use (if not continuity as such).

189 Although experiments have suggested that ‘corn-driers’ were not necessarily suited to the task of drying barley, it is noted that oats require parching; un-sprouted barley also implies drying, rather than malting (Green 1996: 138).
190 However, this as easily represents the accumulation of private wealth, and development of private literacy.
191 Within the region, ‘military’ buckles have been found at Barnsley, Great Witcombe (fig. 4.22.1), Chedworth, Wortley, Sudely, Whittington (Gloucestershire), Monkton Deverill, Rushall Down (Wilt.), for example (RCHME 1976: xxxvii, 71, 60, 112, 125, 132, 134; Salway 1981: 448; Mawer 1995: 60, 64). Locally made examples have been found at Spoonley (fig. 4.22.2), Kingscote and possibly Woodchester (Hawkes 1961: 6; RCHME 1976: 70, 72).
Northwest sector of the Belgic civitas

Although there has been comparatively less modern investigation of the Northwest Belgic territory than of the Dobunnic civitas, there are possible differences between the changes within these two regions. Similarities occur along the border with the Dobunnic territory, suggesting that cultural traditions transcended political boundaries (although it is of course possible that both areas lay within the Dobunnic civitas). Late Roman villas cluster around towns, such as Bath and Cunetio, for instance (Corney 1997: 349), as elsewhere, indicating a similar pattern of rural retreat for urban elites.

Again, as in other regions, developments include the predominantly agricultural (rather than residential) function of some villas during the fourth century, as at Truckle Hill (see Chapter 4, Auxiliaries and Foederati). However, regional variation is noted, with possible conversion of primarily agricultural sites to ritual centres (see also Chapter 6). Agricultural activity ended at Littlecote villa after AD 360 (Walters 2001: 136-37, 142), after which, perhaps at the end of the fourth century, the barn received an Apollo mosaic with ‘Orphic traits’ (Toynbee 1981: 2-3; figs. 5.19-5.20). 192

Such imagery, as also seen at Woodchester, alludes to Roman or Trojan origin mythology (see Simpson 2001: 359-60), and may therefore have had particular significance in the construction of identities within this locale. The mosaic may also indicate the special nature of this place (perhaps pointing towards a cultic function, see Chapter 6). Although the villa buildings were demolished and decayed during the early fifth century, two timber buildings were built on the site during the post-Roman period.

Similar ‘post-villa’ occupation to that seen elsewhere is recognised at Castle Copse (phase 4), in the form of a structure (or two lean-to buildings) on a different alignment to earlier buildings (fig. 5.21, circled), built of cob walls upon stone footings (Howe 1997: 126, 141). As elsewhere, this later phase included industrial activities within previous areas of occupation, although ‘crude patching of mosaics and wall paintings’ may indicate attempts to perpetuate Classical style (ibid. 142). The continuity of this particular villa site is perhaps unsurprising, considering its palatial dimensions, and its dominant location - overlooking the River Churn (see Chapter 3), and linked to Chisbury Castle hillfort via Bedwyn Dyke (Walters 2001: 143; see Chapter 4). This location may be compared to that of the similarly palatial villa at Woodchester (see Chapter 3), which in common with Castle Copse, did not develop from a pre-Roman site, but was established in the early Roman period (ibid. 126). Moreover, association between Castle Copse villa and the eastern end of Bedwyn Dyke perhaps parallels the incorporation of Maes Knoll hillfort within the western terminal of West Wansdyke (see Chapter 4). This may demonstrate both the continued importance of the villa in the post-Roman period, and the association of such sites with hillforts, and may suggest that the construction of defensive earthworks was for a common purpose.

Figure 5.20 Littlecote villa: third (above, with villa on the far left, and barn and corn-drier at top) to fourth (below) century changes (Walters 2001, figs. 7.12 and 7.13)
Durotrigian civitas

Durotrigian villas demonstrate similar changes to those seen in the Dobunnic region. Continuity into the fifth century is occasionally confirmed, as at the twenty-four room villa at Dewlish, where Honorian coins were associated with hearths placed on tessellated floors (Dark 2000: 115). At Dinnington (Somerset), close to the Fosse Way, a unique representation of Greek mythology (Daphne and Apollo, from Ovid's Metamorphoses) occurs in a mosaic of the late Roman villa.194

The Classical Virgilian Aeneid myth is unusually portrayed as a narrative, as in a mosaic located in the frigidarium at the fourth century villa at Low Ham (Somerset) (Barrett 1978: 308-09; fig. 5.21).195 It has been suggested that a mosaic at Frampton villa also portrays a scene from the Aeneid, and that the mosaic at Keynsham (Somerset, on the possible Durotrigian-Dobunnic border), in depicting the story of Europa, likewise alludes to the Aeneid (ibid. 309, 310-11; Perring 2003).196

194http://www.sal.org.uk/salon/index_html?id=453#section17
195 http://www.somerset.gov.uk/somerset/culturecommunity/museums/explore/lowhamromanmosaic/
196 Current Archaeology 206; British Archaeology 2002 'News'
The context of these mosaics is important with regard to their social significance. Location of the Low Ham mosaic within baths suggests the socio-political role of this imagery – in this case, the context is one in which the exclusive construction or maintenance of elite (masculine) relationships (probably primarily situated within the Imperial framework) is perhaps more likely, than when such floors occur in dining rooms - potentially signalling a slightly more socially inclusive environment. However, it has been suggested that this mosaic was not intended for the location in which it was found, nor was it the original mosaic commissioned by the villa owners. It may therefore have been chosen more for its ‘visual impact’, than its literary content (Barrett 1978: 309; although see Perring 2003, especially page 103).

As in the Northwest Belgic territory, late Roman villa occupation is noted within a hillfort in the region. A nineteen-room corridor villa was discovered within the Southeast corner of Ham Hill (in the ‘Warren’ field), where ramparts had been levelled to form a terrace (Beattie and Phythian-Adams 1913).\textsuperscript{197} Sadly, excavations were limited, and did not employ modern techniques, and so the evidence does not enable detailed comparisons with the villa at Great Bedwyn. However, there are no indications of integration of this hillfort within earthwork fortifications (as at Castle Copse).

\textsuperscript{197} Somerset HER 55112, 56912.
Nevertheless, the Fosse Way runs along the bottom of the hill, and it has been noted above that Roman roads were often incorporated within defensive systems. It is nonetheless apparent that, perhaps as at Chisbury Camp (see Robinson 1997: 30), this site was appropriated during the early Roman period by the military (Roman armour and weaponry have been found on the site), knowledge of which was feasibly retained within social memory and oral tradition. Its function as an important locale for the assertion of Roman power, combined with its possible long-standing recognition of the site as a significant regional locale (as well as its strategic position within the landscape), may explain this late Roman use, in the recreation of local identities and possible renegotiation of Roman cultural identities. The developments of features such as the substantial bathhouse at Lufton (Somerset) demonstrate the adoption of Mediterranean style at a late date (Todd 2005; fig. 5.23).

**Dumnonian civitas**

Although villas east of Exeter demonstrate the same trajectory of development as elsewhere during the late fourth century (Dark 2000: 152), few are recognised beyond the Exeter hinterland. Modifications to the villa at Holcombe during or after the mid fourth century, including the addition of a substantial bathhouse (Todd 1987: 220; fig. 5.24), similar to an example at Lufton (Todd 2005; see fig. 5.23), suggest its occupants' late adoption of 'Roman' practices.

This was arguably part of the process of extending social links within the locality, in order to enhance social status. However, it has been suggested that this feature, as at Lufton, may instead represent a baptistery (ibid.). Other villas, such as Seaton, were abandoned before the end of the century (Todd 1987: 221), with Magor out of use before c. AD 350 (Dark 2000: 152).

---

198 Somerset HER 27292.
Villas: discussion

Parallel developments are seen during the later Roman period within both the urban and rural landscapes. Many scholars have recently argued that, during the later Roman period, Romanitas was transferred from the cities into the countryside, and channelled into villa construction as elites increasingly transferred their homes to rural locations (Evans 1990: 95). The construction of some new villas, adopting Mediterranean architectural style, may feasibly be linked to an influx of administrative elites from outside the region (e.g. Branigan 1977).

However, the apparent late phase of enthusiasm for Mediterranean style that is evident within rural contexts across the Southwest region commonly occurs at sites that had gradually developed since the LPRIA. These diachronic changes are therefore likely to demonstrate the process of modifications over the long-term by local landowning families.

Members of the local elite who had invested heavily in the State (both financially and socially) to preserve their power within, and over, local communities arguably may have found it necessary to emphasise their place within the Roman world – and perhaps their sense of Roman identity - in order to maintain not only their authority, but also their sense of self. However, changes were often principally made to building façades. The adoption of these styles alongside the continuity of practices witnessed since the LPRIA may indicate that (for much of the population, including some elites) ‘Roman’ style architecture continued to symbolise status, prestige, and probably power, at the end of the Roman period, without necessarily indicating the adoption of Roman cultural identity. The juxtaposition of circular and rectangular buildings at some villa sites may represent the deliberate emphasis of social hierarchies, and the renegotiation of identities within a ‘Roman’ discourse.

199 Legislation in AD 367 against migration to country estate suggests that this was a problem for the State (Salway 1981: 398).
The repetitive presence of particular mosaic imagery may indicate attempts by elites to (re)create a particular mythological narrative in the construction of identities. These particular pavements were possibly created to display the Classical education of the villa owners, demonstrating status through ‘civilised’ behaviour, and conspicuous consumption through the acquisition of prestigious material culture (although it is acknowledged that not all landowners may have been aware of the cultural significance of some imagery). In addition, the occurrence of scenes from and allusions to Romano-Trojan origin myths may demonstrate the reinvigorated expression of Roman cultural identity. However, the inappropriate placement some mosaics may not only indicate that the villa inhabitants were unaware of the cultural significance of these works. Such accoutrements may have been intended to assert prestige, rather than to signify Romanitas.

It is alternatively (but tentatively) suggested that such behaviour was linked to the renegotiation of ethnic identity during this time of social and political upheaval, indicating attempts by some local elites to maintain authority over local communities within changing historical conditions, by drawing upon perceptions of continuity from shared elite ancestry. The popularity of such imagery at this time within the Southwest may represent a belief that such mythology alluded to the origin myths of the aristocracy. This may therefore represent continuity of the process initiated in the LPRIA, in which a small number of elites perhaps incorporated Mediterranean culture in the expression of ‘Britishness’ (see Chapters 2 and 3). The distribution may be coincidental, but those villas (so far uncovered) containing fourth century mosaics displaying imagery related to Trojan origin myths are located in the centre and border zones of the Durotrigian, (North and South) Dobunnia, and the Northwest sector of the Belgic civitates, within areas where barrow activity had a long history (fig. 5.24). Considered alongside the burial and ritual evidence (see Chapter 6), their role in the expression of ethnicity remains a possibility - particularly where practices within private contexts do not demonstrate the permeation of ‘Roman’ social structures and values throughout everyday life.

Whilst not necessarily an assertion of Romanitas, the presence of this style may have significantly changed local landscapes, and thus identities. Although perhaps initially signifying prestige, this style may have influenced the way some local elites came to think of themselves and of others. Whether or not they were also involved in the expression of cultural or ethnic identity (or a combination of identities), the reinvigoration of symbols of Roman status and power embedded within collective memory related past and present (Giddens 1995: 39). This encouraged the continuity of ‘imperial’ frameworks of power during a period of instability.
Some villas perhaps adopted an increasingly administrative role, collecting taxes in the form of grain (annona) during the second half of the fourth century (Millett 1990: 129, 204; Salway 1981: 454), which arguably stimulated agricultural intensification (Dark 1996: 57). This role may be related to the more frequent presence of corn-driers at many sites. However, it has also been claimed that these features represent the malting of grain for the production of beer, which was feasibly used in exchange (Millett 1990: 205; Walters 2001: 135), thus enabling systems of obligation to become established outside the sphere of Roman administration. In the absence of wine from the Continent after the end of the fourth century, beer may have been a valuable commodity, perhaps used to cement patron-client relationships through feasting and drinking. As such, it was possibly a symbol of communal identity amongst members of fraternal (primarily military) groups.

The plan of villa complexes (as with other nucleated settlements) suggests the organisation of communities into kinship groups, though other social, perhaps quasi-military, units are also possible. Sometimes, as tenant farms were abandoned, what appear to be ancillary domestic buildings were constructed in closer proximity to the villa buildings, as at Great Witcombe (Leach 1998). The reorganisation of space may have enabled tenants to be brought under closer control, as elsewhere in the Empire (Evans 1990: 98). This might also be seen in the apparent bounding of territories at this time, with the construction of minor earthworks defining the extents of villa estates. Such territoriality was perhaps encouraged by the socio-political organisation imposed throughout the Empire, and further encouraged by competition over resources during the early fifth century, due to both environmental and socio-economic changes. It may also have been related to the increased incidence of violence witnessed at some villas within this region.
With (or even before) the collapse of State control, elites may have consciously reconstructed estate communities, leading to increasing autonomy (which should perhaps be seen as part of a wider process of political and social fragmentation). In some areas, fragmentation may have led to the concentration of ownership, with the development of ‘great estates’, in which some territories were absorbed (totally or partially) into larger units (Arce 1997: 19; Charravia and Lewit 2004: 32; Heighway 1987: 10), with consolidation and annexing perhaps being a necessary response to economic and environmental changes. Such developments may have led to the formation of socio-political units during the early fifth century, particularly if supported by private armies, with social organisation gradually becoming bound up in systems of obligation between the landowner and his retinue (or commonly kinship groups, less commonly, religious communities), within small, dispersed territorial units (Hodder 1978: 218, 222, 223). Local ‘grandees’ or ‘apparatchiks’ (and possibly from an early date self-styled ‘kings’) may have thus evolved (Faulkner 2000: 130, 134, 135; Liebeshuetz 2001; Reece 2000: 4), ruling hereditarius – essentially coloni, or tenants tied to the estates (Drinkwater 1992: 212; Faulkner 2000: 115; Millet 1999: 203; but see MacMullen 1964; Schachner 2006: 44, 50-2; Van Ossel 2006: 535-36). It has been argued that the development of patron-client relationships and the interaction between dominus and colonus within the local landscape during the later fourth century (see Sarris 2004: 60-1) tends towards feudalism, particularly if land was allocated in return for military service (Hodder 1978: 207; Pohl 1997b: 43, 114, 204; Wickham 1984: 12-3). However, more variable responses to change have been suggested (see Schachner 2006: 44, 50-2; Wickham 2005: 60-1). The levying of rents upon tenant farmers – who in some cases may have been members of the burgeoning ‘middle class’ (Schachner 2006: 46; Ellis 2006; see Sodini 2003: 25, 46-8) - may have prevented such a development (Devroey 2001: 114; Wickham 2005: 58-9).

In this scenario, competition may have played a role in the construction of distinct community identities (Scull 1992: 17-19), aiding bids for political cohesion, so as to provide a sense of security. Common practices (in particular rituals, see Chapter 6), and the adoption of symbols that might unite past and present (and thus emphasise the long-standing authority for the landowners), may have enhanced community ties (see Cohen 1985). Whilst villa buildings possibly symbolised Roman elite power and authority into the fifth century, there were also elements within this architecture that arguably emphasised links with the non- or pre-Roman past, which were potentially appropriated within attempts to recreate collective memories in the reconstruction of local identities. Many villa buildings, like other rectangular rural buildings, continued to follow the pre-Roman practice of east - southeast facing doorways, as at Great Witcombe (see Leach 1998). Symbols associated with the pre-Roman past, signifying regional identity and sustainability were thus

200 Later texts may represent these estates as landholdings of c. 125 acres (Davies 1978: 34; Devroey 2001: 113).
seemingly used in conjunction with Roman symbols of power, which perhaps suggested military capability and status via association with the Empire.

Villas remained significant into the fifth century, although some dwelling practices changed. These changes may represent a structural break, but do not necessarily represent different inhabitants. New buildings were created on villa sites, constructed according to local building practices (paralleled at a wide range of sites across the region), suggesting the continuity of the local population, rather than the settlement of migrants. However, it is almost impossible to determine whether the occupants of particular buildings were descendents of previous inhabitants, or whether they came from different status groups. The location of symbols of power, such as belt buckles, suggests that they maintained or created positions of authority, perhaps centred upon military control - another discourse through which new identities might be negotiated. At most sites, however, this reoccupation seems not to have been long lasting. This accords with apparently widespread abandonment of rural sites and urban centres during the early fifth century.

If the changes witnessed at villas do in some cases indicate the abandonment of buildings during and after the early fifth century, the question arises (bearing in mind the importance of particular locales in creating Roman identity), for instance, as to where the former inhabitants of the villas relocated (cf. Chavarría 2004, 2005). To what extent were new locations recreated within a Roman ideological framework? It will be argued that some villa-owning elite maintained the positions they achieved in the later fourth century, and moved to Iron Age hillforts within or near to their estates during the early fifth century (cf. Hodder 1978: 218), as part of the process of reconstructing communal identity.

**HILLFORTS**

**Dobunnic civitas**

Ritual activity dating to the earlier Roman period within the Early Iron Age hillfort on Crickley Hill was referred to in Chapter 3. Settlement on the hilltop may have begun during the fourth century, with sporadic buildings constructed in the silt of the rampart ditches, containing larger amounts of local grey wares (Jarrett 1999; see fig. 5.26). But the main first phase of hillfort reoccupation is dated to during or after the later fourth century. The presence of a worn late fourth century 'military' buckle (manufactured on the Rhineland, but possibly subsequently modified) suggests that the second phase of occupation might be given an approximate TPQ of c. AD 420 (see Chapters 2 and 4, fig. 4.16; Jarrett 1999; forthcoming). However, associated grass-tempered ceramics (found during this Period, 4b) may indicate a much later date for this activity, perhaps placing phase 1
activity in the mid fifth century (ibid.). Other indications of a fifth, rather than later fourth, century date include the numbers of Romano-British sherds found at this site, though these are substantially fewer than those found on local late Roman settlements, representing only a small number of vessels, generally of small sherd size (see Burrow 1981), and of restricted range. There are also few coins from the site. This assemblage is similar to that of reoccupied hillforts elsewhere in the Southwest, where imported ceramics are present to date occupation to the sixth century (e.g. Cadbury Congresbury and South Cadbury: see below; see Alcock et al. 1995; Rahtz et al. 1992). However, there are fewer Romano-British sherds at Crickley than at Congresbury, which may indicate that reoccupation began at an earlier date at the latter site.

The Crickley Hill settlement consists of two contemporaneous zones, constructed over at least two phases (Periods 4a and 4b), each terminated by fire destruction. The Western zone is located on a plateau towards the western tip of the hill, and the Eastern zone approximately 200m downhill, behind the ramparts in the southeastern sector of the hilltop (fig. 5.26). The two settlement zones are not inter-visible, principally due to ground elevation, although prehistoric features (including a Neolithic enclosure, see Snashall 1998) that lie between may have further obscured the view.

![Figure 5.26 Crickley Hill Western (high status) and Rampart (low status) settlements, and related features (diagram: author, after Savage 1988)](Copyright image)

201 Loom weights, within the entrance area may also suggest occupation into, or during, the sixth – eighth century (see Jarrett 1999, and forthcoming), in comparison with Poundbury (see Chapter 4).

202 Romano-British sherds are currently being quantified, although an estimate would be less than 175 sherds in total, compared to several hundred to thousands at local late Roman sites, as well as only three very worn late Roman coins (Jarrett 1999).
The Western settlement might be considered to be of higher status than the Eastern settlement, due to a number of factors. The former, enclosed by a sturdy timber palisade (with an apparent guardhouse adjacent the entrance), incorporated a granary, itself enclosed by a palisade fence (fig. 5.27). This zone contained several timber buildings, including a large, centrally placed rectangular post-built sub-divided structure, surrounded by a number of post-built and timber-framed circular buildings (all possibly manufactured off-site by skilled artisans, pers. comm. Prof. Philip Dixon). This settlement zone was relatively clean of finds, as compared to the Eastern zone. The juxtaposition of roundhouses and rectangular buildings has also been seen above at other rural sites in the region (Rural Settlements; Villas), and occurs at other hillforts including Cadbury Congresbury (fig. 5.28), and perhaps South Cadbury (see Alcock et al. 1995; Rahtz et al. 1992)

Figure 5.27 Western settlement zone, Crickley Hill (Diagram, author, from Dixon 1988).

Green = excavation extents. Dotted lines = probable lines of features outside cuttings. Grey = modern hillside
The Eastern zone was unenclosed, and contrasted with the Western zone in that it contained numerous sub-rectangular and sub-circular sunken featured buildings (that probably had superstructures of cob or turf), arranged in a regular ‘street-like’ plan (fig. 5.29). Various forms of industrial activity took place within this zone, including iron and bronze working. Similar ceramics have been found within both zones, suggesting their contemporaneity - as might the destruction of both settlement zones by fire on two occasions. The second of these fires coincided with the abandonment of the site.

203 See footnote 127 above.
The hillfort at Crickley Hill had been a visible part of the Great Witcombe landscape since the villa’s inception (fig. 5.30), and it is likely that the villa community migrated to the hillfort after its decline and abandonment during the early fifth century (see Jarrett 1999). Similarities between buildings at Crickley Hill, and at sites within the hinterland, support the hypothesis of local migration(s) to this site during the early fifth century from the surrounding villa estate. Similar building techniques (such as polygonal building forms) are found in buildings of the Eastern zone and at the nearby recently abandoned settlement at Birdlip Quarry, which may have lay within the Great Witcombe estate (see above, Rural Settlement; fig. 3.17).

204 It has been argued that the neo-Brittonic place name form of Crickley – crúc (meaning ‘heel-shaped hill’) – was only applicable if seen from Great Witcombe villa, due to the location of the hillfort along the escarpment (Gelling 1994).
Domestic practices also suggest a degree of continuity in the local population. Structural changes noted early in the Roman period at some local sites in the reorganisation of domestic space (for example, with the peripheralisation of hearths, as also seen at Birdlip) are replicated within the central building of the Western settlement at Crickley (see fig. 5.27, 5.31). A possible ‘communal’ hearth was located near the doorway, with a separate cooking pit located away from the communal area (see Chapter 3; above, Rural settlements). However, the hearths in most of the buildings within the Eastern zone remained centrally placed, reflecting the local continuation of pre-Roman practices (Jarrett, forthcoming; see fig. 5.29).

Building alignment might also be informative with regard to the renegotiation of identities. In opposition to the more typical E-SE building alignment (which continue from prehistory, see Chapters 2 and 3; see below), the central building of the Western settlement was aligned approximately southwest, seemingly upon the villa at Great Witcombe (fig. 5.32, see red arrow), c. 1 mile away across Ermine Street in the valley below (fig. 5.33). This alignment was also a feature of the nearby round ‘guardhouse’, located next to the palisade enclosure entrance (see fig. 5.27). More research is needed to confirm how common such alignments were, although preliminary analysis indicates that the door of the rectangular building at Cadbury Congresbury appears to open to the west (downhill, into the hillfort, though possibly to a site beyond, such as Wemberham villa), with the circular building aligned north (Rahtz et al. 1992: 138, 140, figs. 3).

---

205 Current tree cover on the hill makes consideration of inter-visibility between sites difficult. It has been suggested that the occupation of Cadbury Congesbury is related to the abandonment of Gatcombe (Rahtz et al. 1992).
Figure 5.32 Great Witcombe villa (arrow), from Western settlement central building, Crickley Hill (Photograph: author)

Figure 5.33 Crickley Hill (top right) and Great Witcombe villa (bottom left), Ermine Street (red line) (Image after Google Earth)
Alignment of buildings in the Eastern settlement frequently lay between E and SE (see fig. 5.29), again in common with most buildings of the pre-Roman period (Fitzpatrick 1997; Oswald 1997), and frequently later (see Chapter 3). This orientation also enabled alignment upon the elite LPRIA and early Roman barrow cemetery at Birdlip (see fig. 2.27). If this reference was intentional, then it would seem that social memories central to community identity were potentially provoked during the early – mid fifth century in early post-Roman attempts at social reorganisation. Ancestors, who perhaps had some significance as the founders of the Dobunnic dynasty (considering their wealthy grave goods and burial forms, see Chapters 2 and 3), were possibly reincorporated by elites within the construction of regional identity and local structures of power. Some buildings in this zone, however, were aligned SW, perhaps following that of the central building in the Western settlement. This may indicate the significance of the nearby villa to non-elites, perhaps in creating ontological security, by acknowledging previous social relationships established within the old villa community, and in doing so, perpetuating hierarchies within the new settlement. The elite attempted to stabilise their position, not merely to retain control over their subordinates, but also to retain self-esteem within a changing environment (Freeman 2001).

Figure 5.34 Cadbury Congresbury, possible early-mid fifth century features (after Rahtz et al. 1992, fig. 4.158)
The zoning of sites (as indicated by the diagonal bank at Cadbury Congresbury, see fig. 5.34, and the enclosure of a distinct settlement zone at Crickley, incorporating a granary, see fig. 5.27) support the suggestion that these sites may have adopted the centralised role previously held by urban sites.

Other hillforts, such as Salmonsbury, indicate sporadic activity through the Roman period, with possible settlement, accompanied by a modification of the defences, during or after the later Roman period (Donovan 1935: 243-4, 257-58; fig. 5.35). However, more work is needed to determine the extent and form of late activity on this site. A comprehensive survey of hillforts at which Romano-British artefacts have been found would surely inform and reform current understandings of fifth century settlement within the Southwest and beyond.

Romano-British pottery profiles perhaps continue into the fifth century, as seen in the handmade ceramics at Crickley Hill (see Jarrett 1999; fig. 5.36), which may be comparable with finds at rural sites in Somerset (see above). There was a change in ceramic manufacturing techniques, a reduction and collapse of many regional industries (or a restriction in their ranges), and an increase in domestic production. As noted above, the predominance of coarse, thick-walled vessels (some similar to pre-Roman wares) may have affected a range of domestic practices related to dining and serving, and so influenced transformation of identities.
No systematic study of hillfort reoccupation has been undertaken for the Belgic region (Yorke 1995: 26, though see Payne, Corney and Cunliffe 2006), but occasional excavation has provided some indication of reuse at this time. Romano-British artefacts were discovered within the fill of the eastern entrance ditch terminals of Liddington Castle (south of Wanborough), and the ramparts may have been modified within the post-Roman period (Corney and Payne 2006a: 111, 113). Some enclosures, such as Bilbury Ring, were occupied from the LPRIA, into the fifth century (Corney and Payne 2006b: 141). Early Roman ceramics, including Samian fragments, were found at Chisbury Camp hillfort during 1930s pipe lying. Considering the occurrence of this ware in the post-Roman period (see above), it is not inconceivable that its presence may at times represent later activity. Romano-British ceramics (as well as coin hoards) have been found at Castle Ditches Camp (Tisbury), and provide promising indicators for future study (Corney and Payne 2006a: 104, 105). Stray finds, such as the fifth century penannular brooch from Oldbury (fig. 5.37) – a hillfort near to the Western end of East Wansdyke, as well as Roman coins (ibid. 123-24) - sometimes suggest reoccupation. However, without further excavation, post-Roman reoccupation of sites cannot be assumed.

Geophysical survey of Oldbury demonstrates alteration to the Iron Age circuit at some point (Corney and Payne 2006b: 142). A villa has also been recognised nearby, and possible ritual activity has been noted outside the hillfort defences (ibid.). The site also has an interior enclosure (fig. 5.38), that has been tentatively dated as post-Roman (Corney and Payne 2006a: 125), and may indeed represent zoning - similar to activity witnessed at other reoccupied hillforts.

Durotrigian civitas

Detailed survey of Roman material at hillforts in Somerset has revealed extensive use of these sites in the late Roman period, as least in the Northwestern sector of the Durotrigian territory. Almost all
of the hillforts examined have some form of Romano-British presence attested to by material remains, although these include both early and late Roman finds (Burrow 1981). Sporadic archaeological investigation, and a survey of the NMR and HER, has likewise revealed similar activity in Dorset (see Appendix, Table 9; see fig. 3.40), although in most cases finds belong to the third century or earlier. It is generally supposed that late Roman re-use or re-occupation of hillfort sites was of a ritual (see below), agricultural, or industrial nature. It does not appear to be high status in nature at this time, although more excavation is required.

The most conclusive evidence for late fourth century hillfort settlement within the Durotrigian civitas so far has come from the hillfort at Poundbury, outside Dorchester, which appears to have been a revival or development of the earlier Roman period farming settlement (see Chapters 2 and 3). By the late fourth century, the occupation area was reduced to one or two structures (fig. 5.39, black outline), and the cemetery encroached upon the southern part of the settlement (Green 1996: 149ff; see below).

However, the hillfort at Poundbury was redeveloped, perhaps during the mid fifth century or earlier. The location of late activity outside the rampart area (with no internal occupation noted) may argue against a primarily defensive role for the settlement. Various building types have been recognised, although building forms were invariably rectangular or sub-rectangular, and mostly timber-framed or post-built (Green 1996: 73, 82; 126-7, 130, 133-5, 147; pers. comm. May 2004). Structures were similar (in size, materials, and form) to fifth - sixth century buildings at Wroxeter, and have parallels at Dinas Powys (Alcock 1963: 30, 32, 298), Barnsley Park (Webster and Smith 1982: 107), and Crickley Hill (Jarrett 1999), but finds suggest that the buildings at Poundbury more probably date to the later fifth – sixth century, than earlier (see Chapter 4). As elsewhere, this variation of styles and building technologies gives an impression of technological experimentation and a diverse social mix. Alternatively or additionally, this suggests that a number of different activities took place at the site. Social zoning is evident (Green 1996: 135). Grain was stored in the mausolea of the late Roman cemetery, which had become surrounded by late or post-Roman buildings (ibid. 129; fig. 5.40). This might be taken to suggest the incorporation of ‘Roman’ symbols of power within this settlement within the process of renegotiating local identities, although these features appear to have been partially but deliberately demolished – a practice paralleled on the Continent, where mausolea provided a convenient source for building stone (Caseau 2004: 129).

---

207 The cemetery had stopped expanding by the late fourth - early fifth century (ibid. 71).
208 Structures were of timber, dry-stone, or organic construction, with superstructures built upon terraces (either post-built, or timber-framed using sunken sill-beams), placed directly on the ground surface, or sometimes with floors sunk into ‘scoops’ within the ground; the timber-framed buildings used sunken sill-beams and were recognised by their drip-gullies (Green 1996: 73, 82; 126-7, 130, 133-5, 147; pers. com. May 2004).
Copyright image

Figure 5.39 Poundbury later Roman settlement features (Green 1987, fig. 41).
The Iron Age ditches (with late Roman material in their upper fill) were covered by a metalled surface in one part of the site, suggesting that a significant amount of traffic used or visited the settlement, and arguably indicating that market activities were transferred here from Dorchester (Green 1987).209 There was a general ‘material poverty’ (with a dearth of fifth- or sixth-century artefacts), and Romano-British finds have been considered residual (1996: 136). However, it has been argued above that certain artefacts of the late Roman period were continually used (and possibly manufactured) into the fifth century. These finds may allow the primary phases to be placed within the late Roman period and the fifth, rather than the sixth, century. It is noted that the numerous bone artefacts compare with those from post-Roman Western (rather than Anglo-Saxon, or Romano-British) sites (Green 1996: 136).210

Perhaps the best known occurrence of hillfort reoccupation within Durotrigian territory is at South Cadbury. It has been suggested that the possible Durotrigian centre of power at Ilchester (see above) was transferred here in the post-Roman period (Alcock et al. 1995: 2, 151). However, activity at Ilchester is still evident at this time, and the late Roman finds from the hillfort (Leach 1982: 12), suggest differing, concurrent, functions for the two sites (though these probably changed over

209 Another rectangular structure (R20), measuring 4.27 m NS by 2.44-3.05 m W, had been built on a terrace platform in this vicinity (ibid. 63).
210 Whilst initially indigenous hand-made pottery was recorded, on reappraisal this has been categorised as “unlikely” to belong to the late- or sub-Roman phase (Christopher Sparey Green, pers. comm.).
time). Although a number of late- and post-Roman features have been discovered at South Cadbury, excavation was limited to 6% of the hilltop; perhaps consequently there is currently no evidence for storage facilities or agricultural processing, or metalworking (Alcock et al. 1995). The presence of a large timber post-built rectangular building on the summit of the hillfort interior has been suggested (fig. 5.41) (seemingly using interior space to create socio-political division), though this is associated with later pottery (ibid. 31). Although ploughing has destroyed the stratigraphy relating the two structures, a possible late- or post-Roman roundhouse (with central hearth) has also been identified. Its construction methods (post-built) perhaps contrast with those commonly seen locally during the pre-Roman period (ring ditch) (Alcock 1972: 101). However, this building cannot be dated to the late- or even post-Roman period with certainty (Alcock et al. 1995: 31-2). On balance, there is no solid evidence that might support late-Roman occupation of the site, although that is not to exclude the possibility that it might be found in further excavations. However, as we shall see, ritual activity of this date (see Chapter 6) may make fifth century occupation likely, in view of similarities with other sites (see above).

![Figure 5.41 Summit structures, South Cadbury: L1 = Late- or post-Roman, L3 = possible Late- or post-Roman, and L2 = Iron Age (Alcock et al. 1995, fig. 2.20)](Copyright image)

**Dumnonian civitas**

As noted in Chapter 2, hillforts were not characteristic of the entire Dumnonian territory. East of the civitas centre, hillfort activity is similar to that in other parts of the Southwest. Extra-mural settlement (perhaps associated with external earthworks) is apparent to the south of the ramparts at
Cannington (Somerset), on the possible northern civitas border with Durotrigia (Rahtz 1964; 1969). Investigations of this site were limited (and sadly much of it has since been destroyed through quarrying), but two rectangular houses and much Romano-British pot was found, and at least one building was of post construction (Somerset HER 10444, 10439, 12770). The occupants possibly came to Cannington from a nearby villa at Combwich (Burrow 1979, 1981; Pearce 1978). Finds from the site are similar to other reoccupied hillforts in the Southwest.\textsuperscript{211} The hillfort at High Peak (near to the coast, west of Sidmouth) was, unusually, established de novo during the late- or early post-Roman period, with a radiocarbon date from the site centring on 350 + / - 95, although earlier activity at the site is known (Pollard 1966).

Hillforts within the region have again not been systematically studied to determine whether late Roman activity might be indicated. Occasional finds, such as the ‘Roman’ glass bead at Berry’s Wood univallate hillfort (Newton Abbot, Devon) are perhaps promising, although the date of this find is unconfirmed (NMR 447025). Other sites, such as Mothercombe, on the Western bank of the Erme (not far from Oldaport, see Chapter 4), and Bantham, on the bank of the Devon Avon, have the appearance of seasonal trading posts (Pearce 2004; Todd 1987). Although Roman period metalwork and ceramics from the latter occur within the same contexts as late fifth – sixth century imports (Fox 1955), these were recovered from middens, which feasibly allows a late Roman origin for this site. Considering the later Roman material at Oldaport (see Chapter 4, fig. 4.2), this possibility cannot be excluded, and it is conceivable that the development of a new trading site, and control over the distribution of goods, was important in the development of social hierarchies and identities at this time. These sites are located near to the only possible LPRIA and Roman period enclosure-barrows and barrows so far found in the Dumnonian region, at Branscombe (see Chapters 2 and 3), which may suggest the role of trade and exchange in the development of local social hierarchies in both the LPRIA, and late- to post-Roman period.

\textit{‘Cornovian’ pagus}

There are few hillforts in this region (Todd 1987: 162), and even fewer reoccupied hillforts are datable to the late fourth – early fifth century. It has been argued that the reduced occupation of rounds coincides with the reoccupation of hillforts or hilltop settlements in the region (Thomas 1956; 1988). However, contemporaneous activity can perhaps be seen at both types of site. Late activity at Chun Castle (Penwith) may feasibly begin during the later Roman period (Preston-Jones and Rose 1986: 138), but evidence is slight, and the absence of Romano-British wares from excavations (albeit not undertaken under modern conditions) perhaps make a post-Roman date

\textsuperscript{211} However, the nature of extra-mural reoccupation has similarities to activity in Durotrigia, which may have been politically proscribed (see above). Therefore, this site might rather lie within the Durotrigian civitas.
more likely (see Leeds 1927: 236). Although most buildings at this site are circular (and therefore probably of Iron Age date), some wall-lines may tend towards rectangular (ibid. 216), perhaps indicating the presence of oval houses dating to the Roman period or later. Few buildings were excavated, but fortunately, these included an oval house situated in the southeast quadrant of the enclosure. This building appears to have had a central partition (ibid. 219; fig. 5. 42, marked in red) – a feature unusual for the Roman period within Cornwall, although this may in fact indicate the presence of two houses, rather than one (1931: 37), or of a cellular building similar to those found within courtyard complexes. The building(s) do(es) not appear to have had a central hearth, but instead the hearth was placed towards the northeast corner (1927: 219), against the rampart (1931: 37). This is arguably reminiscent of the changes seen during the early Roman period at Birdlip, where the relocation of hearths from a central to peripheral location within domestic buildings may indicate the restructuring of identities (particularly gender), and symbolic domination of domestic space through the influence of Classical social structures (see Chapter 3). If this is the case, this building might more readily be placed well within the post-Roman period, during which it is argued ‘Roman’ practices become more widespread in the development of elite society.

An imported Bi amphora sherd (also labelled as LR2), probably dating to the mid fifth – mid sixth century, was retrieved from this building (Leeds 1927: 219; Thomas 1956: 77), possibly indicating ‘Roman’ dining practices, when seen in conjunction with the possibly bipartite building form.212 Evidence for tin smelting and iron working has been found on the site, as have ingots (Leeds 1927: 218-19), perhaps indicating one mechanism by which the local elite developed. Other possible evidence for later Roman tin working at Chûn includes moulds and crucibles (Thomas 1988a: 19). The location of this site next to a Neolithic chambered tomb may have influenced its reoccupation, enabling the appropriation of the prehistoric past in the construction of new identities – just as the tomb had influenced the construction of the hillfort at an earlier date (see Bradley 1998a). This appropriation may also be seen in the (possibly later) inscription (recording ‘Rialobranos, son of Cunoualos’, Thomas 1994: 286; fig. 5.43), near the site on a possible prehistoric menhir. The stone itself (known as ‘Men Scryfa’) is close to the prehistoric ‘Men-an-Tol’ and the ‘Nine Maidens’ stone circle. Through inscription of this possibly ancient stone, the landscape was recreated, constructing a continuum between ancient past and present, legitimising and naturalising the new political order (Bradley 2002).213 Other late- or post-Roman inscriptions of Western Britain may also have appropriated prehistoric stones for this purpose (see Okasha 1993).

212 However, such sherds are perhaps more likely to date to the late fifth, or early sixth, century in Western Britain (Campbell 2007: 19, 26).
213 This inscription may date to the later Roman period (Handley 2001: 179), but it is more usually argued to date from after the mid fifth century (see below).
Figure 5.42 Chūn Castle (after Leeds 1926, fig. 3). Oval house marked in red
The location of a burial and inscription at Carnsew on the Hayle Estuary (perhaps of mid-fifth century date, see Chapter 6) may suggest occupation of the nearby Trencrom hillfort, but evidence has yet to be found to confirm this (Thomas 1994). However, the probable hillfort at which the stone was reputedly found (and where it now rests), and the possible Roman fort on the estuary, provide other possible sites for investigation.

More common (and more certainly seen during the later Roman period and after) is the (re)occupation of coastal fortified sites (e.g. promontory forts or cliff castles), again suggesting a link between control of trade and the development of social hierarchy. One such site is Trevelgue Head (Restormel), where late Roman coins were found stratified beneath a ‘dark age’ hut (see Chapter 2 and 3; Todd 1987: 228; Wright 1940: 175), perhaps indicating occupation spanning the late- to post-Roman period. LPRIA and early Roman activity included iron and bronze working, and this is likely to have continued into and beyond the late Roman period (Rose 1999: 33; Wright 1940: 175). Fortification was required to defend this position, but again, the control and redistribution of ores and metalwork may have been a prime mechanism through which local power was achieved. This site was located near to an outcrop of iron ore (*ibid*).
Figure 5.44 Tintagel settlement plan (Morris et al. 1999, fig. 7)
The best known site in the region is Tintagel (fig. 5.44), on the North Cornish coast. No certain prehistoric occupation of the Island has been identified, although Early Medieval activity possibly eradicated any earlier activity (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 309). The earliest structural phase recognised (N) consists of post-supports cut into the bedrock on the Lower Terrace (ibid. 39, 55-6, 310; fig. 5.45), which unfortunately it had no finds. The subsequent phase Q was accorded an early fifth century ante quem date (a hearth was radiocarbon dated to AD 395-460), with a later phase radiocarbon dated to 415-535 (ibid. 39, 55-6). Similar features within early post-Roman structures, such as levelled clay floors, are found elsewhere in the Southwest during the Roman period (ibid. 43, 230). Fragmentary remains of slate walls were also found (Harry and Morris 1997: 16, 33, 34, 39, 66, 122, ns.127 and 128). However, on the Middle Terrace (see fig. 5.45), buildings were perhaps timber-framed during the initial phase, their plans identified by timber-slots within the bedrock (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 315). Perforated slates suggest that in some buildings turf super-structures rested upon stone base-walls. These possibly represent temporary sub-rectangular structures, similar to transhumance huts found on nearby Bodmin Moor, and Gwithian, dating to between the fifth or sixth century to the eighth century (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 39, 55-6; Harry and Morris 1997: 16, 33, 34, 39, 66, 122, ns.127 and128; fig. 5.46).214

---

214 These may also be compared to probable turf-walled buildings at Crickley Hill (Gloucestershire), dating to the late fourth – sixth centuries (see above), where turf may have been used due to proximate metalworking, to reduce risk of fire. However, it is possible that their construction in Cornwall may be related to the shortage of timber. One should be cautious in assigning turf-walled structures a temporary life.
As at hillforts elsewhere in the Southwest, late- or early post-Roman industrial activity is possible, perhaps associated with material dated to cal AD 340-530 (95% confidence), or cal AD 390-430 (at 68%) (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 314). By the time Mediterranean imports reached the site, ‘Roman-type’ ovens (box hearths) were in use (fig. 5.47) (ibid.), demonstrating changing practices at this site during or after the mid-late fifth century (see ibid. 43-4). These features are similar to hearths found at other post-Roman hillfort settlements in the Southwest.
Finds at Tintagel include Oxfordshire colour-coated *mortaria* and flanged bowls in local fabric (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 43, 230). The earliest ceramics, third - fourth century locally produced granitic wheel-made pottery (see Quinell 1993: 33; 86: 129; Harry and Morris 1997: 15, 77, 79, 81), indicates the possibility of late Roman activity on the site. However, it has been argued that the small amount of Romano-British pottery on the Island belongs to post-Roman occupation, beginning at the later end of the radiocarbon sequence (i.e. mid fifth century), with early Roman glass probably brought to the site at a later date (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 230, 311).

It has been pointed out that the coastal position of Tintagel may have enabled its development as a trading port (Hodges 1982: 52), with a relatively safe harbour in the Haven below (fig. 5.48), probably using the 'Iron Gate', near the Lower Terrace, as a natural quay (Thomas 1993: 38, 41). Tintagel may therefore have operated as a periodic market or fair site (Hodder 1978: 207), or 'gateway' community, enabling primitive redistribution within a system of local exchange between adjacent territories (Hodges 1982: 30, 51-2). The apparently temporary nature of the structures may support the hypothesis that this site was a port. This should be considered in conjunction with the record of the sailing season in the *Codex Theodosianus* (c. AD 380) as 13 April – 15 October, and the three-month journey from the Mediterranean to Southwest Britain (Bowman 1996: 101). Storage along the Lower Terrace perhaps includes granaries (Harry and Morris 1997), suggesting the collection and redistribution of grain, possibly organised by some form of centralised leadership.

---

215 These ceramics are found on the site and elsewhere in the region stratified with later ceramics, e.g. at Trethurgy (Quinell 1986: 129), although it is argued that they are not residual, as they are replaced by different locally made wares during the fifth - sixth centuries (Thomas 1993: 84). Stray finds, such as the leather draw-string purse containing ten low denomination coins of Tetricus I (AD 270-273/4) to Constantius II (as Augustus) (AD 337-61), deposited within a rock-cleft on the landward side of the Great Ditch, also suggest late fourth century activity (see Quinell 93: 33; 86: 129; Harry and Morris 1997: 15, 77, 79, 81, 25). However, amphora sherds found beneath the earth core of some buildings (Harry and Morris 1997: 16, 33, 34, 39, 66, 122, ns.127 and 128; Preston-Jones 1995: 138, 146), indicate a date during or after the mid-late fifth century (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 245).

216 The deep draught boats requiring docking (Hodges 1982: 97) would be easily accommodated at this site, with a depth of at least 9m allowing vessels to have used the Haven as a harbour for fishing and for transporting slate at a later date (Thomas 1993: 39). However, not all accept that this bay functioned as a harbour at this time (Todd 1987: 218), and Tintagel Haven often has perilous tides, although it is suggested local pilots may have been used (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 329). Thomas considers whether the site would have been situated in a "too marginal position" to be a trading post or emporium (1993: 86).

217 Gateway communities are necessarily located along a trade route - as was perhaps the case at Tintagel. This type of site conforms to the model of a dendritic central place system that uses middle-men to redistribute goods and is usually adaptable in the face of competition (Hodges 1982: 24). Such trade or exchange may have limited the extent of inter-group conflict (Hodder 1978: 218).

218 Occupation was perhaps limited to mid July to mid August, due to the three month journey from the Aegean, via Carthage (Campbell 1996: 86) and possibly Gaul (Bowman 1996: 101) - indicated by the presence of 'D' ware (Thomas 1988b: 429) from Bordeaux and the presence of Bil in Brittany (Dark 1996: 35).

219 Agricultural processing might also be inferred by the presence of a quern stone (Thomas 1993: 57).
In view of the lack of evidence for centralised leadership at the end of the fourth century (notwithstanding the likelihood of developing social hierarchy at this time), it is debateable whether this activity represented a Dumnonian ‘royal court’ during its early phases. More than seventy sub-rectangular and rectangular structures have been recognized (Preston-Jones and Rose 1986: 138; see above, fig. 5.44). Whilst not all date to the Early Medieval period (and those that do were not all necessarily occupied at the same time), this still indicates a higher number of buildings than seen at other post-Roman central sites, suggesting that this site fulfilled a unique role. Although it has been argued that the actual amount of imported ceramics (perhaps totalling 100-200 vessels) counts against the site being a redistribution centre (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 332), it is possible that a mercantile community settled here (see Dark 1994: 211).

As was noted in Chapter 3, milestones (or route markers) have been found in the area, perhaps suggesting the presence of a road leading to the Island, which possibly acted as an administrative site. The recently discovered inscription from the Island may also belong to this collection of official markers. The inscription (which lies beneath the more famous ‘Arthognou’ inscription) may read: H AUG – either H[onorius] AUG[ustus], or H[onorio] AUG[usto], indicating its erection during the reign of Honorius (AD 393-423) (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 196). This inscription is of the sort that might be expected on a milestone, which would make this the latest dated milestone yet found in Britain (ibid.).

220 However, this assumption is commonly made (e.g. see Preston-Jones and Rose 1986: 138, but see p.163). It has been argued that the spatial separation of low and high status structures, on the terrace and possibly plateau, indicates social zoning (Harry and Morris 1997: 122). However, no certain high-status buildings have been recognised during any phase (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 335). There is currently insufficient evidence to confirm the presence of a high-status building on the plateau, or the remains of an ‘official’ building beneath the eleventh century chapel (site A) (Thomas 1993: 61). Such a building might be expected to be associated with high-status objects, as at Dinas Powys (Harry and Morris 1997: 122). A ‘better-made building’, associated with high-status artefacts, arguably represents the habitation of the elite, but this structure dates to a later phase of occupation (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 316).
There is a barrow with signs of Roman period activity (although it is not known whether this is late or early) located approximately 10km away from Tintagel at Davidstow. This may indicate the influence of Classical mythological frameworks in the construction of status, community, and possibly cultural or even ethnic identity by elites within the region, as may have occurred elsewhere in the Southwest during and after the LPRIA (see Chapters 2 and 3). A similar process might be seen in the erection of an inscribed stone nearby. The ‘Latinus’ stone, although moved several times (Okasha 1993: 333), perhaps lies close to its original location. It is presently on the bed of the River at Worthyvale, less than seven km from Tintagel Island (figs. 5.49). The stone is bilingual, carrying the typical Latin-ogham combination found in South Wales, which may date from the early - mid fifth century onwards (Handley 2001; Okasha 1993; see above). The ogham inscription records the name of the buried individual as ‘Latini’ (Macalister 1945 (1996): 449), and may suggest attempts to assert affiliation with Irish kin. The Latin text reads, LATINI IC IACIT FILIUS MAGARI (ibid. 448-49) or LATINI IC IACIT FILIUS MACARI, ‘Of Latinus here lies, the son of Macari’ (Okasha 1993: 78(i), 333-335; Thomas 1994: 263-64). The former name is, of course, Latin; the latter (‘Macarius’) may be ‘Roman’ or Greek (Thomas 1994: 263; 274, n.21).221 The burial of an individual (most likely indigenous) carrying a name from Classical mythology associated with the founding of Rome so close to Tintagel is of interest. It is probable that inscribed memorial stones were used to differentiate elites from the surrounding population (aiding the process of social stratification), by emphasising wealth and status, distinguishing origin, and asserting education, as well as perhaps defining landownership and kinship ties (see Pearce 2004).

Again, this behaviour may only demonstrate an emphasis upon status. However, considered alongside the other changes witnessed within this region (see also Chapter 6), it might be conjectured that here we are seeing attempts by local elites, through a regional medium, to express

221 The name is also that of a magistrate in early first century Galicia (Edmondson 1986: 316).
ethnic origin from mythological Mediterranean stock - perhaps encouraged by contact with adjacent regions, and with Ireland (see below). The stone is roughly dressed, which may suggest emulation of Roman grave- or (perhaps more likely) milestones (though it has vertical text, similar to Irish ogham stones).

On balance, it seems likely that Tintagel played a minor role as a harbour during the later Roman period, possibly in some official and commercial capacity (although it was not necessarily extensively occupied). It is likely that the role of the site changed over time, in response to late fourth and fifth century socio-political and economic developments in the region. Charles Thomas suggests that at some point after AD 400, an unknown ‘grandee or potentate’ seized the site (1988a: 9). If so, its development may parallel that seen on the Continent during the fifth century, where members of transient ‘barbarian’ aristocracies established ‘pre-emporia’ (i.e. ‘major periodic craft centres and markets’), often in coastal locations – similar to the permanent emporia that developed on the Continent and in Southern Britain during the seventh - eight centuries (Randsborg 1989: 236-37). Perhaps the importance of Tintagel as a port of trade increased during (or more likely, after) the early fifth century, with subsequent control by a local leader feasibly only lasting one generation (Harry and Morris 1997: 115), before a regional role for the site was developed. Radiocarbon dates from the site indicate a hiatus (of less than 50 years) between the putative ‘grandee’ phase, and a hiatus (of more than 50 years) between the subsequent phase W, which might belong within the late fifth – or sixth century (ibid. 110, 115, 48, 114, 122). It seems likely that this later phase relates to a more centralised leadership, as suggested by the evidence from hillforts in the lowland regions (Burrow 1981: 170).

**Hillfort reoccupation: discussion**

A major change in settlement patterns noted during and after the late fourth century is the reoccupation of hillforts. More work is needed, but initial analyses suggest that this was a relatively uniform phenomenon across the Southwest during the later Roman period. Later Roman period activity at hillforts (where dated) follows the same pattern as activity noted during the early Roman period, when sites in proximity to roads and major rivers were reoccupied (see Chapter 2). This may suggest that control of trade was again one factor by which elites maintained power (Appendix, Table 9; fig. 2.10). The reoccupation of hillforts might also suggest attempts by local aristocracies to claim continuity, by appropriating the local landscape in the assertion of authority and identity, expressing legitimacy through ancestral ties, perhaps aided by mythological narratives. As we shall see, there is a potential link between settlement and ritual activity within this process: sporadic ritual

---

222 This apparent hiatus is indicated by a turf layer. However, it is conceivable that the turf layer represented a structural wall deposit and the proposed hiatus of c. 50 years should therefore be contracted.
activity at hillforts (ubiquitous during the late fourth century) perhaps brought these sites within the orbit of nearby villas (see Chapters 3 and 6).

A ‘Celtic revival’ model might argue that hillfort reoccupation represents opposition to the ‘Roman’ way of life, with the removal of State controls. However, as was seen in Chapter 3, Roman period activity at hillforts was relatively common, and often occurred in close proximity to ‘Roman’ sites such as villas, towns, and roads, suggesting that such action was seen as acceptable practice for some local elites, and was thus not generally in opposition to Roman culture and power. Furthermore, it should be noted that violence is only occasionally evident at these sites during the early Roman period, and rare after this time - it occurred sporadically during the early Saxon period, which perhaps argues against hillforts as centres of State opposition. Bearing in mind that these sites lay upon the estates, and in proximity to the villas, of the local landowners (who were often also the local civil servants and magistrates), this is all the more unlikely. This practice is also seen across the Western Empire (Chavarría and Lewit 2004: 32-3).

In many cases, considering the apparent abandonment of most villas and towns during or after the later fourth century, the reoccupation of hillforts is likely to represent migration from villas. There is evidence of similar material culture, and similar practices, at both types of site. For instance, detailed analysis of both sites suggests the relocation of the villa community at Great Witcombe to the nearby hillfort at Crickley Hill. The presence of similar materials and practices at villas and at sites that were in all probability located on villa estates, including nearby hillforts, suggests the reoccupation of hillforts by villa owners, and / or the development of these sites by members of local communities for the new occupants.

On the Peninsula, the occupation of sites, such as Chûn and Tintagel, to a certain extent mirrors the trajectory seen elsewhere in the Southwest, representing attempts to create social hierarchy through settlement type, the acquisition of material culture, the control of resources, and perhaps trade. Tintagel acted as the primary point of entry into Britain during the fifth century (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 329), and whoever controlled this site (if indeed it was an elite site, and not a market or port) may held a prime regional position. The monopolisation of trade by developing regional elites would have followed the practices of late Roman ‘barbarian’ societies on the Continent during the later Roman period (Randsborg 1989: 238). Wooding (1996) has suggested that imports arrived at the site via an irregular ‘tramping’ trade, from a range of sources (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 330; Bowman 1996: 101). In this case, the adoption of ‘Roman’ symbols of prestige and power in the development of social hierarchies within the region
during and after the later Roman period would have provided a market (and created a demand) for these goods.\textsuperscript{223}

However, that is not to suggest centralised power within the ‘Comovian’ region at this point in time, and other sites along the coast (such as Bantham) developed as major ports. Contact between the Mediterranean and South Cornwall may be seen in the possible fifth century development of the place name Bridanoc ‘the British one’ as a label for the Lizard (Pearce 2004: 210). This perhaps represents the perceptions (and the imposition) of external (i.e. Classical ethnographic) categories, perhaps derived from trade. However, this label might otherwise indicate the development of a sense of identity beyond that of the region, possibly internalised during and after the fifth century, as ‘British’ identity developed in opposition to migrant settlements (see Jarrett 2009).

Consequently, hillfort reuse may represent the contestation and renegotiation of the past within the creation of a new social order and within the reconstruction of identities (see Barrett 1999: 256; Knapp and Ashmore 1999: 16-19). By reoccupying hillforts, the late- and post-Roman elites were drawing upon sites associated with the past and the ancestors (see Chapter 6). It might be expected that, through the construction of local mythologies, the role of such sites as edifices of power may have rapidly become ‘naturalised’ for the local population (Giddens 1984: 194). As commonly seen during periods of instability, the past was used as a resource, with monuments and architecture appropriated to link the past with the present (Bradley 1987: 3). In this way, hillforts and other sites were perhaps seen as ‘traditional’ edifices of power, and were as such probably integrated within both the reconstruction of elite and community identity.

Although towns and villas were defined as ‘proper’ locales within which cultural and status identity might be negotiated within a Roman discourse, hillfort reoccupation represents a transformation of established ‘ways of operating’ that previously distinguished urban and villa space (de Certeau 1984: xiv, 29). Attempts were made by elites to retain social distance and demonstrate status at these sites, in the absence of traditional symbols of prestige (such as monumental architecture and artistic works, including mosaics). Nevertheless, links with the Roman past remained highly significant in the renegotiation of power, with architecture associated with the imperial elites retaining cachet into the fifth century. In some cases, villa sites remained as foci for elite settlement on hillforts.

\textsuperscript{223} It has also been proposed that the arrival of imported ceramics within Southwest Britain possibly later became more ‘directional’ (Campbell 1996). It has furthermore been suggested that, rather than demonstrating trade, the presence of post-Roman imported pottery may be indicative of diplomatic activity, related to Justinian policies, and should therefore be dated to the sixth century (Bowman 1996: 103; Harris 2003). However, it is possible that the earliest imports begin to arrive during the mid fifth century, with activity evident during this time at Tintagel.
Romano-British finds (commonly late types of BB1 or its local imitations, fragments of Samian and later Oxford ware imitations, and occasionally glass, and particular types of penannular brooch) were also brought to hillforts from the surrounding areas. It might be argued that this merely reflects utilitarian concerns, appropriating available resources at a time of market decline. However, a selection process is evident, with only particular types of ceramics and metalwork brought onto the hilltops at the expense of others. It is suggested that Romano-British finds acted as mnemonics for the power and status inherently represented by this material, reflecting attempts to validate authority, during the earlier phases of occupation. For some, they may also have signified ethnic identity based upon ideas of Mediterranean origin (see Chapters 2 and 3). Certain finds were perhaps used owing to their resemblance to imported wares. That Samian and the later fourth century Oxford ware imitation were treasured suggests that these finds possibly symbolised high status dining practices: the owners of such relics might easily claim prestigious ancestors. As tangible links with the past, these finds may have aided a sense of stability in the construction of new community identities. The incorporation of material removed from nearby villas or urban sites possibly represents attempts to link Roman sites with rural post-Roman settlements in the construction of both collective and personal identities.

It was suggested in Chapter 2 that some hillforts had a centralising function during the LPRIA. Communal centrality is arguably resumed at some sites after the later Roman period, in which case the hillforts may have replaced towns and villas in this role – a change that is highlighted by the presence of granaries. To some extent, the reoccupation of hillforts was perhaps a reaction by local curiales to the loss of authority to provincial officials, which arguably required the assertion of alternative forms of power by signalling aspects of culture inaccessible to immigrant administrative elites. Thus, the apparently permanent occupation of British hillforts during the fifth century and afterwards might suggest that they were more than refuges. As well as fulfilling defensive requirements, the exodus to, and reoccupation of, prehistoric hillforts perhaps reinforced claims to legitimate authority (cf. Williams 1998a and 1998b; cf. Petts 1998b), outside the Imperial superstructure.

The roundhouse was also readopted at hillforts, alongside rectangular buildings. Again, some see this behaviour as indicative of ‘Celtic revival’ and ‘nativism’, though again these terms are wholly inappropriate, considering the apparent minimal breakdown in ‘Roman’ social structure at the

224 Burrow argues for an urban or proto-urban role (although Hodges denies this possibility, 1982: 23), suggesting that such reoccupation requires major organisation (1981: 20).
225 However, that is not to say that apparently ‘indigenous’ elites of the later Roman could necessarily legitimately trace their ancestry to the pre-Roman era, nor that all those that might necessarily considered themselves indigenous.
226 The number of buildings changes over time, and recognition of large middens supports the permanent role of these sites: see Dixon 1992; Rahtz et al 1992.
domestic level after the end of the Roman period – particularly for elites. Continuity of some practices, as might be seen within the oven and hearths of the central high status building at Crickley, might demonstrate the perpetuation of a ‘Roman’ worldview in some instances. But, nonetheless, on closer inspection the apparent ‘revival’ of pre-Roman building traditions is more complex than accounted for by notions of ‘nativism’, given the incorporation of building technologies developed during the Roman period (such as the use of stone, and polygonal plans), perhaps due to outside influence. Building techniques, as well as forms, differentiated these structures from sub-circular buildings used by non-elites at Crickley Hill.

Roundhouses are often considered in isolation when formulating ideas surrounding any ‘return’ to pre-Roman culture. But it is the relationship of these buildings to others that is most important in rewriting the cultural ‘code’ used to assert status (see Derrida 1991: 63, 68). Roundhouses are juxtaposed with rectangular buildings, though the latter remain as high status, during the fifth century at least. It therefore seems likely that by placing roundhouses and rectangular buildings in close proximity, elites were able to continue to appropriate symbols of power derived from the Mediterranean. The construction of rectangular buildings (albeit in timber) by elites during earlier phases of reoccupation may represent attempts to perpetuate established symbols of authority and identity within the recreation of community and place. What we are therefore seeing in this behaviour is just one phase within a long trajectory of architectural development, in which architectural style responded to changing historical conditions.

Similar changes are apparent within both urban and rural settlements across the region, and compare with changes seen elsewhere in the West, in which we may first see a relationship between the declining role of urban sites in maintaining elite status through munificence, and a late phase of Classical influence at villas. It subsequently became clear that, divorced from the socio-economic network embodied by and in the Roman empire, villas were no longer suitable domains for the perpetuation of status. Instead, defended sites became more relevant (although the idea of villas as prestigious locales may have remained significant for some time). At new elite sites, Roman symbols of authority retained their power to legitimise status well into the fifth century.
CHAPTER 6: BURIAL AND RITUAL IN SOUTHWEST BRITAIN, C. AD 350-450

INTRODUCTION

The importance of burial and ritual in the construction of ethnic and other social identities, and in examining the emphasis on cultural identity, was outlined in Chapter 1. It was acknowledged that the liminality and replication of funerary and other ritual ceremonies provide significant arenas for the affirmation, renegotiation, and contestation of the social order, and create opportunities for identity construction (e.g. Bloch and Parry 1982; Chapman 1977; Hodder 1982; Huntington and Metcalf 1979; Middleton 1982; Turner 1995; Ucko 1969). This chapter will concentrate upon examining burial and ritual contexts within the Southwest region, to consider how they may have facilitated identity construction from the late- to post-Roman period.

This survey begins with a general summary of normative burial rites and ritual practices within Southwest Britain at the middle of the fourth century, so as to enable the regional changes to be considered. Changes in burial practices normally indicate the transformation of socially determined world-views, but may be influenced by external stimuli (Randsborg and Nybo 1986: 161). It might be argued that these changes sit easily alongside the transformations noted within the other contexts seen above, whereby changing socio-political structures encouraged a broader range of the population to adopt elite practices. In some cases at least, the adoption of ‘Christian’ rites, for instance, may have been part of the widespread process of reconstituting community identities, in attempts to maintain social stability in the face of internal and external threats and transformations.

The following section will examine modifications in burial and ritual practices of the later fourth century and after within a range of contexts across the region, with a summary and discussion of evidence at the end of each section. This will be accomplished by outlining burial and ritual practices within each civitas (as in previous chapters, beginning with the area hitherto commonly seen as most the ‘Romanised’, and finishing with that generally believed to have been most ‘unromanised’), and end with a regional summary and discussion of the evidence. Thus, the Dobunnic civitas again provides an index against which changes within other regions are evaluated. This approach will enable the changing significance of specific contexts and practices to be explored, and will highlight transformations to cultural and social identities. Discussion of these
transformations will take into account the political and economic changes outlined in Chapter 4, to explore the significance of both internal and external changes upon behaviour and identities.

SUMMARY OF MID FOURTH CENTURY BURIAL AND RITUAL PRACTICES IN SOUTHWEST BRITAIN

Two overlapping traditions have been identified through statistical analyses within Southern Britain in the later Roman period (Petts 2003), with spatial segregation between the two distinct rites often evident in urban and suburban contexts. These rites are found across much the Southwest region, although change over time is evident. Inhumation is the prime method of burial for both traditions, and had been adopted throughout the Roman period within the Southwest region. Cremation, only found within the first tradition, had formerly been common in most areas of the Empire (though was relatively uncommon in Southwest Britain), but was in decline during the third century.

---

227 Dr. David Petts (University of Durham) ‘Burial in Western Britain AD400-800: Late Antique or Early Medieval. Debating Late Antiquity in Britain AD300-700’ Conference, York, 14-15 June 2003
228 Christian *areae* consisted of separate plots in which pagan burials were excluded, to avoid spiritual interaction (and pollution) between Christians and pagans (Green 1977: 46, 47).
The first rite is attested by clusters of graves, or sporadic burials (sometimes inter-cutting one another), which may have various alignments, but are often aligned NS, upon topographical features, or sometimes upon buildings (e.g. see fig. 6.1). Skeletons are commonly slightly flexed, though are sometimes extended or crouched, and occasionally exhibit ‘aberrant’ practices (such as decapitation or prone placement). These graves are commonly found within extra-mural urban roadside cemeteries, or often in either rural or sub-urban cemeteries of family plots. Within such cemeteries, each cluster potentially represents a distinct family plot, or burial club. Graves were primarily dug into the ground surface, and were rarely by this time accompanied by markers, although some special graves are known. Burials were frequently accompanied by grave goods (such as vessels, hobnails and jewellery, and coins – possibly representing ‘Charon’s Fee’, if found around the mouth area), suggesting to some that these burials should be seen as pagan, or at least non-Christian. The first set of practices was initially more common, but as the century progressed, increasingly gave way to the second rite.

The second group of practices are generally found within organised cemeteries of rows of graves commonly aligned WE, and with little intercutting (e.g. see fig. 6.2). Burials are primarily extended and supine, and few are accompanied by grave goods, although a restricted range of items (such as particular ceramics - commonly BB1 or its imitations, and fine red wares) are sometimes found within grave fills, perhaps indicative of graveside ritual. Coffin burial was not uncommon, but graves
without coffins were more usual, with cists and stone-lined graves frequently found. Status was therefore generally marked by the commissioning of elaborate coffins or tombs (in the form of mausolea or mortuary enclosures), or occasionally by grave markers, marking the location of the grave within the cemetery or wider landscape, and possibly through ostentatious funerals, instead of grave goods (Philpott 1991: 227).

These rites are recognisable across the Western Empire, and have long been claimed to represent the Christian burial rite (see below). In particular, WE orientation is seen as indicative of Christian belief, considering that in early State Christianity, the association of God with sun-cults perhaps emphasised the belief that resurrection would come from the East (Green 1977: 47). It has therefore been argued that WE orientation was adopted during the fourth century as an incorporation of pagan burial rites – perhaps earlier Roman solar cults - into Christian burial practice (Philpott 1991: 1; Rahtz 1977: 54).

This interpretation is influenced by the homogenous nature of these burial practices across a wide area. Their occurrence within managed cemeteries suggests corporate control. It has been argued that the only group with the desire and ideology to prescribe burial rites in such a way during this time was the Church (Petts 2003). However, at this time, the position of the Church was that funerary rites were private and the concern of the family: it was not until a much later date that it began to involve itself in burials (Dierkens and Périn 1997: 94).

It is therefore suggested that, whilst this rite may have marked adherence to the Christian belief system for some communities, its spread may largely be related to patronage relationships. Local Christian elites were, as we shall see, few in number in the Southwest during the later Roman period, but may have established burial grounds for their dependent communities. This may be inferred from Continental comparisons, and by the presence of focal graves. In this scenario, elites may have effectively imposed rites upon those community members who had either no strong ‘pagan’ beliefs, or no objection to such a change, seeing no contradiction between these rites and their own beliefs. These changing practices therefore may indicate engagement within a Roman cultural framework that was under renegotiation.

---

229 Cist burials were found on rural sites within this region, including Lower Slaughter, Upper Slaughter, Temple Guiting, and Nettleton - cutting third century levels (one burial with a coin of AD 337-341) (Philpott 1991: 62, 63, 82).

230 Belief in a Roman solar cult is perhaps indicated in the region by, for example, the wheel pendant at Barnsley Park, Gloucester (Webster and Smith 1982: fig. 30: 90).

231 Dr. David Petts (Durham) ‘Burial in Western Britain AD 400-800: Late Antique or Early Medieval’, Debating Late Antiquity in Britain AD 300-700 Conference, York. 14-15 June 2003.

232 The creation of organised and managed cemeteries might indicate municipal rather than church control of amenities (Philpott 1991: 227). At Poundbury, for example, the contemporaneous main and peripheral cemeteries demonstrate different burial practices and levels of organisation (Farwell and Molleson 1993). It has been demonstrated that ‘managed cemeteries’ actually wasted space, rather than conserved it, thus rendering a functional motivation for urban planning unlikely: Christopher Sparey-Green (Canterbury Archaeological Trust) ‘Living amongst the Dead- from Roman Cemetery to sub-Roman settlement at Poundbury’, Debating Late Antiquity in Britain AD 300-700 Conference, York. 14-15.
The range of burial and ritual contexts will now be considered on a *civitas* by *civitas* basis, to determine the extent to which changing practices may have been related to or incorporated within regional identities.

**BURIAL AND RITUAL PRACTICES IN SOUTHWEST BRITAIN, C. AD 350-450**

**URBAN AND SUB-URBAN BURIAL AND RITUAL**

**DOBUNNIC CIVITAS**

Many established cemeteries continued to develop into the late fourth century (and perhaps in a small number of cases, after the fourth century). The main cemetery at Cirencester (the ‘Querns’), containing over 450 burials, was located beside the Fosse Way (between the city walls and the amphitheatre) outside the Western Bath Gate (fig. 6.3), and was founded during the late third or early fourth century (McWhirr *et al.* 1982). The large number of graves suggests that the cemetery served the Cirencester community and beyond. These numbers may also reflect the extended use of this site for burial into the fifth century, considering that one burial overlay an Honorian *siliqua* (*ibid.* 127). However, sporadic burials, such as the two bodies discovered within the silted ditch of Ermine Street, suggest that after the removal of State control (presumably accompanied by decline in urban administration) burial was of a more haphazard nature.

Most burials within this cemetery were inhumations, with graves dug directly into the ground surface. Stone-lined graves were also common, although often partial (Green 1982: 67), with a concern to cover, frame, or support the face. Stone- or slab-lined graves often utilised building materials from adjacent sites, mirroring behaviour on the Continent. There were also a small number of cremations. One had been placed under an inverted urn, and another within an upright urn covered by a slab (McWhirr *et al.* 1982). The urns (both black burnished ware) were placed within shallow pits cut into the limestone bedrock (*ibid.*). Another cremation was placed within a hollowed late first century stone column shaft, although the deposition of this burial appears to have been much later (*ibid.* 31; 109).

---

233 Other burials were contemporaneous with an apparently post-Roman wall in area CT near the Querns site, where shell tempered pottery was found near the ditch and graves 720-1, 729-735. This pottery was, however, perhaps from the plough soil, and thus of limited use for dating a later phase of the cemetery: none was found stratified over the upper levels of the rest of the site (McWhirr *et al.* 1982: 116; 117).

234 Cylindrical hollowed blocks (representing Philpott’s type 2 category of cremation containers) are comparable to early examples from *Galla Narboniensis* (Philpott 1991: 7).
Various grave alignments were adopted, and field boundaries may have had some influence, their direction sometimes perhaps facilitating or causing NS alignment, (fig. 6.4, blue circle). Burials clusters (fig. 6.4, green circles), and inconsistently aligned burials (fig. 6.4, red circles), suggest the continued organisation of burial by social or family groupings (or burial clubs) during the later fourth century.\textsuperscript{235}

It might be supposed that the reference to the four British provincial Bishops attending the Council of Arles in AD 314 implies the location of a ‘cathedral’ in Corinium during the fourth century, but there is currently little archaeological evidence for the presence of a Christian community within the town at this time.\textsuperscript{236} Gloucester is in fact the only urban centre within the Southwest region for which a sub-Roman Episcopal Church has been proposed (Dark 1994: 38), and even this remains far from certain (Watts 1991: 228). The fact that the later Episcopal See was located at Worcester (fig. 6.5), to the north of the territory, perhaps suggests that there was no central Christian site in Cirencester itself during and after the fourth century.

\textsuperscript{235} Burial clubs essentially fulfilled the role of kin groups in the ceremonial remembrance of the deceased (Salway 1981: 695).

\textsuperscript{236} The acrostic scratched into wall plaster of a house in Victoria Road (Snyder 1998: 212) is of dubious significance regarding evidence for Christian belief, and may belong to the early rather than late Roman period (Wacher 1997: 311).
Figure 6.4 Burial groups at Bath Gate cemetery (McWhirr 1982: 72)
The dearth of WE burials suggests a possible rejection of the ‘Christian’ burial rites that were now rapidly spreading across the Empire. This apparent adherence to Roman pagan beliefs and practices (at least by administrative elites who may have had some control over burial) is perhaps demonstrated by the restoration of the Jupiter column in the provincial capital of Cirencester (Green 1986: 64; Boon 1982: 40).

These burials do not represent a cross-section of society: rather, there is a preponderance of male inhumations. Some have interpreted this as evidence of a community of veterans (McWhirr et al. 1982: 109). The age of death peaks in the c. 35+ age group, which might support this interpretation, although, alternatively the burials may be of those who had attained a sufficiently high status position within the civil service.237

---

237 However, this bias might as equally represent higher survival rates for men than women within this community, or socio-cultural restrictions relating to status placed upon the burial of women on this site.
Although the vast majority of burials were inhumations by the late fourth century, the occasional cremation has been found at Gloucester that might be dated to the later Roman period. A similar cremation to that at Cirencester, placed within an architectural fragment, has been discovered within the town. Several late cemeteries have been excavated around Kingsholm, close to the early Roman fort on the edge of the *colonia*. A significant sub-urban cemetery was discovered at Kingsholm Road, where the burial of a male that had been cut into a later Roman *mausoleum* on this site (fig. 6.6), accompanied by grave goods that possibly had ‘Gothic’ military associations, was discussed in Chapter 4 (see *Auxiliaries and Foederati*; figs. 4.18; see also Brown 1975). The burial practices adopted probably emphasised a multitude of identities, including masculinity; elite status; militarism; perhaps allegiance to the Roman world; and probably ethnic identity, asserting origins in Eastern Europe. Burials within this cemetery, which most probably began during the fourth century, were aligned EW, and contained few grave goods (see Frere 1984: 314-15; Hurst 1985). This site was a later Roman extension to the earlier cemetery at Gambier Parry Gardens, which contained hundreds of graves (including military burials), of ‘pagan’ type (see Frere 1984: 315; see Chapter 3).

Figure 6.6 Fifth century grave, Kingsholm, cut into earlier *mausoleum* (Hurst 1985, Pl 6a)
The alignment of graves in this cemetery does not by itself indicate Christian belief (see above), and the presence of grave goods within this focal grave (including a knife, and possible 'military' accoutrements, see Chapter 4) perhaps argues against such an interpretation. However, the rites in this cemetery do mark a change from previous practices, which suggests the adoption of new ideologies; and it is possible that for some, these rites did represent their Christian beliefs, and membership of a Christian community. The *colonia* status of this town (and probably the presence of veterans in the area), make it is possible that this particular cemetery served a nearby Christian community (considering the importance of Christianisation within the army, see Petts 2003: 168), rather than representing a civic burial ground established by a Christian member of the local elite.

It has been suggested that the inter-mural burials at the Tiley site in Gloucester might indicate the presence of a Christian centre, particularly considering the construction of the Church of St. Oswald over the cemetery, but this is no more than a tentative conjecture (Dark 2000: 106; Herbert 1988). Evidence of Christian practices has been found at Bourton-on-the-Water – a site easily accessible from the Fosse Way - in the form of two probable baptismal tanks (Boon 1992: 43; see Guy 1981: 273-74; see Chapter 5 and below).

**Northwest Sector of the Belgic Civitas**

As the extent of the urban defences during the Roman period are far from certain (see Cunliffe 2000: 106-10), it is difficult to determine whether burials associated with the town at Bath dating to this period might be considered as inter-mural. Remains have been found within the civic zone, close to the walled precinct of the ritual centre. For instance, the severed head of a girl was found within an oven cut into a mortar floor of a late- or post-Roman house in Abbeygate Street, Bath (*ibid.* 119-20; fig. 6.7; see Chapter 5). However, this has more the appearance of a termination ritual, or crime, than of formal inhumation (see Chapter 2).

As might be expected, more formalised burial practices occur on the periphery of the town: for example, stone coffins were found in the area of the Crescent, which probably date to after the mid fourth century.\(^{238}\) Coffins were sometimes lead-lined, as at Bathwick, and some stone sarcophagi have been found (including two sand-filled examples, again at Bathwick Hill) (*ibid.* 142). Grave alignment varied (although these particular examples were aligned NS), but an increasing tendency towards EW orientation is discernable (however, a systematic survey is required to clarify these apparent trends).

A possible mid-late fourth century mausoleum was discovered in the nineteenth century at Julian’s Road, within the town – one of several within the Northwest Belgic region (see below, *Rural burial and ritual*). Late fourth and early fifth century activity at the temple site in Bath will be discussed below (*Temples*). There is otherwise little evidence for ritual activity in association with the town.

As might be expected, numerous extra-mural cemeteries have been found in association with small towns, but no definite intra-mural adult burials have been identified. Although burials within the cemetery at Camerton mainly date to the fifth – sixth centuries (Dark 2000: 111), as most graves were oriented EW, and some contained Roman coins, at least some graves may have been associated with the Roman settlement, and therefore arguably belonged to the fourth to fifth centuries (although see Rahtz 1977: 55).

Characteristically, inhumation is the dominant burial rite by the fourth century. Although inhumation predominates, it is noted that a number of later Roman cremations are concentrated within the Northwest Belgic region (often alongside with inhumations) (see Appendix, Table 11). Though most are within rural locations (see below, *Rural burial and ritual*), urban examples are occasionally noted, as in the cemetery at Wanborough (Anderson and Wacher 1980: 119).

---


240 At *Cunetio*, the possible location of an extra-mural inhumation cemetery has been suggested by the presence of a lead coffin (Corney 1997: 346). Sporadic burials have been found outside Bath, as at Lansdown (reputedly ‘centred on the Holy Well of St Winifred’) (http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/search/fr.cfm?RCN=EHNMR-1315821). It has been suggested that the extra-mural cemetery on the Fosseway at Walcot, Bath, was dismantled during the construction of the town circuit, but there is uncertainty over the date at which the wall was constructed (Cunliffe 2000: 140; see above).
There is no definite evidence for inter-mural ecclesiastical structures within central, public spaces, as is found on the Continent. In general, there are few definite signs of Christianisation in the Northwest sector of the Belgic civitas during the later Roman period, and pagan ritual activity seemingly persists into the fifth century in the hinterland of some small towns. Although little is known about the possible small town of The Ham (Westbury, Wiltshire), this site apparently had an industrial focus, considering the nearby iron-ore deposits and evidence of metalworking (Corney 2001: 35). Possible ritual shafts are associated with the site, one containing a horse and a cow skull, and four human skulls (ibid.).

**DUROT RIGIAN CIVITAS**

As in other regions of the Southwest, burials in the Durotrigian civitas continued to be restricted to extra-mural locations during this period, with the exception of occasional infant burials – as at Colliton Park (Corney and Cox 2007: 11). As elsewhere, inhumation was the majority rite, although a number of cremations are known, for example, from the late Roman extra-mural cemetery at Alington Avenue (Philpott 1991: 54) - a site that also incorporated a number of ‘aberrant’, pagan rites. Most burials within cemeteries around the town were extended, although flexed inhumations do occur (again at Alington Avenue cemetery); and a crouched burial was found at Maiden Castle Road cemetery, contained within a circular grave enclosure (Philpott 1991: 72, 77, 78, 82; Woodward 1993: 222; 227, 235). Most burials were placed within simple dug graves, although in the Crown Buildings cemetery (by the West Gate of Dorchester), a central plaster-packed burial in a lead-lined coffin formed the focus for the surrounding EW aligned graves (Green 1982 ibid. 68, 69). A particular effort had been made to protect the corpse (ibid.).

The largest extra-mural cemeteries associated with Dorchester lie within the Iron Age hillfort to the northwest of the civitas capital at Poundbury. Although the location is similar to that of other hillfort cemeteries, all but the final phases of this cemetery were essentially urban, and the site probably formed the main burial ground for the town from the late third century until the end of the fourth century (Green 1996: 122; see Chapter 3). Several cemeteries coexisted at this site during the

---

241 Inter-mural ritual shafts have been recognised elsewhere within the South, 50 miles away at Calleva Atrebatum (Fulford 2001).
242 Aberrant burials include, two decapitated skeletons buried near a ‘dwarf’ in the cemetery at Alington Avenue: one had lost the right arm, had a damaged lower left arm, and was accompanied by a decapitated dog placed across the legs (Philpott 1991: 72, 77, 78, 82; Woodward 1993: 227). These burials arguably reflect the (non-Christian) beliefs and anxieties of the mourners, indicating attempts to ease safe passage to the ‘Otherworld’.
243 Maiden Castle Road cemetery also contained a decapitated skeleton with a dislocated spine and a mutilated left arm (Philpott 1991: 72, 77, 78, 82).
244 A metalled surface demonstrates links with the town to the East (Green 1996: 130; 1988: 66).
late Roman period (fig. 6.8) and are believed to represent distinct ‘Christian’ and ‘pagan’ communities (ibid. 145, 148).

Figure 6.8 Poundbury late Roman cemeteries (from Farwell and Molleson 1993, fig. 33)

Copyright image
The cemetery on the Eastern Periphery of the site (fig. 6.9) contained 90 burials (including three cremations), placed within small and tightly packed graves, mostly oriented SN, with 15 burials accompanied by grave goods (Farwell and Molleson 1993: 14). Clusters, surrounded by space, were apparent within this sector, and have suggested the organisation of burials within family or other groupings, such as burial around focal graves (ibid. 24; fig. 6.9, red circles). Burials were predominantly placed in wooden coffins, although there were two cist graves, one lined with limestone roof tiles, replicating Mediterranean practices (ibid. 19). A grave within this cemetery contained a Colchester derivative brooch (fig. 6.10A) dated to c. 20BC – 20 AD, at the right knee of a 30-year-old female (Farwell and Molleson 1993: 84; fig. 6.11), demonstrating the placement of 'heirlooms' or 'antiques' within graves during the later Roman period.
The Northern Periphery cemetery contained 36 WE and SN oriented inhumations, aligned within and on the boundaries of the settlement enclosure (fig. 6.12), frequently overlying earlier occupational deposits and features (see Chapters 2 and 3). Burials were regularly interred within wooden coffins, and two-thirds of burials in this area were accompanied by grave goods, including hobnails in the area of the feet (*ibid.* 14). ‘Heirlooms’ are again found, including a head-stud brooch (fig. 6.10B), dating to AD 60 – 80 (similar to an example found at Kingsdown Camp, Mells, Somerset), which was placed at the left shoulder a 7-year-old child (Farwell and Molleson 1993: 84; fig. 6.13).

Site C (fig. 6.14), to the southeast of the Main Cemetery (see fig. 6.9) contained 101 extended graves, with a relatively high number of child burials (Farwell and Molleson 1993: 14-5). Burials were mainly (but approximately) oriented WE. However, whilst some may see this as indicative of ‘Christian’ rites, it should be noted that burials were aligned with pre-existing enclosures, and grave goods accompanied thirteen of the 91 burials, with a higher number of finds within the grave-fills than elsewhere on the site (*ibid.* 16).245 This may indicate the complex renegotiation of ideologies and practices at this time, perhaps incorporating a number of contradictions.

245 This number of grave goods is lower than for the graves of the Northern and Eastern Peripheral cemeteries, but more than three times that for the Main Cemetery (Farwell and Molleson 1993: 16). Although the high number of finds
The majority of the burials were placed within coffins. Stone-lined graves were relatively common, but it has been suggested that this may be fortuitous, representing the ‘tidy disposal of masonry rubble’ from earlier masonry structures (ibid. 15). However, bearing in mind the significance of burial rites in the expression of identities (and the incorporation of spolia within graves and ritual contexts noted elsewhere, see below), the deliberate incorporation of this material as part of the burial rite is perhaps more likely. Evidence for Continental or Mediterranean influence can perhaps be seen in the deliberate covering of children’s graves with tegulae and rough shale slabs obtained from adjacent building remains, and in a possible cairn of flints placed over the body of a dismembered infant (Farwell and Molleson 1993: 15, 16, 19).

within the fills has been put down to burial in proximity to buildings of the earlier settlement, the deliberate deposition of finds cannot be ruled out.
‘Antique’ copper alloy brooches were also associated with burials in the eastern sector of site C. Again, a first-second century Colchester derivative (fig. 6.10C) was deposited, in this instance placed between the right elbow and pelvis of a 30-year-old male buried, as if worn at the waist (Farwell and Molleson 1993: 87; fig. 6.15). This position may replicate practices witnessed in the LPRIA within the region (see Chapter 2), and perhaps indicates a regional costume, or a regional methods of wearing traditional Roman dress (i.e. the toga).

Conflict between those who controlled burial practices within the public domain, and those who prepared the deceased for burial, may be reflected in the apparent concealment of grave goods: jewellery was found beneath the head of one skeleton (Green 1982: 70), and a spindle whorl concealed behind the head of an elderly woman (Farwell and Molleson 1993, Table 7). This behaviour may reflect a disparity of belief and practices within families, or between families and Christian or civic leaders, arguably indicating the construction of separate public and private identities.

246 However, it has been noted (Ross 1999: 69, 71) that where brooches are found in unusual positions within the grave, they may have sinister or supernatural associations with the Otherworld, such as the brooch found at the knee of a pre-Roman ‘priestly’ burial at Deal, Kent, for example (Aldhouse Green 2001: 182; see Chapter 2).
Figure 6.14 Site C Periphery cemetery, Poundbury (Farwell and Molleson 1993, fig. 11)

Figure 6.15 Location of early Roman brooch at waist of late Roman burial, Site C, Poundbury (after Farwell and Molleson 1993, fig. 16)
The Main (i.e. largest) cemetery at Poundbury contained 1114 predominantly extended, EW oriented burials, with few grave goods (ibid. 14). This site was established during the first quarter of the fourth century, and continued in use until the late fourth century (Green 1996: 129). Although some burials cut earlier domestic structures, there was little intercutting of graves (Farwell and Molleson 1993: 16). Graves were organised into NS rows (defined by two enclosures), rather than being arranged in family plots, as in the ‘peripheral’ cemeteries (ibid. 14). The combination of these factors has led to the widely accepted suggestion that this should be seen as a Christian cemetery, but again, we may be seeing the beliefs of those responsible for organising this cemetery, more than the beliefs of the majority interred within this locale. Several grave enclosures within this cemetery, including seven subterranean mausolea (each containing several burials), formed the foci for further graves (Farwell and Molleson 1993: xii; Green 1982; 1996: 129, 148), suggesting the influence of patronage ties. Although genetic traits demonstrate biological associations between those interred within and outside mausolea, relatives were widely distributed across the cemetery, and did not in general focus upon these special graves, suggesting a gravitation of non-kin around these high status features.247

In one mausoleum, a coin (pierced, perhaps for suspension within the tomb) inscribed with a chi-rho design suggests a Christian significance for this feature (Farwell and Molleson 1993: 89; Woodward 1993: 236). Images of the Imperial city may have decorated the interior of another mausoleum, and together with chi-rho motifs, support its identification as a ‘Christian’ tomb (Green 1996: 129, 148).248 The worn floors of this mausoleum, and a worn path leading to it have suggested to some the development of this feature as a Christian memorium (Farwell and Molleson 1993: 89; Green 1982: 68, 85; 1988: 151; 1996: 85). At the east end of this structure, a spread of late Roman pottery and glass may indicate food preparation for rituals such as the cena graveside feasts (Green 1982: 83, 73; 1977: 47). It is sometimes proposed that these mausolea developed as martyria churches similar to the probable church at Icklingham (Green 1982: 68, 73; see Chapter 3).249

247 Individuals belonging to the same family (identified by a distinctive pronounced jaw) were buried within a mausoleum, and within a plain unenclosed coffin (Woodward 1993: 235); both burials were approached by paths branching from the main path (Green 1988: 90). In mausoleum R8, a portrait found on the interior wall is thought to represent the deceased. The foremost figure (painted with a pronounced jaw) bore resemblance to a skeleton with a projected jaw-line buried within the tomb; a similar facial type was also recognised in mausoleum R7 (Farwell and Molleson 1993: 146).


249 Ibid.
The area around Dorchester has perhaps yielded more potential items of Christian symbolism than anywhere else in the Southwest (although the collection is still small). Stray finds from the town centre (concentrated within the Southwest quadrant) include a spoon decorated with an ‘icthus’ (Christian ‘fish’ symbol) (Cooke 2008: 8), which may suggest the presence of a small Christian community in this area.

It has been argued that these two Poundbury mausolea burials (and perhaps those in the other mausolea at this site) were those of either clergy or the curiales class - particularly since there were traces of purple and gold threads within the graves (Green 1982). This occurrence of purple fabric within mausolea at Poundbury perhaps demonstrates imperial aspirations, if not actual political status (see Ammianus Marcellinus 26.8.8). Comparison with Continental evidence supports suggestions that these monuments contain the burials of high-ranking officials and their families, or at least wealthy individuals asserting a cultural identity via association with imperial elites.250 This may be confirmed by a wall painting within one Poundbury mausoleum (fig. 6.16), depicting several figures, perhaps representing the male occupants of the tomb. Apparently wearing the costume of civic dignitaries, they carried rods, possibly as insignia of office (ibid. 66).

Figure 6.16 Wall painting, Poundbury mausoleum R8 (Pearce 2004, fig. 43)

250 The Theodosian Law Codes restricted certain shades of purple for the Imperial family or clergy (Croom 2000: 25), but the evident need to affirm this law within the Edicts may imply its common disregard. Therefore, the presence of such garments in the Poundbury mausolea may suggest illegal imperial emulation. Analysis of the dyes used on this particular fabric might determine whether the surviving hue represents use of the Imperial purple dye, or its imitation (see Harris 2003).
As well as *mausolea*, several funerary enclosures dating to the late Roman period or after have been recognised within a Western peripheral zone of the cemetery (fig. 6.17). Features R4 and R6 had signs of a superstructure, fence, or timber revetment for a mound, whilst the partially excavated R5 also contained stakeholes and a possible doorway (Farwell and Molleson 1993: 50; Woodward 1993: 235). Comparable graves are found both in Wales and Eastern Scotland, and to the east, at Lankhills (see Clark 1979), although it was seen in Chapter 2 that similar graves might also be recognised during the LPRIA within Southwest Britain, as at Leckhampton Hill (Cotswolds) (see Chapter 2, fig. 2.26).

The location of the ditched enclosure graves at Poundbury beyond the limits of the Main Cemetery, to the south and southwest of the *mausolea* (see fig. 6.8, above), may indicate their later date. Post-Roman use of the cemetery is perhaps evident in the scatter of over one hundred shallow graves, without coffins, and mostly without grave goods, perhaps contemporaneous with nearby buildings (*ibid.* 74ff.; see fig. 5.39, above).

---

251 Comparable Welsh examples occur at Tandderwen. Both round and square examples of ditched enclosure graves have been found in eastern Scotland, as at Boysack, Burton Flemming, Lunan Valley, Garbeg, and Whitebridge (Ashmore 1980; Close-Brooks 1984).

252 It has been suggested that late- or post-Roman enclosure graves found at Tandderwen, Clwyd, are comparable with the earlier ‘Arras’ type graves found during the first century BC in Yorkshire, and as such represent an intrusive form (James 1992). One grave was dated to AD 433–680 (Pearce 2004: 148). This form continued into the Late Iron Age (and into the British Roman period), in the form of ring-barrows (O’Brien 1999: 130), although no square or rectangular enclosures of this type have been recorded (*ibid*), perhaps negating the direct influence of ‘Arras’ graves.
No intramural burials have been identified within the other towns of the Durotrigian region, although several suburban cemeteries were established during the later Roman period. At Ilchester (Somerset), several such sites were associated with previous areas of occupation, demonstrating transformation of the sub-urban, as well as urban, landscapes. The largest cemetery was located at Northover, behind the Western suburban building fronts along the Fosse Way, consisting of over 1500 burials, with a TPQ of AD 367-75 (Leach 1994: 10; fig. 6.18). Of the excavated sample, most burials were aligned ESE-WNW, with heads to the West, with three burials found in stone coffins, and some in lead coffins, leading the excavator to propose this as a possible Christian cemetery (Leach 1982: 11; 1994: 10, 97).

Figure 6.18 Northover cemetery, Ilchester (Leach 1994, fig. 27)

253 Graves encroached beyond the Western boundary into the previously occupied area in the later period (Leach 1994: 97).
254 Most burials were buried either in shallow graves or within wooden coffins or limestone cists (Leach 1994: 98).
The fourth century Little Spittle cemetery (also in a suburb of Ilchester) contained at least 42 inhumations aligned NW-SE or NE-SW, placed within two inner enclosures, and representing a demographic cross section (Leach 1982: 11, 12, 86; fig. 6.19). The rural practice of placing family burial plots in alignment with pre-existing agricultural enclosures seems to have been adopted. Grave goods were found, and arguably indicate the continuity of pagan beliefs, as might the possibly contemporaneous deposition of second century (potentially votive) objects, perhaps as termination deposits, within a nearby well (ibid.). Such ‘ritualisation’ of a previously agricultural site had the potential to solidify community identities. As at Poundbury, some grave goods were possibly concealed: a brooch was placed behind the head of a female, and a knife placed within the shroud of a burial (Leach 1982), which may again reflect disparity between individual and corporate beliefs. Graveside ritual might be seen in the patch of burning that lay adjacent to the coffin burial of a male aged 20-25, accompanied by hobnails, (ibid. 88), which may relate to the feasts commonly taken on the birthdays of the deceased or at special festivals - when libations were often made to placate the spirits of the dead (MacDonald 1977: 36).

Where ceramics are also found, such remains may therefore represent the use of wine as part of a purification ritual in some cases (Salway 1981: 704).

Townsend Close cemetery (fig. 6.20), again outside Ilchester, and possibly contemporaneous with the Little Spittle and Northover cemeteries, also appropriated agricultural boundaries to enclose the burial ground (Leach 1982: 86). Most skeletons were extended and aligned NE-SW, although there was also one crouched and one flexed inhumation. Seven of the burials had coffins, but none were placed within a cist. Few grave goods were found, although chicken bones accompanied several bodies, and in two instances, boots had been placed beside the corpse, rather than in the customary position at the feet (ibid. 102). Again, the burial practices seem to indicate ‘pagan’ beliefs. There was a predominance of male burials (ibid. 12).

---

255 Eight inhumations – that included child, but not infant, burials (although one burial was accompanied by infant skull fragments) - were interred within coffins, and although most burials were extended and supine, six were prone, and three were decapitations (Leach 1982: 11, 12, 86).
256 Grave goods included coins in the mouth, iron knives, and hobnails, with one example accompanied by chicken bones. A coffin burial (grave 16) contained a female, aged 22-30, and Black Burnished ware; animal bones accompanied the decapitated female (aged 25-30) in grave 3; and a sheep jaw and the forelimb of a horse was found with a prone burial (ibid. 102; 86).
257 Studies of the range and position of grave goods suggest that worn jewellery may indicate status, with clothing reflecting wealth or social position in life (Woodward 1993: 226). However, unworn items - such as hobnailed boots and animal bones (as seen in the periphery cemeteries, and the nearby Alington Avenue cemetery) - represent useable goods for the afterlife, or offerings to the Gods (ibid.).
258 The Roman calendar had a number of festivals of ancestor worship including Paternalia in February, Lemuria, and Rosalia, in May, when living relatives would visit the tombs of their dead (Henig 1984: 191, 168).
259 A female aged 25-35 interred within a wooden coffin was accompanied by broken Black Burnished ware, a brooch pin, and animal bones (Leach 1982: 12).
260 However, the burials of females and small children are noted (Leach 1982: 86). Of the fifteen burials, nine are male, three are female, and at least two infant burials have been recognised.
There may have been intra-mural burial at Shepton Mallet (Gathercole 2003: 8). Burial practices are otherwise similar to those at other towns within the region, with two smaller cemeteries of ‘pagan’ NS aligned graves (associated with family groups or properties – as at Ilchester), and one larger cemetery of primarily EW burials within rock-cut graves, often containing coffins. A *mausoleum* surrounded by a timber structure was identified within the Eastern ‘pagan’ cemetery, containing two NS aligned graves (Heighway 1987: 10; O’Brien 1999: 19). Within the *mausoleum*, a male buried in a stone coffin was accompanied by one of the few crossbow brooches from the region (see Chapter 4) (Heighway 1987: 10). Continuity of this cemetery into and beyond the fifth century is suggested by radiocarbon dates (Leach 2009: 61).²⁶¹ A further *mausoleum* was found at Wells (Rodwell 1982).

**D U M N O N I A N C I V I T A S**

No definite extra-mural cemeteries have been discovered around Exeter (Todd 1981: 156). On the other hand, intramural burials were found, aligned with the street and possibly *basilica*, within the *forum* (Pearce 2004: 130; fig. 6.21). Radiocarbon dates indicate that at least one burial may date to the early fifth century (*ibid.*). This burial location has not been found at other Southwestern *civitas* centres (such as Dorchester and Cirencester), although it is found on the Continent (e.g. San Nazaro, Milan, see Elsner 1998: 231), arguably demonstrating a source of cultural influence. Burial practices suggest the adoption of Christian ideologies (at least by those who managed these burials), and considering their location within the area of a later Anglo-Saxon monastery (Bidwell 1980: 87-8), perhaps indicate the presence of a Christian community (and possible church) within

---

²⁶¹ However, the supposedly late fourth century chi-rho monogram pendant previously used to support this date, and referred to by Peter Leach within his earlier reports on the site, has now been demonstrated as a hoax (Minnitt 2008).
the town centre during and after the fifth century. The presence of a chi-rho monogram, roughly inscribed on the base of a BBI sherd, perhaps supports this assumption. Such burials were related to both the changing role of the city in its appropriation by the Church during the fifth century, and changing attitudes in relation to the polluting qualities of burials.

BURIAL AND RITUAL IN ASSOCIATION WITH URBAN CONTEXTS:
DISCUSSION

Across much of the Southwest, although some Christian burials occur, these are relatively uncommon at this date, and the ‘pagan’ burial rite remains dominant for some time yet, even at sites associated with urban contexts. Inhumation remained the predominant rite, although some late cremations are known (mainly, but not only, from urban contexts, see below, *Rural burial and ritual*), particularly within the Dobunnic and Northwest Belgic regions. According to Macrobius, by the end of the fourth century the practice was no longer undertaken in Rome (Nock 1932: 324). It therefore seems unlikely that this rite signifies the burial of administrative elites coming into the region, though it may still be intrusive. It might instead be related to the influence of Irish or Germanic auxiliaries stationed in towns. However, there is no correlation between the distribution of military buckles and later Roman cremations (fig. 6.22). Considering the heterogenous populations that might be anticipated within an urban context, it is difficult to be sure of the influences behind this rite; study of such behaviour within rural locations may be more informative (see below, *Burial and ritual within other rural contexts*).
There is a possibility that those who adopted cremation saw it as an archaic ritual that signified stability. This theory is arguably supported by several examples from different sites (primarily within the Dobunnic civitas) found in association with reused Graeco-Roman style architectural fragments. The use of tegulae within inhumation graves may parallel this activity, as at Poundbury. Such acts of spolia occur on the Continent, and are clearly significant with regard to identity. It might be suggested that this behaviour indicates attempts to reconstitute social memories and identities within a process of ‘forgetting’ - literally putting the old order to rest.

![Figure 6.22 Cremations (black= rhombus. Probable late examples = red rhombus) in relation to towns and ‘military’ buckles (blue dot) (Map: author)](image)

Other features of ‘pagan’ burial have been seen as indicative of ‘nativism’. Some (e.g. O’Brien 1999: 5) have proposed that NS alignment indicates survival of pre-Roman practice, perhaps deliberately re-asserting non-Roman forms of burial in opposition to imperial control, as acts of ‘nativism’. This approach is somewhat one-dimensional, as the occurrence of the NS rite across Northern Europe (see Chapter 2; Todd 1977: 39) and the fact that features of these graves parallel those seen within Mediterranean regions must be taken into consideration.\(^{262}\) Another, stronger objection to this hypothesis may be that this rite was not dominant, and that graves seem to be more commonly aligned upon (and in some cases inserted into) existing earthworks (Viner and Leach 1982: 101). This association perhaps reflects deep ties with the local landscape, associated in some cases with tenure claims, but in others providing a tangible expression of place, enabling the recreation of mythologies that constituted local communities and kinship groups. Likewise, the

\(^{262}\) However, it remains possible that this rite was appropriated by subalterns, rejecting (and thus in opposition to) the dominant culture of the Imperial elite.
presence of hobnailed sandals or boots has been suggested as representing particularly indigenous beliefs (Watts 1991: 212), but again these rites are found elsewhere during the late Roman period, commonly along the Rhine and Danube, and as far away as Turkey (Goldman 2006: 18).

Chapters 4 and 5 argued that Roman symbols of power continued to be used into the fifth century within settlement and military contexts. Some burial and ritual practices may have therefore demonstrated the assertion of ties with the ancestral past, with depositions used to create new orders out of old (see Rowlands 1993: 147, 148, 149). Architectural fragments tangibly re-presented the ancestral past upon which society increasingly depended to provide structure and stability, as well as protection. This material had for several centuries acted as a public mnemonic for imperial power, but with State fragmentation and collapse, became appropriate objects to accompany the dead to the ancestral Otherworld. Individual kinship groups might call upon the power of the Roman past in asserting the legitimacy of their position within the new society. Funerary ritual asserted relationships and affinity both within and outside the family, and reinforced the hierarchical order of society (Middleton 1982: 148). The past was ‘made sense of’ by reconstituting mythological narrative, an unbroken line between past and present providing stability, at the same time that the landscape was reconstructed both in response to, and influencing, socio-political and economic disjuncture (see Tilley 1994: 18, 22). The same process might be evident in the deposition of heirlooms within graves.

It is perhaps significant that in the Southwest during the late Roman period burials accompanied by ‘antique’ brooches were often within peripheral sectors of cemeteries. Such actions might reflect the appropriation of ancestral symbols by those on the social periphery attempting to develop alternative forms of power, possibly in the assertion of lineage. Personal ornaments, and ceramics perhaps symbolic of ‘civilised’ behaviour (such as Samian and its imitations), from the early Roman past were frequently selected for deposition – being both familiar and ‘other’ to those who may have ‘curated’ these objects over several generations. The removal of these objects from circulation seemingly represents attempts to manipulate the Roman past in the reconstruction of community identities and the new regime, within a process of ‘forgetting’. Removal of these items from circulation might be interpreted by some as representing a possible abandonment of Romanitas by the surviving kin, although more likely represents the reconstruction of meaning for these objects within new historical conditions. Funerals were perhaps seen to transferred material fragments from the Imperial past to the material world of the dead, within a process of remembering the deceased as a product of Empire, and forgetting the remains of Empire as products of the past.

‘Curation’ of similar objects at elite sites (although not only by elites) into the sixth century (see Jarrett 1999, 2009; Rahtz et al. 1992) demonstrates their continuing significance (and that of the
Romano-British past that they embodied), beyond this transitional period. Viewed in conjunction with other contexts, this behaviour may rather be another example of attempts to control, and in some cases perpetuate or replicate, Roman symbols of power to emphasise links with early Roman period ancestors, as well as maintain status. Authority was perhaps presented as belonging to ‘an external and unchanging order’, with ancestor worship creating lineage for elites (Bloch 1982: 11, 12, 36).

Objects embodying the ‘Roman’ past were disposed of within ancestral domains, their presence in the everyday rejected, as symbols of power were reworked and controlled within new elite discourses. Although their meanings were subject to transformation as each specific context changed - whether historically or socially - these manifestations of the past had previously structured the replication of social identities, but as the social system embodied by these objects collapsed, their meaning had to be given relevance within alternative structures of power. Discard removed barriers to reconstruction of the past, and renegotiation of social memories, enabling the regeneration of local landscapes and communities. Artefacts, that had long maintained social order through perpetuation of a social structure imposed and accommodated during the early Roman period, were necessarily destroyed, or ‘remembered’ by their absence, to remove their potential as aide-memoires for the old order (see Rowlands 1993: 145) in the reconstruction of identities.

Mediterranean (specifically North African) rituals such as the graveside feast may also demonstrate access to elite ‘Roman’ culture, displaying engagement in the Roman world (perhaps in relation to professional identity), prestige, and social position. Graveside feasts, which would have ensured continuity of memory surrounding the deceased, emphasised the status of the kin within the community. The repetitive act of attending the grave, and remembering the deceased and their position in the world of the living, may have secured the status of the surviving kin, and may demonstrate the increasing significance of ancestral cults. Such cults of the dead are frequently used to render communities and political society eternal, but may have also supported the continuity of ‘Roman’ practices as effective mechanisms by which to display power and status. Regular ceremonies might have also helped in the construction of community identities centred upon prominent families, encouraging the continued focality of special graves.

However, this practice does not necessarily indicate pagan beliefs, as such rites became incorporated within Christian traditions. Although initially a pagan rite condemned in Tertullian (Apologeticus 39), the cena was soon incorporated within Christian ideology, possibly reinterpreted as a symbolic last meal (mirroring the ‘Last Supper’ of Christ), perhaps with the surface of the grave acting as a mensa or table (Bullough 1983: 188; Thomas 1994: 205, 208, n31). Recreating this and other rituals, and translating them as Christian rites, would have demonstrated power during a time of apparent fragmentation and change.
Prolonged use of pagan rites may suggest either an innate conservatism, or perhaps deliberate opposition to the expression of Christian identity. Notwithstanding the general prevalence of ‘pagan’ burial and ritual practices across the Southwest during the later Roman period, it is probable that Christian rites gradually became more common. The relegation of non-Christian burials to peripheral locations may demonstrate the normalisation of Christian burial. Bearing in mind the dominant position of Christianity within the Roman discourse at this time, ‘pagan’ cemeteries may indicate a challenge to this discourse, indicating the development of new ways of negotiating status within changing historical conditions. ‘Peripheral’ cemeteries may have therefore been seen as places of resistance, in the construction of communities opposed to dominant structures of power centred upon (or at least incorporating) Christian belief.

By the late fourth century, burial within managed cemeteries, with few grave goods, little intercutting, and WE orientation, appears to be the majority rite at many towns of the Durotrigian region, although Roman pagan rites seemingly continued into the fifth century alongside this new burial rite (for exactly how long is unknown). ‘Christian’ cemeteries were generally distinct locales through which community identities might be constructed. However, it is recognised that the Church was not generally concerned with controlling burial rites until the seventh century on the Continent (Effros 1997). Cemetery organisation is therefore, as on the Continent, likely to have been due to local initiatives, perhaps reflecting the rise of individual secular power and control. Cemeteries were created as part of landscape reorganisation within the construction of new mythologies during this time, forming cultural foci for local communities (Tilley 1994: 2, 17, 22). Such control and exploitation is common within systems of domination (ibid. 26-27). In some cases, identity may have been centred on a shared religious belief. In other cases, adherence to a common set of practices (influenced by focal graves) may have bonded communities within patron-client relationships. The concentration of mausolea within the Main Cemetery at Poundbury might demonstrate the significance of this locale to the administrative elites of the civitas. These and other focal graves may represent the burials of the elite founders of the cemeteries (as on the Continent), with satellite burial of kin or clients reflecting the increasingly privatised nature of power and authority in Late Antiquity.263

It has been suggested by Christopher Sparey Green that the Poundbury cemetery lay within the Frampton villa estate, and that these burials represented those of an associated Christian community, on estate land given to the Church (Green 1982). The possible presence of a house

263 In Gaul, wealthy patrons often donated land, or even private cemeteries, to the Church for Christian burial, perhaps as acts of piety, and prominenti would support private chapels on their estates (Thomas 1994: 61).
church (or other form of Christian ritual centre) at Frampton is discussed below (see Burial and ritual at villas; Petts 2003). As was noted above, there is also the possibility that an early church may have developed from a decorated mausoleum at Poundbury.

However, even if this latter suggestion were true, continuity of any late fourth century Christian community (or family or individuals) associated with this cemetery into the fifth century cannot be assumed, particularly considering the form of possible fifth century rites noted at this site, which no longer appear ‘Christian’. The demise of Christian burial at this site during the fifth century is perhaps more understandable if Christian rites were instigated during the later Roman period under the influence of particular prominent individuals or kinship groups, than if these rites represent the adherence to Christian beliefs by a large community during the fourth century. If, as the burial evidence suggests, Christianity was adopted by some regional elites during the late fourth, it may be argued that this change became integrated within the construction of interlocking local, and perhaps regional, identities within the Durotrigian civitas.

There are possible indications that burials around some urban centres, such as Bath, were becoming more commonly oriented EW, and small Christian burial grounds may be found in Gloucester. It is perhaps significant that the enclaves of possible Christian communities in the region, as potentially noted from burial rites and small finds, are found at or near the civitas centres (and within the Dobunnic civitas, at Gloucester), and along the route of the Fosse Way (fig. 6.23). This distribution may demonstrate the role of the road network in spreading new ideologies (and might possibly relate to missionary activity along this road system, with a deliberate targeting of civitas centres). It might be speculated that such activity was unsuccessful at Cirencester, and that the community at Gloucester (including the military veterans) were more receptive. (If missionaries travelled by sea, they would have come to Gloucester before Cirencester).

Many sub-urban burials (particularly within Durotrigian territory) were closely associated with habitation sites, which may reflect changes in perceptions surrounding group identities around towns, in which the creation of more discrete burial grounds (as seen here) relates to the reconstruction of more localised community identities. Although few burials were intramural, it might be argued that where such burial occurred, this behaviour acted towards subverting the function of towns, as the urban landscape was recreated under the control of new structures of power. At Exeter, an (apparently small) Christian elite community may have appropriated and re-worked the Roman past in the construction of new identities, demonstrating profound ideological

264 The importance of boundaries and associated burials in the assertion of kinship has been demonstrated for early Irish society (Charles-Edwards 1989), and this may indicate a common cultural tradition between Irish and Durotrigian burial ideologies (Green 1986; Ross 1967).
changes. The corporeal remains of the select few, that would previously have been seen as polluting the consecrated urban space, were now seen as enhancing it, as on the Continent (Caseau 2001: 29, 36). Perhaps the location of this town close to maritime routes encouraged the introduction of new ideologies. However, the adoption of Christian belief may have been closely related to the transformation of cultural identities at this time, considering that towns were a significant locale for the emphasis of *Romanitas* (Loesby 2001).

![Figure 6.23 Probable ‘Christian’ cemeteries (red cross) in relation to the Fosse Way and civitas centres (Map: author)](image)

This possible assumption of a focal role for Christian worship (Dark 2000: 106-111) may have in part maintained the diocesan structure of the Church into the fifth century in this area. However, it is perhaps more likely in this predominantly rural region that Exeter continued to act as the centre of the Bishopric, under the jurisdiction of a deacon or peripatetic priest (Faulkner 2000). Conversely, the decline of the Episcopal Church may have accompanied urban decline in many regions (such as Gloucestershire), with ecclesiastical organisation transformed through the development of Bishoprics coinciding with political territories (Jones 1982) – as we see with the development of the Worcester See in the Saxon period.

A study of particular practices, alongside the supposed collection of practices that are commonly seen as Christian, demonstrates a variety of changes that may be part of wider processes, but these cannot all be assumed to belong to a unified, linear, trajectory, in which the population became Christianised. Elites in particular (and undoubtedly the non-elites also) used ritual to fit their own changing agendas, with evident regional and local variation. Some rites, though often seen as ‘Christian’, may reflect more general concerns regarding the after-life, incorporating notions of the soul that are reflected in attempts at corporeal preservation. Rites increasingly adopted across the Western Empire, such as stone-lining and the use of cists, also increasingly occur in the Southwest.
The nature of this practice, in being used within ‘Christian’ and ‘non-Christian’ cemeteries alike, may have allowed a degree of coincidence between regional and cultural identities, or at least enabled the reconstruction of local identities by incorporating aspects of the changing cultural repertoire.

Some feel that the increasing use of stone lining, or (in particular) the incidence of cist graves, represent the appropriation of pre-Roman burial traditions, and therefore represents ‘nativism’. However, cist burial and stone lining may instead represent the influence of Continental or North African rites. Stone-lined graves are found throughout the Empire, particularly within Christian North Africa (Green 1977: 49-50), but also in non-Christian areas such as Germania, seemingly reflecting a desire to preserve the corpse (as with gypsum burials, Woodward 1993: 236). They may thus be related to the creation of more individualised identities during this time, which might perhaps be particularly seen in the placement of stone slabs to cover the face. (The same influences may also have stimulated the increasing number of extended EW burials, stone sarcophagi, and lead-lined coffins.) These burials were therefore perhaps more likely to have been incorporated within the reconstruction of ‘Roman’ identity, rather than representing attempts to ‘revive’ the pre-Roman past. There is consequently little to support claims that these rites represent a distinctly ‘nativist’ movement, in opposition to the culture of the State. The situation in which post-Roman societies renegotiated their culture in relation to and through the material and practices that they had access to is likely to have been much more complex.

In the absence of grave goods (whether or not signifying Christian belief), we see the use of grave forms to create social hierarchies. Although mausolea fulfilled this role in some cemeteries, new forms of focal grave developed during the later Roman period, and in some cases may have been present within cemeteries alongside the mausoleum. The juxtaposition of alternative forms of special grave perhaps demonstrates the creation of new cultural markers to assert varying social identities at this time - particularly status. Although mausolea were generally no longer constructed after the fourth century, these new forms of enclosure grave continued to be constructed, at least into the seventh century (see Jarrett 2009).

Two types of special grave that developed at the end of the Roman period, often attracting satellite burials, were the (usually, but not always, square or rectangular) ditched-enclosure grave (which may have incorporated, or been covered by a barrow), and the (often rectangular, but also circular) cairn-enclosure grave (often surrounded by a curb of stones). The former more commonly (but not

265 Stone-lined graves were especially common during the late third-fourth century in the Elbe-Saale Basin, where the grave usually contained a male inhumation in a coffin, oriented NS, and was often accompanied by a selective range of Roman imports (Todd 1977: 40-41).
only) occurred within urban contexts (such as Poundbury), whilst the latter was more frequently found within rural contexts (such as Bradley Hill). Both have parallels from outside the region (in Northern and Western Britain, and Ireland), and circular examples may externally appear to replicate prehistoric barrows if covered with a cairn.

These new forms of focal grave have been compared with the mausolea found within Continental Christian cemeteries, implying ‘Roman’ influence. Gravestones of rectangular or square plan may have had superstructures, and (though later seen in rural locations) their more common occurrence within urban or sub-urban contexts within the Southwest may support this supposition in some cases. In addition, the presence of coins or hobnails (as at Bradley Hill), suggests the emphasis of ‘Mediterranean’ practices related to knowledge of Classical mythologies. Furthermore, late- and post-Roman enclosure-cairns and ditched enclosure graves often occur within the same regions as secondary and primary barrow burials, which may indicate their incorporation within the same ideological system.

However, graves such as the circular enclosure at Maiden Castle Road, containing a crouched burial (Woodward 1993: 235), demonstrate that not all enclosures imitate mausolea on a Mediterranean model, and that some may be more influenced by prehistoric or Irish forms of grave. The possible contemporaneity (and occasional juxtaposition) of enclosure graves and masonry mausolea (with examples known just outside the region to be of the same date) may indicate attempts by local elites to use enclosure graves to create social (and perhaps cultural) differentiation.

Ditched-enclosure graves (and to a lesser extent, cairn-enclosures) are similar to LPRIA and early Roman enclosure-barrows within the region (which replicated Continental, and perhaps in some cases, Mediterranean, forms). Some late- and post-Roman ditched-enclosure graves were constructed in areas where similar activity occurred during the LPRIA, perhaps indicating enduring traditions, whereas cairn-enclosures were more commonly found in coastal regions, perhaps suggesting influence from Ireland. Dating of the Northern and Western British, and Irish, examples is difficult, and whilst superficially earlier, it is possible that the Southwestern examples were contemporaneous with or earlier than these graves. Therefore, the presence of these grave
forms within the region may indicate cross-cultural exchange with Irish Sea regions, or emulation of Western British graves in the creation of hierarchy by Western, Northern, and Irish, societies in the adoption of ‘Roman’ burial rites. This is perhaps likely, considering the introduction to Ireland and ‘Pictland’ of extended inhumations in long-cist graves (Alcock 1992: 231) during and after the fourth century, and similar ritual activity at prehistoric monuments. Contact is also evident in the transmission of artistic styles along and between the Western coast of Britain and Eastern Ireland.269 Alternatively, this behaviour may demonstrate the ‘barbarisation’ of elite culture within the Southwest region, as witnessed on the Continent.

Figure 6.24 Primary (semi-circle) and secondary (arc) barrow, and enclosure-barrow burials. Probable late- and post-Roman (purple - labelled), (undated and early) Roman period (red), and LPRIA (green) (Map: author)

Notwithstanding the likelihood that square graves with evidence for superstructures in urban contexts may represent the appropriation of Mediterranean models in the reconstruction of new identities, enclosure graves must be considered individually. Considering the possibility of other influences, assumptions should not be made that enclosure graves per se represent the perpetuation of ‘Roman’ models (or ideas), or imitation of Continental (Christian) cella memoriae, and in particular, that they necessarily represent any continuity or reinvigoration of Romanitas. Construction in new materials may have contributed to the creation of new identities for local elites. Some enclosure graves may therefore represent a re-working of symbols of Romanitas to demonstrate social status in the renegotiation of power during and after the later fourth century. The loss of authority by local curiales to provincial officials (which might arguably be represented by radiocarbon techniques (Close-Brooks 1984: 99). Again, it is probable that the Illoughhann and Killabuonia graves date within or after the sixth century.

269 Evidence for contact can be found in contexts such as the Norrie’s Law hoard, in Fife (e.g. see Fowler 1964; Laing and Laing 1995: 105, 108, 123), demonstrating the presence in the north of metalwork, such as proto-hand pins, otherwise found predominantly in the Southwest region. Other mechanisms for the extension of these rites outside the Empire may have included the trade and exchange of metal ores, or other resources such as slaves, or possibly through undetectable social relationships such as diplomatic intermarriage.
mausolea burials) perhaps necessitated the assertion of alternative forms of power by the local aristocracy (which nonetheless appropriated ‘Roman’ symbols). It is perhaps significant that these graves (and other focal graves, such as burials within temples, see below) predominantly contained young adult males, possibly demonstrating the growing importance of this age group within an increasingly militaristic society.

RITUAL AND BURIAL ACTIVITY AT VILLA SITES

DOBUNNIC CIVITAS

Similar changes may be witnessed at villas to those seen within sub-urban and urban contexts during the early fifth century. At some sites, there seem to have been burials in close proximity to habitation. At Frocester Court, a small number of adult burials were found within the villa complex (Gracie and Price 1979: 14; fig. 6.25). Burial occurred within the villa hypocaust at Kings Weston (Boon 1950: 18), but as previously mentioned (see Chapter 4), this may not represent ‘normal’ behaviour. However, another burial was noted at the site (truncated by modern disturbance, but apparently extended), under the surface of the courtyard, close to the east wing (Boon 1993: 80) - its location perhaps similar to those at Frocester. A further grave lay approximately 823m west of the villa (at West Town Lane, Shirehampton), approximately 76 cm deep, within a 1.6 m long Bath stone coffin containing hobnails, aligned SE-NW (ibid.).

Several graves within a cemetery of at least 26 burials were dug through the structure of the probable villa at Winthill, Banwell (Somerset) (Hunt 1964; Rahtz 1968: 195; Rahtz and Fowler 1972: 198). The range of burials at villas often mirrors the expected demographic ranges of the villa settlements, which provides little support to suggestions that this activity represents that of religious communities.

There is little ritual activity at Dobunnic villas that may be dated to the late or post-Roman period with any certainty. However, the ox skulls placed within the foundation trench of a building of this date at Frocester (fig. 6.26, structure 21) probably represent a ritual foundation deposit. Although the evidence for Christian worship has received a great deal more attention than that for pagan ritual behaviour, considering the possible syncretism of ritual practices at this time (Hopkins 2000: 284; Watts 1991: 203; 208), it may be difficult to distinguish these apparently opposing religious systems archaeologically.

270 A deposit of cow skulls was also found within the ditch of an urban enclosure at Exeter, dating to the later Roman period (Bidwell 1980: 72).
Christian iconography is perhaps more recognisable within the archaeological record (but see Mawer 1995): several examples have been found at Chedworth villa, although these are unfortunately unstratified (Webster and Smith 1982: 111-112, 133-135). A chi-rho had been inscribed upon the masonry fabric of a possible baptistery, although after an initial phase of demolition, the stones upon which it was found had been inverted, in a possible act of rejection (Goodburn 1996; Webster 1983). The probable baptismal pool at Chedworth had been partly destroyed (Boon 1992: 43).

271 Finds include a piece of tile inscribed with a simple cross; a piece of building stone with an inscribed tree or palm pattern; an Oxford ware Colour Coated beaker inscribed with crosses on the base; and three sherds of Black Burnished Ware bowl (Webster and Smith 1982: 111-112, 133-135).
This destruction might be compared to the damage to a number of other baptismal tanks. It has been suggested that this phenomenon represents ‘neutralising the magic of rejected gods’ during the later fourth century, perhaps in suppression of Gnostic theology (Perring 2003: 123). Octagonal features at an aisled villa at Keynsham, near Stroud (possibly within the border zone of the Dobunnic civitas), and at Great Witcombe, have been compared to features at Holcombe and Lufton villas, which arguably represent baptisteries (Todd 2005: 309). Consequently, a possible ritual role for these sites has been suggested (see above, Villas, and below, Durotrigia; but see Henig 2006). However, the occurrence of similar features within earlier (second century) villa phases elsewhere (as at Whittington, Gloucestershire, see O’Neil 1952: 19, fig. 1), demonstrates that they need not be allocated a ritual function. The hexagonal features at Lufton, and both Keynsham and Great Witcombe, may be compared with bath complexex, and summer dining room complexes, respectively, in Continental villas (Cosh 2001: 228, 230-31; Ellis 1995: 175-76).
Stone mausolea were also found at Nettleton and at Truckle Hill (Foster 2001: 197), suggesting the adoption of mechanisms for the expression of status comparable to those found within urban contexts. The addition of late mosaics, the presence of occasional ritual artefacts, and the transformation of previously subsidiary buildings at some villa complexes (see fig. 5.19-20, above), has suggested the conversion of these sites to ritual centres during or after the later fourth century (Toynbee 1981; Walters 2001: 136-37, 142, 143). Such transformations may have facilitated their survival, although for how long is unknown. It has been considered that the nearby ritual centre at Bath may have influenced such changes (Walters 2001: 143).

Some sites (such as Littlecote) may have functioned as Christian house churches (see Petts 2003), or oratoria (private chapels), in comparison with developments seen on the Continent (Chavarría and Lewit 2004: 31, 38-9, 41). However, the symbolism may therefore as likely represent the religious affiliation of the villa owner, as the religious function of these rooms (ibid. 41). The plan fits well with dining rooms on the Continent (Ellis 1995: 174). Studies of similar features at Continental sites demonstrates that these changes are related to transformations in dining practices during the later Roman period, with the development of the trionch triclinium (Polci 2003: 86, 88; Toynbee 1981: 3). With regard to the Continent, it is argued that these transformations to dining space represents a move away from the negotiation of status through public locales, to an increasingly formalised mediation of patron-client relationships contexts within such private ceremonial space (Polci 2003: 89; see also Chavarría 2005: 550). Cosh (2001: 230-31) has alternatively suggested that, rather seeing this as a dining room, it reflects a Southwestern British
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trend (comparable with Continental practices) for elaborate bath suite complexes, the arrangement at Littlecote seen alongside those at Lufton, Low Ham, Halstock and Dewlish. Whether representing dining room or bath complex, the likely role for these rooms was in developing patronage. These changes might therefore represent late phases of secular symbolic domination, as is perhaps witnessed within the Dobunnic region (see Chapter 5), in which Mediterranean style was more extensively adopted in the emphasis of status, relating to the reconstruction of local power and identity.

Perhaps the best-known feature of this region was the recently unearthed baptistery (and arguably chapel), at the site of a unique double villa at Bradford on Avon (close to a LPRIA settlement), which as with many other wealthy villas in the Southwest was established during the mid third century. The baptistery was seemingly constructed in the fifth century, and cut through a fourth century mosaic (see Henig 2006: 106).

**Durotrigian Civitas**

It is argued that, within Durotrigia (and, for that matter, across the Southwest), architecture was important for the performance of Christian ritual - perhaps reflecting a distinctive liturgy, and explaining the dearth of portable ritual equipment (Perring 2003: 99). Some villas again have architectural features that have suggested a Christian presence. The cold plunge baths added to the villa at Dewlish during the mid fourth century, and probably slightly earlier in the century at Lufton (and its counterpart at Holcombe, see above, Villas), may have functioned as baptisteries and suggest the use of these villas as places of Christian worship (Perring 2003: 113; Todd 2005). More specifically, such features may suggest the use of these sites as house churches (Petts 2003). Todd notes (2005: 308) that the temples at Nettleton Shrub and Pagan’s Hill possibly formed architectural models for the octagonal ‘bath’ at Lufton (and at Holcombe), perhaps lending weight to suggestions that these two sites were cult centres at the end of the Roman period.

But again, these features may easily fit with secular use, as on the Continent (Polci 2003; see Henig 2006, and above). It has been argued that the buildings at both Frampton and Hinton (perhaps established during the early – mid fourth century) should not in fact be seen as villas (due to their form, fabric, and location), but might better be seen as religious centres (Painter 1967: 24), or simply houses (Branigan and Fowler 1976: 127, 129). The chi-rho medallion placed within an apse at Frampton, demonstrates unambiguous Christian imagery (fig. 6.28), but Christian motifs are commonly juxtaposed with scenes from pagan Classical mythology, as here (with Orphic, and Bacchic images), and at Fifehead Neville (Laing 1997: 111).
Christian imagery is also seen at Hinton St. Mary, where a mosaic in the NE range contains a bust perhaps representing Christ within a chi-rho roundel (Painter 1967: 18; fig. 6.29). Some (including Christopher Sparey Green and Martin Henig, pers. comm.; see also Pearce 1978: 52-64) have recognised a close resemblance between this image of Christ and representations of the emperor Constantine (Pearce 2008).

Although such representations may have been transmitted to the populace via coinage, most coins show a profile view of the emperor, making sculpture a more probable source. Replication of such imagery was arguably a further opportunity to demonstrate the broad horizons of either the mosaicist or the commissioning elites (fig. 6.30).

273 This image has been compared to that upon a gold medallion in the British Museum, in which a similar bust is clearly labelled “CRISTVS” (Painter 1967: 18-9).
274 However, due to an absence of imperial dress and insignia, this has been contested (ibid. 18). Some (such as Sam Moorhead), see a closer resemblance between this image, and those of Magnentius, although this suggestion is hard to accept, considering the images of this emperor found on coins.
There is minimal evidence for ritual activity at Dumnonian villas (which is unsurprising, considering their small number), although a significant octagonal feature at Holcombe villa has been mentioned above (see above Villas). This has been compared to Continental features (and with less massive features within the Dobunnic territory), and is more closely paralleled by an example at Lufton (see above; Todd 2005). Similarities to features at temples within the Southwest, such as Nettleton Scrubb, have also been noted (ibid.).

It has been suggested that these features may represent baptisteries, and therefore indicate Christian ritual practices (Todd 2005); and that Holcombe may therefore have functioned as a ritual centre in the later Roman period (but see Henig 2006). It was noted in Chapter 3 that ritual practice was possibly seen at an early date in the Roman period at this site, in the deposition of a mirror within a pit beneath the villa during the Conquest period (Fox 1972).

275 A recently discovered comparison dating to the early fifth century has been found at Bax Farm (Kent) (Wilkinson 2009: 12).
Similar changes to those seen within urban contexts may be witnessed at villa sites during the later Roman period, in the placement of the dead close to the living at some sites within the Dobunnic and Northwest Belgic region. This change demonstrates a breakdown in the binary opposition of dead: living (see Tilley 1994: 2). Such transformations arguably related to changing attitudes towards corporeal pollution (see Chapter 3), paralleling activity in towns (see below), and on the Continent, in both villa and urban contexts (Chavarría 2004: 81-3; Lewit 2003: 261, 266, 268). Changing attitudes to notions of pollution were possibly influenced by Christian ideologies, although these changes are not necessarily indicative of Christian belief. It may also relate to the changing role of the villa in relation to the State system, as these sites were transformed to accommodate the changing socio-economic environment.

Whilst the cutting of villa walls by graves might merely indicate that buildings had so fallen into decay as to be no longer recognisable (and therefore suggest a date of the late fifth century at the earliest), most graves appear to be deliberately placed within villa features. This practice (in conjunction with continued settlement at these sites) therefore points to the continuing symbolic significance of these locales into and beyond the fifth century.

Although further investigations of structured deposition, and possible ritual practices are necessary, there are potential indicators of pagan activities at some sites. Christian symbolism is found at villas, but in phases that were often short lasting. It has been suggested that the complex combination of Classical imagery on mosaic pavements (especially, but perhaps not only, within the Durotrigian civitas) may indicate the use of villa space to provoke and facilitate intellectual engagement in debates current in Roman elite society across the Empire (Perring 2003: 97). Allegorical statements used to create a suitable environment to facilitate Christian practices - architecture was possibly to generate ritual space developing from Roman domestic dining practices (ibid. 98, 117 n. 119, 118), suggesting the active membership of some elites within Classical networks. However, the features seen by some as having a ritual function, such as the trionch at Littlecote, more probably parallel Continental dining rooms or bath suites, than suggest the presence of ritual rooms (Chavarría 2005: 550; Ellis 1995; Polci 2003: 86, 88; Toynbee 1981: 3). Nonetheless, the possible depiction of Christ as an imperial figurehead within the mosaic at Hinton St Mary suggests an attempt to merge the
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276 However, this opposition has commonly been ignored during the later Roman period, in the burial of infants in association with urban and rural buildings across the region during the later Roman period (see Scott 1991).
277 For example, at Frocester Court one grave contained a male aged 50-55, wearing hobnail boots and with his head to the NE; another contained the flexed inhumation of a male aged 30-40, who had died from a cut to his leg; another was that of a prone female, aged over 45; and another, SE aligned and dug into the villa garden path, contained a female of about 48 years (Gracie and Price 1979: 20).
power of the State with that of Christ, and to emphasise the role of the emperor as secular head of the Church.

The syncretic appropriation of some pagan practices within Christian ritual is also likely at this time,\(^{278}\) enabling gradual conversion (Rahtz 1991: 11).\(^{279}\) Syncretism is confirmed by the interchange of symbolism within Christian, pagan, and secular contexts (Hopkins 2000; Watts 1991: 203; 208), and includes the juxtaposition of Christian and pagan imagery on these late fourth century mosaics. Arguably, syncretism was a mechanism for elites to gain control of the supernatural, as was possibly seen during the Roman period in the process of *interpretatio Romana* (see Chapter 3).

Syncretism is perhaps also seen within the Northwest sector of the Belgic *civitas*, where some villas may also have been transformed into ritual centres. It is perhaps significant that during the LPRIA, at least one possible identity group was located within the area of these villas (see Chapters 2 and 3), which may suggest the incorporation of some sites within the construction of identity at the end of and after the Roman period. Significantly, Box lay near to a LPRIA barrow burial, which may suggest a long tradition of ancestor worship within this area. However, the changes to these villas may otherwise be due to the presence of administrative elites recently engaged from outside of the region, or this behaviour may rather represent a late, secular, phase of symbolic domination (see Chapter 5).

Octagonal features, of possible ritual function, are constructed at a number of villas during the fourth century, and are similar to features in Portugal and Gaul (Todd 2005: 309). Whilst later examples in the Balkans, Lower Danube, and Greece, may have been modelled on fifth century modifications to the fourth century baptistery of St John Lateran in Rome (*ibid.*), examples from the Western Empire clearly predate this feature. Possible baptisteries at sites such as Bradford on Avon demonstrate the wealth of some Christians, and the desire to transform Classical features in order to practice ritual, perhaps demonstrating a break with the pagan past.

**BURIAL AND RITUAL ACTIVITY AT HILLFORTS AND HILLOP SETTLEMENTS**

**DOBUNNIC CIVITAS**

The (re)location of some ritual foci to hillforts in the later Roman period may have reintegrated these sites within the cultural landscape prior to their adoption as secular central sites. Ritual activity is evident at a number of sites within Dobunnic territory. There may also have been some relationship

\(^{278}\) However, due to the re-use or continued use of late Romano-British artefacts into the fifth century and beyond it is difficult to ascertain how rapidly pagan ways were abandoned in the post-Roman period.

\(^{279}\) It has been argued that Christian imagery was initially talismanic (Brown 1999: 31).
between ritual at Henley Wood temple (see below, *Temples*), and at the adjacent Cadbury Congresbury hillfort – the sites are mutually accessible across a shallow saddle of land (see fig. 6.31). At this site, middle Iron Age skull bones were found in association with a possible ritual focus pre-dating later fifth and sixth century ritual activity (Rahtz *et al.* 1992: 59, 228, 242). These fragments of Iron Age human skull, from a liminal location, appear to have been preserved through some form of embalming (perhaps for many hundred years), and were possibly associated with local mythological narratives. An ox skull within a possible ditch derived from material of the diagonal bank (of probable ‘ultimate Roman’ date), carbon dated to the late- or post-Roman period (*ibid.* 207, 210-11), compares with possible ritual deposits at Frocester (see above, fig. 6.26). Both may represent foundation or termination deposits.
Likewise, at Crickley Hill, the presence of a young pig within the void of a beam-slot of the entrance threshold (see Dixon 1994) may represent a termination deposit, bearing in mind the creation of a new entrance to the fort at this time (see Chapter 5). It seems to have been relatively common for pre-Roman human remains to be re-deposited within liminal contexts during the early fifth century. At Crickley, fragments of human tibia, teeth, and jawbone were found in the hearth area and under the threshold of a structure adjacent the new entrance of the lower status settlement (Jarrett 1999; see Chapter 5). It may be significant that materials were physically transformed within this building (which had evidence for bronze working and perhaps ceramic production).

Perhaps most significantly, a prehistoric ritual mound at Crickley – the ‘Long Mound’ – had also received votive deposits during the later fourth century – and during the LPRIA (see below, Burial and ritual at prehistoric monuments; see Chapters 2 and 3; fig. 3.62). The ‘Short Mound’ - a smaller imitation of this monument - possibly replaced the Long Mound as a ritual focus during the later fourth or early fifth century (fig. 6.32). The only dating evidence for this monument was an underlying complete, and possibly early Roman, bowl (in local fabric, imitating BB1 ware). Nearby stray finds and features suggest that this mound might belong to the same early fifth century phase of construction (although there is no clear stratigraphic relationship).

If this is indeed the case, there may be a link between this monument and the use of ‘antique’ ceramics, that had been curated for several hundred years, before being smashed onto the surface of a road (perhaps as a termination deposit), which may indicate comparable acts of spolia to those seen within funerary contexts. The road led down into the valley below (containing Ermine Street and Great Witcombe villa, fig. 5.33). The ‘Short Mound’ (6.32) did not receive later Roman votive deposits (like other similar mounds within the region, see below, Burial and ritual activity at prehistoric monuments), perhaps indicating a date within the early Christian period. This also

280 The relationship between metalworking and ritual was discussed in Chapter 2.
281 The deposition of a near-complete lid in local reduced ceramic (copying BB1), within the hollow left by a posthole of an earlier Iron Age structure (perhaps representing a structured ritual deposit), may also feasibly belong to this period (Jarrett 1999).
suggests that it was not in use – nor constructed before or during – the period in which the Long Mound received votive deposits, i.e. the later fourth century.282 Alternatively, this and similar monuments were contemporaneous with late Roman prehistoric monument reuse, but fulfilled different functions, such as cenotaphs for recently dead members of the elite. Other mounds attributed to the late Roman period are concentrated within the Dobunnic region and are also associated with hillforts (see below, Burial and ritual activity at prehistoric monuments).283 A building near to the Crickley Short Mound may have had a ritual function (being placed outside on this terrace, next to the mound, and not far from a LPRIA burial), although there is no conclusive evidence to prove this supposition (Jarrett 1999; forthcoming).

A double burial on the slopes of the hillfort on Leckhampton Hill (see Chapter 2) on the Cotswold Ridge, approximately 2 miles from Crickley Hill, contained a bronze crown, similar to the late Roman example found at the temple site at Huckwold-cum-Morton in Norfolk (Heighway 1987: 23; RCHME 1976: 77). This may therefore have been the grave of a priest. There is little archaeological evidence for the existence of a priest class during the Roman period (see Chapter 3), but in the later Roman period, regalia is more frequently discovered, perhaps suggesting a greater need to legitimised ritual power through ‘correct’ practices. Other burials in association with hillforts within the region include the cemetery established at Henley Wood temple, adjacent to (and perhaps serving) Cadbury Congresbury hillfort (see below, Ritual and burial activity at temples).

NORTHWEST SECTOR OF THE BELGIC CIVITAS

The extent of hillfort reoccupation within the Northwest Belgic region, and the relationship between hillforts, temples, and post-Roman cemeteries (as yet remain undiscovered), is presently unknown. Although few hillforts within this region have been examined in detail, there are hints at similar hillfort activity to that seen elsewhere in the Southwest. The presence of Romano-British pottery and pennant sandstone roof tiles close to a rectangular platform outside the Oldbury hillfort ramparts, near to a Bronze Age barrow (see fig. 5.38) has suggested the location of a temple at this site (Corney and Payne 2006a: 127). A possible shrine has also been suggested at Liddington, due to Romano-British finds in the area (ibid. 115). However, in the latter instance, no convincing features support this suggestion, and the former case may simply represent non-temple ritual activity, considering the ritual deposition of similar material within mounds elsewhere. Other sites may also have been appropriated for ritual activity: tentative evidence comes from Old Sarum, and possibly Ashley’s Copse (Corney and Payne 2006b: 142).

282 The ceramic beneath the Short Mound may perhaps be paralleled with local fifth century wares (ibid’); further work may elucidate its date.
283 These hillforts are generally unexcavated, although Roman pottery often appears as surface finds.
Although the cemetery at Poundbury was associated with a hillfort, this site is better classified as a sub-urban cemetery, due to its establishment during the Roman period, apparently to serve the population of nearby Dorchester. There is little other evidence for hillfort burial within the civitas, although as in Dobunnia, there is evidence of temple activity within hillforts (see below, *Burial and ritual activity at temple sites*). At Maiden Castle, the stone Romano-Celtic temple was replaced by a circular timber shrine during or after the later Roman period (Woodward 1992: 18, 22-3; fig. 6.33), clearly demonstrating changing aesthetics, comparable to those witnessed in the construction of domestic structures during and after the later fourth century.

![Copyright image](image)

**Figure 6.33 Maiden Castle temple and shrine (Woodward 1992, fig. 8)**

Just as there is little evidence for the late- or post-Roman reoccupation of hillforts within Dumnonia (see Chapter 5), there is likewise little indication that temples were located at this category of site during this time. It was seen in Chapter 3 that Gallo-Mediterranean style ritual activity occurred at Cadbury hillfort (Tiverton, Devon), although the absence of evidence for later activity suggests that either this was a short-lived phase, or that subsequent activity was archaeologically undetectable (e.g. consisted of organic matter).
Although Cannington cemetery is located adjacent to an Iron Age hill fort close to the possible boundary of Dumnonian and Durotrigian territories, the organisation of burials at this site (which had in excess of 2000 burials - 400 were excavated and 542 skeletons were recovered) has much in common with urban cemeteries (see Rahtz, Hirst and Wright 2000). The ‘standard’ late Roman burial rite continued to be used into the post-Roman period (ibid.). Material culture from the site demonstrates links with other sites within the Southwest (particularly with elites of the Bristol Channel area, and possibly Cornwall), with two type G penannular brooches found within grave fills (Dickinson 1982: 47).

This possible appropriation of ‘Roman’ symbols of legitimacy (with the particular types of penannular brooch perhaps acting as an alternative to the crossbow brooch: see Chapter 4) in the construction of alternative structures of power by a small number of elite may perhaps be paralleled in the adoption of Latin titles for personal names, as occasionally found upon memorial stones. The inscription on the Sourton Cross, Okehampton, incorporates the title PRINCIPI (from the Latin Principius) (Thomas 1994: 270, 281), and the inscription at East Ogwell (potentially dating to the late fourth or early fifth century) uses the ‘title’ POPLICI ‘Public(i)us’ (Thomas 1994: 270, 281; see below: Memoria). This behaviour compares with the use of such titles on the Continent in the ‘barbarian’ successor States (Pohl 1997b: 44).

‘CORNOVIAN’ PAGUS

Changes to burial practices are noted within the ‘Cornovian’ region during the later Roman period, with the development of long cist inhumation cemeteries (see below, Burial and ritual within rural locations). However, few have been excavated, and it is difficult to date those that have with any certainty, due to a dearth of grave goods. Nevertheless, a post-Roman cemetery has been recognised in association with the settlement on Tintagel Island (which in many ways is similar to hillfort settlements elsewhere in the Southwest), some of which, as was seen, might be dated to the mid fifth century (Nowakowski and Thomas 1990, 1992; see Chapter 5).

Figure 6.34 Tintagel cemetery, from Tintagel Island (Photograph: author)
As with the hillforts at Cannington and Cadbury Congresbury (both potentially located on civitas boundaries), this inhumation cemetery (located on the mainland, in the Churchyard of St Materiana, Tintagel, fig. 6.34) was probably associated with settlement on Tintagel Island. Two main phases of burial are evident during the fifth century. Long-cist and dug graves are initially variously aligned (sometimes relating to landscape features), with possible clusters perhaps indicating kinship groups (Nowakowski and Thomas 1990, 1992), suggesting limited significance for Christian ideology at this stage, but indicating the influence of new rites. Second phase burials (perhaps dating to during and after the later fifth century) were arranged within rows (ibid.; fig. 6.35). No grave goods were found, although soil conditions ensured that no human remains survived.

Some first phase burials were focused upon a granite pillar stone, of the type used for inscriptions in the West and in Ireland, although no inscription has been found (Nowakowski and Thomas 1990, 1992; fig. 6.36; see Chapter 4). If this stone does not represent, for instance, the simple emulation or setting up of memoria, it may have instead emulated prehistoric menhirs.
Ritual activity is evident in the form of open-air fires associated with ceramics (and the presence of henbane seeds possibly indicating the use of hallucinogenic drugs), with timber from the fire dated to c. AD 403 (Nowakowski and Thomas 1992: 8; Snyder 1998: 187) allowing for an early post-Roman date. However, these features, probably representing the remains of graveside feasts (Thomas 1993: 103), are associated with imported amphorae sherds, thus suggesting a date later than the mid fifth century.

Human remains were also found within the settlement on the Island, demonstrating the introduction of new burial practices within the ‘Cornovian’ region. Re-deposited burnt human and animal bones (either cremated or deliberately burnt as rubbish) were found within a box-like hearth in phase Q1 (see fig. 5.47), and in the fill of a stake-hole in phase Q2 at Tintagel Island (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 43, 52). Burnt human bone was also found in the subsequent phase R (ibid.). Human remains were possibly cremated on pyres elsewhere on the Island. The oval fire pit 171/173 of phase Q2 was radiocarbon dated to cal AD 395-460 with 95% confidence (ibid. 43, 54).

It has been suggested that the cremations at Tintagel Head may indicate Irish influence (Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 43, 52; Dr David Petts pers. comm.), in which case they may represent an example of ‘Hibernisation’. However, inhumations began to supplant cremation during the first century AD in Ireland (Edwards 1996: 129). We have seen above that several cremations were found elsewhere in the Southwest during the later Roman period – in both urban (sometimes associated with re-used early Roman spolia) and rural areas, and similar burials are noted in areas outside the Southwest, such as the Peak District (see Jones, H 1997). Whilst caution must be adopted before asserting that these practices represent common ideologies, the wide distribution suggests that Irish influence need not be assumed. It was argued above, and in Chapters 2 and 3,
that the introduction of cremation was related to the adoption of practices located within a Mediterranean milieu. It might be argued that within the Peninsula (bearing in mind the range of cultural transformations witnessed), this practice likewise belonged within the construction of social hierarchy, paralleling the changes witnessed in southern England during the LPRIA.

The grave at Carnsew (next to Hayle harbour) may also have been associated with a nearby hillfort, although this is currently unproven. This grave consisted of an EW aligned cist, covered by sand, charcoal, and ashes, which in turn were covered by a cairn of loose stones (Thomas 1994: 191-192), creating a rectangular platform cairn enclosure (fig. 6.37), similar to examples found in the Southwest and Ireland during the later Roman period (see below, Burial and ritual activity within rural contexts). An associated inscription (arguably dated to c. AD 450-75) has been translated as ‘Here in peace lately went to rest Cunaide. Here in the grave she lies. She lived 33 years’ (ibid. 193). Continental or Mediterranean cultural influence has been argued for this inscription (see Thomas 1994; also Knight 1992: 48; 1996: 108; Okasha 1993), although the similar grave at Cannington, arguably of earlier date (see Chapter 3), may suggest influence from the Bristol Channel region.

Figure 6.37 Carnsew enclosure-cairn (Thomas 1994, fig. 11.4)

285 However, the gender of the buried individual has been questioned, and the inscription has otherwise been translated as: ‘Here in peace has rested Cunatdo. Here he lies in the tomb. He lived for 33 years’ (Okasha 1993: 119).
Whether this name should be read as masculine or feminine, the name is likely to be Goedelic (Jackson 1953: 329, n.1; Macalister 1945: 458; Okasha 1993: 119; Thomas 1994: 193). This does not necessarily indicate an Irish origin for the deceased - adoption of such a name may instead represent a process of ‘barbarisation’ – as might also be seen in burial within a platform cairn. Other late- or post-Roman barrow burials within the region may be indicated in the association of a barrow and memorial stone at Boslow (fig. 6.38), although this may instead demonstrate the appropriation of a prehistoric barrow at this time.

Ritual activity at Cadbury hillfort was noted during the Roman period in the form of shaft deposits (see Chapter 3), which may indicate the location of ritual activity within a hilltop enclosure (Todd 1981: 162), perhaps paralleling activity at hillforts elsewhere in the Southwest. However, there is no evidence to confirm the possible continuity of this activity into or beyond the fourth century.

A common feature of new cemeteries is their proximity to possible trading sites and to elite settlements (which often lie close to mineral ore reserves and evidence for mining and metalworking), perhaps indicating attempts to assert control of trade and resources by demonstrating control of these locales. Cemeteries are also frequently located in proximity to prehistoric monuments.
Before these sites were reoccupied by elites, perhaps during the early fifth century in some cases (see Chapter 5), many hillforts became (re)established as centres of ritual power during the later fourth century. The association between temples and hillforts in the later Roman period was part of a wider process of reincorporating ancient sites through ritual practice. Local elites appropriated and created these locales within a process of landscape reorganisation, at a time when the relationship between landowners, their tenants, and the land, was reconstituted to accommodate socio-economic change (resulting in changes to or reification of the villa estates, see Chapter 5).

Continued use of ‘Christian’ rites at sites such as Cannington (and its use for burials at Henley Wood, see below), suggest that local elites (most probably residing at the adjacent hillforts) continued to appropriate a ‘Roman’ discourse when restructuring the local community (and probably their own identities). It might also tentatively be concluded that these cemeteries were used to mark territorial boundaries, perhaps during attempts to cement the boundaries of civitates within late Roman acts of symbolic domination - or of regional territories in the reorganisation of the landscape during the fragmentation of the Roman State.

Ritual behaviour at hillforts took a variety of forms. In some cases, ‘Romano-Celtic’ temples were constructed or revived at or near these sites, although these buildings seem short-lived (see below, Temples). The maintenance of temples during the Roman period enabled the owners of the buildings to use ritual to transmit and shape cultural information within a rigid and conservative framework. However, with the collapse of the State structure, there was greater variation in ritual, with new forms of ritual activity replacing those that had been seen at temples. This led to the creation of seemingly more ‘ancient’ (even ‘ancestral’) ritual practices that perhaps promoted ideas of permanency (see Rowlands 1993).

At Maiden Castle, a circular timber shrine was constructed over the site of the Romano-Celtic temple, which itself overlay a pre-Roman timber circular shrine. It is suggested that, within this particular locality (in which resistance to Roman rule may have been expressed at the beginning of the Roman period, and where Mediterranean styles was adopted with less enthusiasm than in the Dobunnic and Northwest Belgic regions, see Chapters 2 and 3), this represents a deliberate departure from the dominant culture. This shift in cultural referents from those bound within an imperial ideological framework, to those drawn from outside this structure, indicates an epistemological break in the reconstruction of identities. But this did not (and could not) occur within a simple process of ‘Celtic revival’ - considering the evident integration of numerous components from the ‘Roman’ symbolic system within the daily lives of local people. This behaviour may instead represent an active reconstruction of the past, in which the cosmology replicated through circular
domestic space throughout much of the Roman period was presented as meaningful in the creation of new identities.

There may therefore have been conscious attempts to redefine social memory, by harnessing the power of the ancestors through ritual. At some sites, we may see more direct appropriation of the ancestors. The Leckhampton burial perhaps reflects attempts to legitimise ritual authority within a local milieu (the regalia possibly drawing upon perceptions of imperial power), whilst also creating and maintaining ‘ancestral’ narratives, by evoking an association with a LPRIA enclosure grave (see Chapter 2). Such an emphasis upon the ancestors may have stimulated stability during the reconstitution of social identities and landscape at this time. The presence of fragmentary human remains, commonly placed within liminal contexts at hillfort settlements, may reflect similar processes.  

Monuments such as the Short Mound at Crickley Hill may have also drawn upon ancestral links. It was probably built by local elites in order to perform public rituals to both reify community identity and emphasise social hierarchy and landownership, once the prehistoric Long Mound had become enclosed within the settlement (see Chapter 5). The location of some monuments within possible border zones may further suggest attempts by regional elites at territorial definition. Likewise, the focal menhir within the cemetery at Tintagel may be suggesting attempts to link the dead with the prehistoric past, constructing a cultural continuum in legitimising power.

Similarly, ritual graveside feasts at Tintagel again suggest links with the Roman world, through which the deceased were remembered. In this process, memories of lineage (and accompanying status) were maintained for the kin and their community. It is possible that the introduction of such practices within this region represents attempts to construct and maintain the position of certain kinship groups – possibly the construction of a regional dynasty, considering the location of this activity – within a Mediterranean milieu. This might also be seen in the introduction of cremation to the region, which seemingly occurs (only rarely) at or near sites potentially associated with nascent elites.

Pagan activity at temples became illegal under the laws of Theodosius during the later fourth century (Salway 1981: 708). Such legislative change may at least partly explain the absence of votive deposits from the ‘Short Mound’ at Crickley, for instance (on the assumption that this

---

286 Whilst it is possible that these remains represent residual finds from the Iron Age phase of occupation, the redistribution of pre-Roman human remains at a range of late and post-Roman sites in the West, within apparently structured deposits (and significant liminal contexts, such as hearths and thresholds), may support their later deliberate deposition.

287 The processes by which buried features of the otherwise unique and hitherto unexcavated Long Mound were replicated may only be speculated, although the possibility that mythology or ritual practice preserved such details over several hundred years might provide one explanation (Hollos 1999; Jarrett 1999).
monument represents the decommissioning and replacement of the prehistoric Long Mound during or after the later fourth century), and at other barrows across the Southwest after this time. It is perhaps significant that this site lies only six miles from the Christian cemetery at Kingsholm (which, like Crickley, lies next to Ermine Street).

**RITUAL AND BURIAL ACTIVITY AT TEMPLE SITES**

**DOBUNNIC CIVITAS**

Change in temple use is evident during and after the late fourth century within the Southwest. Metalworking is often seen at these sites, dating to or after demolition phases (but usually pre-dating burial, see below). Within the Dobunnic civitas there is evidence for this at Brean Down (ApSimon 1965; Bell 1986, 1990; fig. 6.39), Uley, and Henley Wood (Watts and Leach 1996).

Figure 6.39 Metalworking and burial within the temple at Brean Down (apSimon 1965, fig. 4.47)

Copyright image
This practice, as with the adoption of these sites as burial grounds, is primarily confined to the Southern Dobunnic and Northwest Belgic regions (Appendix, Table 17; fig. 6.40). Burial at Henley Wood temple began after AD 367-75 (but before c. AD 600), with the placement of five inhumations within the area of the demolished south ambulatory (Watts and Leach 1996: 16; fig. 6.41).

Figure 6.40 Temple reuse in Southwest Britain (Red = burial, blue hexagon = settlement) (Map: author)

Burial practices parallel the nominally ‘Christian’ rite found across the Southwest and beyond, with rows of EW aligned graves, containing few grave goods. However, some finds did occur within graves and their fills, and more commonly occurred with burials of the 25-34 age group, next with the 15-24 age group, suggesting preferential treatment for young adults. A number of ‘heirlooms’ were found again within the fill of some graves (as at Poundbury, see above Urban burial and ritual). Early Roman finds include first century and second century brooches (fig. 6.42), where they occur with burials of 25-35 year olds, and first-second century and late third – fourth beads (Watts and Leach 1996: 64-66, 79, 85-87, 91, Table 52, figs. 90, 71).

288 The evidence may be skewed by the extensive work undertaken within this area by Philip Rahtz; but, the potential remains for the appropriation of temple re-use in the construction of regional identity at these sites.

289 Grave 1 lay within the cella, but was disturbed and therefore possibly not in situ; Grave 6 had been dug against the inner face of the south wall, although half of the skeleton had been removed, perhaps during demolition (Watts and Leach 1996: 16). The double burial (Graves 5A and 5B) was inserted into the rubble and lay upon roof and floor tiles in the Southeast corner of the ambulatory, and a further double grave (62/2 and 62/3) was found in the ambulatory, cutting through the demolition rubble (ibid.)

290 Again, whilst in this context some finds may be residual due to the location of the nearby temple, these finds parallel those found on other fifth century sites (see above).
A male bias is noted (as at Bath Gate cemetery, Cirencester), particularly within the northern sector of this cemetery (Watts and Leach 1996: 52). However, the focal burials, within the temple ambulatory, are not definitely male (ibid. 51): one body, within the double grave 62/3, was potentially female (fig. 6.43).
There are fewer temples from the interior of the Northwest Belgic region, as compared to the numerous examples found within Dobunnic territory (see above, fig. 6.40). Due to antiquarian activity, well-published temples from the periphery are also limited (with notable exceptions), making it possible to suggest only general trends. The temple to Sulis Minerva at Bath is, of course, the most intensely investigated temple within the Southwest. It was noted above that the River Avon flooded during the third - fourth century, covering the temple precinct with silt and mud (Arnold 1984: 33), causing the drainage system to collapse, and necessitating the repeated raising of the floor level (Pearce 1978: 33). Dating the various levels of site use has been controversial. Although the presence of worn slabs suggests prolonged use of the site into the post-Roman period (Cunliffe 2000: 143, 144), the sequence may easily be fitted within the late fourth – early fifth century.  

However, recent research on ceramics from the site suggests activity well into the fifth century (Gerrard 2004: 70-1). In common with other sites within the Southwest, a pewter mould fragment perhaps suggests metalworking in the temple area during the later fourth century (see Corney 2001: 33).

---

291 A temple paving sequence of six levels (5a-f), separated by earth on top of stone collapse, began during the mid fourth century; the early phase 5a was dated numismatically to c. AD 350, whilst the third phase lay under a coin dating to AD 388-402 and late fourth pottery (Esmonde Cleary 1989: 158). This provided a t.p.q. for the worn cobbles; phase 5e was possibly dated to the late fourth century, although excavation implies a chronology into the sixth century (ibid.).
Christianity in or around Bath is attested by the famous defixione inscription reading “Whether pagan or Christian, whosoever, whether man or woman, whether boy or girl, whether slave or free, has stolen from me…” (Boon 1992: 40). An EW aligned timber building constructed over the temple has tentatively been suggested as representing a church (Dark 2000: 111), although the date of this building could belong to any time between the fourth and seventh centuries. However, deposition within the sacred spring of a pagan temple indicates non-Christian behaviour, and a late fourth – fifth century penannular brooch from the ritual spring (ornamented with Christian symbolism, fig. 6.44) suggests either syncretic or outright pagan practices.

Burials do not generally occur within temple buildings in the Northwest Belgic region, although several late Roman burial plots were associated with the temple complex at Nettleton Scrubb, near the Dobunnic border. However, these graves may relate to the settlement, rather than indicating a temple cemetery as such (fig. 6.45): the main cemetery is to the southeast of the settlement, near the Fosse Way (Corney 2001: 34). The rectangular apsidal structure within the cemetery has been interpreted as a mausoleum (ibid.).

The temple became derelict in the later fourth century, but a settlement was established on the site (occupied after AD 370), with possible early fifth century finds associated with buildings (Snyder 1998: 206). The shrine itself had declined over the course of the fourth century. It arguably revived during the period of Julian II, but was then sacked during the third quarter of the century (Robinson 2001: 157-58). A possible church was built on the site after this time (ibid.), although agricultural reuse of the complex is also likely (Corney 2001: 33-4). Again, metalworking activity intensified after the temple declined (ibid.).

At Middington Farm (Wiltshire), a small circular structure (perhaps representing a temple or shrine), with associated hearths and pits, adjacent to the field boundary and road, was the focus of a small inhumation cemetery of six graves (McKinley and Heaton 1996: 44, 70). It is likely that this building played a ritual role, given its focality.

---

292 Nettleton Scrubb has been described as a ‘small town’ with a specialised religious and industrial function’ (Corney 2001: 30-31).
Temple burials have been recognised within the Durotrigian civitas at Lamyatt Beacon temple (Leech 1980; fig. 6.46). One building located at the Poundbury cemetery site may represent a Romano-Celtic temple - dated by ceramics and coinage to the mid fourth century (Farwell and Molleson 1993: 127). However, due to the relationship between this building and subsequent burials (as well as comparison with other sites) there is no reason to suggest that Poundbury should be seen as a temple cemetery.293

The precinct of Pagan’s Hill temple contained a cemetery of at least 100 skeletons (including children and infants), mostly oriented EW (although some were aligned NS), and placed in rows (Rahtz and Watts 1989: 338). The late fourth - fifth century metalworking phase that pre-dates the burials is similar to activity at other temple cemetery sites in the Southwest region. This similarity allows the possibility that the subsequent use of the cemetery may have begun during the early fifth century, before the ‘Saxon’ cemetery was established at this site during the sixth century (ibid. 360, 338).

293 Earlier finds from the site suggest that if a temple did exist, it originated during the late second century (Farwell and Molleson 1993: xii, 127).
Votive offerings were commonly deposited within subterranean shafts, wells, or pits during the Roman period (Green 1986; Ross 1967; see Chapter 3). Later Roman period at Jordan’s Hill temple (near Weymouth) includes such activities. A deposit of bent iron weapons perhaps suggests a military context for ritual activity (Dark 1993: 137). However, the shaft was sealed during the Theodosian period (AD 379-395), and a building – probably a temple but possibly a signal station – was constructed over the feature. The role of Portesham as a focal site has been discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. The placement of burials in association with this possible shrine is seen during and after the later Roman period (Valentin n.d.; see Chapters 2 and 3).
It was noted above (Burial and ritual at hillforts) that several temples were located within hillforts in the Durotrigian region. The location of a late Roman temple within the hillfort at South Cadbury is suggested by the presence of tufa, tile, wall plaster, and probable ritual items (Burrow 1981: 126), although associated late third century coinage may indicate an earlier origin for the building, which was possibly demolished during late fourth century (Alcock et al. 1995: 140). A late Roman temple may also have been constructed at Brent Knoll (Somerset) (although the evidence may otherwise represent domestic activity of this period) (ibid. 136, 139). The building perhaps continued into the fifth century, and again has evidence of metalworking (ApSimon 1965). Changes to the temple building at Maiden Castle have been considered above.

DUMNONIAN CIVITAS

Grave 424 at Cannington (an enclosure platform cairn) has already been considered (Chapter 3, fig. 3.72), the radiocarbon date (centring upon AD 210-440) suggests construction in either the mid- or late-Roman period. This burial arguably represents the grave of a notary, possibly a member of the leading kinship group of the locality, or even the region. However, it has otherwise been suggested that, rather than being built as a ‘mausoleum’, this structure represents a late Roman shrine within which a burial was placed (Rahtz 1977: 58), although there are no finds or other practices to support this proposal. This feature is arguably comparable to the Portesham ‘dynastic shrine’ (see Chapters 2 and 3), and it is possible that this structure had multiple functions, or that its functions changed over time.

‘CORNOVIAN’ PAGUS

It was seen above (Burial and ritual at hillforts and hilltop settlements) that a small number of cremations are known within the region that date to during and after the later Roman period. At Tregony (overlooking the river Fal), a BB1 style jar containing the cremated remains of an elderly woman (dated to the mid fifth century) was buried within a rectangular enclosure (Moss 2006: 6; Smith 2007: 28-9; pers. comm. Imogen Woods, Exeter University; fig. 6.47). The remains were deposited within a local BB1 imitation jar (initially dated to the early Roman period), and was accompanied by a tankard in local ceramic fabric, which may suggest allusions to ‘civilised’ drinking practices. This site lies close to the rectangular enclosed settlement at Carvossa (which perhaps originated as a Roman fort, but appears to have been a civilian settlement since the early Roman period, see Chapter 3). The location of an elite community within the region during or after this period is indicated by an inscribed memorial stone in the nearby St Cuby churchyard, which reads “NONNITA ERCILIVI RICATI TRIS FILI ERCILINGI”, translated as ‘(Memorial of) Nonnita, Erclivus, Ricatus, three children of Ercilingus’ (Thomas 1994: 293). The Tregony cremation was arguably
located close to a shrine site, considering its association with two pits containing the remains of grain, which may represent votive offerings (Moss 2006: 6). The only evidence for ritual activity of similar form to that found elsewhere in Southern Britain is the miniature axe found at St Minver (overlooking Padstow harbour, and near to where several Roman period cremations have been found, see below), suggesting the possible location of a temple or shrine during the Roman period (PAS CORN-79BD53). These changes arguably demonstrate cosmological changes, demonstrating the ideological nature of cultural transformations.

We saw in Chapter 3 that temples are rare, if they exist at all, in mainland ‘Cornovia’, with few if any ritual sites recognised for much of the Roman period. The coin series at Nor’nour temple (Scilly) ends c. AD 371 (Todd 1981: 162; see Chapter 3), suggesting a decline in ritual activity, as elsewhere. However, there are occasional indications that some adopted Gallo-Mediterranean ritual practices on the mainland during the later Roman period. The 11m deep ritual shaft at Bossence (St Erth, Cornwall), contained a pewter jug and dish, inscribed with a dedication to Mars by Aelius Modestus (Pearce 2004: 92; Todd 1981: 162). This activity might reasonably be considered ‘intrusive’. However, the inclusion of stone weights within the shaft (which it has been seen had regional significance, arguably related to local elite control of resources) (Pearce 2004: 92; see Chapter 5) perhaps more likely suggests the involvement of locals within this ritual (bearing in mind the presence of these finds at local, probably elite, sites, see Quinnell 1993).

Further possible ritual activity (potentially indicating the location of a shrine) is seen at Trethurgy (dating c. AD 375-400, continuing to c. AD 400-450), where a possible structured deposit of seasand occurs in one building (structure G) of unknown function (Quinnell 2004: 208-09). Souterrains (locally known as ‘fogous’) have also been suggested as having a ritual function (perhaps linked to

295 It has been proposed that this may be the same individual named as a military prefect on Hadrian’s Wall, promoted to a procurator in control of local mining (Mattingly 2006: 509).
fertility cults associated with the storage of grain within these contexts, see Bradley 2000: 43), although again we have no votive deposits, and all of these rooms and features may otherwise be interpreted as stores (Quinnell 2004: 208-09). However, it was noted in Chapter 3 that a probable fogou (or chambered tomb) at Kerris Vean may have contained a Roman cremation (NMR_NATINV-422659).

BURIAL AND RITUAL AT TEMPLE SITES: DISCUSSION

A number of changes are noted at temple sites within Southwest Britain during the later Roman period. The location of temples within hillforts during and after the mid fourth century may demonstrate attempts to forge links between established ritual practices, and the local elites (see above, Burial and ritual at hillforts and hilltop sites). However, a decline in worship at pagan temples is apparent by the end of the century, which may be due to a number of factors, including demographic changes related to the withdrawal of the State, or more directly, to legislative changes forbidding such activity at this time. Although the Theodosian Code (16.10.11) records the illegality of pagan worship after AD 391, there is no indication of how rigorously this law was enforced (Hopkins 2000: 79, 84).

The transformation of these sites need not reflect reactions against these pagan locales, or a rejection of pagan practices on religious grounds. For example, the deposition of fewer Valentinic issues than might be expected at Henley Wood temple may point to a decline in ritual activity before the material ruin of these buildings (Moorhead 2001: 93), and might also indicate wider changes to the practice of votive deposition, or its transfer to alternative locales.

Changes in temple use during the early fifth century have been seen above in their adoption as burial grounds, after (and during) phases of demolition and metalworking (see Appendix, Table 17; see above, fig. 6.40). This may indicate the de-consecration of pagan foci and their transformation as Christian locales through burial, perhaps in response to Imperial policy (Caseau 2001). However, this behaviour may also be related to the reconstruction of local power, possibly signifying the deconstruction of imperial control and Roman identity. Temples and villas were mnemonics for State authority and (perhaps for some) Roman cultural identity; placing elite burials in association with these sites demonstrated inheritance of this power, legitimising authority over the community. Furthermore, their control by local elites enabled appropriation of these symbols of power within the reconstitution of elite identity. By reconstituting the ritual significance of Romano-Celtic temples,

296 These structures parallel those found in Brittany and Ireland, although the latter are possibly later (Charles Edwards 2000).
297 However, it has also been argued that it is also possible that burials became located at temple or villa sites for a number of more prosaic reasons. Land may no longer have been economically viable; a convenient supply of structural
elites may have taken control of State sanctioned systems of belief, gaining local power through the re-management of ritual land. Some burials were dug into demolition rubble (Watts and Leach 1996: 16), and were perhaps seen as termination deposits. This ritual performance may have been part of a process of forgetting the pagan, imperial, past, as elites both appropriated and transformed the ritual and culturally symbolic power of the site.

Temples were another category of site very much embedded within the Roman cultural system, and the collapse of the villa system may have encouraged the deterioration of estate temples and shrines (Caseau 2001: 30; see also 2004: 136). The act of structural neglect would have transformed the cultural landscape (Knapp and Ashmore 1999:19), again within a process of forgetting, although the continued presence of these sites within the landscape continued to provide a ‘horizon’ upon which new mythologies might be fixed in the legitimisation of new social orders (see Barrett 1999: 262). Sites may have nevertheless retained some ritual significance. The ritual nature of metalworking within certain contexts is possible (Budd and Taylor 1995), and may apply here too.

It is often supposed that a rise in Christian belief was responsible for the decline in Roman pagan worship at temples, and that subsequent burial at these sites represents the Christianisation of these sites. However, this suggestion is perhaps unduly influenced by Continental activity, in particular a later letter from Pope Gregory to Bishop Mellitus (Snyder 1998: 344, n. 117). It was seen above (Urban burial and ritual) that, in the persistence of pagan burial practices, Christian beliefs were contested, and that ‘Christian’ burial was not at this time the majority rite across the region (though these rites were becoming increasingly adopted). There are only sporadic signs of Christianity (and some indications of apostasy) within what appear to be a number of enclaves concentrated within a few locales. Considering the different levels of Christianity on the Continent, as compared to Britain, the demolition of temples within Britain does not necessarily support the assumption that Britain developed on a parallel trajectory (Dark 1994: 32; Thomas 1981: 55, 133). We must remember the changing nature of temple re-use, and interpret sites on their individual merit, so as to avoid a simplistic binary oppositions between Christian and pagan practices.

If this behaviour was undertaken within a Christian ideological framework, or simply represents the appropriation of these sites by local elites for (non-Christian) burial, links with previous rituals may have often been necessary to provide a sense of legitimacy in the reconstruction of ritual space. All factors relating to this change in ritual practice are likely to have affected, or been affected by, transformations in local identities.

material was also at hand; land may have become alienated; and this land may have continued to form a focal point for the estate once occupation was transferred to hillfort sites (Pearce 1982: 135).
The robbing of stone from temples may be related to acts of *spolia* (see above), and perhaps indicates the continued ritual potency of these sites for fifth century communities in their attempts to link the present with the Roman past. The presence of ‘antique’ artefacts within graves or their fills at these sites may mark a similar process. Fibulae were possibly curated (perhaps primarily as heirlooms), although the appropriation of early Roman artefacts from contemporaneous deposits - such as graves or (perhaps more likely, considering their changing role) temples, is also possible. The placing of ‘antique’ brooches within focal contexts during the fifth century may indicate the growing power of previously peripheral groups, if we consider the location of such practices in the later Roman period (see above, *Urban ritual and burial*). The disposal of these curated remnants from the past also signifies deeper (cultural) changes than the contestation and negotiation of power.

This behaviour asserted links between the recent dead and their ancestors who operated within the Roman world. The past was incorporated within personal identities so as to assert status, and to provide a continuum that may provide strength with which to face the future. The authority associated with symbols of *Romanitas* legitimised lineage, and became re-worked in the formation of new community identities.

However, elements of the ‘Roman’ past were disposed of within ancestral domains, and their presence in the everyday rejected. Deposition again enabled the Roman past to be renegotiated in relation to changing conditions. These manifestations of the past had previously structured the replication of social identities, but as the social system embodied by these objects collapsed, they became appropriated in creating mythologies surrounding the ancestors. Within this process, ancestors were remembered and drawn upon to maintain or develop the social position of the surviving kin, within the construction of alternative structures of power. Their disposal removed barriers to the reconstruction of the past, and renegotiation of social memories, enabling regeneration of local landscapes and communities. These acts both responded to, and influenced, systemic rupture, and provided the opportunity for the creation and contestation of new worldviews. Heirlooms that had hitherto been used as aide memoires to evoke and establish continuities with past experience were now removed from circulation in the creation of new identities focused on ancestry and lineage (Rowlands 1993: 145). In this context, although by the mid fifth century temples no longer functioned as centres of pagan worship, ancestral cults potentially developed in association with both focal and other graves within temple cemeteries, reflecting the most powerful mechanism of power and change available at this time.

It has been argued that the temple at Henley Wood arguably acted as a *cella memoria*, signifying Christian identity for a few elites (Watts and Leach 1996: 26). If we consider the probable
importance of military elite identity during this time (see Chapter 4), then inhumations (including double burials) within the monument (in contrast to burials on the Continent) may suggest attempts to assert collective identity – perhaps military brother-hood (and possibly fictive kin). The apparent concentration of young adult males within the temple complex (ibid. 51, 52) may indicate continuity of a male-dominated society, following the pattern seen at Bath Gate cemetery (Cirencester). Alternatively, as not all of these double burials are definitely male (ibid. 51), the location of the graves may emphasise kinship and marital ties. The intertwined positions and the close proximity of some the bodies (see fig. 6.43) possibly emphasise these ties, or reflect attempts to renegotiate gender relationships.\textsuperscript{298}

To those who now relocated from towns to hillforts, the square plan of the temple may have also echoed that of the mausolea enclosing some elite graves within later Roman cemeteries. The re-working of symbols of Romanitas within the creation of new identities seemingly facilitated the demonstration of social status for local elites, and possibly, for some, enabled the expression of other identities. Monuments linked the past and present by reference to ancestors in a bid to control time, and thus gain power (Hodder 1990: 49). Through demolition and re-use, by placing burials within hitherto taboo contexts, the role of the site was transformed by local elites, who were at one and the same time severing links with the State, and appropriating its authority and its symbols of power, demonstrating a new regime’s control over the landscape to the local populace. The generally uniform manner of burial suggests a degree of central control. Considering the protracted time over which burials were placed within this context at Henley Wood, local elites probably drew upon them within the construction of mythologies associated with the creation of community identities.

Thus, through the creation of burial cults and myths, ancestral hero-cults may have developed, symbolising the power of dominant aristocratic lineages (Parker Pearson 2003: 167, 196). As with a variety of landscape features, temples were integrated and imbued with ritual power, becoming associated with the ancestors to create a linear narrative and encourage social stability (Tilley 1994: 30).

The incorporation of temples sites within elite mythologies might also be seen in the grave on the hill summit at Cannington, which Philip Rahtz suggests (1977: 58) may have been placed within a shrine or temple (although there is no definite evidence for the role of this structure). This grave formed a focus for other burials at some point, but it is uncertain whether the burial it contained pre- or post-dated, or was contemporaneous with, the surrounding enclosure. Its focality may indicate

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{298} One body, within the double grave 62/3, was potentially female (Watts and Leach 1996; 51).}
attempts to construct elite identities through a regional ancestral cult, the maintenance of empty space within this crowded cemetery perhaps suggesting that it had become deeply embedded within, or contributed to, the construction of, local and possibly regional and religious identities - bodily acts creating social memory (Connerton 1989). Subsequent graveside rituals may have continued to affirm kinship and other group identities.

The focal feature within the cemetery at Portesham perhaps had a comparable role in the creation of origin myths, emphasising the ancestral nature of this site. This timber building - maintained throughout the Roman period, its ritual nature possibly signalled by the presence of a LPRIA votive deposit (see Ch. 2) - was the focus for both ‘Durotrigian’ and late- and post-Roman burials.

Temples may have acted as either the religious foci of estates or cult centres for a wider region during and after the Roman period (Leech 1986: 272), at which trade and exchange may have taken place, drawing people from a range of territories. Several of the temples chosen for reuse as cemeteries were perhaps located on or near suspected civitas boundaries (see Chapter 3; see above, fig. 6.40). This border location would have made these sites ideal venues for markets (see Chapter 3), providing prime opportunities for the consolidation and expression of regional identities (cf. Caseau 2004: 109). These locations may have in some cases fossilised the earlier territories constructed by regional elites (see Chapter 2), the boundaries of which would have been further ‘reinforced’ by the placement of burials here (Parker Pearson 2003: 134).

The potential location of Cannington on a civitas border arguably gives weight to the presence of a temple at this site, with cultural differences to the east and west of this locale suggesting the convergence of cultural and political boundaries. The placement of ‘Roman’ burials at Cannington during the late Roman period by a developing Dumnonian elite may have been one mechanism by which cultural and political borders and affiliations were affirmed in the construction of regional elite identities, in a comparable manner to processes witnessed during the LPRIA within other parts of Southwest Britain. These locations perhaps suggest that these temple sites had regional significance, which may be supported by the reoccupation of the adjacent hillforts in some cases (see Chapter 5).

No temple sites within the Durotrigian region are definitely located on territorial boundaries (Burrow 1981: 161), and this may relate to the politically fragmented nature of this territory during

299 Lamyatt Beacon was perhaps located on the boundaries of the Durotrigian, Belgic, and Dobunnic civitates, and Henley Wood perhaps on the northwest edge of the Dobunnic civitas (Woodward 1993: 96). It is noted that the sacred sites of emerging territories are often located on boundaries (Bradley 1998b: 172).

300 However, if some inscriptions do date to the later fourth or early fifth century (see below; Handley 2001; Knight 1992), the most westerly inscribed stone at Winsford Hill, on Exmoor (Devon) (see fig. 4.21, above) may instead have marked the location of a cultural boundary. Alternatively, these stones may have later been used to mark Dumnonian territory, representing fluctuating boundaries.
the LPRIA (see Chapter 2). Instead, temples within this region seem to be placed in association with central sites and core areas, and were therefore perhaps more closely associated with central figures or kinship groups, who possibly incorporated these sites in the construction of local and regional identities, based upon small territories more comparable with their pre-Roman predecessors.

There is no evidence at all for temple activity within the ‘Cornovian’ region. However, some structured deposits and finds may suggest the development of ritual contexts during the later Roman period, though ritual was perhaps performed in other ways than elsewhere in the Southwest (see Quinnell 2004: 209). Certain Roman religious observances were perhaps adopted and transformed in much the same way as other cultural attributes (see Chapters 4 and 5). The almost complete absence of votive deposition of ‘Roman’ and other goods within ritual contexts arguably indicates the perpetuation of traditional ritual practices that resonated with local communities as part of the construction of regional identities by elites. Otherwise (or in addition), these practices perhaps indicate the existence of different cosmologies (i.e. rather than being perceived as chthonic, as suggested by the absence of underground deposits during the pre-Roman period in the region, deities may have been seen as residing within other realms - although the presence of fogous perhaps negates this suggestion).

BURIAL AND RITUAL AT PREHISTORIC MONUMENTS

DOBUNNIC CIVITAS

As during the early Roman period, burials were again sporadically placed within prehistoric barrows during the later Roman period, as at Hetty Peglar’s Tump, Uley, where a NE-SW aligned skeleton had been inserted within the highest part of the long barrow, accompanied by fourth century coins (Clifford 1966: 129). This activity (see Appendix, Table 12) notably occurs within areas where a high number of later Roman villas were also found. The range of objects associated with these deposits is again similar to grave goods within contemporaneous cemeteries, and include coins, ceramics, and sometimes fibulae.

Several possible late- or post-Roman barrows, that appear to imitate prehistoric monuments, are found within the North Dobunnic region, associated with hillforts. Examples have been noted at Bathampton (next to an Iron Age hillfort or stock enclosure) and Lansdown Hill, both near Bath (Akerman 1857: 432; Thurman 1869: 174), close to the possible Belgic-Dobunnic border (see

---

301 Large numbers of low denomination coins have been found at Brean and in unstratified contexts at Blaise although Burrow asserts that these sites cannot be interpreted as markets or trade centres (Burrow 1981: 168).
Chapter 3). The date of the Bathampton long mounds is uncertain (though they are often supposed to be medieval pillow mounds), and further investigation is warranted - particularly as later Roman ceramics have been found at this site, as Romano-British sites lies nearby, and as a burial within a stone coffin has also been found nearby (see above, Burial and ritual activity within urban contexts). The long mounds at Lansdown Hill are next to a small Iron Age hillfort and Roman military site, with the remains of Romano-British buildings also recorded nearby (EHNMNR-634347). These features compare with the more certainly Romano-British Short Mound at Crickley Hill (see Ritual and burial activity at hillforts). Some barrows received burials, such as the possible late Roman Long Mound in the ‘Querns’ cemetery (Cirencester), which contained five crouched burials (McWhirr et al. 1982). However, most monuments did not generally receive burials or votive deposits (making dating difficult) - earlier studies noted the occurrence of these features within ‘Roman camps’ (see Thurman 1869).

It was seen in Chapter 3 that ritual activity is noted at a number of prehistoric barrows and ritual sites within the region, some of which date to the later Roman period (see Appendix Table 13). Votive deposition within the prehistoric Long Mound at Crickley Hill (see fig. 3.62) continued until the later fourth century, with the finds including Roman roof tiles, coins (including an issue of Valens), and Oxfordshire colour coated ware (Hollos 1998; Jarrett 1999). This monument became enclosed within the high status, Western, sector of the fifth century settlement on the hilltop (see Chapter 5, fig. 5.26), which it is argued may correlate with construction of its (smaller) imitation, the Short Mound, on a nearby terrace (ibid.).

NORTHWEST SECTOR OF THE BELGIC CIVITAS

Again, several barrows within the Northwest Belgic region attracted secondary burials (Appendix, Table 12; see above, fig. 3.66), and although detailed analyses of associated finds has yet to be undertaken, it is possible that some of the ‘Roman period’ examples date to the later fourth century. Most seem to be confined to the periphery of the region (if they lay within the civitas at all), in association with rivers and roads, and there is a noticeable gap across much of the Belgic territory that is probably located within the study region. However, a search of the HER reveals numerous crop-marks that may represent Roman barrows, which again potentially include burials dating to the

302 These features are recorded as being 1-2 feet high with a slight surrounding ditch, and symmetrical, thus differentiates from Neolithic examples (Akerman 1857: 432; Thurman 1869: 174). The presence of a ditch differentiates these monuments from the example at Crickley Hill. 303 Later Romano-British ceramics (Oxfordshire colour-coated wares) were located as surface finds at Bathampton by the author, Spring 2005. Nearby Romano-British activity is attested by pottery including Samian, iron slag and cinder, and animal remains, with a tessellated pavement suggesting the presence of a villa (ADS NMR_NATINV-203263; NMR_NATINV-203253; NMR_NATINV-203256), and settlement noted on the hilltop itself demonstrates reoccupation (EHNMNR-634210; EHNMR-634213). A Roman enclosure was also found nearby (Nenk et al. 1995: 185-86; EHNMR-1049515). It has been suggested that a stone circle at the site may be of Roman date, although it is unclear why this may be so (NMR_NATINV-203356).
later period. Primary *in situ* cremations were found within barrows at Lamb Down, Codford, accompanied by a third – fourth century pot, and stratified above a coin dating to AD 364-67 (Foster 2001: 173). As well as barrows, other forms of prehistoric ritual sites were sometimes appropriated for burial: an inhumation, buried with hobnails and late Roman pottery, was found next to the Winterbourne stream at Silbury Hill (Corney 2001: 27).

Votive deposition at barrows mirrors the pattern of burials, with evident activity on the periphery of the Northwest sector of the Belgic *civitas*, and a dearth of activity within the interior (see above, fig. 3.66). However, concentrations of secondary barrow activity are noted: a survey of twelve round barrows in Wiltshire demonstrated that nine of the monuments had intrusive Romano-British culture, predominantly involving ceramics (Gingell 1988: 19-76). A different mechanism for the incorporation of barrows within later Roman contexts may possibly be seen in the use of mound material within third - fourth century structures at Camerton (Wedlake 1958: 31).

Finds were deposited within or in association with more prominent ritual prehistoric sites, some of which had become the focus for new ritual features. Later Roman period deposits were found within the upper levels of a prehistoric quarry ditch at Silbury, and an arc of four possible ritual shafts were located at the base of the hill (Corney 2001: 27, 29; see also Dark 1993: 137). Roman pottery and coins were also found at Stonehenge, thought by some to represent casual losses by ‘sightseers or picnickers’ (Robinson 2001: 162), although the evidence from other sites suggests the likelihood of ritual deposition. Recent excavation has revealed further Roman activity at the site, with Roman finds also being found at Avebury (pers. comm. Dr. Nick Snashall, Archaeologist for Avebury), and at West Kennet long barrow (Corney and Walters 2001: 25).

**D U R O T R I G I A N C I V I T A S**

Several primary and secondary Roman period barrows have been found within Durotrigia (Chapter 3, fig. 3.71), and it is again likely that at least some belonged to the later Roman period. Secondary burials within barrows cluster around Dorchester. New barrows were also constructed, such as the example on Handley Down, Gussage Hill, near to Bronze Age and late prehistoric barrows, which covered a cremation that might be dated to the fourth century (NMR_NATINV-209827). The range of votive deposits and grave goods, including Samian and Black Burnished ware ceramics, compare with those found at other sites across the region, and if occurring within late deposits, may demonstrate the deposition of ‘heirlooms’ (in parallel with other types of burial).

---

304 Deposits have been found at other Wiltshire barrows, although much material is found within the plough-soil that may not represent ritual activity, and more work is needed to confirm the extent of later Roman ritual activity at barrows within the region.
As was seen in Chapter 3 (fig. 3.71), votive activity at barrows is also concentrated on Cranborne Chase and in the Dorchester region. As well as correlating with Roman period secondary burial at prehistoric barrows, it is within these areas that late- or early post-Roman enclosure-barrow graves are found. In the South of the region, the possible appropriation of a prehistoric monument might be suggested by the presence of apparently domestic deposits overlying a barrow at St Aldhelms Head (RCHME 1970B: 474) – considering the evidence from the surrounding areas this most likely represents ritual, rather than domestic, activity.

**D U M N O N I A N  C I V I T A S**

Although many prehistoric barrows are known, there is as yet no evidence for their reuse for secondary burial (see above, fig. 3.73), which may suggest that such votive practices were incompatible with regional ritual ideologies. However, a Roman period barrow is noted at Chardstock (East Devon), containing a cremation within an urn, although the date is unverified (see Appendix, Tables 11 and 12). This may belong to either the early or late Roman period, although considering the increasing presence of Mediterranean practices within the Peninsula at the end of the Roman period (including the introduction of cremation, see above), it is most likely to date to the late fourth century or after.

Minimal votive activity at prehistoric monuments is also noted. As elsewhere, this material has only so far been dated very broadly to the Roman period (see Appendix, Table 13), and it is uncertain whether any or all of this activity is early or late. The small number of recorded incidences of such activity may point towards its later introduction.

**‘C O R N O V I A N ’  P A G U S**

A cremation seems to have been placed within a Bronze Age barrow at Wendron Kerrier during the Roman period (NMR_NATINV-425779), and ritual activity is noted at several prehistoric monuments within this region. The location of these practices at sites close to late- and post-Roman settlements, including Gwithian (see above, fig. 3.74; see Chapter 5), may again point to a later Roman date.

Primary barrows of Roman date have also been recognised at Paul, Penwith, again close to later Roman settlements, and at Kerris Vean (EHNMR-625566), which considering the noted changes to burial within the region during the later Roman period, are again likely to be late in date. A further late- or post-Roman mound grave, associated with an inscription, has been found at Boslow (Dark 2000: 158; see above, fig. 6.38).

---

305 Roman material within barrows and monuments occurs at: Lesquit Quoit; Perranzabuloe, Carrick; Gwinear, Gwithian; Camborne, Kerrier; two sites at Wendron, Kerrier; Morvah, Penwith; Chapel Carn Brea, Penwith (ADS).
There is resurgence in activity at prehistoric monuments (particularly barrows, but also henges) during the later fourth century, with both burial and ritual activity at these sites (including Neolithic and Bronze Age round barrows and long barrows) and major sites (including Silbury Hill, Avebury, and Stonehenge). This is defined by the deposition of a restricted range of material culture (including coins, certain ceramics, fibulae, and in some cases architectural fragments). Material of the first, second and third centuries appear sporadically, but fourth century material predominates. Barrows may have been seen as portals to the Otherworld - as locales for communicating with ancestors. It might therefore be argued that the placement of human remains within such contexts (often accompanied by the same range of objects) represent similar 'gifts to the gods', or perhaps more likely, to ancestral spirits - bearing in mind the general absence of finds specifically connected with deities (such as statuettes), as found on the Continent. This may be due to different perceptions surrounding the role of these monuments in Britain, and it is possibly related to the ways in which mythologies were created during and after the LPRIA.

Alongside the reuse of prehistoric barrows, these monuments were occasionally imitated during the Roman period. Intermittent modern investigation has confirmed this activity as later Roman in several cases, and in others this interpretation seems likely. Some of these monuments contained burials, whilst others received neither human remains nor other votive objects, although their comparison with prehistoric features suggests that they may have performed a ritual function.

Much has been written about the role of monuments within the landscape, including specific studies into this activity during and after the Roman period (e.g. van der Noort 1993; Williams 1997, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c), and to a certain extent, the construction of new barrows may have been prompted by similar motivations (and has been discussed in Chapters 2 and 3). The construction of mounds arguably acted as a mechanism for affirming land rights and developing new forms of social identity and cohesion (Williams 1998a: 91). Landscape features were appropriated in the reconstruction of a sense of place at this time, in an attempt to link the distant past with the present, providing the opportunity for creating histories – particularly with regard to the common location of nearby features, including (possibly reoccupied) hillforts. Such activity might therefore be expected at times.

---

306 As well as examples where finds are more certainly later Roman in date (providing a TPQ for such activity) the presence of 'heirlooms' within later Roman graves suggests that some ostensibly early Roman barrow reuse may in fact be dated to the later Roman period. Most examples were examined during the nineteenth century and thus dating evidence is often tenuous.

307 If so, this practice arguably indicates the limits of Imperial power within Britain, considering the outlawing of human sacrifice by Roman authorities (Merryfield 1987).
of social upheaval, and it is therefore no surprise that this was evident in the LPRIA and early Roman period, and again at the end of the Roman period.

Votive activity at prehistoric barrows may have provided a feeling of continuity with the past (and ensured ‘protection’ from the ancestors) at a time when the system was prone to internal change, in the face of externally inflicted disruption. This sporadic activity, which by its nature was open to manipulation within particular political agendas, facilitated the creation of tradition. (The occasional incidence of such behaviour may indicate that it was undertaken in response to specific events that were particularly traumatic or dangerous for the community, see Chapter 3.) The anonymity of long dead ancestors enabled their manipulation by local landowners in the emphasis of ancestral descent, possibly by integrating fictive kin. Ancestors would have played a vital role in the assertion of common (elite) descent, facilitating the construction of origin myths. Ritual activity at other prehistoric monuments may have been seen in the same way, although this behaviour perhaps relates more to appropriation of the prehistoric past, associated with continuity and stability - in the assertion of landownership and legitimisation of power, bearing in mind that secondary burials were generally placed within barrows, but not ritual monuments.

The ancient and recent dead are often used as a tool in legitimising authority - claiming to be ‘traditional’, by the ‘conceptualised belonging to an eternal and unchanging order’ (Bloch 1982: 11) - through the creation of shared histories and mythologies associated with particular locales. The ancestors (incorporated within recreated narratives associating particular kinship groups with places and their people) are frequently a resource in the construction of new communities. Kin groups are often confined to particular locales signifying common experiences, and very much integrated within local identities (Tilley 1994: 17, 18). Kinship may have been even more significant after the breakdown of Roman control, with dominant kin groups becoming the basis of most communities. Ancestors were perhaps essential components of these communities, unifying groups associated with particular estates. The landscape was transformed in other ways, being invested with new meanings that accommodated social, political, and economic changes, as significant places were reworked in the construction of new societies (see ibid. 18, 22). It seems likely that the construction of ‘imitation’ ancestral monuments was part of the same process, although their construction may have taken place as society was becoming increasingly Christianised, but at a stage when Christian and pagan beliefs and practices were still to a large degree syncretised. These sites may have therefore embodied the ancestral past at a time when reverence of the ancestors through votive deposition was seen as inappropriate behaviour.

The same process may possibly be seen in the incorporation of spolia and ‘heirloom’ objects within burial and ritual contexts. The selected votive objects carried associations with the places where they were made (see Helms 1993), or with the ancestors who used these ‘antique’ items
within ‘civilised’ acts, their origin entrenched within their symbolic meaning. This behaviour may indicate attempts to construct links with ancestors through the creation of mythologies, appropriating these ancestors in the construction new communities.

Whilst generalisations are of interest, and likely to be valid with regard to the broader function and meaning of these monuments, contextualised study has highlighted a number of factors specifically related to this practice within the Southwest. Even within the region, various social groups may have perceived these monuments differently, and understandings of the past might have changed over time, with local elites incorporating these monuments within their own agenda in recreating landscapes.

Such cases as the Long Mound at Crickley Hill, which was appropriated by local elites through its incorporation and enclosure within the elite settlement (controlling and restricting access to this monument), demonstrate how ritual and landscape might be manipulated in the establishment and maintenance of power (see Bradley 1987, 2002). A similar process might be seen at Silbury Hill, where earlier in the Roman period the location of a Roman road may have asserted State domination, by segmenting the ritual landscape (see Chapter 3). During the later Roman period, burial and votive deposition at this site may represent attempts to ‘reclaim’ the monument by local elites, again demonstrating control of the landscape within the renegotiation of power and identities in response to changing conditions. This process might also be seen in the incorporation of barrow material within domestic contexts at Camerton (if the perpetrator was indeed aware of their actions), and at St Aldhelms Head. However, we can but guess at the extent to which this represents an act of defiance towards or domination over local ancestral power.

Possible continuity of local mythological narratives are seen in the juxtaposition of practices seen during the LPRIA, early, and late Roman period within some regions, in particular Cranborne Chase. The location of a probable later Roman period cremation barrow at Sixpenny Handley (Dorset), for instance, near to Gussage (and to a later Roman high status settlement), may indicate the continued significance of this locale through oral tradition or ritual activity, perhaps in the expression of identity by a particular kinship or other interest group. Some prehistoric barrows have both Iron Age and Romano-British votive activity (see Appendix, Tables 6 and 13), although it is of course uncertain whether this is coincidental.

Barrows were apparently not appropriated for burial within Dumnonia, which perhaps supports a supposition that identities within this region developed outside a Roman discourse, if indeed regionalism was salient at all within this area. Nonetheless, sporadic deposition is noted during the Roman period (again, some of which is at least likely to be late in date), and a small number of barrows were constructed during and after the end of the Roman period.
In the ‘Cornovian’ territory, there is more evidence for barrow activity, including secondary burial and votive deposition within the vicinity of late- and post-Roman sites, as well as possible primary barrow burial. The insertion of a cremation within a barrow may be suggested to indicate ‘Mediterranean’ influence (though see above, Burial and ritual in association with hillforts and hilltop settlements). The correlation between ritual activity at monuments, and the distribution of tin ingots, may suggest that such activity acted as a mechanism for legitimising land control and social stratification in relation to the control of resources.

The common distribution of this range of barrow activity and construction, and of activity in the LPRIA, early, and late Roman periods, may suggest that these actions belong within the same ideological framework. Barrow burial is seen around some towns, possibly suggesting that some landowning elites holding rural estates close to their urban seats negotiated their identities, and influenced the construction of the identities of their associated rural communities, through this practice. It is perhaps also significant that some burials are placed within barrows during the Roman period near to reoccupied hillforts (see above, figs. 3.40, 3.59), perhaps reifying elite locales created during the LPRIA. This activity arguably reflects the performance of rituals relating to particular beliefs and narratives established during the LPRIA (and perhaps maintained through oral traditions) that incorporate concepts of ancestry, and may be related to the expression of local, and (considering the occurrence of this activity across the Southwest) regional, identity by landowners.

The restricted range of objects may indicate the location of this framework within the Classical world, symbolising ‘civilised’ dining; ‘correct’ dress (with stylistic differences possibly related to the expression of local or regional, or other collective, identities); economic engagement (and the images on the coins were perhaps significant in themselves); and dwelling in particular ways. The presence of architectural fragments within some mounds might also represent attempts to link local villas and other buildings with new community foci, asserting both the power to transform landscape and control populace through ritual. Consequently, activity at prehistoric sites and ‘natural places’ may have taken place outside of the State-sanctioned religious structure, and was perhaps another of the stereotypes used by local elites in appropriation of ancestral power, perhaps to enhance local authority.

However, suppositions that prehistoric monument reuse indicates a return to and reinvention of ‘nativism’ (Hollos 1999: 354; Rahtz and Watts 1979: 184) are untenable. Although this alternative practice perhaps held different meanings in different contexts and to different people, it is proposed that in general, it was not in direct opposition to ‘Roman’ culture. It has been seen that the possible ideologies behind such behaviour (particularly the probable perception of these sites as portals to
the 'Otherworld', see Holtorf 2000-08: 7.10) were evident within Classical, as well as 'Celtic', societies. It is highly likely that Graeco-Roman mythologies emphasising these ideas were known amongst some elites within the region during the later Roman period within the Southwest, bearing in mind the demonstration of literacy by some elites (see Chapter 5). Knowledge of the Aeneid is suggested in mosaic imagery at some sites within the region (see Chapter 5). It was noted in Chapter 2 that in Book 6 of Aeneid, Aeneas is described as watching a procession from on top of a barrow - a site that recalls the Augustan tomb within which Marcellus was interred 23 BC (Burke 1979: 225-26). It was argued in Chapters 2 and 3 that some members of the aristocracy may have (re)negotiated the meaning of prehistoric barrows within a Classical discourse, associating these sites with 'Mediterranean' ancestors, rather than with some form of 'pre-Roman' native past. As seen, there may be some correlation between ritual and elite settlement within this process, from the LPRIA through to the post-Roman period (with oppida, towns, and reoccupied hillforts), suggesting the continuity of aristocracies manipulating the same practices in the construction of identity over a long period.

It was proposed above that deposition at prehistoric monuments during the first and second centuries AD may be related to the similarity of British prehistoric barrows with the Augustan tombs of Rome (see Chapter 3). It might therefore be argued that acts of deposition provided arenas for the negotiation of ('Roman') cultural identity. Classical mythologies contain the burial of heroes within tumuli, and some may have been aware of the construction of 'princely' tumuli in Augustinian Rome (see Toynbee 1996: 144). Therefore, this behaviour is less likely to represent 'Celtic revival', than the influence of elite Mediterranean practices, alongside a desire to reconstruct local landscapes by appropriating prehistoric ancestors. However, we must return to the definitions of cultural and ethnic identity outlined within the Introduction to this thesis, where we see that emphasis upon ancestry (which it is argued this behaviour represents) differentiates cultural identity from ethnicity. The possibility that this behaviour potentially represents the negotiation of ethnic identity in some cases must therefore be allowed.

The potential deposition of 'heirlooms' may represent attempts to demonstrate the enduring continuity, and thus legitimacy, of descent groups at times of political formation, confirming the relationship of the mourners to the deceased (Parker Pearson 2003: 84, 85). But this may also indicate acts of conjunctive sacrifice (see Harris 1982), in which objects symbolising the ancestors were integrated within the construction of collective identities. Votive objects personified both donor and recipient, linking landowners with their elite ancestors. These ritual deposits were similar to objects accompanying burials inserted into prehistoric barrows, the uniform range of finds placed

---

308 Mythologies include the burial of Trojan heroes beneath barrows (such as Eetion, the king of Thebes, or Patrolocus, comrade of Achilles, in Book 6, Ins. 414ff, and Book 23, respectively, of Homer's Iliad).
within barrows across the Southwest (and in some other regions, such as the Peak District, see Jones, H 1997) suggesting their incorporation within an overarching ideology. This behaviour, considering the selection of material culture associated with ‘civilised’ practices, potentially indicates the construction of shared histories (perhaps through mythologies), within a Classical discourse. Although analysis of barrow activity in the sixth and seventh centuries has led to the proposal that such practices were undertaken in opposition to the Church (van de Noort 1993), probably in the contestation of power, it has been seen that such binary oppositions between Christian and pagan practices are perhaps unsustainable during this period. Votive activity at prehistoric monuments seemingly terminates at the end of the Roman period, which may relate to growing antipathy towards public performance of pagan ritual activity at this time. However, some votive activity at monuments (particularly those earlier reused for burial) may represent ‘graveside’ rituals, as seen within cemeteries (see above, Burial and ritual activity at hillforts, and below, Burial and ritual activity within rural contexts). Thus, some forms of ‘veneration’ at barrows had the capacity to be redefined within a Christian ideological framework, as was noted in the study of cemeteries.

Unfortunately, much of the evidence recovered from barrows derives from antiquarian investigations, in which excavations were too poorly executed, or stratigraphy too poorly recorded, to determine the relationship between deposits and Roman period burials. An interesting factor is the dearth of finds from probable later Roman (and possibly fifth century) barrows, suggesting that although there was a continuity of landscape use in constructing community and elite identities (as at Crickley Hill), there was also a transformation of practices to accommodate new belief systems.

BURIAL AND RITUAL ACTIVITY WITHIN OTHER RURAL CONTEXTS

DOBUNNIC CIVITAS

There is limited evidence for late Roman burial within rural contexts within the Dobunnic civitas (with the exception of the occasional villa site), which may be due to the provision of numerous urban cemeteries. Evidence for ritual dating to this period is found primarily at urban sites, temples, and barrows. It was noted in Chapter 4 that burials were sometimes marked by inscribed stones during the late- or post-Roman period within the Peninsula, and although there are no such inscriptions from the Dobunnic region, one example from outside the region may relate to regional identity. The name DOBVNNI (‘Dobunnus’) occurs on a memorial stone at Buckland Monachorum (Devon).

309 To reiterate, finds include ornamental metalwork, coinage, and a restricted ceramic range that correlates with those ceramics found within graves, on post-Roman settlements, and (with the exception of statuettes) at temples, including Samian and BB1, and their imitations.
which reads ‘DOBVNI FABRI FILII ENABARRI’ ([The stone] of Dobunnus the smith, son of
Enabarrus) (Thomas 1994: 237, 265; fig. 6.48). This may record the expression of regional identity
through the adoption of this name (Dark 1994: 110; Rivet and Smith 1979: 339-40).

Figure 6.48 ‘Dobunni’ stone, (after Thomas 1994, fig. 16.5)

A number of later Roman cremations are found on Northwest Belgic sites within the Southwest.
Amongst the fourteen late Roman inhumations in the cemetery at Winterbourne Down (Wiltshire)
are thirty-six cremation burials (Woodward 1993: 219). Two of the inhumation burials in this
cemetery are associated with coins of Constantius II and Valentinian, which have been used
(perhaps erroneously) to date these cremation burials (Foster 2001: 174). Cremations also occur
within the late third – fourth century cemetery at Parsonage Farm (Wiltshire) (ibid. 171). Possible
fourth century pyre debris pits have been found at Maddington Farm, alongside fourth century
inhumations (ibid. 167).

Some have argued that this late phase of cremation burial represents early Germanic activity
(see Clarke 1975: 52), which is possible in some cases, such as at Boscombe Down, considering
the potential Germanic parallels seen in nearby inhumations. However, this association is unique,
and the lack of Germanic finds, and the common presence of Romano-British artefacts, suggests
this is unlikely in most cases.
Later Roman cist burials are occasionally found within the Northwest Belgic region (although there are fewer than in the Dobunnic region), as at Eyewell Farm (Wiltshire) (Fitzpatrick and Crockett 1988: 12-20). Funerary enclosures are rare, although it has been suggested that circular enclosures were part of the mound burials at Overton Down (Rahtz, Hirst, and Wright, 2000: 405). At Boscombe Down Sports Field, eight inhumation burials were found within large chambers, one within a small square enclosure (Foster 2001: 197). This type of grave perhaps has Continental parallels, in the first and second century Germanic elite graves at Lübsow (Todd 1977: 41). A tightly crouched burial (fig. 6.49) is also noted nearby at Boscombe Down (New School Site) cemetery, associated with late Roman coins, a glass drinking vessel, and small ceramic beaker, demonstrating the complex juxtaposition of goods symbolising ‘civilised’ ‘Roman’ practices, with a supposedly ‘native’ burial form (e.g. see Faull 1977).310 Burials were placed within enclosures near to the adjacent village (fig. 6.50).311 Late Roman cremations are also recorded within this area, along with extensive remains suggesting the location of late Roman settlements, a probable temple, and a possible villa.

---

311 Ibid.
As at some Dobunnic sites, ‘Antique’ grave goods (particularly brooches) were found in some graves. A brooch of the first - second century was placed in the fill of one grave dating to the later fourth century or after at Nettleton (Wedlake 1982: 91), and an early (dolphin) brooch accompanied a possible fourth century cremation at Boscombe Down (Philpott 1991: 138, 177). As elsewhere, there is little certain evidence for the presence of either Christian or pagan ritual officials. However, a possible pagan priest’s grave has been identified at Wayside Farm, Nursteed (Wiltshire), due to the presence of what appeared to be ceremonial headgear and collar from the site (Mark Corney and John Valentin pers. comm.; Robinson 2001: 148; Valentin and Robinson 2002: 207). Finds from the civitas occasionally carry Christian symbolism, such as the nail-cleaner strap-end decorated with a peacock and tree of life from Monkton Deverill (Eckardt and Crummy 2006: 87).

DUROTIRIGIAN CIVITAS

There is a potentially significant regional cemetery at Portesham, where a possible LPRIA ‘dynastic’ shrine (with an associated ‘Durotrigian’ cemetery) developed through the Roman period (see Chapters 2 and 3). Its significance is seen in the (re)development of a cemetery on this site during the late- and / or post-Roman period. Five further burials within individual grave cuts (three of which were extended and oriented EW), were adjacent to a large (partially excavated) pit containing a minimum of four EW aligned inhumations (Valentin n.d.: 30-1). Although two skeletons from the pit were radiocarbon dated to the sixth-eighth centuries, Romano-British ceramics associated with the remaining burials provide a terminus post quem of AD 270-400; grave goods were not present within the stratigraphically early graves (ibid.). Cist graves were common in coastal areas, such as at the late- to post-Roman cemetery of nearly sixty graves at Ulwell Farm, near Swanage, which were primarily aligned EW and unaccompanied, though a late Roman coin was found in the fill of one grave (Frere 1984: 322).

Over thirty-four burials were recovered from Catsgore, including children (but not infants) interred within coffins and shallow slab-lined graves (Leech 1982: 31). However, at both Bradley Hill (fig. 6.51) and Catsgore (fig. 6.52), some infants were buried within cists (Philpott 1991: 100), possibly indicating the adoption of new religious ideologies. Cists also occurred at other rural sites across the Durotrigian territory. Notwithstanding ideological changes, pre-Roman practices

312 At Wayside Farm, Devizes, one of a number of pits associated with villa outbuildings contained an unusual set of chains, perhaps representing ceremonial headgear (Mark Corney pers. comm.). A garment collar from the site (Valentin and Robinson 2002: 207) may have also been to ritual apparel. A metal sceptre head was found associated with late Roman pottery in an enclosure ditch at Butterfield Down (Rawlings and Fitzpatrick 1996: 17).

313 As at Charlton Mackrell, Upton, Marshfield, Ham Hill, and Kimmeridge (Philpott 1991: 62, 63, 82). At Long Sutton, cists were associated with third and fourth century coins; at Marshfield, cist burials were dated to after AD 375, and associated with late fourth to early fifth century occupation; and at Ham Hill, one skeleton had a mid fourth century coin in the mouth with fourth century pottery in the grave fill (ibid. 62, 63, 82).
continued on some sites (alongside the adoption of new rites) - as human bones continued to be placed within some midden deposits, as at Bradley Hill (Everton 1981: 218).
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Figure 6.51 Late Roman burials within Building 3, with platform cairn circled (Leech 1981, fig. 9), and arrow pointing to burial within wall-line at Bradley Hill

Funerary enclosures are identified within the region in association with rural settlements: a ‘platform cairn’ was recognised at Bradley Hill (see fig. 6.53) – a type of grave that shows similarities to Irish and ‘Pictish’ grave enclosures (see above). The inhumation within this grave was NS aligned, and a coin of AD 320-40 had been placed in the mouth of the corpse (O’Brien 1999: 21). A possible late Roman circular ‘mausoleum’ was found at Witchampton (Dorset) (Woodward 1993: 253) - a site at which early Roman tumuli were recognised (see Appendix, Table 12; see Chapter 3, fig. 3.71).

314 Parallels from Southwest Ireland have been noted: at Illoughhann, a ditch containing post-settings, perhaps indicating a fence, enclosed an area measuring 5 x 7m; and at Killabuonia, a comparable ditch with post-settings enclosed a 3 x 3m area (Ashmore 1980: 353). However, there are possible differences: the Bradley Hill example does not have the enclosure interrupted at the corners, such as occurs on many (but not all) of the Pictish forms.

315 This type of grave consists of low cairns (sometimes circular within the West), placed over a central long-cist grave and surrounded by a drystone kerb. The Bradley Hill grave was slab-lined, under a rectangular mound with stone revetment; hobnailed boots were found by the right foot (O’Brien 1999: 21).

316 In the Western and eastern cemeteries at Shepton Mallet NS and WE graves were also found within sub-circular enclosures (O’Brien 1999: 19, 21).
The alignment of burials within rural areas paralleled that at urban sites. Although some burials within the late fourth century cemetery at Bradley Hill (figs. 6.51, 6.53) - containing over fifty burials - were influenced by the buildings in the nearby settlement, others were placed adjacent to field boundaries, possibly representing family plots associated with each group of farm buildings (ibid. 31, 33). One burial had been reinterred within the wall of Building 3 (burial F 110), with three other burials placed within slab-lined graves inside the building (perhaps initially a byre) before construction (Leech 1981: 189; see fig. 6.52). Although four of the twenty-one infant burials placed within this building seemingly post-date its use, the remainder were possibly contemporaneous (see figs. 6.51, 6.53).

Grave goods were less common than in the early Roman period (perhaps due to a higher incidence of ‘Christian’ burial rites), but are occasionally found, and at Bradley Hill, typically included hobnailed boots (Leech 1982: 31). Heirlooms are again sometimes found within graves: at Sparkford Hill (Queen Camel, near to South Cadbury), a first - mid second century brooch was found with a skeleton and a pot dating to c. AD 250-400 (Philpott 1991: 138, 177).

Few later Roman burials within the region have been excavated, and it is therefore difficult to generalise regarding burial practices. However, current investigations indicate that the ‘Christian’ rite was increasingly adopted during the fourth century (if the Cannington cemetery is included as ‘Dumnonian’), as in parts of the Durotrigian region. Few grave goods are found, and graves were...
primarily WE aligned, within rows, and avoided cutting other graves (Pearce 2004; Rahtz, Hirst and Wright 2000). Interment within long-cist graves was introduced to Dumnonia at the end of the fourth century (possibly from Durotrigia, but perhaps from South Wales or the Continent), and perhaps spread from this region to Ireland (Dark 2000). Stone-lined graves were also relatively common, and some coffins are found, although dug graves predominated. The general dearth of inhumation cemeteries suggests that most found no need to emulate Gallo-Mediterranean culture in the assertion of status and identity at death.

Some mortuary enclosures are found: a Romano-British circular hut at Beacon Hill (Lundy, Devon), dated by ceramics to the first century BC - second century AD, was subsequently used to enclose an inhumation (Thomas 1994: 167, 169; fig. 6.54; see above, fig. 5.14; Ch. 5). During the following phase of cemetery activity, the hut wall was dismantled, and its larger slabs reused for a rectangular feature filled with small granite pieces forming a cairn approximately 1m high (ibid. 170), creating an enclosure grave similar to examples seen elsewhere in the Southwest. Possible later fourth century inscriptions - dedications to OTIMI and RESTEUTA (Pearce 2004: 104) - were associated with the cemetery (see Memoria within the ‘Cornovia’ section below). In total, sixteen possible late fourth - fifth century inscribed stones have been found in Devon (Appendix, Table 15; see Chapter 4).

A large cemetery of approximately 350 mostly EW aligned, unfurnished, ‘dug’ graves at Kenn (Devon) (fig. 6.55), cut a ground surface containing late Roman pottery (Pearce 2004: 119-20), indicating a date during or after the late-Roman period. The site contained rectangular mortuary enclosures (similar to those seen within the Durotrigian territory at Poundbury, Ed. 1987). These features mostly enclosed single inhumations, although one grave contained three burials (Pearce 2004: 120). Graves within this cemetery included infant burials (ibid. 119).
It was noted in Chapter 4 that numerous inscribed stones dating to the late- or post-Roman period are found across Dumnonia (but primarily within ‘Cornovia’). None specifically declares Dumnonian origin or identity (which would not be expected, considering the more common assertion of ethnic and regional identity in situations of opposition). However, during the later Roman period, Dumnonian identity is asserted in inscriptions from outside the Southwest region, for example, on the tombstone of an auxiliary at Cologne (Bidwell 1980: 11). Epigraphic evidence, dating to the late fourth century, from Hadrian’s Wall also expresses Dumnonian identity (ibid. 16). During the early fifth century (c. AD. 425), those burying a female expatriate in Salonae (within the Eastern empire, in Dalmatia) assert her origin as civis Dunnonia (Snyder 1998: 79). These cases demonstrate the emphasis of regional identity within external (initially military) contexts, most likely originating from the internalisation of external (‘Classical’) categorisations imposed during the course of the Roman period. That is, regional identity was constructed within a ‘Roman’ discourse, through established practices located within a Gallo-Mediterranean cultural framework.
As in other Southwestern rural regions, few cemeteries have been discovered, suggesting that for most, methods of burial established before or during the Roman period continued (see Chapter 2) – i.e. that remains were disposed of in some way that is archaeologically undetectable (such as non-burial of cremations, excarnation, or burial on the shoreline, for instance) (see Fitzpatrick 2007: 164). Some cemeteries, such as Crantock, St. Enodoc, and Harlyn Bay, continued through the Roman period and into the post-Roman period (Olson 1982: 181). However, it is possible that others, such as Phillack (Pearce 2004: 151), Carnanton, Restormel (Todd 1987: 251), and possibly Tintagel, were established during the late Roman period (see above, Ritual and burial at hillforts).

Sadly, soil conditions within the Peninsula are poor, resulting in minimal recovery of skeletal material, and often rendering methods of burial undetectable. However, grave forms and indications of cemetery organisation survive. New practices were introduced within the region during or after the end of the Roman period, with the adoption of some rites that are seen across the Empire, such as extended inhumation within long cist (or stone-lined) graves, with few grave goods. However, alignment is often varied until during and after the later fifth century. Although it is likely that at least some are of Medieval date, twenty-eight long cist cemeteries, similar to late- and post-Roman sites elsewhere, are recorded West of the Tamar (Pearce 2004: 102). As in other areas of the Southwest, there may be some association between elite sites and cemeteries. The location of continuing and newly established cemeteries is significant: it has been suggested above that ports or trading sites may have developed near Phillack and St Enodoc, and it is possible that Harlyn Bay and Tintagel were also used as ports at this time. It is also perhaps significant that several type G brooches (see Chapter 4) have been found near to the Harlyn Bay, and within the St Enodoc cemeteries, demonstrating cultural exchange and possibly indicating a source of influence for these burials in the Bristol Channel region. Cremations were also found in association with the trading (or fishing) settlement at St Minver, located near to the Fowey estuary, on the north bank of Padstow harbour (NMR_NATINV-430827, ADS), where the find of a miniature axe suggests the possible location of a temple or shrine during the Roman period (see above).

There is little direct evidence for early Christianity in the recognition of Christian worship, although Constantinian chi-rho crosses (primarily inscribed upon stone) have been found at Phillack (fig. 6.56), Cape Cornwall, St Just, Sourton, St Endillion, and possibly Southill, and can be compared with late Roman Continental examples (Pearce 2004: 244).

317 There is also the possibility that many remains have yet to be discovered.
A total of thirty-four possible late- or early post-Roman inscribed stones have been found within the region (see Appendix 15; fig. 4.21; see Pearce 2004: 104). Again, none from the ‘Cornovian’ region assert affiliation with the region. However, it was seen in Chapter 4 that Irish personal names occur on several stones, including at Lewannick (fig. 6.57, left), recording the name Ulaugh (reading [HIC] IACIT VLCAGNI) (Okasha 1993: 152), with ogham often occurring alongside Latin inscriptions; and that some memorials include the Irish term maggas, ‘of a son’, as well as the Latin filius. The other example from Lewannick, although inscribed only with ogham text, records a Latin name, Ingenuus (fig. 6.57, right), and reads INGENVI MEMORIA (Thomas 1994: 262-63).
Only a small number of later Roman cemeteries have been found within rural contexts outside those contexts considered above (i.e. hillforts, villas, and temples), but this may reflect the ability to detect such sites, more than any actual dearth of these sites within the rural landscape. However, commercial archaeology is steadily revealing more rural settlements of this period, some of which have associated burials. Burials associated with farmsteads seem to be more common, often potentially organised as ‘family’ plots, which may reflect the definition of kinship groups in the consolidation of rural communities, as well as perhaps the possible separation of urban and rural communities – as is also suggested by changes seen within urban contexts. Such transformations may account for the decline in burial within large urban cemeteries during the early fifth century.

Some rites that occur more frequently within rural contexts, such as crouched burial, have in the past been seen by some as indicators of ‘nativism’. Crouched inhumation has been seen by some as perpetuating pre-Roman rites, and thus representing rejection of ‘Roman’ culture (see Faull 1977). However, considering the contexts in which these burials generally occur (often accompanied by ‘Roman’ practices and finds, or within boundaries or enclosures, or in barrows), it may instead be argued that this particular rite is more related to the perceived fate of the deceased (perhaps allocated a form of ‘sacrificial’ role). Nevertheless, this does suggest some continuity of cosmological ideologies (as suggested by the common alignment of buildings within rural settlements).

Inhumation had been the most common form of burial since the LPRIA, although a small number of cremations have been found within rural contexts. Several late cremations occur within the Belgic civitas, which may show Germanic influence, but this cannot be argued for all cremations within the region. Late cremations also occur on the Peninsula, and may have Irish influence (pers. comm. Dr David Petts), although cremation had been supplanted by inhumation within Ireland at this time (Edwards 1996: 129). If we consider the occurrence of this rite in other regions, such as the Peak District, we again see late examples, which might suggest that this rite was part of wider processes of change. As in the Peninsula, some may be associated with barrows (see Jones, H 1997); but the Peak District has neither evidence for early Germanic activity, nor Irish influence. One explanation for this practice within all three regions might be the presence of auxiliaries – buckles are found within the Southwest and the Peak District (PAS-LVPL467), and their absence within the Peninsula is arguably due to the use of Irish auxiliaries (see Chapter 4). Alternatively, these burials might reflect the appropriation of archaic practices associated with the Roman world by local elites, in
attempts to create hierarchy and possibly cultural and professional identity. However, for the present these suggestions can be no more than speculative.

By examining long-term changes within particular rural localities, it is evident that some locales remained symbolically significant throughout the Roman period, or were again significant at the end of the Roman period, suggesting attempts to maintain local traditions (perhaps through narratives, as well as practices) over long periods (although it is likely that these local traditions were recreated and adapted, as required). If we examine the range of activities within these locales over this time, it would seem that elites continued to control ritual by situating practices within particular (sometimes opposing) cultural discourses. For example, the possible shrine at Portesham draws upon links with Armorica (rather than Northern Gaul) during the Conquest period, the associated burials incorporating symbolism associated with the regional Southern Dorset group. ‘Traditional’ architecture is maintained over the Roman period (with the development of an associated settlement), the site perhaps forming a focus for burials at the end of the Roman period. This renewed significance was perhaps stimulated by social instability, the apparent continuity of this site perhaps rendering it particularly significant within the reconstruction of new identities (or the consolidation of established identities), in the creation of alternative structures of power. The location of this site, and its possible ritual significance, may have encouraged the development of local mythologies supporting regional dynasties established in the LPRIA, which were perhaps incorporated within social memories appropriated in the creation of regional identity during and after the later Roman period.

The incidence of enclosure graves, as at Kenn, may suggest the introduction of new ways of expressing status and cultural identity, and arguably in the construction of regional elites, possibly within the creation of new power structures during or after the late Roman period. The location of these practices within a Dumnonian rural context (rather than in association with nearby Exeter) may indicate that urbanism was not deeply embedded within the identities of regional elites. However, the proximity of Exeter may explain the apparent influence of Mediterranean style, either due to contact with administrative elites based in the town accustomed to expressing status within a ‘Roman’ cultural idiom, or from trade with the Continent. Whilst for the majority within the Dumnonian civitas, Roman identity is likely to have been irrelevant (even as a mechanism of social mobility), it cannot be claimed that they were entirely unaffected by ‘Roman’ culture. For much of the Roman period, Gallo-Mediterranean style was manipulated within established local discourses (cf. Quinnell 1993). However, much more work is needed to establish the extent to which new social structures permeated society.
Historical changes during the late- and post-Roman may have provoked further development of regional ‘awareness’ within the Peninsula, which may be compared to the development of groups within Southern England during the LPRIA (cf. Barrowman, Batey and Morris 2007: 329). In reconstructing society and developing social hierarchies after the withdrawal of Roman military power, external ‘ethnographic’ categorisations (e.g. by Gaulish or Mediterranean elites) may have become more extensively internalised, encouraging the construction of regional identity as society stabilised during the fifth century.

An explicit mechanism for the expression of identity is the accompaniment of burials by inscribed tombstones, some of which denote the ‘territorial’ origin of the deceased. However, such grave markers are uncommon, and no definite late Roman period examples have been found within the region. Nevertheless, over seventy inscriptions have been recognised from Cornwall and Devon (Okasha 1993: 28), nearly sixty of which may date to the late- or post-Roman period (see Appendix, Table 15). Whilst many suggest an Early Medieval date for these inscriptions, it has been argued that they may be placed within the late Roman period (Handley 2001).

Irish influence is possible (and the Irish ogham stones themselves may have been influenced by the Roman tradition of grave and route markers, or even building markers, see Edwards 2001: 17-18; Thomas 1994: 35-6). However, the collection of inscriptions in the region (and elsewhere in the West) demonstrates appropriation of ‘Roman’ methods of memorialisation in the construction of social memory (see Barrett 1993). These stones also demonstrate the purported literacy of the elite kin (and thus their status), and show the construction of regional elite identity within a Roman discourse during or after the end of the Roman period, as well as perhaps appropriating prehistoric monumentality.

The evident differences between Western British late- or post-Roman inscriptions, and those found elsewhere in Britain during the Roman period, on the Continent, and in the Mediterranean during the fourth – and fifth centuries, makes a continuing tradition unlikely, and importation from outside the province more probable.318 Whereas ‘Roman’ inscriptions are more commonly of dressed stone slabs, those in the West are generally of un-carved stone, although some are shaped as pillars (Okasha 1993; see above).319 This factor may support the argument for Irish

318 Although it is argued that Roman period and purportedly late Roman inscriptions generally occur in the same areas (Handley 2001: 197), this cannot be said of the inscriptions of Southwest Britain. It has been seen that Roman period inscriptions concentrate around the urban centres (in particular within and around Bath), whereas no supposedly late Roman inscriptions come from this area. Conversely, the supposedly late Roman inscriptions are concentrated within Cornwall, whereas no sculpture of any form is noted from this area during the Roman period. It is therefore difficult to see the development of these inscriptions as part of a continuing tradition of epigraphy.

319 The belief in Gaulish influence is primarily based upon the incidence of the Hic Iacet formula - which is frequently found in Western Britain, and indicating their role as gravestones - occurring in Lyon at this time (see Knight 1992: 48; 1996: 108; Okasha 1993). However, it has been demonstrated that this formula occurs elsewhere in the fourth century (including other sites in Gaul, but also numerous examples are found in North Africa) (Hanley 2001). This suggests that these inscriptions represent widespread Late Antique developments of late fourth century practices of commemoration,
influence, especially considering the presence of undressed memorial stones bearing ogham inscriptions within fourth century Ireland, and the verticality of texts seen both in Ireland and Western Britain – a deviation from late Roman textual alignment (but see Handley 2001: 189; see Chapter 4). The ogham inscriptions (with their record of military titles as personal names) demonstrate the emphasis of ‘Roman’ origins, possibly by Irish settlers, and potentially by descendants of auxiliaries, or of later foederati troops (Okasha 1993 *passim*). Charles Thomas has made the alternative suggestion that they represent the burial of Christian missionaries en route to the Continent from Ireland and South Wales (Thomas 1994).

The presence of shared cultural traditions between Southwest Britain – in particular ‘Cornovia’ (but also Dumnonia as a whole) - and Ireland during and after this time has been considered above. It has been argued that the elite of Ireland were, like the ‘barbarians’ of Continental and Mediterranean regions, appropriating ‘Roman’ practices in the process of creating and reinforcing social hierarchies at this time, and it is suggested that monumental memorialisation, in imitation of Latin funerary monuments or milestones, was part of this process (cf. Dark 2000: 158, 162, 166). Thus, cultural exchange between Western Britain and Ireland during and after the later fourth century incorporated the development of memoria.

Even though outside influence, and the (re)importation of this idea from Ireland, is more likely than influence from adjacent regions, it cannot be assumed that several generations elapsed between transmission from the Continent or Mediterranean to Western Britain. On balance, the inscribed stones seem to demonstrate an amalgamation of cultural influence, the most probable course of events being export of ‘Roman’ memorial practices to Ireland during the fourth century (alongside a number of other cultural influences), probably from the Bristol Channel region; followed by the import into Western Britain of memorialisation during or after the late fourth to early fifth centuries - again in response to mixed Continental and Mediterranean influences. Considered in conjunction with the other material culture of the region, adoption of these stones in Southwest Britain therefore probably represent changes to the identities of local elites, as part of the ‘barbarisation’ of Roman culture - as seen on the Continent. (Although in this case, we may be witnessing the ‘Hibernisation’, rather than the ‘Germanisation,’ of culture as seen in Southeast Britain.)

and therefore indicate inclusion of the region within the Roman world into the fifth century (*ibid*). Occurrence of the ‘angle-bar A’ has also been used to date these inscriptions to after the late fifth century, due to their occurrence in Gaul c. AD 475; however, their appearance in Gaul and Britain during and after the early Roman period, and across the Continent and Mediterranean during the later fourth – sixth centuries, has been demonstrated (Handley 2001: 190-92). The distribution supports the export of memorialisation to Ireland from the Avon region during the later Roman period, with their subsequent distribution in Western Britain correlating with possible Irish contact through trade and exchange.

320 The use of Latin titles also legitimised ‘barbarian’ leaders, within Roman political framework (Chrysos 1997: 11).
The location of inscribed stones again demonstrates the reorganisation and control of the landscape, supporting nascent ‘systems of dominance’ (see Tilley 1994: 26). It is thought that many stones were placed adjacent to roads and significant tracks (Dark 2000), suggesting their role as route-markers (Pearce 2004); others are found within river valleys (see fig. 4.21). This perhaps indicates the appropriation of the role of earlier, imperial, route-markers, emphasising the position of the elites as new leaders (but within a ‘Roman’ cultural frame of reference) in relation to local and wider communities.

It may be argued that the level of literacy within the region is irrelevant: the use of Latinity found within inscriptions was perhaps used to assert ‘hidden knowledge’ to the illiterate non-elites (again comparable with the LPRIA situation in Southern England) (Tilley 1994: 26-29), further constructing social hierarchy and cultural identity. Their placement within these locations arguably indicates upkeep of these routes. The establishment and maintenance of paths often enables the continuity of socio-political alliance (perhaps including or encouraging the development and perpetuation of inter-familiar relationships made distant through exogamy) between distant groups and political units (ibid. 30).

Again, a number of themes become evident from detailed examination of the evidence. Firstly, with the breakdown of established mechanisms for the negotiation of power through ritual and burial practices, a number of alternative mechanisms were created, through which local elites might have renegotiated both status and power within the community, outside the State structure. This incorporated the appropriation and transformation of ‘Roman’ contexts (such as towns, villas, and temples), and material culture (seen in the use of spolia and heirlooms), in which ‘Roman’ symbols of power and identity were reincorporated and reinvented within the construction of new communities. Secondly, across a wide range of contexts, it is apparent that the ancestors were a valuable resource in the reconstruction of social identities.

Overall, it is again apparent that terms such as ‘nativism’ and ‘Celtic revival’ are inappropriate, considering the bricolage witnessed during this time. However, these transformations do indicate common ideologies in response to changing historical conditions – as indicated by a comparable manipulation of material culture.

322 Through knowledge of ‘ancestral’ paths – and through the invention of myth - the local elite could also assert their roles as guardians of the past of and access to the Otherworld (Tilley 1994: 30).
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

Ethnic, Cultural, and Social Identity in Southwest Britain, c. AD 350-450

INTRODUCTION

The primary aim of this thesis is to consider the nature and extent (if any) of ethnic and social identities within Southwest Britain, c. AD 350 – 450. Because previous interpretations proclaim an early collapse and rejection of Roman culture and Romanitas (e.g. Reece 1980, 1989; Faulkner 2000), with a ‘return’ to pre-Roman culture - often seen as a process of ‘Celtic Revival’ - regional culture was examined from the LPRIA to assess the evidence for continuity, and to consider the possible development of ‘nativist’ ideologies. Alternative interpretations claim Romano-British cultural (and to some extent, political) continuity well into the post-Roman period, and consider that transformations represent wider processes of change within the Empire (e.g. Dark 2000; Harris 2003). Examination of the longue durée has enabled the changing significance of ‘Roman’ material culture within the construction of cultural and ethnic identities within the region from the LPRIA to the fifth century to be assessed. This approach also enabled processes of ethnogenesis to be fully considered.

With the question of ethnicity in mind, it is hoped that this thesis has shed some light on previous hypotheses, and has presented alternative explanations for cultural continuity and change within Southwest Britain during the late- and early post-Roman periods. The conclusions presented below are also hypotheses that might well be tested within other regions – particularly the North and West of Britain – so as to consider evidence for the construction of local, regional, and perhaps in some cases, ethnic, identities by other elites; and to investigate ways in which these identities might have developed after the mid fifth century.323

323 Suggestions as to how identity developed within Southwest Britain c. AD 450-650 were presented at 'Locating the Voice: Expressions of Identity in the Middle Ages' conference, University of Sheffield, June 2008, and recently published (Jarrett 2009), but require revision in the light of the conclusions of this thesis.
CONCLUSIONS

Detailed investigation of a wide range of contexts and material culture (alongside texts) has enabled the proposal of a regionally specific narrative. This not only covers transformations at the end of the Roman period and into the post-Roman period, but also - so as to provide a backdrop to this transitional period - explores changes from the LPRIA and through the Roman period. The results of this thesis will now be summarised, beginning with the conclusions drawn within Chapter 2.

The range of Late Iron Age settlement, burial, and ritual practices within the Southwest region was analysed to determine the extent of insular cultural continuity and external cultural influence, and the correlation between ‘Gallo-Mediterranean’ style settlement, mortuary, and ritual sites. The possible creation of dynasties and related cults, and construction of ‘British’ ethnicity and regional identities within the region during the LPRIA was investigated in the light of this evidence. The potential markers of Roman cultural identity were examined, and considered in relationship to signifiers of ‘British’ ethnic identity. Shortfalls in the recording of data in many early excavation reports make it difficult to investigate a wide range of changing practices, and so to distinguish between potential evidence for the negotiation of cultural or ethnic identity, and the expression of status. However, a number of themes were evident, and it is suggested that:

Some late pre-Roman aristocracies within Southwest Britain appropriated Gallo-Mediterranean style and practices in the creation of opposition to nascent identity groups.

Whilst comparable cultural changes are witnessed across the region as a whole, different areas experienced political incorporation within the Roman world in different ways during the late pre-Roman period. Some may have asserted ‘Roman’ political affiliation after Caesar’s Conquest (and perhaps in a small number of cases, cultural identity through particular forms of behaviour), though it is anticipated not all.

The appropriation of Gallo-Mediterranean style was at least in part a mechanism for recreating local and regional power structures and (re)constructing local and regional identities in the face of changing historical conditions, during and after the mid first century BC. Furthermore:

Regional identities were reified in response to external categorisation, and Roman models of power - in some cases through the development of established social networks, but perhaps in others in opposition to these networks. The constitution of these groups relates to the creation of political territories, rather than representing enduring ethnic entities.
Although elite constructs, regional identities were (at least at times) significant to those incorporated within discursive relationships with elites. These identities were expressed through selective elements of regionally discrete (sometimes material) culture, and disseminated through established social networks. Changes in burial tradition, and ritual practice, for members of regional groups suggest transformations to perceptions of the afterlife, enabling the creation of foci that perhaps represent the development of ancestral cults. Ritual was potentially used to confirm (perceived) common origin and shared culture, although there is little concrete evidence to verify this possibility (and this process may be archaeologically invisible). Common material culture was generally limited to the production of ceramics (and coinage in most areas) which, though essentially indicating the existence of socio-economic networks, may also have become incorporated within the construction of regional identities at this time - used as a medium to transmit particular messages about the regional elite and the notion of territory. However, in conclusion, the extent to which regional 'tribal' identities (which were generally restricted to much smaller areas than commonly believed) may have been ethnic in nature is uncertain, but local variation (incorporating 'traditional' material and practices) argues against this activity representing the presence of immigrant communities.

The evidence suggests that a 'national consciousness' may have been developed at this time:

> *In a small number of cases, political interaction between indigenous and ‘Roman’ elites under (subservient) client relationships may have led to the internalisation and development of the Classical ethnographic construct of the ‘British’ by regional elites.*

Elites may have constructed ethnic identity (by asserting a common Mediterranean origin) within the creation of social hierarchy. It is difficult to date precisely when these practices may have began, but some time shortly after the late first century BC is most likely. It is argued that such behaviour was perhaps stimulated by a need to create ontological security after Caesar’s partial domination of Southern territories (see Freeman 2001). In this respect, *obsides* may have had a significant role in influencing insular LPRIA elite culture, encouraging the potential assertion of Mediterranean ancestry within Southern and Eastern Britain (Creighton 2004). This would suggest a much earlier origin for the ‘Trojan’ origin myth witnessed within the later accounts of Nennius and Geoffrey of Monmouth (cf. *ibid*). Although some innovative cultural changes may have come directly from the Mediterranean, others perhaps reached Britain via the Continent. The role of Classical literacy in disseminating new ideas must also be allowed.

---

324 Some round barrows (such as at Birdlip) seemingly pre-date Continental examples, suggesting the introduction of the idea directly from the Imperial centre.
Alternative interpretations assert that the cultural changes noted in Southern Britain during the LPRIA reflect new ways of expressing non-Roman identity within an indigenous milieu, or that these transformations represent ‘Gallicisation’ (Woolf, G. 1998). However, these processes should be seen as part of a series of events (see below) - in which ancestry (principally, shared elite origin) became paramount in the creation of new identities, which in conjunction with the use of a selected range of objects and practices to emphasise common culture, points towards the ethnic nature of this behaviour. However, the emphasis on ‘Gallic’ cultural associations by kinship groups or individuals is possible in some cases (for instance, perhaps in the creation of regional identities in the South Coast area of the region). It is argued that the ability to manipulate this culture in different ways enabled the development of ‘reactionary’ groups (in this case, perhaps in the Northeast Dorset region).\(^\text{325}\)

In the construction of identities by new and reactionary groups, a major shift in worldview seemingly accompanies potential situations of ethnic construction (though the evidence suggests continuity of populations). Ritual practices (including votive shaft deposition, for instance) suggest changing perceptions of the afterlife reflecting beliefs situated within a Classical frame of reference, which may account for the development of deposition at barrows, sites in all probability associated with the ancestors (and a practice evident across much of the region). This may also be related to the construction of barrows for burial. Classical mythologies (which (re)introduced the idea of the spirits of heroic ancestors residing in barrows) arguably influenced this practice, contextualising the landscape, and creating shared traditions. It is possible that such behaviour (enacted by local landowners) appropriated the identity of (prehistoric) ‘ancestors’. However, this behaviour was part of a Classical discourse - the selective use of particular artefacts, symbolising ‘civilised’ behaviour. Local variation (and the incorporation of local traditions) argues against the idea that this activity represents that of immigrants.

Belonging to an elite ‘ethnic’ group legitimised local power, with the creation of a ‘national consciousness’ enabling notions of ‘right to rule’ to develop during this time of political instability. This identity will have primarily formed distinctions within communities (establishing notions of superiority); however, as suggested by previous studies, there is no evidence to suggest the widespread expression of ‘British’ identity at this time.

The adoption of ‘Roman’ culture sprang from a number of motivations, primarily related to attempts to maintain, transform, or create, structures of power, but also to the (re)construction of regional,

---

\(^{325}\) Tacitus’ belief that similar language and religious beliefs indicate that the Britons (with the exception of the Caledonians and Silurians) were descended from the Gauls (\textit{Agricola} 11) should be noted. Some elites of Southern Britain may have internalised this assumption, but the extent to which it was generally accepted (or known of) is uncertain.
and possibly elite ethnic, identities (perhaps largely in attempts to create ontological security after political rupture). The term ‘Romanisation’ is thus misleading, and possibly inappropriate, with regard to cultural change at this time, as it assumes an external force controlled this process, whereas I contend that this change was mainly driven from within.

Chapter 3 examined continuities of, and transformations to, pre-Roman culture in relation to the increasing adoption of Mediterranean-style culture during the early Roman period, across the region and across socio-economic groups. The possible significance of cultural change with particular regard to the construction of new cultural identities was considered, and the concept of public and private identities was explored. Potential ethnic markers, such as the range of votive deposits and the forms of secondary burial at barrows and other prehistoric ritual sites, and the forms of barrow graves, were examined. The relationship of this activity to LPRIA sites that showed signs of ‘Gallo-Mediterranean’ influence (particularly enclosure and barrow graves and oppida or oppidum-type sites), and to Roman period central sites, was analysed. It was suggested that:

*Mediterranean style is likely to have been primarily used in the creation or maintenance of social hierarchy, with few adopting a ‘Roman’ cultural identity*

‘Roman’ material culture and style had various meanings within various contexts, being only gradually and partially incorporated within the reconstruction of community and personal identities, with minimal change to social structures. A disparity between public personas and private practices was often noted, and it was argued that this perhaps signals the negotiation of collective identities located outside of the State (or perhaps in some cases even in opposition to the State), whilst at the same time new styles were appropriated in the expression of status.

It is argued that, only where transformations in both style and practices represent a clear ‘epistemological break’, within which material culture supported the negotiation of new social structures (bearing in mind the rigid social structure embodied within and by Roman cultural identity), might it be assumed that cultural identities were re-written to accommodate the new worldview. It was noted that only micro-scale analysis might detect such processes (and currently such analyses are limited).

It was also argued that, contrary to the claims of many, ‘Roman’ culture influenced the construction of identities throughout the Southwest:

*In no part of the Southwest was ‘Roman’ culture excluded in the construction of regional identities. Regional groups were mediated through Gallo-Mediterranean style, as local cultural manifestations were transformed to accommodate this culture.*
Changing historical and material conditions required the incorporation of new forms and styles of material culture within the renegotiation of identities (and any exclusion of such culture was selective and limited). In this scenario, the adoption of Roman symbols of power was integral to the inter-relationship of elite power and regional identity. In addition:

- The salience of ‘British’ identity remained primarily an elite construct during much of the Roman period, but became more cohesive and expansive over this time.

During the early Roman period (first - third century), prehistoric monuments increasingly received votive depositions and secondary burials within mounds (perhaps in veneration of ‘Mediterranean’ ancestors) – so as to enable the legitimisation of ‘rightful’ power and landownership, and reconstruction of local landscapes within a Classical discourse. This was in continuation of ideologies and practices established during the LPRIA, and may represent the development of local or regional (and possibly dynastic) ancestral cults, perhaps maintained over several centuries through mythologies and ritual practice. The apparent placement of spolia within burial and ritual contexts was also noted, some of which may date to this period (though most evidence belongs to the later Roman period), supporting the suggestion that relationships with the ancestors were created and mediated through material culture located within a ‘Classical’ discourse.

The dominant view is that these practices represent generalised ancestor worship, divorced from ideas of Mediterranean descent, and possibly in assertion of ‘non-Roman’ ancestry (e.g. Holtorf 2000-08). However, the restricted range of votive deposits suggests their deliberate selection within a defined cultural frame of reference, common to many landowners across wide regions. These finds characteristically include Samian and sometimes other fine wares (which, it is argued, symbolise ‘civilised’ practices), and architectural fragments such as window glass and tiles (i.e. from ‘Mediterranean’ style buildings). These deposits feasibly embodied both the (Mediterranean) ancestor spirits to whom they were donated, and their donors, who were attempting to construct continuous cultural links between the past and the present.

Holtorf’s contention that similar activity within Ireland indicates minimal Roman impact upon parts of Britain must be contested, considering the occurrence of barrow reuse within areas in which Classical influence was more prevalent such as the Gloucester hinterland. Much barrow reuse and construction within the Southwest is focused around civitas centres, towns, and villas, and within ‘military’ zones, near military sites, or ports. Local variation (with the incorporation of ‘traditional’ material and practices) again suggests that this activity was undertaken by local, rather than migrant, elites. The occurrence of similar activity within Ireland is likely to be due to cross-cultural exchange, particularly from the Bristol Channel region, and is possibly in some Irish cases due to
the emulation of practices seen as Roman. It is noted that finds from Irish sites also almost exclusively have ‘Roman’ associations.326

Some graves within Southwest Britain are similar to LPRIA enclosure-barrow graves, indicating the development of interregional traditions, and perhaps suggesting the development of local mythological ancestral traditions incorporating burial practices. But there is also a general correlation between the distribution of ‘Gallo-Mediterranean’ style LPRIA graves, and the Roman period reuse and construction of barrows. This again suggests continuing local and regional traditions within a milieu influenced by Classical traditions, established during the LPRIA. Emphasis on shared ancestral history within a range of contexts, by reference to common culture, supports the ethnic nature of much of this practice.

Chapters 4 - 6 explored cultural changes during the later fourth – early fifth centuries. So as to better assess the concept of ‘Celtic revival’ (and the argument that there was a ‘return’ to pre-Roman culture), settlement, burial, and ritual practices supposedly indicative of ‘nativism’, were reassessed in the light of the evidence from earlier periods (presented within the previous chapters). The range of grave goods within cemeteries, and accompanying primary and secondary barrow burials was examined; and the votive deposits within barrows were all also compared with finds from temples. The spatial relationships between late Roman enclosure graves, LPRIA ‘Gallo-Mediterranean’ style sites, and Roman-period barrow activity was analysed; and the relationship between apparent LPRIA regional identities, and the construction of regional identities in the late- and post-Roman period was considered.

The alternative suggestion of ‘Roman’ continuity into the post-Roman period, and the relationship between this activity and the assertion of Romanitas was explored, in relation to the same evidence. It was argued that traditional interpretations surrounding early fifth century developments have been framed within terms that are far too simplistic in nature. As opposed to both the ‘Celtic revival’ and the Roman continuity theses, it is proposed that:

Attempts were made by elites to consolidate communities through appropriation of ‘ancestral’ sites, practices, and assertion of lineage, in order to both stabilise society, and harness and legitimise alternative forms of power to those of the State. However, this activity remained framed within a ‘Roman’ discourse of power.

The ‘Celtic revival’ and ‘nativism’ hypotheses claim that changes represent rejection of the Roman past, perhaps within a ‘return’ to pre-Roman culture and identities, possibly in resistance to the

326 The collection of ‘Roman’ finds in Ireland includes examples from funerary contexts, and ritual deposits at major Iron Age centres (see Edwards 1996: 1-5), which indicates either the adoption of a new artefactual repertoire within the transformation of indigenous practices, or contact with western Britain, or immigrant activity.
Roman State (Collingwood 1932; Faulkner 2000; Reece 1989). The political reforms and historical conditions are indeed likely to have placed increasing financial pressure upon the landowning elite and may have encouraged the construction of alternative structures of power to that of the State; and the inferiority imposed upon British elites by the Gaulish and Mediterranean aristocracy may have encouraged the renegotiation of ethnic identity in direct opposition to ‘Roman’ cultural identity by a small number of elites. However, longue durée analysis suggests that this was unlikely to have been a strategy for the majority (even of elites), and demonstrates, at the very least, the complexities of opposition to the Roman State.

Some activities commonly seen as indicators of ‘Celtic revival’ – such as the return to hillforts – parallel Continental military developments, and it is evident that Mediterranean-influenced buildings were constructed at hillforts (whether for ritual or habitation) well into (and beyond) the fifth century. Whilst such sites may have signified ‘ancestral’ power, they were primarily occupied by those who were at the same time appropriating ‘Roman’ cultural symbols. This demonstrates a general need to expropriate the past in legitimising positions into the fifth century. Elite practices at these sites demonstrate a replication of Classical social structures and relationships, rather than an assertion of ‘pre-Roman’ cultural ties. Other cultural elements often seen as ‘native’, such as roundhouses, were placed in proximity to rectangular structures in emphasis of elite identity, through juxtaposition with non-elite ‘inferior’ culture. Hillfort reoccupation is a prime example of the appropriation and transformation of landscapes in the assertion of local authority. The appropriation of these locales in the construction of community may have enabled the reassertion of power in the face of increasingly centralised authority.

Crouched burials were not emblematic of ‘non-Roman’ identity, as previously claimed (cf. Lucy 2000), but were rather related to ‘sacrificial’ burial within late- and post-Roman society, paralleling LPRIA behaviour. These burials often occur within boundary contexts, which may replicate the deposition of LPRIA burials within earthworks and enclosures, and are often accompanied by similar finds to those selected for votive deposition within mounds. Likewise, NS aligned burials were related to ritual belief, rather than ethnic identity (contra Faull 1977). Their occurrence was also commonly due to alignment with existing boundaries, infrequent, and sporadic, with no discrete correlations with material culture or other practices. Conversely, some elite graves attempted to replicate those of the Roman elites, with the construction of timber mausolea (paralleling behaviour seen within urban contexts with regard to secular buildings), and the emulation of elite Christian grave forms found on the Continent.

Close examination of the range of enclosure-barrow graves found during this period may indicate varied but related traditions, with cross-cultural exchange also perhaps encouraging the ‘barbarisation’ (specifically, ‘Hibernisation’) of elite grave forms, paralleling activity witnessed across
the Empire. Processes of ‘barbarisation’ were perhaps related to a need to secure ‘barbarian’ cooperation for the security of ‘Roman’ nations, with the probable provision of legitimising symbols of power, perhaps donated as diplomatic gifts (see Heather 1997: 70). Some enclosure-barrows parallel examples found in Ireland, Western, and Northern Britain, which may themselves represent the imitation of elite grave forms seen as ‘Roman’ by the elite of Ireland and North and Western Britain, in the creation of social stratification – as seen in frontier regions on the Continent. However, it is also likely that some special graves within Southwest Britain imitated regional LPRIA and early Roman forms that had been used in the construction of regional and possibly ethnic identity. We therefore see an amalgamation of practices - the ambiguity of these graves being open to (re)interpretation, according to context.

Temple destruction is evident, but cannot be seen purely as an act of defiance against the State. However, this phenomenon may nonetheless relate to the creation of alternative structures of local or regional power. Burial at these sites suggests attempts to remember, rather than forget, the Roman past (but also to reinterpret this past), with temples perhaps the most tangible forms of the ‘ancient’ Roman past in some areas (e.g. Avon). Temple cemeteries are often associated with reoccupied hillforts, perhaps indicating attempts to provide continuity between the Roman past and the present, in the reconstruction of post-Roman society. This behaviour is paralleled on the Continent, where it is involved with the imposition of Christian ideologies.

Temple burial may parallel the presence of spolia and heirlooms within graves, which suggest attempts to transform social memory by incorporating and reinventing (but rejecting) the Roman past, in the reconstruction of society and community. The range of grave goods within some cemetery graves is similar to that found deposited within prehistoric barrows and accompanying barrow burials. This selective range of grave goods and votive deposits includes Samian and its imitations, architectural fragments from ‘Gallo-Mediterranean’ style buildings, and early Roman brooches, and suggests a symbolic repertoire embodying ancestors situated within a Classical discourse.

The reappearance of ‘Celtic’ art (primarily metalwork) has also been seen as indicative of ‘Celtic revival’. However, this is again indicative of cross-cultural trade and exchange between Western and Northern Britain and Ireland during this period, and again possibly relates to the ‘barbarisation’ of culture witnessed across the Empire, as seen (primarily) in clothing. It is possible that some metalwork forms (such as certain types of penannular brooch) were used to express regional identities, although these identities crosscut pre-conceived cultural regions. Rather than being seen as evidence of ‘Celtic revival’, they should instead be seen as evidence of the construction of elite
(perhaps military) identity as an alternative to that of the State (before or after the cessation of Roman rule).

Conversely, against the thesis of Roman continuity, there is no indication that Roman cultural identity was meaningful to many during the Roman period within the region, and considering the association between this identity and citizenship, it is highly unlikely that many upheld such an identity after the end of Roman rule.

The argument of this thesis can be seen as an attempt to break the dominant binary paradigm of ‘Celtic revival’ versus Roman continuity. The evidence suggests something different to either of these models. Many practices derived from the Roman world were deeply embedded within society, and the selective continuity of some ‘Roman’ cultural attributes is evident into the post-Roman period – in particular, those synonymous with prestige and power. However, these symbols and practices were transformed within post-Roman society. There are evident social, cultural, political, and economic transformations that will have affected the ways in which a wide range of social identities were reconstructed, from the LPRIA, through until the post-Roman period. It is suggested that:

*During and after the later Roman period, ‘Roman’ material culture continued to be manipulated primarily within the negotiation of social hierarchies - its common use within elite discourses facilitating inter-relationship between local, regional, and perhaps ethnic, identities.*

Regional identities continued to incorporate a bricolage of regional and wider cultural traditions, with ‘Roman’ culture incorporated in this process in a variety of ways. However, a Classical discourse continued to inform methods by which elites both mediated their status, and attempted to construct regional polities from Roman *civitates*. Whilst Dobunnic elites may have had cause to oppose the State by the later fourth century (having the most to lose in the fourth century political reforms), in reality they had only recently begun to fully engage with Mediterranean culture in creating and maintaining social hierarchies. There are evident parallels between developments seen in the Peninsula during the late fourth century and later, and central Southern England during the LPRIA, for example: literacy and a Classical education began to be used in the expression of prestige and status. With increased Gallo-Mediterranean contact, a range of new practices became adopted by elites of this region. In areas such as ‘Cornovia’, the significance of ‘Roman’ culture and practices - within this process - intensified. Discrete distributions of particular objects, such as stone weights and bowls, alongside the continuity of local ceramic industries beyond the fifth century, suggests
attempts to consolidate regional distinctiveness within a ‘Mediterranean’ cultural framework, whilst at the same time creating challenges to that framework.

In other areas, mechanisms established during the LPRIA remained significant. Spatial analysis (particularly within Northeast Dorset) demonstrates correlation between LPRIA and later Roman enclosure-barrows and barrow burial and votive activity, suggesting continuity of kinship groups using ‘Mediterranean’ practices to create regional oppositions. In the creation of regional groups, in areas such as South Dorset, mythology and ritual may have continued to have been used to maintain dynastic cults.

However, by the end of the Roman period, elite practices were sufficiently similar and widespread to enable their incorporation within the negotiation of a broader, ‘British’ ethnic identity, in reaction to external opposition. (This process would have been enabled through the development of inter-regional bodies, such as the Councils indicated within texts such as DEB - see ch. 22 – if we believe this text). Bearing in mind that ethnicity and territory are often closely related, with defined territorial occupation entailing an exclusive sense of ‘belonging’ (Hodder 1978: 232), ethnic identity may have become an important mechanism for maintaining links between territory and kin groups, at a time when both internal and external conflict threatened to disrupt established relationships. It is proposed that:

\[\text{Intensified interaction with ‘Others’ during the later Roman period (mid fourth – early fifth century) – with increasing raids upon the region, and ‘alien’ settlement in the Southeast – encouraged the spread of ethnic identity incorporating Classical constructs.}\]

‘British’ ethnic identity became increasingly salient for elites, negotiated within a wide range of contexts (embodying ancestry), and mediated through material culture symbolising the civilised-barbarian construct. As noted above, evidence within a wide range of contexts demonstrates attempts to both construct a continuum with early Roman ancestors, and locate them within a Classical cultural framework through the use of a common culture. This process, along with the appropriation of ‘Roman’ symbols of power, was a highly relevant mechanism for the negotiation of changing historical circumstances.

The emphasis upon ethnicity may have served to legitimise authority within a changing society, particularly as strong political leadership was lacking and as opportunities increasingly arose to achieve status through the attainment of military power. This same process may be witnessed on the Continent: it is evident that in fifth century Gaul, a military and ethnic ideology supported emergent political allegiances (Dickinson 2002: 85). In Britain, the threat of raids was a potential resource for those members of the elite with sufficient wealth to support private armies, who wished
to enhance their own power within local communities. It also provided opportunities to gain power at the regional, or even (potentially) at ‘national’, level after the withdrawal of imperial control.

It is at this time, during the early – mid fifth century, that we begin to see a widespread inter-relationship between community, regional, and ethnic identity across the Southwest region. It is therefore to this period that we should look in the search for the beginnings of ethnogenesis for ‘British’ identity.
A P P E N D I X
Table 1 LPRIA oppida and oppidum-type sites and enclosures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ditches</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minchinhampton</td>
<td>OPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranham</td>
<td>OPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagendon</td>
<td>OPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gussage</td>
<td>ENC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hod Hill</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilchester</td>
<td>OPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollard Royal</td>
<td>ENC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildenhall</td>
<td>OPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon</td>
<td>OPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hengistbury Head</td>
<td>OPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodborough</td>
<td>ENC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rumps</td>
<td>ENC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 LPRIA sword and mirror burials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>GRV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barrow Wake, Birdlip</td>
<td>393011</td>
<td>215151</td>
<td>MIRROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trelan Bayho, St Keverne</td>
<td>174900</td>
<td>19550</td>
<td>MIRROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>369300</td>
<td>73600</td>
<td>MIRROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symondsbury</td>
<td>345590</td>
<td>90660</td>
<td>MIRROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulbury Camp</td>
<td>392900</td>
<td>94200</td>
<td>MIRROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portesham</td>
<td>361000</td>
<td>86100</td>
<td>MIRROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bay, Bridport</td>
<td>347000</td>
<td>92000</td>
<td>MIRROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verne Common Road, Portland</td>
<td>368000</td>
<td>73000</td>
<td>MIRROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson Hill, Hillside Farm, Bryher</td>
<td>877400</td>
<td>14410</td>
<td>MIRROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove, Portland</td>
<td>366000</td>
<td>83000</td>
<td>MIRROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow Wake, Birdlip</td>
<td>393012</td>
<td>215152</td>
<td>SWORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crickley Hill</td>
<td>393013</td>
<td>215153</td>
<td>SWORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Peverell</td>
<td>364200</td>
<td>893420</td>
<td>SWORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryher</td>
<td>381000</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>SWORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitcombe, Dorset</td>
<td>371100</td>
<td>88000</td>
<td>SWORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Nash, Coleford (Forest of Dean)</td>
<td>357000</td>
<td>210000</td>
<td>SWORD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 LPRIA cremations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leckhampton</td>
<td>394910</td>
<td>218380</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham Hill</td>
<td>348300</td>
<td>116400</td>
<td>BARNWOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnwood</td>
<td>385000</td>
<td>217000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handley Down, Gussage Hill, Dorset</td>
<td>398000</td>
<td>114000</td>
<td>BARROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Margarets Mead, Marlborough</td>
<td>419600</td>
<td>169100</td>
<td>BUCKET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box, North Wiltshire</td>
<td>381370</td>
<td>167770</td>
<td>BARROW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data and comments from NMR / ADS.. Data removed for copyright reasons
Table 4 LPRIA primary and secondary barrow burials, and enclosure graves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>PRIM</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>CREM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Barrow Wake, Birdlip</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Leckhampton</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR/ENC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Ebworth, Painswick, Stroud</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Ebworth, Painswick, Stroud</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Amesbury, Salisbury, Wiltshire</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR/ENC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Upton Scudamore, Wiltshire</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Durrington, Salisbury, Wiltshire</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR/ENC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Durrington, Salisbury, Wiltshire</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR/ENC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Durrington, Salisbury, Wiltshire</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR/ENC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Durrington, Salisbury, Wiltshire</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR/ENC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Gussage</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR/ENC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Crab Farm, Shapwick, Dorset</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Winterborne Stoke</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Tyneham, Purbeck</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Wimborne St Giles, Dorset</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Pimperne, Dorset</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Winterborne Whitechurch, Dorset</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR/ENC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Shapwick, Dorset</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BAR/ENC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>Winterbourne Kingston, Dorset</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>ENC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Kings Weston Hill, Blaise Castle Estate</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>Bincombe, Dorset</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Collingbourne Ducis, Kennet, Wiltshire</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Shapwick, Dorset</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>Frampton, Dorset</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Possible LPRIA votive weapon deposits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>SITE_NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>POT</th>
<th>COIN</th>
<th>BRCH</th>
<th>GLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>South Cadbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Spettisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>Bulbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Ham Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Hod Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Uley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>Maiden Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Gussage I</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Possible LPRIA votive deposition at barrows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>SITE_NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>POT</th>
<th>COIN</th>
<th>BRCH</th>
<th>GLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Condicote, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Belas Knap, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Timsbury, Avon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Alvesdiston, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Combe Beacon, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Bishops Cannings, Kennet, Wiltshire</td>
<td>NEO</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Amesbury, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Wilsford 39, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Collingbourne 12, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>Davidstow, Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Bristol, Avon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Codford, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Crickley Hill, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SITE NAME</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>POT</td>
<td>COIN</td>
<td>BRCH</td>
<td>GLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mildenhall, Wilts.</td>
<td>BA Y I'A'C</td>
<td>421550</td>
<td>166230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timsbury, Somerset</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>367600</td>
<td>159600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilsford cum Lake, Salisbury, Wilts.</td>
<td>Wilsford 5</td>
<td>411640</td>
<td>141260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bournemouth, Dorset</td>
<td>BA Y</td>
<td>412820</td>
<td>92490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bournemouth, Dorset</td>
<td>BA Y</td>
<td>412860</td>
<td>92530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bournemouth, Dorset</td>
<td>BA Y</td>
<td>416730</td>
<td>91060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long Bredy, Dorset</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>357030</td>
<td>91350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cardinham, Cornwall</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>213800</td>
<td>67600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Painswick</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>339x</td>
<td>67600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Painswick</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>339x</td>
<td>67600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leckhampton</td>
<td>prim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ham Hill</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barnwood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gussage</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Birdlip</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hailes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Litton Cheney</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trelan Bayho</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Symondsbury</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bulbury</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portesham</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Bay, Bridport</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verne, Portland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grove, Portland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crickle y Hill, Gloc.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bradford Peverell</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bryher</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitcombe, Dor.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coleford</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shapwick, Dor.</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winterborne Stoke</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tyneham, Purbeck</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Kingston, Dor.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K. Westo</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Box, Wilts.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ebworth, Stroud</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ebworth, Stroud</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amesbury, Wilts.</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upton Scudamore, Wilts.</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durrington, Wilts.</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durrington, Wilts.</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durrington, Wilts.</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durrington, Wilts.</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durrington, Wilts.</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wimborne St Giles, Dor.</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pimperne, Dor.</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winterborne Whitechurch, Dor.</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shapwick, Dor.</td>
<td>PRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bincombe, Dor.</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 LPRIA Gallo-Mediterranean influenced burial practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>CREM</th>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>ENC</th>
<th>XTN</th>
<th>BKT</th>
<th>SWD</th>
<th>MIR</th>
<th>TOOL</th>
<th>GAM</th>
<th>BRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rodborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Margarets Mead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leckhampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gussage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdlip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hailes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litton Cheney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trelan Bayho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symondsbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portesham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bay, Bridport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verne, Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove, Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crickle y Hill, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Peverell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitcombe, Dor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapwick, Dor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterborne Whitechurch, Dor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapwick, Dor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bincombe, Dor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8 Early Roman forts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>233000</td>
<td>84000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanstallon Fort</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>203000</td>
<td>67000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>191800</td>
<td>48300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restormel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>210250</td>
<td>61080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grambla Wendron camp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>169300</td>
<td>28300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinear Gwithian temp camp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>158300</td>
<td>39800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alverdiscott, Huntwhaw, Torridge</td>
<td>Temp. camp</td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>251000</td>
<td>125000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bampton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>300790</td>
<td>121940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry Cliff Camp, Branscombe, Torridge</td>
<td>Temp. camp</td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>318860</td>
<td>88150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixham, Torbay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>294000</td>
<td>56000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury Barton Farm, Lapford</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>273000</td>
<td>107000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayhanger</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>300860</td>
<td>122050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colebrooke</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>276530</td>
<td>98820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullompton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>301810</td>
<td>107630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friernhay Street, Exeter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>291000</td>
<td>92000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gittisham, Honiton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>313250</td>
<td>99300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moretonhampstead, Teignbridge</td>
<td>Temp. camp</td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>273000</td>
<td>89000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinhoe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>266310</td>
<td>149330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tawton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>265900</td>
<td>100000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okehampton Fort</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>263000</td>
<td>49000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Place, Exeter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>291000</td>
<td>92000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomeroy Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>313000</td>
<td>99000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew's Hill, Cullompton</td>
<td>Temp. camp</td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>301000</td>
<td>107000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>296000</td>
<td>88000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury Farm, Axminster</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>329000</td>
<td>97000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exmoor Camps</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>276000</td>
<td>138000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Burrow, Countisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>278000</td>
<td>149000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crab Farm, Shapwick</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dor</td>
<td>395000</td>
<td>102400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hod Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dor</td>
<td>385600</td>
<td>110600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Gates, Pamphill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dor</td>
<td>399000</td>
<td>99000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maumbury Rings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dor</td>
<td>369000</td>
<td>89000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dor</td>
<td>400000</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant Keyneston</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dor</td>
<td>392630</td>
<td>105590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddon Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dor</td>
<td>344000</td>
<td>101000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gloc</td>
<td>402700</td>
<td>201400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dymock</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gloc</td>
<td>370000</td>
<td>231200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsholm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gloc</td>
<td>383000</td>
<td>219000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldbury on Severn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gloc</td>
<td>360850</td>
<td>191910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate Street, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gloc</td>
<td>383100</td>
<td>218500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chew Magna</td>
<td></td>
<td>Som</td>
<td>358220</td>
<td>164000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carhampton, Dunster castle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Som</td>
<td>299200</td>
<td>143300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Som</td>
<td>348000</td>
<td>116000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Lawn Camp, Ilchester</td>
<td></td>
<td>Som</td>
<td>352600</td>
<td>122900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudford</td>
<td></td>
<td>Som</td>
<td>357570</td>
<td>121020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Sub Hamdon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Som</td>
<td>347650</td>
<td>117300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunnington Park, Wiveliscombe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Som</td>
<td>309000</td>
<td>127000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainsbury Upoton, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Som</td>
<td>299000</td>
<td>129200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bransdown Hill, Sherston</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilt</td>
<td>386600</td>
<td>187300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildenhall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilt</td>
<td>421780</td>
<td>169380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford - sub - Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilt</td>
<td>413000</td>
<td>131000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanborough</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilt</td>
<td>419300</td>
<td>185400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston super Mare</td>
<td></td>
<td>Som</td>
<td>333100</td>
<td>158000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banwell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Som</td>
<td>340300</td>
<td>158760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 Roman period activity at hillforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawksdown Camp, Axmouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hembury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Camp, Alveston, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbury Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathampton Down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat's Castle, Carhampton, Somerset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batsford, Gloc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battlesbury Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckbury Camp, Temple Guiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilbury Rings, Wylye, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratoon, Wilts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent Knoll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent Knoll, Sedgemoor, Somerset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury Hill Hillfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadbury Castle, Devon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannington Hillfort, Sedgemoor, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casterley Camp, Upavon, Kennet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisbury Camp, Little Bedwyn, Kennet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chislebury Camp, Broad Chalke, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chun, Penwith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearbury Ring, Downton, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clutton, Bath &amp; North East Somerset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton Valence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crickley Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolbury Hill, Killerton, Broadclyst, Devon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolebury Churchill, Som. Spearhead, &amp; RB coin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duntisbourne Rouse. Pinbury, Gloc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Woodbury, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SITE	DETAILS	COUNTY	X	Y
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th>SMT</th>
<th>Wps</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>L DETAILS</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grovely, Barford St Martin, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible RB settlement, outside East end of fort. Scoops &amp; adjoining enclosures. 2 RB coin hoards AD 337 - AD 408, with part of a glass vessel, &amp; six silver rings, buried in 2 earthenware pots</td>
<td>406160</td>
<td>135380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham Hill Hillfort, Montacute, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB villa</td>
<td>348000</td>
<td>116000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haresfield Beacon, Ringsfield, Gloc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB lead sling bullets (glandis) in area of E defences between outer ditch &amp; the outwork</td>
<td>382250</td>
<td>209000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawksdown Camp, Axmouth, Devon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB lead sling bullets (glandis) in area of E defences between outer ditch &amp; the outwork</td>
<td>326290</td>
<td>91430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hembury, Devon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short-lived RB military presence within the hillfort, mid - late C 1 AD</td>
<td>311200</td>
<td>103100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hengistbury Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>417810</td>
<td>90470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutton, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 3 - 4 AD pottery</td>
<td>336960</td>
<td>158260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimsbury Castle, Painswick, Gloc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brooch, coin</td>
<td>386900</td>
<td>212000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsdown Camp, Mells, Mendip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>371000</td>
<td>151000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knook Castle, Upton Lovell, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>396000</td>
<td>144000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leckhampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>394780</td>
<td>218350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liddington Castle, Bromham, Kennet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oliver's Castle</td>
<td>420900</td>
<td>179700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Sodbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB coins</td>
<td>376100</td>
<td>182600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinsell Hill Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>417700</td>
<td>164000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milbur Down Camp, Devon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB farmstead to the E, Abattoir field</td>
<td>288000</td>
<td>69000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash Hill, Calne Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>393470</td>
<td>169330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton Abbot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB glass bead</td>
<td>284600</td>
<td>71000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norbury Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB occupation within the hillfort: pit</td>
<td>412780</td>
<td>215450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Camp, Taunton Deane, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>319620</td>
<td>126260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham Hill, Gotherington, Tewkesbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>398450</td>
<td>228170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogbury Camp, Durnford, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>414320</td>
<td>138280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Sarum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>413800</td>
<td>132700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldbury Camp, Calne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 RB coins &amp; other RB artefacts within the hillfort</td>
<td>404970</td>
<td>169250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonsbury Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>417000</td>
<td>220000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenberrow, Stanton, Tewkesbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB pot, fragments of iron, a bronze brooch, part of rotary quern</td>
<td>408000</td>
<td>233400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>Hoard</td>
<td>SMT</td>
<td>Wpns</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>DETAILS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cadbury Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>362800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton Earthworks, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>397000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokeleigh Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promontory fort.</td>
<td>355950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tedbury Camp, Great Elm, Mendip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pot of coins 'mostly Constantine Junior' (AD 337-40)</td>
<td>374400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Castle, Dowdeswell, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB pot</td>
<td>399860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Castles, Bathealton, Taunton Deane, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB coins</td>
<td>305730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ditches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>399600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevelgue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron furnace</td>
<td>182600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trewsbury, Coates, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB coins</td>
<td>398100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uleybury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>378500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wambrook, Somerset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron working site</td>
<td>331090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood, Somerton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>346060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winklebury Camp, Berwick St John, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB coins</td>
<td>395200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>414350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlebury Camp, Weston super Mare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoard coins (dated to c. AD 450), quantity of RB pottery, glass beads &amp; fragments</td>
<td>331400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarnbury Castle, Be rwick St James, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB material: pot, tiles, coins &amp; burials - villa?</td>
<td>403550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 Roman towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>SITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 11 Roman period cremations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amesbury 71, Salisbury, Wilts.</td>
<td>410540</td>
<td>144380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagendon</td>
<td>401000</td>
<td>206000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Fm, Dumbleton, Tewkesbury, Gloc.</td>
<td>401000</td>
<td>236000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnwood</td>
<td>386000</td>
<td>217000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow Pleck 2, Berwick St John, Salisbury, Wilts.</td>
<td>395470</td>
<td>117540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Villa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>374560</td>
<td>165510</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4c</td>
<td></td>
<td>RB cemetery: 46</td>
<td>8 inhumations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>374700</td>
<td>165000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB cemetery: 46</td>
<td>4 RB stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourton on the Water, Gloc.</td>
<td>417200</td>
<td>220500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hollowed out scoop of stone block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boscombe Down</td>
<td>419120</td>
<td>139250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Peverill, Dor</td>
<td>367060</td>
<td>91470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approx. GR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Stoke, Gloc.</td>
<td>361000</td>
<td>182000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barrows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratton, Wilts.</td>
<td>391350</td>
<td>152320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small pit</td>
<td>prob RB cremation cut into buried land - 1.4m below current GS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Hinton, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td>412200</td>
<td>176800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ditched enc, pit.</td>
<td>LPRIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockley, Som.</td>
<td>346920</td>
<td>167350</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hut Circle, pits, posthole, building, ditch, cremation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromham, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td>397050</td>
<td>166210</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>road, pit, building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carn Brea, Penwih, Cornwall</td>
<td>138580</td>
<td>28060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Well, gravel pit, sand pit, rd., cremation, inhumation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlcombe, Som</td>
<td>372000</td>
<td>168000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building, ditch, cemetery, cremation, inhumation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chardstock, Devon</td>
<td>329800</td>
<td>103100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td>Inhumation &amp; cremation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham, Gloc.</td>
<td>395000</td>
<td>222000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yard, linear feature, wall cemetery, cremation, inhumation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheselbourne, Dor.</td>
<td>373550</td>
<td>100990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch, Dor.</td>
<td>415400</td>
<td>93500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ditch, inhumation cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>401000</td>
<td>201000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remains 2 RB cremations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td></td>
<td>401900</td>
<td>201700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Near former site of S Gate. 8 complete inhumations &amp; cremations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td></td>
<td>401720</td>
<td>201590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB limestone sarcophagus. cremations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb Down, Codford</td>
<td></td>
<td>399010</td>
<td>139070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stratified over late C4 coin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppice Corner, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>383000</td>
<td>219000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB cemetery, N side Ermine St. @ Hucclecote. Up to 100 inhumations &amp; 50 cremations with pot c. 50-200 AD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfe Mullen, Dor.</td>
<td></td>
<td>399400</td>
<td>98230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB Cemetery. C1-C2 cremations &amp; C 2-4 inhumations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alington Avenue, Dorchester</td>
<td></td>
<td>370200</td>
<td>90050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poundbury Eastern L3-L4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark Road (BT trench), Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>383908</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 cremations in urns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drayton, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td>340040</td>
<td>124770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probable RB barrow containing burnt bones &amp; ashes, &amp; RB brooch in stone-lined cist. primary or secondary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter, Devon</td>
<td></td>
<td>245700</td>
<td>89000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probable L C1 – E C2 ritual shaft. Animal bones &amp; possible cremation urns, with 7 inhumations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter, Devon</td>
<td></td>
<td>292180</td>
<td>92260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 RB urns, containing ashes &amp; coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field's Farm, Duntisbourne Abbot</td>
<td></td>
<td>398300</td>
<td>208400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site of RB cemetery. 11 cremations &amp; inhumations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordington Hill, Dorchester</td>
<td></td>
<td>369890</td>
<td>89890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB settlement associated with C2 pot &amp; 3 coin; cremation pre-mid C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambier Parry Lodge Est., Tewkesbury Rd, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>383000</td>
<td>219000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible RB field ditches, cremation ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester 383290</td>
<td>218370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 1-2</td>
<td>settlement</td>
<td>300m W of defences of RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>218370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>small town. Within 10m R. Kennet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester 386500</td>
<td>217900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Inhumation, cremation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>217900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester 384130</td>
<td>218960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Inhumation, cremation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>218960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grismond's Tower, Cirencester Park 402020</td>
<td>202050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BAR Barrow cremation cemetery.</td>
<td>Neolithic, RB, EBA, LBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heddington Wick 411200</td>
<td>215700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>RB coffin- fragmentary inhumation &amp; cremation</td>
<td>Caistor-ware urn building, cremation, inhumation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heddinton, Wilts. 398340</td>
<td>167080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>RB inhumation &amp; cremation cemetery, E of Weir Farm. RB pot, tile &amp; coins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillfield Lodge Development, Denmark Rd, Wotton, Gloc. Hackpen Hill on Monkton Down. 383909</td>
<td>219260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large pot urn, C 1 T-headed bronze brooch &amp; bronze ring (possibly armour). On SW slope below barrows 7, 8, &amp; 9.</td>
<td>Possible cremation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway St./Quay Lane, Exeter 292000</td>
<td>92000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>RB pot / urn &amp; cremation</td>
<td>Painted wall plaster &amp; brick tiles, tesserae Possible villa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway Street, Exeter 292000</td>
<td>92000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M C1 occupation Coin - AD 244-367. LC2 hoard - 1600-2000 coins, pre- Commodus, AD 180-192.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilchester, Somerset Winterbourne Down 351900</td>
<td>122400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB cemetery. Bank enclosed C4 cemetery. 36 cremations. 14 inhumations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Chapel, St Minver Lowlands, Corwall</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>7591</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>RB inhumation &amp; coffin. Burnt bone &amp; pottery</td>
<td>St Minver Padstow Harbour N Shore (Between the hamlet of Rock &amp; St Enodoc Church, but nearer Ch) sandhills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerris Vean, Paul</td>
<td>1443</td>
<td>2632</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Grave - urn fragments, calcined human bones, part granite bowl, charcoal &amp; black soil. IA or RB. Fogou?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimmeridge, Purbeck, Dorset</td>
<td>3919</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>RB Villa, cremations - urns, coins from Gallienus - Constantius Kingsholm</td>
<td>Barrow 2 later. 2 cremations - secondary ditch fill. One deposit - burnt flint &amp; cremated bone over main concentration of cremated bone; other under concentration flint nodules. Tip of ae spearhead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambourne Downs, Cornwall</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>5173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>BA or RB barrows cremations &amp; coins</td>
<td>Possible RB Cremations &amp; inhumations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Sutton, Somerset</td>
<td>3472</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Possible RB Cremations &amp; inhumations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longbrook Valley, Exeter</td>
<td>2910</td>
<td>9200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>RB inhumation cemetery &amp; settlement with roundhouse, pits &amp; gullies found. IA pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyncroft Estate, Wanborough, Wilts.</td>
<td>419000</td>
<td>185000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bowl barrow - Amesbury 71. 2ndary inhumations &amp; cremations RB pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melcombe Horsey, Dorset</td>
<td>374000</td>
<td>101000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA bowl barrow - primary inhumation &amp; 2ndary cremations &amp; possible inhumations RB pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minchinhampton, Gloc.</td>
<td>389000</td>
<td>201490</td>
<td>C3-4</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Walled cemetery. 7 burials: 4 M inhumations; 3 F - LS sarcophagi one - contained cremation in blue-green glass vessel sealed in lead urn. Nearby villa complex – assoc?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mechanoids Factory, Catherine St., Gloc.</td>
<td>383000</td>
<td>219000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB stone coffin - child inhumation; near to C3-4 cremation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fm, W Overton, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td>413000</td>
<td>168000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB cremation in pewter urn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northacre Business Park, Westbury</td>
<td>385000</td>
<td>152000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB cremations &amp; inhumations with C3-4 coins &amp; urns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament St., Gloc.</td>
<td>383000</td>
<td>218000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cremation urn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul, Penwith, Cornwall</td>
<td>144310</td>
<td>26320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Julian Road. RB cremations - stone coffins, buildings – inc. probable mausoleum E. rd. alignment, replaced MC4 by cobbled pavement or courtyard, rd. rerouted to S. &lt;100 LC3-4 coins &amp; pottery. Pavement prob. facilitated access to the cemetery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulton, Bath</td>
<td>364520</td>
<td>156650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB cremations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allegedly at Queen Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentridge, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilning &amp; Severn B, S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preshute, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portesham, West Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priddy, Mendip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purton, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Camel, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roughground Farm, Lechlade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorwell Fm, Corsham, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewton, Salisbury, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewton, Salisbury, Wilts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BAR settlement w/ rectilinear enc., pits, hearths, ditches, corn drying oven, inhumations &amp; cremation. ae fig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixpenny Handley, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB urn c remation w/ two glass lachrymatories &amp; coin - at Elm Inn, Cogdean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixpenny Handley, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 BA cremations w/ urns. IA &amp; R-B inhumation cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Margaret's Hospital, London Road, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB coins, pot, quern, brooch &amp; urn containing cremation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Minver Lowlands, Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cremation, quarry, ditch, building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stogursey, Somerset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cremation, building, ditch, tile kiln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Benger, Wilts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cremation, town defences, building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tar Barrows, NE of Cirencester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BAR RB cremations in tumulus, Beacon Hill. Earthenware urn - ash, bone &amp; RB coins at ground level under heap of stones, below tumulus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant Keyneston, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB fm - timber framed buildings, c. AD 50-55, abandoned 70-75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant Launceston, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RB Legionary Cemetery. 2 cremations, c. AD 65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewkesbury, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tintagel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In box hearth C5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 Roman period barrow and enclosure burials (primary and secondary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Vtv</th>
<th>Prim</th>
<th>INH</th>
<th>CREM</th>
<th>COIN</th>
<th>POT</th>
<th>BRC</th>
<th>WPNS</th>
<th>ARCT</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hog Hill, Winterbourne St Martin, Dor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amesbury 44, Salisbury, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amesbury 71, Salisbury, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avebury, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagendon, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow Pleck 2, Berwick St John, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloxworth, Purbeck, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Roman period barrow and enclosure burials (primary and secondary)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Vtv</th>
<th>Prim</th>
<th>INH</th>
<th>CREM</th>
<th>COIN</th>
<th>POT</th>
<th>BRC</th>
<th>WPNS</th>
<th>ARCT</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boyton, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Peverell, Dor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Peverell,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulford, Salisbury, Wi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chardstock, Devon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlcombe 7 Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlcombe, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chewton Mendip 35, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chewton Mendip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Knowle, Purbeck, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterborne St Martin, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterborne St Martin, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfe, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Crichel, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixpenny Handley, Dor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everleigh 1, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everleigh, Kennet, Wi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fittleton, Kennet, Wi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fodington Fm, Dorchester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Acre Plantation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frampton, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant's Grave, Kilmersdon, Mendip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant's Grave, Holcombe 1, Mendip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handley Hill, Wimborne St Giles, Dor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetty Peglar's Tump, Uley, Stroud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerris Vean, Paul, Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynston Down, Tarrant Keyneston, Dor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kill Barrow, Tilshead, Salisbury, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knap Hill, Alton, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowle Hill, Church Knowle, Purbeck, Dor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanceborough, Winterborne Monkton, Dor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launceston Down, South, Tarrant Launceston, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laverstock, Salisbury, Wi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Keep, Dorchester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melcombe Horsey, Dor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miserden, Stroud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Vtv</td>
<td>Prim</td>
<td>INH</td>
<td>CREM</td>
<td>COIN</td>
<td>POT</td>
<td>BRC</td>
<td>WPNS</td>
<td>ARCT</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse Barrow, Tolldown, Dyrham &amp; Hinton, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>375280</td>
<td>176890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixpenny Handley, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>401030</td>
<td>117000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley Down, Wimborne St Giles, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA CREM</td>
<td>401000</td>
<td>117000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley Down, Wimborne St Giles, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA CREM</td>
<td>401010</td>
<td>117000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley Down, Wimborne St Giles, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA CREM</td>
<td>401020</td>
<td>117000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overton Hill, West Overton (7), Kennet, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB INH</td>
<td>411000</td>
<td>168000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weymouth Avenue, Dorchester, Ne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEO INH</td>
<td>369000</td>
<td>90000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portesham, Dorchester, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA CREM</td>
<td>364570</td>
<td>86460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preshute, Kennet, Wi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA CREM</td>
<td>417000</td>
<td>170450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rew 5B; Winterborne St Martin, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>363000</td>
<td>90000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixpenny Handley, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB INH</td>
<td>396290</td>
<td>118140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixpenny Handley, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEO INH</td>
<td>401220</td>
<td>117380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snail Down, Collingbourne Ducis, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB INH</td>
<td>422000</td>
<td>152000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snail Down, BA</td>
<td>422040</td>
<td>152070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Afflington, Corfe Castle, Purbeck, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>396000</td>
<td>78000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portesham, Dorchester, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>364000</td>
<td>86000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixpenny Handley, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>401040</td>
<td>117000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Catherine 4, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>376000</td>
<td>170000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>376260</td>
<td>170270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Easton 2, Mendip, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>361000</td>
<td>154000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Easton 3, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>361000</td>
<td>176890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Easton 4, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>361760</td>
<td>153960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Easton 5, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>361890</td>
<td>154160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Benger, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>393000</td>
<td>178000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tar Barrow, Cirencester, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA CIST</td>
<td>402900</td>
<td>202500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant Launceston, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA CREM</td>
<td>392000</td>
<td>190000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hog Hill, Winterborne St Martin, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>366000</td>
<td>88000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upavon, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA CREM</td>
<td>416630</td>
<td>154610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendron, Kerrier, Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA CREM</td>
<td>169000</td>
<td>35900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood, Somerset, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>346000</td>
<td>129000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Horse Hill 5; Osmington, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA INH</td>
<td>372000</td>
<td>84000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 Possible Roman period votive activity at prehistoric barrows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Prim</th>
<th>PHS</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>POT</th>
<th>COIN</th>
<th>JWL</th>
<th>GLS</th>
<th>TILE</th>
<th>ARCT</th>
<th>WP</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wimborne St Giles, Dor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterborne Monkton, Dor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterbourne Monkton, Wi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterborne Stoke, Sal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterborne, S Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodchester, Kings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcutts Handley, Dor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodford, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wor Barrow, Handley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Name | Vtv | Prim | INH | CREM | COIN | POT | BRC | WPNS | ARCT | x  | y  |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Prim</th>
<th>PHS</th>
<th>C POT</th>
<th>COIN</th>
<th>JWL</th>
<th>GLS</th>
<th>TILE</th>
<th>ARCT</th>
<th>WP</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadmayne, W. Dor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromham, Kennet, Wi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Ground, Hampnett, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crickley Hill, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chglapel Carn Brea; St Just;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penwith; Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charminster, W. Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chedworth, Cotswolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheselbourne, W. Dor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiseldon 1, Swindon, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester, Cotswolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codford, W. Wilts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colerne, N. Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingbourne Ducis 19, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingbourne Ducis 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingbourne Kingston 12, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coln St. Denis, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combe St Nicholas, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condicote, Glos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coneybury Henge, Amesbury, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfe Castle, Purbeck, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidstow, N. Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester, W. Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durrington 3, Salisbury, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durrington, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Chinnock, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Chinnock, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Worlington, N. Devon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonsham, E. Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagstones, Dorchester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fyfield, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant's Cave, Luckington, N. Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorsey, Bigbury Cheddar, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gussage St Michael, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorsey, Bigbury Cheddar, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton N &amp; S Barrows, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heytesbury 4B, W. Wi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilmington, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gussage St Michael, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinear, Gwithian; Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton N &amp; S Barrows, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heytesbury 4B, W. Wi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilmington, Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gussage St Michael, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinear, Gwithian; Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Prim</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>POT</td>
<td>COIN</td>
<td>JWL</td>
<td>GLS</td>
<td>TILE</td>
<td>ARCT</td>
<td>WP</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Offa's Tomb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almondsbury, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>358000</td>
<td>182000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Weston Hill, Blaise Castle Estate, Bristol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>355050</td>
<td>177920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Barrow, Bishops Cannings, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>406680</td>
<td>164790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knap Hill, Alton Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>412100</td>
<td>163650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesquit Quoit, Lanivet, N. Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>207070</td>
<td>62750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Ashton, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>352100</td>
<td>171100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Crichel 5; E. Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>395880</td>
<td>111570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Crichel 7; E. Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>396040</td>
<td>111590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marden Beeching, Stoke, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>409070</td>
<td>152170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough, Wilts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>418230</td>
<td>168130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melcombe Horsey, W. Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>374000</td>
<td>10100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membury, Devon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>327300</td>
<td>103400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Lilbourne 3, Kennet, Wilts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>419990</td>
<td>157870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minchinhampton 4; Stroud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>389060</td>
<td>201490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morvah, Penwith, Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>141000</td>
<td>34000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morvah</td>
<td>B/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>141910</td>
<td>142040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Bavant 11, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>392000</td>
<td>143240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notgrove, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>409570</td>
<td>221200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley Down, Wimborne St Giles 24, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>401830</td>
<td>117541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overton Down, West Overton, Kennet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>412600</td>
<td>171040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perranzabuloe, Carrick, Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>177180</td>
<td>51730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixies Mound, Stogursey, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>320900</td>
<td>145570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randwick, Stroud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>382490</td>
<td>206900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hood's Ball, Figheldean, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>410220</td>
<td>145940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodmarton, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>395000</td>
<td>197000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Lot LB, Withington, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>404870</td>
<td>215780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalbourne, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>432100</td>
<td>159000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewton 5A, Salisbury, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>408600</td>
<td>144790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Barrow, Orcheston, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>404550</td>
<td>147230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixpenny Handley 25, E. Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>401130</td>
<td>116590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixpenny Handley, E. Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>395600</td>
<td>117380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixpenny Handley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>398890</td>
<td>114420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixpenny Handley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>400460</td>
<td>115850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixpenny Handley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>399880</td>
<td>115320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Prim</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>POT</td>
<td>COIN</td>
<td>JWL</td>
<td>GLS</td>
<td>TILE</td>
<td>ARCT</td>
<td>WP</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerton, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lodge Camp, Berwick St. J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southway Grove, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s Epistle, Dowdeswell, G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Easton, Mendip, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonehenge, Amesbury, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swell, Cotswolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple, Guiting, Cotswolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cursus, Amesbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary, Avebury, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilshead 10, Salisbury, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timsbury, Som.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tormarton 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upavon 1A, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Tump LB, Brimpsfield, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster, S.Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendron, Kerrier, Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Overton 6, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Overton 9, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitfield Farm, Bradford Peverell, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsford cum Lake 39, Salisbury, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsford cum Lake 51, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Hill, Wiltshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Tump, Rodmarton, Gloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterborne Kingston, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterborne St. Martin, Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterborne Monkton, Kennet, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterbourne Stoke 30, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterbourne Stoke 32, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterbourne Stoke 33, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterbourne Stoke 38, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterbourne Stoke 39, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterbourne Stoke 43, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterbourne Stoke 50, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Prim</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>POT</td>
<td>COIN</td>
<td>JWL</td>
<td>GLS</td>
<td>TILE</td>
<td>ARCT</td>
<td>WP</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 Late Roman period military buckles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>STYLE</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>LAT</td>
<td>Og</td>
<td>Inscription</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>Rom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinnor, Oxon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Triangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cublington, Bucks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Triangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW of Barbury Castle, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plain loop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildenhall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilminster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laocke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitchurch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurdington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 Late- or post-Roman period inscribed stones
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>LAT</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Rom</th>
<th>Brit</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>GK</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenidjack, St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penwith</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawgan, St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CNEGVMI FILI</td>
<td>GENAIVS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meneage</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanscow; St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VLCAGNI FILI</td>
<td>SEVERI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breock</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLOTUALI</td>
<td>[F]ILI MOBRATTI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redruth</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAVORI FI[LI]</td>
<td>VIT[O]RI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Columb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>BONEMIMORI</td>
<td>[F]ILLI TRBVNI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Clement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Clement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I{A}</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>IUS</td>
<td>IACONIUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Columb Mj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Endellion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>[I]ACIT NADOTTI</td>
<td>FILIVS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Hilary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cel</td>
<td>Cel</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Just in Penwith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SELNIVS IC</td>
<td>IACIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tregony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NONNITA ERCLIVI</td>
<td>[R/N]ICATI TRIS</td>
<td>FILI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevaylor Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[..]</td>
<td>[..]</td>
<td>BELIE[ASDI]</td>
<td>NDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitestile, Gwennap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[..]</td>
<td>[..]</td>
<td>IUM[..] PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthyvale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VALCI FILI</td>
<td>VETTANUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monachorum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[D]AP[.]</td>
<td>[FILI]</td>
<td>NICIN[..]</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckland (now Tavistock)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SABINI FILI</td>
<td>MACCODECHETI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthyvale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthyvale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VALCI FILI</td>
<td>VETTANUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthyvale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthyvale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>LAT</td>
<td>Og</td>
<td>Inscription</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Brit</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>GK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ogwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA[   --   ]OCI FILI [   --   ]PLICI</td>
<td>(The stone) of Caucus, the son of Peblig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fardel 1, Ivybridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SVAQQUCI MAQI</td>
<td>[The stone] of Safaqucus, son of Qicus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fardel 2, Ivybridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FANONI MAQVI</td>
<td>[The stone] of Fanonus, son of Rinus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fardel 3, Ivybridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAGRANVI</td>
<td>Of Sagranuus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanivet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ANNICV FIL[I</td>
<td>[The stone] of Annicus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewannick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INGENVI</td>
<td>The/ memoria/ of Ingenuus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewannick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VLCAGNI</td>
<td>[Here] lies [the body] of Ulcagnus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lustleigh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DATUIDOCI</td>
<td>[The stone of] Datuidoci [son of] Conhinoc[i]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redgate St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DONIERT</td>
<td>ROGAUIT PRO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRINCIPI IVRICI</td>
<td>Principius the son of Audentius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewannick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ULCAGNI</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DATUIDOCI</td>
<td>[The stone of] Datuidoci [son of] Conhinoc[i]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Kew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DATUIDOCI</td>
<td>[The stone of] Datuidoci [son of] Conhinoc[i]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavistock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INGENVI</td>
<td>[The stone] of Ingenuus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trewint, Altarnun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ANNICV FIL[I</td>
<td>[The stone] of Annicus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tintagel Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PATERN[</td>
<td>Artognou, father of a descendant of Coll has had this made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tintagel Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LATINI IC IACIT</td>
<td>FILIUS MAGARI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthyvale, Slaughter-bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LATINI IC IACIT</td>
<td>FILIUS MAGARI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 16 Type G buckles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cad. Cong.</td>
<td>344150</td>
<td>164930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camerton</td>
<td>368000</td>
<td>156000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannington</td>
<td>324700</td>
<td>140500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairford</td>
<td>415250</td>
<td>201790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goss Moor</td>
<td>195000</td>
<td>59000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harnham Hill</td>
<td>413000</td>
<td>128000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padstow</td>
<td>188980</td>
<td>75860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trewhiddle</td>
<td>200000</td>
<td>51000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydney</td>
<td>361700</td>
<td>202600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempsford</td>
<td>416700</td>
<td>196900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlebury</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Enodoc</td>
<td>193100</td>
<td>77200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 17 Temple reuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>BUR</th>
<th>METALWORKING</th>
<th>SETTLEMENT</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nettleton Scrub, West</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>382260</td>
<td>176970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brean Down, Sedgemoor, Somerset</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>329350</td>
<td>158820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiden Castle, Dorset</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>366000</td>
<td>880000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Kitchen Hill, Wi.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>383340</td>
<td>138780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henley Wood, Yatton, North Somerset</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>344270</td>
<td>165200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamyatt Beacon, Mendip; Somerset</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>366900</td>
<td>136100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Blaise Castle, Bristol, Avon</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>355860</td>
<td>178370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagan's Hill Chew Stoke; Avon</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>355720</td>
<td>162600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hill, Uley, Stroud, Glouc.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>378900</td>
<td>199700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 Late- and post-Roman Tin ingots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnanton</td>
<td>187700</td>
<td>64300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chun</td>
<td>140500</td>
<td>33950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanlivery</td>
<td>207000</td>
<td>60000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par Beach</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentewan Valley</td>
<td>201000</td>
<td>71000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawgan in Pydar</td>
<td>188650</td>
<td>64420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penwithick</td>
<td>203000</td>
<td>64000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praa Sands</td>
<td>157000</td>
<td>27000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madron</td>
<td>143000</td>
<td>33000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trethurgy</td>
<td>203470</td>
<td>55640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vellin Antron</td>
<td>176500</td>
<td>34500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent's cavern</td>
<td>293440</td>
<td>64160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruton</td>
<td>368000</td>
<td>134000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chewton Mendip</td>
<td>357480</td>
<td>151370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Cuthbert Out</td>
<td>353100</td>
<td>148000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackmoor</td>
<td>350750</td>
<td>156090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charterhouse</td>
<td>350000</td>
<td>155000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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