CAMBRIDGE A R C H A E O L O G WEST NORTH AN INTERIM STATEME Christopher Evans, Craig Cessford and Hayley Roberts

Extending in total over 13.6ha, Sites II and IV were excavated, generally with a 25-strong team, between November of 2012 and May of this year. It involved two main areas of excavations – A & B/Site IV and C/Site II (plus ancillary exposures both north and south of the latter) – along the crest of a great 'inland' gravel ridge traversing the heavy clayland plain west of Cambridge proper (Fig. 1). Despite often horrific, winter working conditions, which saw both thick snow-cover and high groundwater levels/flooding, the fieldwork programme was completed to schedule. It eventually saw the investigation of 1865 archaeological features and the digging of 1861 excavation units/'interventions' (plus another 500–600 unrecorded exploratory cuttings through natural features, *etc.*).

As indicated by the earlier evaluation fieldwork, the archaeology was found to have suffered heavy plough-damage. While, as a result, very limited horizontal strata survived as such (local patches of road gravels only), within the southern end of the main area (A/B) a buried soil extended over and masked prehistoric features, and along the southeastern margins of Area C there were both colluvium and buried soil deposits. Again, as evaluation-attested, there were large swathes of 19th/early 20th century hand-dug gravel quarries, but which at some points displayed remarkable sensitivity to the archaeology (i.e. interrupting along the line of major ditches).

As is reported upon by Roberts below, the programme included a major outreach component (e.g. hosting special public-volunteer digging weeks), and not only did its open-day attract a high number of visitors, but the work also drew a great deal of media attention.

The sites' main occupation horizons are further detailed below and, at this time, only the baldest précise will be offered (Fig. 2):

1) Leaving aside the occasional recovery of Paleolithic flint, as well as also very limited evidence of Neolithic and Early Bronze Age usage, the landscape's main colonisation horizon occurred during the *Middle Bronze Age* (*c*. 1500-1300 BC). This involved three sub-rectangular/-square enclosures (PE 1-3). Apart from three minor ditch lengths – insufficiently articulated to be accredited as a fieldsystem as such – these were accompanied by four ring-ditch monuments (RD-1-4). Of the latter, the largest, Ring-ditch 1 (c. 25m diam.; Fig. 4), lay north of the westernmost enclosure; the small ring-ditch (No. 2) that cut it had four cremations. Note that, lying north of RD-4, Cemetery 6's two interments - an un-urned cremation and a crouched inhumation - might also be broadly contemporary.

2) Apparently all of *Late Bronze /Early Iron Age* date, three distinct areas of 'open' settlement were exposed (PS 1-3), though that in the southeastern corner of Area C might be associated with two quasi-concentric ditch lengths. The most extensive settlement swathe (PS 2) extended over, and truncated, the fills of the main Middle Bronze Age enclosure (PE 3). Apart from a few large pits/well features, it consisted of a dense array of postholes, including a series of four-posters and few possible/partial roundhouse arcs. At this time it is difficult to delineate the full extent of the northernmost settlement (PS 3), but which nonetheless had an impressive series/'avenue' of four-posters; Cemetery 3, comprising two circular-ditched *Late Iron Age* cremation settings, lay some 30m to the northeast.

3) The main areas, Site II/Area C and Site IV/Areas A & B, were essentially focused upon two *Romano-British* settlements – respectively, RB1 and RB2 – with the latter being sub-divided into two 'quarters' (RB2 A & B). That in southeast, RB1, was by far the simpler and of predominantly only Early Roman date. Generally its finds densities were low, though dumped midden deposits occurred within a pit and an adjacent ditch length. Part of a 'square' paddock setting, the latter probably relates to the location of the settlement's household, though no buildings *per se* survived therein. That said, a half-circle-ditched corn drier was recovered (with another partial 'ring-circle' probably marking the location of still another) and a small contemporary cremation cemetery was excavated north of the main settlement (Fig. 2.C5).

Note that not all of the settlement-area was recovered; its eastern extent, though, will be exposed in next season's excavations and its south/southwestern axes will be traced though watching brief-phase machining.

The settlement was found to be bisected by a major northeast-southwest oriented roadway (Fig. 2.W1), whose northward projection had earlier been recovered in Site I's evaluation trenching. Running southeast off of it was what was probably a trackway (Fig. 2.W2) that continued in that direction and linking it with West Cambridge's earlier excavated Vicar's Farm settlement. In the field immediately to the north was found still another roadway (Fig. 2.W3). Though ditched, it was much more minor that the main northeast-southwest route and it clearly continued west from the main road to the larger Roman settlement (RB2).

As mentioned, the latter Roman settlement was sub-divided into two 'quarters', separated by what appears to be an 'open area' (Fig. 2.OA) and from which still another trackway appeared to run northward (Fig. 2.W4). The use of this complex clearly continued much longer than RB1 and lasted into the 4th century AD. Having characteristic 'dark earth-type' deposits, the western portion was then reorganised into a more 'organic-form' layout and had quantities of iron slag associated. Deep waterlogged wells were found in both parts of the settlement, with examples of boxtype and wattle-lined timber constructions surviving (Fig. 6); organic artefacts were also thus preserved, including shoe leather and furnishings (e.g. part of a wooden stool/chair). Although there is not evidence that either settlement was of particularly high status (e.g. low coin numbers, etc.), at the northern end of the RB2A portion some quantity of redeposited stone was recovered. This could suggest that a significant building occurred within the wider area, perhaps north beside the Godmanchester Road-line. While trenching was conducted immediately north of this area to see if such a building could be located, the results proved negative. That said, a very unusual feature did occur within the base of one of the large pit-wells at the northern end of RB2A: the (reused) tile-lined base of a pit and which included a fragment of a mosaic (Fig. 5). Four contemporary cemeteries were present: C1 & 3 seeing both cremations and inhumations (C3 being initiated by ditch-circled Latest Iron Age/Conquest Period cremations) and C7, which had just two cremations; whereas C2 involved only inhumation burials. The latter cemetery occurred at the northeastern end of a major double-ditched boundary (Fig. 2.DDS), whose cursus-like axis was parallel with RB1's main roadway and, together, they attest to a system of large-scale landscape 'blocking'.

A few general remarks are warranted concerning the layout/location of the Roman settlements, and particularly their remarkable sensitivity to the ridge's topography. This is most apparent in the case of RB1, whose axes are off-alignment to the longer distance-determined road (Fig. 2.W1), but closely respect the lie of the land/ridge-slope; this also being evident in their southwestward kinking. The bulk of the main RB2B settlement is similarly arranged and it would seem that the optimum location within this 'heavy land'-landscape was along the southern side of the ridgeway and with settlement *per se* extending down its flanks to encourage water run-off.



Figure 1. North West Cambridge environs





4) Omitted from the simplified phase-plans included here, the site-areas were crossed by a series of *Post-Medieval* field boundaries and parallel furrows (i.e. ridge-andfurrow remnants). Surprisingly, in the light of the scale of the area's *Medieval* usage as documented in Hall and Ravendale's *The West Fields of Cambridge* (1976), little material of that date was forthcoming. This is particularly true of the road/trackway connecting the two Roman settlements (Fig. 2.W3), as the evaluation showed that this would appear to directly correspond with the line of one of their Medieval trackways. Given this, that no Medieval material was found in association – instead, only Roman – must indicate the reuse of the Roman road (as an upstanding earthwork) in Medieval times.

An unexpected *Modern*-phase finding was the recovery of what seemed to be the zigzagging lines of WWII-vintage defensive trenches at the extreme northern end of the site (Fig. 2). Associated with a small circular ditch/trough setting that could well have marked a gun emplacement, it is currently thought that these are likely to be associated with the defensive perimeter of a Huntingdon Road-side house commandeered as a command headquarters.

As will be further discussed below, what is singularly noteworthy is the area's paucity of Middle/later Iron Age occupation. Yes, a site of that date is known from the evaluation immediately east of Area C/Site II, but to not have any other such settlements recovered along such a large swathe of the ridge-gravels as was exposed is remarkable (given local clayland-scape densities at Longstanton, *etc.*) and potentially raises questions concerning the foundation-origins of its Roman settlements.

Top-/sub-soil Surveys, Test Pitting and Environmental Sampling

In an effort to try to tease out data/distributions from the sites' soil-cover - especially knowing that its archaeology had been severely plough-damaged - its top-/sub-soil horizons were subject to a series of sampling trials (Fig. 3).

Geophysical Surveys

The central swathe of Site IV had been subject to magnetometry survey during the course of the evaluation fieldwork. In order to further understand the site's top/-sub-soil dynamics, during the excavation-phase it was decided to undertake three additional surveys.

1) Because ironworking slag had been recovered there during the evaluation, at the topsoil-surface level a 2.3ha central swathe was subject to magnetic susceptibility survey, and in which high-value readings registered within the core-areas of the settlements' two main 'quarters' (Fig. 3.A).

2) In order to test whether slight Roman building remains registered within the lower, sub-soil level (and which might not survive full machine-stripping), two 20 x 50m areas were targeted for further magnetometry survey; this being on a tighter 0.50m interval and across reduced surfaces once the topsoil had been machine-removed (Fig. 3.B & C). While the results are not particularly convincing, they suggest that non-robust building traces might, indeed, have registered at this level (and which were not apparent at the final stripped-surface level).

3) Topsoil-magnetometry survey was also conducted across the entire 3.3ha-area of the (potato) field immediately north of Site II's main exposure. This was done in the hope of plotting the route of the Roman road-line, which by then (following Site IV's stripping) was known to cross it, as well as also any other early features. Unfortunately, due to the density of ferrous-anomalies evidently present in that field, the results proved negative and were disappointing.

Metal-detecting and Test Pitting

Prior to the excavation the fields were commission-ploughed and harrowed to permit metaldetecting throughout the greater site-area. This was then conducted along a series of northsouth transects set at a 20m interval. Unfortunately, the results proved disappointing. Corresponding to the fact that almost no 'early' finds whatsoever occurred upon the surface, only seven Roman coins were thus recovered.

When compared to the results from other Roman rural sites this was obviously a very low register and suggested that some masking/disturbance factor must be responsible (?quarrying). Accordingly, the decision was made to run metal-detecting trials across the two areas reduced for the lower level geophysical surveying (Fig. 3.B & C). These showed significantly higher coin-density levels. It was, therefore, decided that within the course of the site's main machining programme metal-detecting sampling would occur along a 10m-wide northwest-southeast transect traversing the centre of the main site-core (Fig. 3.D). This, too, showed 'respectable' coin-density levels and, as a result, further 10m-wide sample transects were deployed to gauge coin-level variability across the greater site-area. These were expediently located, as this could not impede the site's main machining programme. Eventually, five other transects were so-sampled (Fig. 3.E-I); in two cases these were done late in the site's excavation and made use of the delayed removal of the concrete trackway bisecting the main settlement area: E and F. Of these, the main aim of the former was, rather than metal-detecting, instead the recovery of soil samples to check on the presence of hammer-scale and whether iron smelting had actually occurred on the site.

It should be mentioned that, in order to gauge sub-soil artefact densities, within Sample Area B (Fig. 3) metre-square test pits - arranged on a 10m grid (six in total) - were hand-dug through the sub-soil horizon. Their artefact densities ranged from 0 to 8 pottery sherds and 0 to 4 animal bones per metre, with average densities of 2.8 and 1.5 sherds/pieces respectively. Equally, metre-square test pit sampling also occurred across the colluvial deposits along the southeastern side of Area C/Site II in order to appraise the flintwork densities therein.

Environmental Sampling

Twenty-three pollen cores were obtained from a number of the sites' deeper features, an initial group of six are currently being assessed by Dr. S. Boreham. Similarly, Dr. C. French took soil-micromorphology column-samples from both the colluvium and buried soil within Site II/Area C, and also from Area B's locally surviving buried soil.

In addition, 345 bulk environmental samples were taken for flotation, as well as seven samples for the identification of insects from the deep-cut Roman waterlogged wells; these, too, are currently being assessed.

Recovered Finds

In total, more than 55,500 artefacts were recovered, whose by-category breakdown is shown in Table 1 below:

Material Type	Quantity	Weight (g)
Bone - Animal	14464	233649
Bone - Human	13018	43246
Brick	25	5623
Brick/Tile	8	1117
Burnt Clay	347	6246
Burnt Flint	31	630
Burnt Stone	298	38846
Charcoal	58	82
Ferrous Concretion	143	10151
Flint	709	8896

Glass	23	363
Leather	52	N/A
Masonry	4	40900
Metal - Cu alloy	242	1376
Metal - Fe	2191	20307
Metal - Other	18	608
Metal - Pb	147	2833
Mortar	2	287
Other - Coal, etc.	44	1118
Pottery	20639	337708
Shell	774	5677
Slag	629	76937
Stone	229	58710
Tile	1083	75207
Tobacco Pipe	5	15
Wood	175	N/A
Worked Bone	7	337
147 1 1 0		

Table 1: Artefact totals by category.

As discussed below, pending the spot-dating of this material it is difficult to discuss it in any detail. That said, a few remarks are warranted concerning the sites' metalwork and waterlogged finds. All of Roman date, of the latter, noteworthy is the recovery of so much leather. All of it probably relates to shoes and their production, and there were 11-12 identifiable shoes present (Fig. 6). Of the preserved wood, while most consists of roundwood, of the remainder there are a few definite items/objects; these include part of a legged stool/chair and a bucket (Fig. 6). On viewing the woodwork, Richard Darrah has stated that it demonstrates a fairly coarse level of technology, such as the use of adzes when cutting planks when otherwise a saw might have been expected.

Of the metalwork, some 2,586 pieces (c. 24.7kg) were recovered, of which 391 were copper alloy, lead and composite items. 1434 items were recovered from 182 features, 1406 consisting of iron items, 27 of copper alloy and, the remainder, lead. Although the assemblage is largely composed of iron nails, there are also several important metal items. These include a Roman copper alloy steelyard arm from well F.1236 (also found in this feature was a copper alloy brooch, a Roman coin and 45 iron objects), two disc brooches (one gilded – F.1236; SF 212), a rosette brooch fragment (F.910; Fig. 5), Romano-British bracelets ([5970]; F.1020), hair pins (F.2023), toilet items (F.1088; F.2092) and needles (F.695). Other pieces include unidentified items, such as a rhomboidal-shaped tapering pin/stud from ditch F.1013 (copper alloy). An unusual find was the recovery of a possible Roman *pilum* head (c. 20 cm long; iron; Fig. 5) found in well F.1148. Of the 91 coins retrieved, the majority are certainly Roman in origin, with a further rare Iceni coin (Fig. 5) and another Iron Age coin, dating from the 1st century BC/AD transition, also found during metal-detecting.

Site Phasing/Periodisation

As full spot-dating of the ceramics and other material has not yet been completed and no absolute scientific dating has been undertaken, the majority of features have simply been assigned to four broad periods (Natural/nonreal, Prehistoric, Roman, Post-Medieval/Modern, Undetermined; Table 2). A significant number of isolated features, particularly postholes, contain no dateable material; these have generally been assigned to a broad period based upon either their proximity to features that do have dateable material or the composition of their fills. Significant archaeological remains are limited to the Prehistoric and Roman Periods, with the Roman dominating. The other periods can largely be viewed as constructs of archaeological recording that bracket the prehistoric and Roman features.

Period	No. of features	% of features
Natural/not real	30	Excluded from
		calculation
Prehistoric	491	26.4
Roman	1203	64.6
Post-	161	8.6
Medieval/Modern		
Undetermined	10	0.5
Total	1865	
	(excluding	
	natural)	

Table 2: Breakdow	vn of investigated a	and recorded feature	s by broad period.

Natural

Natural features (30) consist of a variety of types of feature including tree-throws, root-bowls, hollows, geological anomalies, *etc.*. Although a significant number of natural features or features that proved not to be real were investigated (*c*. 300), the majority were not recorded. Records exist primarily in those instances where these features impinge upon genuine archaeological features in such a manner than it proved worth recording them to clarify the nature of the genuine features. Natural types of features, principally tree-throws, that contained cultural material or for which there is other good evidence that they are contemporary with periods of archaeological activity at the site have not been categorised as natural but have been assigned to the relevant period.

Prehistoric

Just over a quarter of the investigated and recorded features are assigned to the Prehistoric Period (491, 26.3%). These can be considered by feature type, with postholes and pits dominating numerically (Table 3).

Feature type	No.	%
Postholes	325	66.2
Pits	97	19.8
Ditch (enclosure)	23	4.7
Ditch (ring)	6	1.2
Ditch (other)	11	2.2
Watering hole	5	1.0
Burial (cremation)	9	1.8
Burial (inhumation)	1	0.2
Stakehole	5	1.0
Beam-slots	3	0.6
Tree-throw	3	0.6
Buried soil	3	0.6
Total	491	

Table 3: Feature breakdown for all Prehistoric features by feature type.

The Prehistoric features have been grouped into four main types of designated use-category (Fig. 2):

- Prehistoric Enclosure (PE): rectangular, sub-rectangular or square area enclosed by a ditch and possibly associated bank or other elements such as a hedge-line where the barrier consists of several straight or near straight sections.
- Prehistoric Settlement (PS): area of largely unenclosed discrete features such as pits, postholes etc.
- Ring-ditch (R-D): Circular or near circular ditches that may be the remains of ploughed out round barrows, round houses, or of other features.
- Cemetery (C): two or more burials found in relatively close association.

In addition there are several other groupings of features, which may or may not form elements within the main types of use-categories:

- Pit Cluster (PC): any closely associated group of discrete features dominated by, but not necessarily exclusively consisting of, pits.
- Posthole group (PG): any closely associated group of postholes that probably form a structure, but where the particular form is unclear. Excludes four-posters, *etc.*.
- Four-poster: a square or near-square arrangement of four postholes.
- Isolated features (I): any ditch, pit, posthole, burial or other feature not found in association with other features.

The Prehistoric features can thus be broken down:

	No.	%
Prehistoric Settlement 1 (PS1)	91	18.5
Prehistoric Settlement 2 (PS2)	312	63.5
Prehistoric Settlement 3 (PS3)	20	4.1
Prehistoric Settlements Total	423	86.2
Prehistoric Enclosure 1 (PE1)	4	0.8
Prehistoric Enclosure 2 (PE2)	17	3.5
Prehistoric Enclosure 3 (PE3)	12	2.4
Prehistoric Enclosures Total	33	6.7
Ring-Ditch 1 (R-D1)	4	0.8
Ring-Ditch 2 (R-D2) plus Cemetery 4 (C4)	6	1.2
Ring-Ditch 3 (R-D3)	6	1.2
Ring-Ditch 1(R-D4)	1	0.2
Cemetery 6 (C6)	2	0.4
Ring-ditches and Cemeteries Total	19	3.9
Isolated feature	16	3.3
Total	491	

Table 4: Feature breakdown for all Prehistoric features by landscape units.

Although a quantity of Palaeolithic and Mesolithic flint artefacts were recovered these all derive from residual contexts. Their distribution is broadly similar to the material of this date recovered during the 2009 evaluation, with a principal focus upon the eastern end of the investigated area of the gravel ridge (Site II/Area C). The investigated Prehistoric features span the Neolithic to the Iron Age, with the bulk of them dating to the Middle Bronze Age or later.

The identified Neolithic features consist solely of two isolated tree-throws, though it is probable that several more exist (F.2033 which produced Early Neolithic pottery and F.1638 which produced Late Neolithic-Early Bronze Age flint). There was also a considerable quantity of Neolithic flint recovered from the buried soil and residually in later features from the eastern end of Site II / Area C. Excluding the Palaeolithic material, which relates to activity that originally took place an unknown distance to the northwest and does not relate directly to usage of the development area, the evidence indicates occasional small-scale Mesolithic to Early Bronze Age visitation and utilisation of the gravel ridge. At present there are suggestions that some parts of the ridge may have been favoured foci for these episodes, but this requires further analysis to elucidate it. It is possible that some of the relatively poorly dated ring-ditches date to the Late Neolithic or Early Bronze Age, however the limited dating evidence suggests that some or all of them are of Middle Bronze Age date.



Figure 4. Middle Bronze Age ring-ditches (R-D1+2)

The commencement of significant archaeologically discernible activity on the gravel ridge dates to the Middle Bronze Age. The spatial logic of the archaeological features suggests that there was a generalised southeast to northwest progression; although this needs to be confirmed by more detailed dating evidence, it will be used to structure the discussion. The most southeasterly evidence comes from an area of prehistoric Settlement PS1; this area had formed a focus for activity since at least the Neolithic if not the Mesolithic. There appears to have been continuity of settlement at PS1 from the Middle Bronze Age until the Early Iron Age, it is therefore impossible to assign the majority of Prehistoric features from this settlement to individual periods as many contain no dateable material. The only feature that can be assigned to the Middle Bronze Age at present is a watering hole that contained pottery of this date, as well as part of a human skull (F.2810). The bulk of the features from this area are postholes (56, 66.7%), none of these can be convincingly reconstructed into structures and most had no dateable material. The only posthole dated so far contained Late Bronze Age pottery (F.2719). There are also a number of pits (23, 27.4%), these are typically fairly amorphous and poorly defined, with the only example dated so far contained Late Bronze Age or more probably Early Iron Age pottery (F.2723). A watering hole having Early Iron Age pottery (F.2736). There were two broadly northwest-southeast aligned gullies (F.2727 and F.2729) that may have formed the boundary of the site at different points in time.

Feature type	No.	%
Pits	23	27.4
Postholes	56	66.7
Ditches	2	2.4
Watering holes	3	3.6
Total	84	

Table 5: Feature breakdown for Middle Bronze Age to Early Iron Age Settlement PS1, excluding stakeholes directly associated with ditches.

Located just over 100m due north of PS1 was a substantial ditched enclosure PE1. Although partly truncated by later quarrying, PE1 was a west-east aligned rectangular enclosure *c*. 64m by *c*. 28m in extent with a *c*. 3.5m wide entranceway on its southern side. The enclosure appears only to have been ditched on three sides, with its northern side either open or more probably defined in some other manner, such as a hedge-line. The ditches of PE1 were up to 2.55m wide with a surviving depth of up to 0.8m, the fills of these suggested the existence of an internal bank. Material culture was sparse in the ditch fills with just minor quantities of pottery and animal bone. There were no surviving internal features; however, a small pit that contained no dateable material (F.2607) was located on what was approximately the putative northern boundary of PE1 opposite the southern entranceway.

Separated by as little as *c*. 21m from PE1 were a sequence of features that included another substantial enclosure. Although stratigraphic evidence is lacking, spatial logic suggests that the earliest feature in this sequence was a broadly north-south aligned ditch (F.2526/F.2662). This relatively insubstantial ditch was over 125m long; it produced no dateable material and was a maximum of 0.7m wide by 0.3m deep. The next feature in the sequence was probably horseshoe-shaped ring-ditch R-D3, whose location suggests that it was placed respecting the ditch. The initial cut for this was *c*. 11m in diameter and up to 1.8m wide (F.2681), with a surviving depth of up to 0.85m; there was then evidence for a partial recut (F.2695) up to 1.2m wide and with a surviving depth of 0.35m. There was negligible evidence for activity within R-D3, just three postholes (F.2686-87, F.2705) that had no dateable material. The ditch of R-D3 was 100% excavated, with a concentration of cremated bone within one of the fills of the first phase of the ring-ditch ([8752]); this does not appear to represent the *in situ* remains of a cremation, but may perhaps attests to a disturbed burial. Lying just outside RD-3 was an unurned cremation (F.2702). This may be associated with the ring-ditch, but the presence of a Roman cremation cemetery in the same area means that this is questionable.

Almost certainly positioned with respect to RD-3 and the earlier ditch was enclosure PE2. This was a rectangular west-east aligned ditched enclosure, *c*. 60m by 39m in extent, that appears to be distinguished into western and eastern halves, with the eastern having more substantial ditches. The eastern half of PE2 had ditches up to up to 2.2m wide with a maximum surviving depth of 0.86m, with evidence from the fills for an internal bank and a 2.6m wide entranceway on the southern side. The ditches of the western half were slighter with a maximum of 1.3m wide, although a width of 1.0m was more typical, and a maximum surviving depth of 0.5m. Material culture was sparse in the ditch fills, with just small

quantities of pottery and animal bone. It is possible that there was a second earlier ring-ditch (F.2814) on the southern side of PE2, but this was extremely poorly preserved and its existence cannot be regarded as more than speculative. A group of postholes in the north-eastern corner of PE2 contained no dateable material, but are probably associated with it; four of them appear to form a line parallel to the ditch of the enclosure.

In a swathe broadly north to northeast of PE2 were three un-urned cremations (F.2677, F.2699 and F.2701), these lack any direct dating evidence and two apparently occurred in complete isolation. One cremation (F.2701) was found in close proximity to a crouched inhumation (F.2710), the two being separated by only 3m, although there is no way to determine if they are related they have tentatively been designated as Cemetery C6 pending further dating. These cremations and inhumations may be Middle Bronze Age, although later dates for all of them cannot be excluded and one other nearby un-urned cremation with associated hobnails is certainly Roman (F.2606). In the same broad area 85m northeast of PE2 was a ring-ditch R-D4, this was 7.4m in diameter and up to 0.7m wide with a maximum surviving depth of 0.26m. As far as can be determined the ditch of R-D4 formed a complete arc with no breaks or entrances, although as it was truncated by two later ditches this cannot be relied upon absolutely. There were no contemporary features within the ditch of R-D4 and no significant deposits within the investigated portions of its ditch.

Feature	Weight of	Diameter	Depth	Comment
	cremated bone (g)	(cm)	(cm)	
2606	141	0.30	0.12	Deposit with cremated bone truncated.
				Probably Roman as hobnails present
2677	170	0.32	0.13	Deposit with cremated bone truncated
2699	808	0.28	0.15	Deposit with cremated bone truncated
2701	713	0.68	0.27	Deposit with cremated bone truncated

Table 6: Isolated cremations.

Located 120m northwest of PE2 was a more substantial roughly square ditched enclosure PE3. This was 86m by 73m in extent, with ditches up to 3.0m wide and with a surviving depth of up to 0.9m. There was evidence from the fills suggesting an internal bank and in places the ditch appeared to have been re-cut at least once. Although later quarrying had removed part of the enclosure circuit there appears to have been an entranceway in the southeastern corner that was up to 8.4m wide; the evidence for a second entranceway of unknown width on the northern side of the enclosure is less certain, but appears probable. Material culture was sparse in the ditch fills, with just small quantities of pottery and animal bone recovered (though some apparently articulated animal bone from F.1291/[3842] may provide useful radiocarbon dating evidence). While there was no convincing evidence for any internal features, much of the interior of PE3 had been removed by later quarrying. The internal features that were identified appear to post-date the enclosure and will be discussed subsequently.

To the north of PE3 was a west-southwest to east-southeast aligned ditch (F.1383, F.1477/F.1526), which was 78m long and yielded no dateable material. The ditch was up to 1.13m wide with a maximum surviving depth of 0.45m, there was a *c*. 1.3m wide gap roughly at the mid-point of the ditch that appears to have been marked by a pit (F.1575). Beyond this ditch, 6.8m north of it and 30m north of PE3, was a substantial ring-ditch R-D1 *c*. 24.5m in diameter (Fig. 4). This had a relatively insubstantial ditch up to 0.65m wide, with a maximum surviving depth of just 0.23m. There were two opposing entrances on the western and eastern sides, 0.8m and 1.3m wide respectively. Outside the western entranceway of R-D1 were two postholes (F.1424 and F.1433) suggesting some form of structure. The area outside the western entranceway had been heavily disturbed by the construction of an early 20^{th} century concrete farm-track so it is impossible to tell if there was a similar structure in this location. This modern trackway had also affected a considerable portion of the interior of R-D1, including the centre of the feature. The only surviving feature in the interior was a single posthole containing no dateable material (F.1417).

Cutting through the ditch of R-D1 on its southeastern side was a smaller ring-ditch R-D2; this was 10.1m in diameter with a ditch up to 0.88m wide and 0.15m deep. Although the ditch of R-D2 cut through the silted-up ditch of R-D1, it would probably have avoided/respected any internal bank or mound. The northwestern side of R-D2 had been entirely removed by a later Roman ditch, therefore it is possible that it had an entrance on this side or was even penannular in form. Neither RD-1 or RD-2 contained any dateable material, despite being

completely excavated. Cutting through the silted-up ditch of RD-2 on its southeastern side was a row of four broadly circular pits (F.1414, F.1428, F.1434 and F.1449) containing unurned cremated bone that from Cemetery C4. None of these pits show any signs of *in situ* scorching and there is no evidence that any of the cremated bone was in containers when it was deposited. Although these lack any direct dating evidence, they are most probably Middle Bronze Age. A short distance away there was another pit also containing cremated bone (F.1328), which is probably part of Cemetery C4. Given the relatively shallow depth of some of the pits and the presence of later Roman ditches, it is plausible that some pits containing cremations have been removed in their entirety.

Feature	Weight of cremated	Diameter	Depth	Comment
	bone (g)	(cm)	(cm)	
1328	708	0.47	0.15	Deposit with cremated bone
				truncated
1414	640	0.75	0.45	Deposit with cremated bone
				truncated
1428	1146	0.40	0.30	Deposit with cremated bone appears
				complete
1434	74	0.35	0.08	Deposit with cremated bone heavily
				truncated
1449	373	0.8	0.40	Deposit with cremated bone appears
				complete

Table 7: Cremations associated with Cemetery C4.

Just over 70m north of R-D1 was an insubstantial broadly north-south aligned ditch (F.1822), this produced no dateable material and was 28.8m long with a width of up to 0.44m and a maximum surviving depth of 0.12m.

The Middle Bronze Age landscape of the gravel ridge is one with only limited direct evidence for occupation at the southeastern limit of the investigated area (PS1), presumably linked to the relatively close proximity of water near to the surface. Beyond this there is evidence for a densely utilised 'monumental' landscape stretching for around 400m with four ring-ditches (R-D 1-4) and three rectangular enclosures (PE1-3). At least two of the ring-ditches are linked to cremation burial and it is likely that all were; the role of the rectangular enclosures is less clear but the lack of evidence suggests that they were not linked to any substantive occupation. Beyond this, to the northwest along the ridge there is a relative lack of evidence, including a paucity of residual material in later features. Notable by its absence from the landscape is any evidence for Bronze Age fieldsystems, as the few relatively ephemeral and isolated ditches certainly do not relate to this.

The nature of the archaeology of the ridge changes markedly in the Late Bronze Age as the ring-ditches and rectangular enclosures go out of use, although some of them probably enjoyed some form of 'after-life' continuity. There is, however, an apparent expansion of occupation along the ridge. Beginning again at the southeastern end of the investigated area activity continued at PS1 which originated in the Middle Bronze Age, although it is difficult to assign any particular features to this period with any certainty at this stage. There is no evidence that PE1-2 continued as a focus of activity, there is however evidence for activity in PE3 and its environs, though whether this relates to the enclosure or to the adjacent burial related monuments (R-D1-2 and C4) is debatable. This is defined as PS2 and is located c. 320m northwest of PS1. PS2 consists of a swathe of postholes within the northeastern portion of PE3 - the only part of it not removed by later quarrying - cutting though the adjacent portions of its infilled ditch and spreading to the north and east. These postholes cut through a very poorly preserved 'buried soil', which appeared to fill the upper portion of parts of the northern and eastern ditches of PE3. The upper fills of the ditch of PE3 contained Late Bronze Pottery whilst the postholes of PS2 produced pottery spanning the Middle Bronze Age which may be residual from PE3 - to the Early Iron Age, suggesting a long-lived and quite extensive zone of domestic occupation with the PS2 area. Given the longevity of the PS2 settlement it is difficult to distinguish structures as many of the clusters of postholes may be fortuitous, there do however appear to be several clusters or arcs that may relate to structures and some alignments that are probably fence-lines. The most unambiguous groupings are four-post structures, with six easily identifiable instances and a similar number of probable examples. These four-posters may be either Late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age in date. The other elements of PS2 are pits, ditches, beam-slots and tree-throws. Three pit clusters were clearly defined; these all appear to be Early Iron Age. The northwestern extent of PS2 appears

to deliberately avoid the earlier ring-ditches R-D1-2 and to be partly defined by the eastsoutheast aligned ditch (F.1383, F.1477/F.1526) between these and PE3.

Feature type	No.	%
Pits (main site)	26	8.3
Pits (pit clusters A-C)	14 + 13 + 14	13.1
Postholes (main site)	209	67.0
Postholes (main site, 4-posters)	26	8.3
Postholes (pit clusters Â-C)	0+1+0	0.3
Ditches (main site)	3	1.0
Watering holes (pit clusters A-C)	0+2+0	0.6
Beam-slots (main site)	1	0.3
Beam-slots (pit clusters A-C)	0+2+0	0.6
Tree-throws (main site)	1	0.3
Total	312	

Table 8: Feature breakdown for Late Bronze Age to Early Iron Age Settlement PS2.

There is evidence for a further area of occupation, PS3, located *c*. 175m north of PS2. This was the same area as the tree-throw (F.2033) that produced Early Neolithic pottery. The most easily recognisable element of PS3 is a group of three four-post structures, one of which produced relatively large assemblages from two of its postholes. There were also several other isolated postholes and other features. Several features of PS3 were entirely sealed beneath later Roman features and only revealed through excavation. It is, therefore, likely that more features were originally present that were either entirely removed by Roman activity or remained hidden under the unexcavated portions of Roman ditches.

Feature type	No.	%
Pits	2	10.5
Postholes	5	26.3
Postholes (4-posters)	12	63.
Total	19	

Table 9: Feature breakdown for Late Bronze Age Settlement PS3.

Outlying the three defined areas of Prehistoric settlement there were a number of isolated pits, postholes and tree-throws. Whilst some of these are definitely or probably Prehistoric, they majority failed to produce and dating evidence.

PS1 and PS2 definitely continued into the Early Iron Age, whilst the status of PS3 is currently unclear. The best evidence for continuity until the Early Iron Age at PS1 is a watering hole, which contained pottery of this date (plus probably from a Collared Urn; F.2736). At PS2 there are three well-defined tightly grouped pit clusters that all appear to be predominantly Early Iron Age, at least one of these appeared to have two watering holes (F.1752 and F.1801) and two beam-slots (F.1768–69) associated with it, thereby suggesting a greater range of activity. This cluster was the closest to R-D1, lying only 24m from its ditch.

To date no Middle or Late Iron Age features have been identified from the current investigations, although there was evidence from the evaluation for a Middle Iron Age settlement at Site II, located *c*. 30m to the east of the area covered by the current investigations. Demonstrably Late Iron Age features were also absent, although this may well in large part reflect it being masked at this stage of analysis by the continuity of settlement into the Roman Period. Settlement of this period was identified in five locations, including Sites II and IV. As with the Middle Iron Age, the activity at Site II lies to the east of the area of current investigation. The evidence from Site IV fell within the area of investigation; however, further investigation revealed that many of the ditches defined as Late Iron Age in the evaluation are, in fact, Roman in date and some of the ditches thought to potentially be Late Iron Age presence, this remains elusive pending further assessment.

It is possible that the major Roman settlements that were investigated during the excavations have their origins in the latest Iron Age before the Roman invasion of AD 43. Currently there are no features that can de demonstrated to be clearly earlier than this; these sites will therefore be discussed under the Roman Period.

Period	Date	Comment
Palaeolithic	Pre-9600 BC	Artefacts recovered, these are not indicative of activity in the
		immediate area
Mesolithic	9600 - 4000 BC	Occasional small-scale visitation and utilisation
Early and Middle	4000-2900 BC	Occasional small-scale visitation and utilisation, some
Neolithic		deposition in tree-throws
Late Neolithic	3000-2500 BC	Occasional small-scale visitation and utilisation, some
		deposition in tree-throws
Early Bronze Age	2200-1500 BC	Occasional small-scale visitation and utilisation, some
		deposition in tree-throws
Middle Bronze Age	1500-1000 BC	Some settlement (PS1) plus four ring-ditches (R-D1-4) and
		three rectangular enclosures (PE1-3)
Late Bronze Age	1000-800 BC	Three area of settlement (PS1-3)
Earliest/Early Iron	800-600 and	Two or three areas of settlement (PS1-2 and possibly PS3)
Age	600-400 BC	
Middle Iron Age	400-100 BC	One area of settlement (east of PS1)

Table 10: Summary of Prehistoric evidence by period.

Roman

The Roman Period dominates the sites' archaeological record, constituting almost two thirds of its investigated and recorded features. These can be broken down by feature type (Table 11). Ditches dominate at just over half the total number, and whilst this is largely genuine there is an element of this that is related to the multiple numbering of complex ditches (where it was impossible to relate particular individual re-cuts between different slots). The other common elements are pits that constitute around a quarter of the features, with postholes representing over an eighth.

Feature type	No.	%
Postholes	166	13.8
Pits	306	25.4
Ditch	610	50.7
Watering hole	30	2.5
Burial (cremation)	25	2.1
Burial (inhumation)	18	1.5
Corn drier	1	< 0.1
Beam-slots	17	1.4
Metalling	1	< 0.1
Tree-throw	7	0.6
Root bowls	3	0.2
Buried soil	5	0.4
Hollow	5	0.4
Slumping	9	0.7
Total	1203	

Table 11: Feature breakdown for all Roman features by feature type.

The Roman Period archaeology can be divided into a series of broad analytical groups including settlements, a network of routeways and some isolated features (Table 12). The bulk of the investigated features, unsurprisingly, relate to the settlements, with RB2 alone representing over 80% of the investigated Roman features.

	No.	%
Road W1	9	0.7
Trackway W2	1	0.1
Trackway W3	82	6.8
Trackway W4	0	-
Open Area	0	-
Double-ditch System	4	0.3
Routeways Total	96	8.0
Settlement RB1	100	8.3
Settlement RB2A	254	21.3
Settlement RB2B	749	62.1
Settlement Total	1103	91.7
Isolated features	4	0.3
Total	1203	

Table 12: Feature breakdown for all Roman features by analytical group.

Two principal Roman settlements were identified: RB1 and RB2. Although the definition of Settlement RB1 is relatively – but not entirely – unproblematic, it is questionable to what degree the relatively sprawling Settlement RB2 is a single entity and it is capable of considerable sub-division. The network of routeways includes a major road running northeast-southwest from the gravel ridge onto the clay (Fig. 2.W1), a trackway running off from this towards the southeast (W2), and another trackway running off from the main road northeast along the ridge (W3) that possibly turns to the northeast (W4). Linked to this network at the junction of tracks W3 and W4 is a possible 'Open Area'. Finally, there is major double-ditch boundary system running northeast to southwest from the ridge down onto the clay (Fig. 2.DDS).

Routeways

Road W1 - This was located toward the eastern end of Site II/Area C and ran in a northeastsouthwest direction from the gravel ridge down onto the clay. It was traced for a distance of 130m across the excavated area and was also identified in trenches to the southeast, giving a total length of 210m. The road was delineated by well-defined continuous ditches; typically 10–11m apart, these were *c*. 1.8 wide and 0.8m deep. No traces of any metalling survived associated with the road. It passed through Settlement RB1; though the bulk of the investigated area of RB1 lay to the west, it is conceivable that Settlement RB1 is, in fact, a conflation of two settlements separated by Road W1. This, however, seems less likely than that it is one settlement lying astride the routeway.

 $Trackway \ W2$ - This joined with Road W1 and ran perpendicular to it towards the southeast. Only a very short length of 8m of it could be traced before it ran into an area of intensive Post-Medieval/Modern quarrying. It is, therefore, impossible to describe Trackway W2 in detail. That said, the short exposures of ditch revealed were broadly similar to those of Road W1.

Trackway W3 - This was a sinuous, but broadly southeast-northwest aligned routeway whose line was intermittently traced across several excavated area for a distance of 480m. It presumably joined to Road W1 beyond the limit of excavation and appeared to terminate in RB2's Open Area. Trackway W3 was composed of a series of discontinuous and extremely irregular ditches that were typically 8m apart and up to 2.0m wide. Up to four phases of recuts were discernible in places along its route, although it is unclear to what extent many of the roadside features were truly ditches and to what extent they were in fact elongated pits dug along the routeway's sides. Towards the southeastern end of the area of excavation a metalled surface was identified. While this did not survive further to the northwest, it appears that many of the apparent ditches were in fact *ad hoc* gravel quarries dug close to areas where the surface of the routeway had deteriorated to such a degree that it had become difficult or impossible to use. In general, Trackway W3 appeared to meander, probably following the topography of the ridge located around 100m or so back from its actual crest. There is a suggestion that it may have been aligned in part upon R-D4, which may have still been extant as a low mound. Trackway W3 ran through Settlement RB2 dividing it into RB2A to the northeast and RB2B to the south and west; it is currently unclear to what extent this is a meaningful division.

Two wells (F.1821 and F.1841) were located within the line of Trackway W3 at the eastern end of Settlement RB2. Feature 1821 was in a broadly circular cut 4.0m in diameter, with a maximum surviving depth of 1.1m, whilst the cut for F.1841 was 4.45m in diameter, with a maximum investigated surviving depth of 0.5m No trace of any well-lining survived. When allowance is made for the likely extent of the actual shafts of these wells the line of Trackway W3 would have been somewhat impinged upon, but not seriously compromised, as a routeway. The function of these two wells is uncertain; the water they supplied could be linked to the requirements of the users of Trackway W3, the inhabitants of Settlement RB2, plus agricultural needs relating to nearby fields or a mixture of these.

Trackway W4 - The existence of this 'way' is speculative, due to the extent of Post-Medieval/Modern quarrying. It appears likely that there was some form of routeway running along the western side of Settlement RB2 in a northeasterly direction from the Open Area. The eastern side of Trackway W4 was effectively defined by the westernmost enclosure ditches of Settlement RB2; no trace of any metalled surface associated with this putative routeway survived and no features associated with its western side were identified due to later quarrying. As a result, Trackway W4 is something of a 'ghost' and defined on the basis of spatial logic with no actual archaeological features assigned to it.

Open Area - The Post-Medieval/Modern quarrying frequently respected the deeper Roman ditches with their relatively dark fills, running up tight to the edges of such features and on occasion 'jumping' over them. Based upon this phenomenon and the lack of truncated ditch terminal ends, it seems likely that there was some form of 'open area' that was only defined by an area of Post-Medieval/Modern quarrying (Fig. 2.OA). By its very nature, this archaeological 'negative' is something of a nebulous entity. It lies at the junction of Trackway W3 and putative Trackway W4. In a sense both the Open Area and Trackway W4 represent a 'best guess' solution to identify a spatial logic to the Roman system of settlement and routeways in an areas of intensive later truncation.

Double-ditch System - This ran northeast to southwest from Settlement RB2B on the ridge down onto the clay. It was defined by a pair of parallel ditches 31m apart, which were 0.8m wide with a maximum surviving depth of 0.3m and no evidence of any re-cuts. It was traced for a distance of 60m across the excavated area and the line of the ditches was also identified in a trench to the southwest, giving a distance of 120m. After this point it could not be identified in further trenches; it is likely to have continued as a boundary beyond this point defined either by ditches that were too shallow too survive or in another archaeologically invisible manner. Additionally, it appears to run into Settlement RB2B, where a pair of corresponding ditches that run right through the area of settlement until truncated by Post-Medieval/Modern quarrying. These mean that the Double-ditch System can be traced for a length of 210m.

Settlements

Settlement RB1 - This is located towards the southeastern end of the area of investigation. It was split in two by Road W1. It is conceivable that Settlement RB1 is in fact a conflation of two settlements separated by that road; although this seems less likely than that it is one settlement lying astride the routeway. The extent of the settlement's ditched enclosure system is unclear as several of its boundaries lay beyond the area of excavation. Settlement RB1 appears to be a relatively simple, almost single phase entity, probably dating to the mid 1st to early 2nd century AD; though its associated well was probably not backfilled until the late 3rd century AD. There were a series of broadly rectilinear ditched enclosures, some of which were sub-divided. No structural elements surviving, but is seems likely that the main focus of occupation lay to the west of Road W1, within a sub-rectangular enclosure 63-71m by 50m in extent. This had a rectangular sub-enclosure 35m by 21m in extent located in its northwestern corner and that is the most likely location for any putative building(s), although only a few relatively nondescript features were present within it (F.2517-18 and F.2534). An alternative hypothesis is that this sub-enclosure relates to an inhumation cemetery. Two of the internal features (F.2517-18) were morphologically very grave-like; although no bone was present, the preservation in this area was very poor.

The eastern boundaries of this sub-enclosure were notable for the densities of pottery and quern that were deposited in its ditches (F.2513-14). There appears to have been a 7.7m wide entranceway into the sub-enclosure and the deposition of pottery and querns was obviously focused upon the terminals of these ditches. The artefact-rich deposits were 100% excavated and traced for 5.5m to the south of the entrance and 7.0m to the north. In total, 25kg of pottery and 8.5kg of quern was recovered; animal bone (1.4kg) had generally degraded to the state where some of it was visible as an impression, but could not really be recovered. This material appears to represent some form of 'household clearance' deposit, perhaps linked to the abandonment of Settlement RB1.

Located in this enclosure was a tightly defined cluster of at least 19 pits, plus two wells (F.2756 and F.2768). The latter of these contained a leather shoe dated to 275-300 AD and some semi-complete ceramic vessels. In the northeastern corner of this enclosure was a small sub-enclosure 9.7m by 8.9m in extent that probably contained some structure or other feature that has left no archaeological trace.

Immediately to the east of Road W1 there was a small sub-enclosure 13.7m by 11.8m in extent that housed an unusual 'T'-shaped feature (F.2567). This was 3.5m by 2.8m in extent, with 'slots' up to 0.90m wide and with a maximum surviving depth of 0.19m. In places the sides of the cut for this feature showed evidence for scorching and the slots were backfilled with sterile clay. At present, the identified parallels for this feature suggest that it was a corn drier. The only other noteworthy feature east of the roadway was a rather shallow clay-lined pit (F.2811), which presumably fulfilled some form of specialised function.

Located 35m north of the ditched enclosure system of Settlement RB1 was cremation Cemetery C5. This was situated immediately to the north of Prehistoric ring-ditch R-D3, suggesting that this may still have been extant as a low mound. The cemetery consisted of five cremations that can definitely be identified as Roman, whilst a un-urned cremation in the same area has been assigned to the Bronze Age. Located 60m north of Settlement RB1 was an isolated un-urned cremation (F.2606), this contained a number of hobnails and has, therefore, been dated to the Roman Period. Several other un-urned cremations have been assigned to the prehistoric period (see above), but it is conceivable that some of these are Roman.

Feature	Cut	Weight of cremated bone (g)	Cremation container	Dish 'lid'	Secondary vessels	Additional items	Comments
2606	[8374]	141	None	Unknown	Unknown	Hobnails [8373]	Isolated burial, plough damaged
2663	Not identified	195	[8743]	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Plough damaged
2664	Not identified	336	[8705]	[8704.1]	[8704.2]	Unknown	Plough damaged
2665	Not identified	1	[8728]	No	[8729]	Unknown	Plough damaged
2666	Not identified	485	[8713]	[8711]	[8710]	Unknown	Plough damaged
2667	Not identified	261	[8742]	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Plough damaged

Table 13: Cremations associated with Settlement RB1, C5 plus F.2606.

Although Settlement RB1 is not a complex entity, its relative simplicity, which largely derives from its lack of later Roman occupation, it is analytically useful as it allows it to serve as an immediate Early Roman agricultural settlement exemplar on the gravel ridge. This is strengthened by the recovery of several significant artefact assemblages (F.2513-14 and F.2768) and the intensive sampling of waterlogged deposits from well F.2768. Our understanding of the settlement is strengthened by the identification of the associated cemetery, the ceramics from this cemetery and those of the putative 'household clearance' event will potentially provide useful comparators to compare the funerary versus domestic pottery.

Settlement RB2 - This is a rather sprawling entity that may effectively mask several distinct Roman settlements or phases of settlement development, which further analysis should disentangle. It is possible that it is some form of 'aggregated' or 'linear' village, composed of a group of farmsteads with their associated irregular aggregated fieldsystems. RB2 was divided into two portions by Trackways W3/4 and the Open Area: RB2A to the northeast and Settlement RB2B to the south and west. The Double-ditch System also runs through Settlement RB2B and, in addition, RB2B was divided by a major long-lived ditch system with up to eight phases of re-cutting. Based on differences in alignment, RB2B could be divided into three broad sectors (northern, central and southern). Taken in conjunction, all these factors implies that RB2B could be further sub-divided into six to eight spatial units; however, to do so would be premature at this stage. Given the relative complexity of settlements RB2A and RB2A, by necessity they can only be dealt with in a cursory manner at this stage.

While the western, southern and eastern edges of RB2A were clearly defined, the northern part of the settlement continued into an area of intensive Post-Medieval/Modern quarrying and was only investigated through trenching. RB2A incorporates a 'latest'/terminal Iron Age cemetery (C3), which continued to act as a foci for burial and as a topographic feature throughout the Roman Period. In the western part of RB2A the settlement was divided into a network of at least eight roughly square enclosures, each approximately 25m by 22m in extent; indications from the trenching suggest that there may well have been four further enclosures to the north. To the east the area was less intensively sub-divided and just three enclosures can be identified. There is evidence that there was a relatively complex 18m-long entranceway, which went through several phases, on the southern side of RB2A leading to Trackway W3. There was also at least one 4.6m wide entrance into RB2A on its eastern side. In most of the enclosures of RB2A there was little surviving evidence for what activities took place.

At C3 the cremation and inhumation (F.824 and F.2036) in the ditch-circle and the inhumation in the penannular ditch (F.2036) show that these continued to be utilised for burials; additionally there were a series of rather more dispersed burials within the general area (Table 14):

Feature	Туре	Location relative to C3	Comments
1931	Inhumation?	16m to the southeast	Extremely heavily disturbed.
1935	Inhumation	30m to the southeast	Well-preserved E–West aligned extended inhumation, skull and ribs removed by later ploughing. Possible pillow stone under skull and hobnails.
1958	Cremation	7.5m to the southwest	In a well-defined pit with four vessels, only a small quantity of bone (109g) spread through several fills. Under the pots there was an articulated 'rack' of sheep ribs [5426] and there was also what appears to be a brooch.
2005	Cremation	15m to the northeast	In well-defined cut with single container vessel [5988], 569g of bone.

Table 14: Roman burials in vicinity of C3.

No convincing structural remains were identified within RB2A, although some gullies may indicate the locations of structures. At this stage the best insight into RB2A is provided by its four wells; it should, though, be noted that the two watering holes linked to Trackway W3 may also have served the needs of the settlement *per se*. All four wells lay on or beside the same ditched boundary-line. Taking them from southwest to northeast, the first encountered is F.2058. This was a large circular cut *c*. 5.1m in diameter, with a surviving depth of 2.16m. Although indications of the shaft survived, no trace of the actual lining was present. There was a notable concentration of pits and other features immediately to the northwest of this well and which appeared to be located within a small sub-enclosure. The most notable of these was a sub-circular pit (F.1997), measuring 0.90 by 0.84m in extent. Its sides and base were clay-lined and set into the clay of the base was a secondary lining composed of tile fragments and tesserae. The function of this feature is unclear, although given its proximity to the well and its clay lining it is likely that it held water; the tile and tesserae lining would have provided a less easily damaged/disturbed base than the clay.

Some 35m northeast of well F.2058 was F.2023, a large broadly circular pit *c*. 4.4m in diameter, with a surviving depth of 1.67m located between the ditch-circle and the penannular ditch of C3. Although indications of the shaft survived, no trace of the actual lining was present. Only 1.0m to the northeast of F.2023 was well F.2056, which consisted of a sub-circular cut 4.2 by 4.0m in extent, with a surviving depth of 1.7m. Set within this was a square timber box-lined well structure, 1.1m by 0.9m in extent. This consisted of four quite substantial oak uprights in the corners, some lightweight rods between these (added purely to hold them in place during construction) and some quite substantial oak boards connecting the uprights.



Figure 5. Tile-lined pit (left) and metalwork: top, pilum; middle, Iceni coin; bottom, rosette brooch

centimetres



Figure 6. Roman waterlogged wells and organic finds: top right, stool / chair piece; below, leather shoe

Located 15m northeast of F.2056 was F.2044, a roughly circular well 5.4m by 5.3m, with a maximum surviving depth of 1.96m. While no trace of a lining proper survived, there were some large pieces of reused stone in the base of the well that appear to have been placed there to provide a firm/dry footing during construction. There were also two *in situ* upright roundwood stakes; these also appear not to be part of the well lining proper, but to relate to a temporary expedient during construction.

It is currently unclear if these four wells, plus potentially the two linked to Trackway W3, form a consecutive sequence or if some or all of them were in use concurrently. They all lie within *c*. 55m of each other and may have formed a cluster, similar to the two defined from RB2B; whilst those beside Trackway W3 lay 100m away and were probably a different group. It should also be borne in mind that the northernmost (F.2044) lay under 3m from the edge of excavation and more wells may have lain beyond the investigated area.

As already mentioned, Settlement RB2B is potentially an amalgam of many distinct elements. Whilst it is well-defined on most sides, to the northeast it has been severely affected by later quarrying. The area of RB2B was the focus of some 'Latest'/terminal Iron Age activity, including Cemetery C7 and two small square enclosures. One other point worth noting is that the southeastern extent of the ditched enclosure area of RB2B may have been linked to surviving low mounds of R-D1-2. As Settlement RB2B is the most complex element of the excavated archaeology, it is of necessity the least understood at this interim stage. As a result, this summary will simply list some of its main elements.

Perhaps the easiest way to gain insight into RB2B at this stage is through its cemeteries and wells. It appears that Cemetery C7 may have been replaced by C1 (predominantly cremation with some inhumations) located in the northwestern part of RB2B, and that eventually C1 was itself superseded by C2 (exclusively inhumation). Based upon the associated ceramics – plus the general pattern that inhumation burial was rare until the late 2nd century, becomes common during the 3rd century and entirely supplants cremation by the end of the 3rd century - these two cemeteries probably span the mid/late 1st to late 2nd centuries and late 2nd to late 3rd centuries AD respectively.

C1 consisted primarily of cremations (12 identified), plus a few inhumations (two definite). Heavy disturbance by later ploughing, which had almost completely obliterated several cremations, makes it feasible that some burials have been removed in their entirety. The core of the cemetery consisted of a tight group of nine cremations and two inhumations over an area of 5.0m by 4.5m. This core was located immediately to the northeast of northwestsoutheast aligned ditch (F.550/F.551/F.868), although it is unclear whether this ditch was actually in existence when the cemetery was active. Located 6m to the southwest of the cemetery core were two further cremations (F.535 and F.542); whilst 8m north of the cemetery core was a single cremation (F.549) that can be un-problematically associated with the cemetery. There is no stratigraphic evidence to determine if the inhumations in the cemetery core were later than its cremations or if they are contemporary. There is no evidence for a strong layout/organisation of the cemetery, though there was no intercutting of burials. All of the cremations were placed within substantial coarseware vessels and at least seven had inverted Samian dishes used as 'lids' to seal the cremated bone. At least nine possessed secondary ceramic vessels, in a range of forms and fabrics, that were typically placed beside the primary container (in one case it was placed within the cremation container; F.506). Additional items are relatively rare, it is unclear if nails in some of the cremations (F.507 and F.508) were deliberate additions or they related to caskets, etc.. Neither of the inhumations had associated grave-goods or hobnails, but one appeared to have been interred within a coffin (F.858). The dating evidence suggests that C1 spans the mid/late 1st to 2nd centuries AD with no evidence for continuity into the 3rd century.



Figure 7. Roman internments: left, cremations; right, inhumations

Feature	Cut	Bone	Cremation	Dish 'lid'	Secondary	Additional	Comments
		(g)	container		VESSEIS	items	
502	Not identifiable	1088	[1211] 70-150AD	[1212] 150-250AD	[1210] 50-100AD	None identified	Substantively complete, upper portion truncated
503	Not identifiable	129	[1220] 100-200AD	Probably [1221] 50- 150AD	Unknown	Unknown	Very heavily plough damaged
504	Not identifiable	36	[1227] 50-100AD	None apparent	Unknown	Unknown	Extremely heavily plough damaged
505	Not identifiable	293	[1224] 50-200AD	None apparent	[1225] 50-200AD	Unknown	Truncated by land drain and plough damaged
506	<i>ca.</i> 0.6m diameter circle, steep sides and rounded base 0.25m+ deep	226	[1341] 50-100AD	[1320]50-100AD	[1321] 100-200AD	[1267] hobnails [1326] unusual stones	Substantively complete, upper portion truncated
507	Not identifiable	798	[1270] 100-200AD	[1271]: no spot-date	[1272] 50-150AD [1273] 40-400AD	[1329] iron nail [1343] iron nail	Substantively complete, upper portion truncated
508	Not identifiable	672	[1323] 50-200AD	[1276] 150-250AD	[1277] 50-100AD [1278]	[1328] iron nails	Substantively complete, upper portion truncated
535	0.59m by 0.54m rectangle, 0.16m+ deep with vertical sides and flat base	1455	[1334] 50-200AD	None	[1336] 200-400AD [1337] 150-300AD	None identified	South-western outlier. Substantively complete, upper portion truncated
542	Not identifiable	150	[1361] 100-300AD	Unknown	Unknown	None identified	South-western outlier. Extremely heavily plough damaged
549	Oval, 0.55m by 0.37m, with steep sides and flat base 0.40m+ deep	645	[1408] 120-300AD	None	[1409] 40-70AD	None identified	Northern outlier. Substantively complete, upper portion truncated
823	Circular <i>ca.</i> $0.45m$ diameter, steep sides and concave base $0.18m$ + deep	644	[2304] 100-400AD	[2302] 150-250AD	[2305] 50-150AD	None identified	Substantively complete, upper portion truncated
869	Not identifiable	1	[2465] 100-400AD	Unknown	Unknown	None identified	Extremely heavily plough damaged

Table 15: C1 cremations.

Feature	Cut dimensions	Skeleton	Orientation	Coffin	Hob- nails	Grave goods	Dating evidence from fill	Comment
850	1.96m by 0.78m, 0.25m deep	[2388]	N – S	None	No	None	Pottery 50– 100AD	Poor skeletal preservation
858	1.80m by 0.73m, 0.25m+ deep	[2426]	ENE – WSW	Seven nails [2397]	No	None	Pottery 150– 400AD	Poor skeletal preservation
867	0.98m+ long by 0.54m, 0.15m+ deep	None	N – S	None	No	None	None	Possible child burial, but no bone survives

Table 16: C1 inhumations.

Cemetery C2 was located 200m south of C1 and consisted solely of inhumation burials. It is likely that C2 was, in some respects, the succeeding burial ground to C1. Cemetery C2 was identified during the evaluation and four graves identified, although only one (F.076) was excavated and one of the unexcavated examples proved not to be a real grave upon later investigation. Cemetery C2 was located in the corner of a ditched enclosure; there was little evidence for other activity in the vicinity, but if one accepts that the line of the Double-ditch System continues through Settlement RB2B, then C2 lay within its axes. In total, C2 consisted of 10 inhumations in the core of the cemetery, plus one possible burial with no surviving bone (F.658) and an additional outlier burial (F.510). All the burials within the core were extended and supine with their heads to the southeast. The graves in cemetery-core were all aligned southeast to north-northwest, and although there were what might be identified as rows of graves these were not particularly well-defined. The graves were of variable depth and in many instances extremely difficult to identify; as a result, it was necessary to remachine this area an additional two times to be confident that all the interments had been identified. The outlier burial was perpendicular to the core-area burials and lay on the opposite side of a ditch (F.517) that it clearly derived its orientation from. In general, bone preservation was extremely poor. The associated ceramic suggests that burial activity in C2 commenced no earlier than the mid 2nd century and did not necessarily continue after the 3rd century.

In total, 21 wells were identified within Settlement RB2B; this figure may, though, be somewhat misleading if tightly clustered groups of wells are counted as single entities (in which case there were only seven wells/well groups). In addition, the wells can perhaps be divided into two broad groups. The wells will be discussed in a broad progression from north to south. The northernmost well F.564 lay under 2m from the edge of excavation and there may well be more wells beyond. Its construction cut was roughly circular and *c*. 6.7m in diameter, with a surviving depth of *c*. 2.9m, indicating an original depth of some 3.3m. At the base of the well there was a square timber box-lining [4196], *c*. 0.8.5m by 0.85m in extent and consisting of thin planks *c*. 25mm wide. The pottery that was associated with the construction of the well is mid 1^{st} – 2^{nd} century in date and there were two coins that potentially provide a *terminus post quem* (SF. 19-20). Its backfilling contained pottery dating to the mid 1^{st} – 4^{th} century AD, plus some animal bone and quern. Also probably associated with the backfilling was a copper alloy dice (SF. 21); the waterlogged deposits at the base of the well were intensively sampled.

Twenty-two metres to the southeast, well F.586 had a broadly circular construction cut, 8.0m by 7.5m in extent and 1.65m deep. Although none of the original lining survived, the well had a distinctive profile indicating that there was originally a central wattle-lined shaft. It contained a considerable quantity of pottery (1359 sherds, 25671g; plus 96 sherds weighing 1072g occurring residually in F.610) plus quern stone (4655g), most of which had apparently been deposited as a single 'household clearance'-style event during the construction of the well. This material appears to date to the early–mid 2nd century AD, whilst the backfilling of the well dates to the 3rd or 4th century AD.

Feature	Cut	Skeleton	Coffin	Hobnails	Grave goods	Dating evidence	Comment
	dimensions					from grave fill	
076	1.83m by	??	Yes, 8 nails	Yes, 23	None identified		From evaluation
	0.52m						
500	2.26m by	[1202]	Yes, nails [1201]	No	None identified	Pottery 150-	
	1.02m					400AD	
501	1.96m by	[1207]	Yes, nails [1205]	Yes [1206]	None identified	Pottery 50-400	
	0.60m					and 150-400AD	
510	2.15m by	[1216]	No	Yes [1215]	None identified	None	Outlier on different alignment
	0.80m						
629	2.43m by	[1641]	Yes, 9 nails	Yes [1720]	Complete pot [1642] between feet,	Pottery 100-	
	0.75m		[1643]-[1648],		150-250AD	300AD	
(20)	0.05	[1(20]	[1/16]-[1/19]	N/ [1(20]	D 111 1 1 1 6 (11/20)	D. // 50	
630	2.35m by	[1628]	Yes, 6 nails $[1(22), [1(27)]]$	Yes [1630]-	Possible brooch by feet [1638]	Pottery 50-	
(21	0.55m	[1697]	[1032]-[1037]	[1031] Vez	Complete a et [1(00] 120 200 AD	SUUAD	Shull also d hataa a faat aa haha
051	1.99III Dy	[1087]	ies	res	Complete pot [1690] 120-200AD	Pollery 50-	decentitated but head area removed
	0.97111					TITUAD	by land drain
658	0.82m by	None	No	No	Complete pot $[17/8]$ 150- 400 AD	Pottery 50BC-	Small cut with no surviving hone
050	0.02m 0y	None	110	110	complete pot [1740], 150-400AD	50AD	could be infant or child burial with
	0.4011					50/10	no survival
666	2.10m by	[1766]	Yes. [1767].	Yes [1787]	None	None	
	0.90m	[-/-/	[1769], [1770],	100[1/0/]			
			[1786]				
848	1.80m by	[2379]	Yes [2382],	Yes [2384]	Iron objects near waist [2385],	Pottery 50-	
	0.80m		[2383]		[2386]	100AD	
849	1.60m by	[2491]	Yes	Yes [2517]	Complete pot beside right tibia	None	
	0.60m			and [2518]	[2494] 150-250AD, iron objects		
					over torso [2493]		
856	2.15m by	[2406]	Yes [2405]	Yes [2424]	Complete pot between feet [2423],	Pottery 50-	
	1.00m			and [2425]	not spot-dated	300AD	
865	2.31m by	[2497]	Yes, 45 nails	Yes [2499]	Complete pot [2500] by right	Pottery 150-	
	1.30m		[2496]		hand/pelvis 150-300AD	400AD	

Table 17: C2 inhumations.

Well F.548, 26m to the southwest of F.586, had already been investigated during the evaluation (F.247), when it produced $2^{nd}-3^{rd}$ century AD pottery (261 sherds, 4906g), fragments of a glass cup with trailed lip decoration, an important assemblage of environmental material and a piece of lathe-turned wooden furniture. This feature was an oval in form, 7.6m by 4.1m in extent with a maximum surviving depth of 1.22m. No trace of the original well-lining survived. The excavation produced further pottery of $2^{nd}-3^{rd}$ century AD date (271 sherds, 2731g).

Thirty-five metres to the southeast of F.548, adjacent wells F.614/615 are probably best thought of as a single well that was replaced/repaired in the same location. The oval construction cut(s) measured 3.9m by 2.5m in extent, with a maximum surviving depth of 1.1m. No trace of the original lining survived and it appears that both phase of the well were probably backfilled in the 3rd century AD. All four/five of these wells can broadly be thought of as forming a 'northern' group, albeit quite a widely spaced one with its most distant members 75m apart. There was then a 125m gap to what might be conceived of as a 'southern' group of wells.

A group eleven inter-cutting wells (F.996, F.1028, F.1119-25, F.1236 and F.1364) appear to represent a single complex of short-lived wells that were located in an area where the natural gravels were unstable. These were all broadly circular or oval in form, with diameters of 2.2-3.5m and maximum surviving depths of up to 1.42m. No traces of their original linings survived. Only very limited material assemblages were obtained from most, the ceramics all appear to be $2^{nd}-3^{rd}$ century AD in date. The exception to this general paucity was F.1236, whose backfilling included interesting metalwork such as a coin (<11118>), a gilt brooch (<11119>) and a balance arm (<11122>).

Located only 2.5m south of the cluster of wells discussed above were another pair (F.1020 and F.1308/1148). The earlier (F.1020) was broadly circular and 3.2m in diameter, with a maximum surviving depth of 1.42m. No trace of its original lining survived, but a group of reused stone blocks on the south side of the base appear to have been placed there to provide firm/dry footing during construction. The pottery from it suggests a mid–late 3^{rd} century date for its backfilling, whilst a leather shoe indicates a date of *c*. 250–75 AD. It appears that this well was succeeded by a 0.9m diameter shaft (F.1308), which had a 0.7m deep wattle-lining (F.1148) constructed from a variety of roundwood, some of which had become heavily distorted by post-depositional pressure. The latter was backfilled in the 3^{rd} –4th centuries AD; its fill was relatively sterile of material culture, but did contain an iron object identified as the shank and head of *pilum* or javelin (<11127>) that was nearly vertical as if it had been thrust into the feature. If this was the case then the wooden shaft would probably have projected for over a metre above the contemporary ground surface. Given their dating, it is likely that these two wells are effectively the successors of the well cluster to the north.

Sixteen metres south of this group was another well complex (F.1168, F.1220 and F.1402). This was a complex entity that may represent either two or three successive adjacent wells. They were located in a large irregular oval cut, 3.3m by 3.2m in extent with a maximum surviving depth of 1.6m. There were two phases of plank revetments with wattle uprights in the base of the feature, the role of these is uncertain, as they appear to have been too flimsy to form the lining proper and may simply represent short-lived construction related features. The earlier of these incorporated part of the seat of a chair or a stool as a plank (Fig. 6). There was also a spread of stone and timber in the base of the feature, it is unclear if this represents material placed there to provide firm/dry footing during construction, some form of collapsed revetment, backfilling after the life of the well or something else entirely. One of the pieces of timber was a complex structural element with evidence for several phases of earlier use. The pottery from the well(s) spans the mid 2^{nd} to 4^{th} centuries AD and there was a leather shoe of *c*. 175–200AD; it seems likely that the first phase dates to the mid–late 2^{nd} century AD, with final backfilling in the 4^{th} century

Several timber buildings consisting of postholes and beam-slots were recognisable in RB2B, although most of these were relatively poorly preserved. The lack of surviving horizontal stratigraphy and internal features makes identifying the functions of these building problematic. In addition to the buildings themselves, there were a number of small sub-enclosures whose size and form strongly indicates that they once contained buildings, even

though no physical traces of these survived. The best surviving and most complete structure was 9.6m long by 5.2m wide. It appears to have gone through several phases of modification and no less than 55 features were associated with it. In contrast, no other structure had more than ten identifiable archaeological elements.

A portion of Settlement RB2B is notable for the presence of dark humic fills in the upper portions of many of its features. These were not technically true 'dark earths', but potentially share several characteristics with such deposits. In quite a few instances this dark upper fill appeared not to relate directly to the feature *per se*, but rather represent material that had accumulated in the hollows left by largely filled-in features. The impression gained is that the dark deposits are, in fact, the preserved remnants of much more general horizontal spreads that have been entirely removed by later ploughing elsewhere; though, in areas they did appear to be detectable as a swathe of subsoil that was noticeably darker than elsewhere. This part of the site was also distinguished by a number of distinctive curvilinear ditches that were also filled with similar dark deposits; in these instances this material did appear to be a more genuine fill as such. Additionally, there was a noticeable concentration of ironworking slag discovered in this area, predominantly associated with the dark fills. It seems likely that these dark humic fills, curvilinear ditches and iron slag represent a late – if not the latest – phase of Roman occupation at RB2B. The dating of this is currently uncertain, but it is no earlier than the mid 3rd century AD and may belong to the 4th century AD.

Isolated Features

The vast majority of Roman features could be assigned either to a settlement or routeway, with only a few pits and postholes otherwise occurring in near-complete isolation. It is possible that some of the un-phased isolated features are also Roman; nonetheless the overall impression is that, beyond the settlements and their ditched enclosures, the digging of features was extremely rare.

In summary, the evaluation and excavation indicate that in the Early Roman Period the gravel ridge was intensively occupied by a series of settlements. These appear to have been largely self-sufficient, low to moderate status agrarian communities, whose inhabitants were neither poverty stricken or in possession of any great wealth. There are suggestions that there may have been some internal hierarchical relationships between these settlements, but this requires a much greater degree of specialist work to elucidate. It appears that by the middle of the Roman Period a degree of settlement nucleation and probably specialisation was taking place. The ridge was a less densely occupied place, although it is unclear at present if the population level was stable and simply concentrated in fewer settlements or if it had instead declined. By the mid 3rd century there may well have been no occupation as such within the excavated area. Yet, this is unlikely to represent any from of true abandonment of the area agriculturally speaking and it may simply represent a continuation of the earlier nucleation (i.e. off-site), which led to there being no settlement within the excavated area. If nothing else, the continuity of Trackway W3 into the Medieval Period as *Mill Way* suggests that there was no fundamental breakdown in the exploitation of the ridge.

Whilst it is currently impossible to accurately gauge the population of the Roman settlements, it is possible to attempt a broad approximation based upon the overall number of investigated features, plus wells and burials – the needs for water, and the certainty of death, are after all constant human factors.

	No. of features	Feature %	Wells*	Well %	Burials	Burial%
Settlement RB1	100	8.3	1	9.1	6	15.8
Settlement RB2A	254	21.3	3	27.3	7	18.4
Settlement RB2B	749	62.1	7	63.6	25	65.8
Total	1203		11		38	

Table 18: Comparison of Roman Period settlements (*wells whose construction cuts are physically separated by less than 1m counted as a single entity).

Saxon and Medieval

No definite Saxon or Medieval features were identified; a very small quantity of Medieval pottery was, though, recovered. Although a number of furrows and ditches may be Medieval in origin all the dateable material recovered from such features was 16th century or later. The excavation area incorporated Site III from the evaluation phase; this was a trackway interpreted as relating to the documented Medieval routeway known as *Milenwaye* ('Mill Way'). The dating of this trackway was ambiguous in the evaluation, the excavation indicated that all the surviving ditches and metalling were Roman in date, and although the routeway may have continued unaltered into the Medieval Period, this has left no discernible archaeological traces.

Post-Medieval/Modern

Post-Medieval/Modern (153 features, 8.2%) covers a range of feature types including furrows, quarry pits, land drains, *etc.* Some, notably furrows and quarry pits, were only investigated on a limited scale to either confirm their identification as Post-Medieval/Modern, characterise their nature or elucidate their relationship with earlier features. As with natural/non-real features, records exist primarily in those instances where the Post-Medieval/Modern features impinge upon earlier archaeological features in such a manner than it proved worth recording them to clarify the nature of the genuine archaeological features. In addition to the recorded features, *c.* 100 additional brief investigations of Post-Medieval/Modern features were undertaken to confirm identifications but not recorded.

In general the Post-Medieval/Modern features are of negligible archaeological significance and will not be discussed. Several of the investigated ditches correspond with known Medieval and later field boundaries and are, therefore, of some significance as they allow the archaeological investigations to be located within the framework of *The West Fields of Cambridge*. One of the late gravel quarry pits (F.2717) contained a large assemblage of material culture; this was partially recovered and can be dated to *c*. 1888–1900. A rather unusual discovery was a ditch that contained the articulated leg of a horse (F.2720).

A very roughly circular ditched enclosure (F.544) – 8.4m in diameter with steep almost vertically sided ditches 0.5m wide with a maximum surviving depth of 0.5m – and a number of zigzag trenches – 0.4–0.9m wide with surviving depths of up to 0.8m – appear to represent a WWII defensive emplacement relating to a property of Huntingdon Road. These features contained only residual material culture. This compliments the recovery of a weather observation-station building of the same period at Site II during the 2009 evaluation.

Undetermined

Undetermined features (10, 0.5% of the total) consist of postholes and pits that are genuine archaeological features, but which contain no dateable material and are so isolated that they cannot be confidently associated with any features that can be reliably assigned to any period.

Outreach (Hayley Roberts)

Outreach was an important element of the excavations. It was decided that for the Cambridge audience a volunteer program, schools visits and an openday were the most appropriate methods to involve members of the public. The time of year, scale and visual appearance of the site were an early concern, as was the embargo on early publicity, and it was realised and accepted that these restrictions would limit the number of people that we could connect with.

Over the course of the six months, through some very wet and cold weather, a successful programme emerged, allowing local people the chance to directly benefit from the development and the opportunities that it presented. They were able to engage with the archaeology, potentially an unfamiliar subject, allowing them a greater understanding of the history of their landscape.

Volunteers

Two main volunteer weeks were held in February, one of which was planned to coincide with the school half term. A total of 16 volunteers worked with us, two were students from the University of Cambridge Division of Archaeology who participated out of term time. The remainder came during the volunteer's fortnight and, combined, they spent 50 persondays working on site. Some had a little prior experience of archaeology, but many of the volunteers had just come along wanting to know more. It should perhaps be briefly stated here that, although we called this event 'volunteering', it was actually an education experience, designed to engage local people with archaeology.

The programme was limited advertising, and was only shared around several mailing lists and mentioned to local neighbours as part of a letter-drop; however, we received far more enquiries than provision could allow (54 enquiries). Most of these were from people who live in Cambridgeshire, but some were from much further afield (e.g. Spain). Priority was given to early bookings, to those who could dedicate more time (and therefore gain a much higher quality experience) and to those who lived nearby. As Figure 8 demonstrates several of the volunteers are going to be directly affected by the development (living or working in properties adjacent to the development). At least one admitted that he had previously been against the development, but has since mellowed and now is making the most of the opportunities that it presents.

In order to understand volunteer types and to gauge reactions to the excavation an evaluation questionnaire was used. Out of seven respondents, three were university members, four were not. This is an example of how university outreach projects, and archaeology in particular, can reach all audiences. The volunteers had a broad and evenly spread age range between 25 & 65+ years. This is contrary to the usual assumption that all volunteers will be retired; many participants booked holidays from work in order to attend. One volunteer has since been employed by the Unit as a result of his participation in the volunteering programme. The volunteers also bucked the usual (national) trend for travelling by car, with at least two arriving on bicycle, three on foot and one on public transport.

CAU scored 39 out of a possible 40 for the quality of the teaching and 37/40 for the quality of the facilities at NWC excavation. Although all enjoyed their time with us most of the volunteers suggested that warmer weather and less mud would make the project more enjoyable, but they did accept that there was not much we could actually do about that. Many of those that we had to turn away requested to bring family members who were under age (16), an insurance issue that will hopefully be resolved for future projects.





Figure 8. Distribution of volunteer home residences



Figure 9. A word cloud summarising how the volunteers felt about their experience

The majority of the participants wanted to attend because they had a previous interest in local history and archaeology. Some also wanted to learn archaeological skills. By the end of their experience they all understood the archaeological features that they were digging and the majority felt that they had, albeit in a minor way, contributed towards our understanding of the archaeology and, therefore, the interpretation of the landscape. It has been debated in the literature whether excavation can help volunteers or communities to create a greater sense of identity, belonging and even potentially of ownership. This was not predicted for this project, due to the small scale and top-down nature of the volunteer involvement; however, it is hoped that the volunteers will have gained a sense of participation and enjoyment. This will allow them to feel more involved in the project and therefore the bigger development, important in their position as neighbours and stakeholders.

Archaeological excavation should always be a learning experience; it is not just a form of entertainment. This opinion is always foremost when working with volunteers in the field and has come across positively in the feedback, (expressed as 'interesting', 'informative' and 'fascinating'). The other feelings expressed above, such as enjoyable and friendly, are required in order to provide a good environment for learning. Two words that could be taken as negative are 'mud' and 'cold'. Both of these were primarily a cause of the time of year, but actually added an extra dimension to the experience. The raw power of the elements is something that many people no longer fully appreciate and exposure over a few days on an archaeological excavation can really awaken awareness. Not only did the volunteers gain an appreciation of the natural world, but the experience helped to create a greater understanding of people who had to survive in conditions prior to central heating. A couple of the volunteers also stated that it was nice to experience digging 'out of season' and an event outside of school holidays made it easier to take leave. The number of volunteer places available had to be limited by the cold weather and welfare facilities; this is something that could be improved upon with additional preparation.

Not only was this volunteer programme important in helping the North West Cambridge Development create good relations with the neighbours, but it also allowed these very local people to gain a greater understanding of the landscape within which they live.

Schools

The schools visits (and open-day) were held in conjunction with the University Science with allowing Festival. us to attract and connect а large audience (www.cam.ac.uk/sciencefestival). These were planned to occur as late in the digging season as possible, in theory allowing for better weather and for a greater understanding of the landscape. Each visit was different, tailored to the age of the class, the archaeology that we were digging at the time, any other relevant topics they were currently teaching at school, and the weather. Most sessions consisted of an introduction to archaeology, explaining the subject before a guided walk across site, looking at different features, many of which were being dug as they looked on (Figs 10 & 11). This naturally allowed the class to be drawn into a process of discussion and interpretation, bringing them deeper into the subject and creating a greater engagement with the topic. Controversial issues were broached (e.g. the treatment of human remains) and the children were encouraged to voice their opinions.

The second part of the session was essential, considering the atrocious weather the children had to experience. It was held inside a heated marquee and allowed a more hands-on approach, looking at and analysing objects. It enabled the landscape to become a bit more 'real'; sometimes it is easier to connect with an object that you can handle and directly relate to. It also encouraged those children that didn't want to participate within group discussions a chance to interpret things for themselves.

In total, 13 classes/sessions visited the site, equating to 279 children. Table 19 demonstrates the location and type of school as well as the age of the class. Several other classes could not book or had to pull out short notice due to circumstances beyond our control (mostly transport related). This was a popular event that teachers, children and parents all enjoyed and left having learnt something (i.e. 'Thank you so much for creating such a memorable visit for our students').

School Name	Class size	School Year
Sancton Wood School (Independent Day School) CB1 2EZ	One class of 28	Years 3 & 5
Petersfield School (State primary) SG8 5QG	Two classes of 25	Years 2 & 3
Mayfield Primary (State primary) CB4 3HN	Two classes of 30	Year 3
(One class of 15	Years 8 & 12 special needs
<i>Chesterton Community College</i> (State Humanities College) CB4 3NY		
Cambridgeshire Home Schools	Four groups totalling 73 children plus parents	Mixed ages (Toddlers through to 16)
Norfolk and Suffolk Home Schools	One group of eight children plus parents	Mixed ages (Toddlers through to 16)
Stanley Drapkin, Steeple Bumpstead (Primary state school) CB9 7ED	One class of 30	Year 3
Heritage School	One class of 15	Year 2
(Independent Day School) CB2 1JE	a ala that misitad NIWC	

The information about the schools that visited NWC.

The visits were designed to challenge all children in different ways; it was noted by teachers that during the visit normally quiet children would speak up and engage and those that find concentration challenging would become focused. At the start of one session a child openly admitted that he was bored, by the end he gave his thanks and admitted it was the best school trip ever! These school visits had a real impact upon the 279 children and the supporting teachers, allowing for a very different and cost effective learning experience which transcends topics and ages (the schools were not charged for the sessions, only providing their own transport).



Figure 10. Site tours: left, school party (top) and local residents (below): right, open-day tours





Figure 12. The Roman Street Party

Open-day

The open-day programme was always going to be challenging. Inviting large numbers of people onto a working excavation area and construction site can be hard enough at the best of times, but the nature of the archaeology and the ground conditions added an extra challenge (Figs 10 & 12). Sometimes other forms of interpretation may be more appropriate but, due to the high demand for authenticity and the location on the outskirts of Cambridge, we felt that that at NWC it was important to show the excavation itself.

The large landscape project was partially on a gravel ridge, but partially also on clay. The water table was extremely high, the gravels unstable and after six months the site had been repeatedly weathered by rain, snow, and frost, and was not looking at its best. Anybody who has tried to walk across a clay field will understand what conditions were like underfoot. The geology and the archaeology were hard enough for experienced archaeologists to see, excavate and interpret when recently exposed, let alone members of the public six months later. Due to these conditions we decided that one controlled event should be held and that this should be part of the University Science Festival. It nicely coincided with the end of our investigations and allowed us to reach a much broader audience. It did however mean that we had to plan in advance, problematic when you have only just started excavating! The Roman Street Party theme was selected; not only did we hope to find route-ways across the landscape but it was a broad enough topic to carry most Roman discoveries.

Once the conditions became apparent it was realised that by holding a typical site open-day we would inevitably disappoint some visitors. Members of the public often have preconceived ideas about archaeological sites and therefore, as some would be disillusioned by viewing the reality at the site, we were really keen to avoid negative experiences. In order to counter this we hired the Roman Military Research Society to re-create a Roman Street Scene. As our interpretation progressed they were asked to help us interpret the domestic and civilian side to Roman life. They recreated a kitchen scene with real cooking, demonstrated trade and production with a cobbler, as well as other pastimes including games and religious activities. The CAU also employed a metal-worker who, although not dressed in period costume, tried to recreate Roman metalworking techniques. The Roman Military Research Society were using replicas of several of the type of artefacts that we discovered, helping to bring to life our broken bits of pot and muddy holes.

On the day of the event we all woke up to snow. Although we had wanted to demonstrate a large scale, 'real' excavation to members of the public the whole thing was hidden beneath a white blanket. The guided tours were converted into 'talks', although 5 minutes into the first one it was apparent that visitors were still desperate to go and look at site. We tried to highlight the features using balloons, and although these could not stand up to the wind for the whole day they were a very helpful interpretation method. At several points during the tours people were given the opportunity to turn back to the heated marquee, but the thirst to see more was still strong.

This was also demonstrated by the fact that 446 people that came through the gates, a large number considering the snow and the fact that there was no parking within a 15 minute walk! Once with us they also did not seem dissatisfied and (although hard to prove) many spent at least 1.5 hours, often much longer, getting the most from the event.

Inside the marquee, besides the re-enactors, was an artefact display, as well as posters detailing what we had found. The other element of an archaeological excavation that it was felt important to interpret was how we excavate. In more sympathetic conditions this would have been demonstrated on the guided tours as well as in the displays. On the day the most successful way this was achieved was by demonstrating a working Total Station (that was nicely paralleled by the Roman *groma*). It enabled discussions about soil removal and planning archaeological features, answering some of the most frequent questions archaeologists get asked, e.g. 'How do you know where to look?'.

The Roman Street Party was a major success, thwarted only a little by the weather. '[I] liked all the interactivity and real artefacts, shame about the weather' (Charlotte, a visitor). The fact that 446 people braved the elements demonstrates the strong appeal of archaeology and the potential that it has to allow developers to engage with local residents. The main visitor type was self-selected due to the weather, but were dedicated to learning and with a real interest in the subject. With better weather it is suspected that several hundred more would have attended. These numbers are aided by the fact that the event was completely free and held as part of the University Science Festival. In challenging conditions we successfully told the previously unknown story of the area without disappointing a keen and local audience.

Press

A press release was distributed in the week before the open-day resulting in good coverage, particularly in the local press. We had two articles in the *Cambridge News*, a short article on BBC Look East, an interview on BBC Radio Cambridgeshire and one on Star Radio. We gained advertisement far and wide on the internet, on both specialist and general websites

http://www.cam.ac.uk/news/layers-of-history-unveiled-at-north-west-cambridge-site

http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-cambridgeshire-21893150

 $\frac{http://www.cambridge-news.co.uk/News/SLIDESHOW-Roman-origins-of-Cambridge-development-site-revealed-by-dig-20130321060000.htm}{\label{eq:constraint}}$

 $\frac{http://access cambridge archaeology.wordpress.com/2013/03/22/spotlight-on-north-west-cambridge-excavations/$

http://www.pasthorizonspr.com/index.php/archives/03/2013/layers-of-time-uncovered-bronze-age-to-world-war-ii

Since the excavation has finished we have also featured in *Current Archaeology*, with another follow up article planned.

The site's outreach events were successful in allowing local people to engage with and learn about the archaeology discovered during the excavations. It did this using several methods: a hands-on volunteering experience, schools visits and a large-scale open-day. Through these a range of people were able to learn about the recent discoveries, broadening their knowledge. Through active engagement local people were able to learn about their local history and landscape. This will have helped the development to create and improve good relationships with local residents.

The project has also contributed in a very positive way to the education of local children, providing a lasting impact on their understanding of the world in which they are growing-up in. In a less direct manner the hundreds of people who attended the open-day, and the many more who were reached through the press will all have had their lives enriched by the knowledge that was previously unknown and hidden beneath their feet.



CAMBRIDGE ARCHAEOLOGICAL UNIT

