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The excavation of an early to mid-first century AD settlement at Cadeby Quarry, Cadeby revealed evidence for two sub-rectangular timber structures, along with structured deposition and pottery production. The results have added new information on Iron Age rural settlement patterns, including the use of rectangular structures in the transitional period between the Late Iron Age and early Roman periods. The structures discovered at Cadeby are a rare discovery in this region of Britain, and they may have served a range of functions including living areas and grain storage. The settlement appears to have lasted up until AD 60/70. Other activity in the area includes the structured deposition of querns and pottery vessels and mid-1st century pottery production.

INTRODUCTION

University of Leicester Archaeological Services (ULAS) carried out an archaeological excavation at Cadeby Quarry, Leicestershire (centred on SK 42913 02170) in October 2009, over an area of c. 1ha of land in advance of gravel extraction on behalf of Tarmac Ltd (Figs 1–2).

The excavation revealed evidence for an early to mid-first century AD enclosed settlement. The site, which was identified in a geophysical survey (Donaldson 2005), comprised a large rectangular enclosure with internal structures and associated features. Immediately to the south of this a linear ditched boundary was located, along with dispersed settlement activity further to the south.

This article presents the summary of the results; a full report (Speed 2010a) is available on the Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS), held by the Archaeological Data Service at the University of York under ID: universi1-85072, available at http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/library/greylit/query.cfm, or at the Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record.

Site description, topography and geology

The site is located in Cadeby Quarry, which lies to the west of Cadeby and south-west of Newbold Verdon in west Leicestershire, centred on national grid reference SK 42913 02170 (Fig. 1). It lies within the parishes of Cadeby and Newbold Verdon. The area of gravel extraction covered c. 28ha, consisting of a generally flat agricultural field, while the area of archaeological excavation was c. 1ha.
The underlying geology is Triassic mudstone including Mercia Mudstone group (formerly ‘Keuper Marl’), with overlying deposits of glacial sands and gravels (British Geological Survey South Sheet, Fourth Edition Solid 2001; First Edition Quaternary, 1977). The overlying soils are known as Arrow soils, gleyic brown earths which are deep permeable coarse loams affected by groundwater (Soil Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 3, Midland and Western England).

BACKGROUND

Prior to the excavation in 2009, the application area had been investigated for archaeological potential, beginning with a desk-based assessment (Meek 2004). The report noted that the Historic Environment Record lists numerous archaeological sites in the vicinity of the quarry area, including evidence for Iron Age occupation and land division in the form of rectangular enclosures and numerous pit alignments. A subsequent geophysical survey revealed evidence for several positive linear and rectilinear anomalies (Donaldson 2005), interpreted as ditches and enclosures from an Iron Age farmstead or small settlement (Meek 2005). Within other areas of the quarry (c. 1km north-east) a Bronze Age ring ditch with a series of internal pits and four other possible associated pits were excavated.

One pit contained material radiocarbon dated to c. 1500 BC (Jones 2008). An evaluation was conducted in the field immediately to the north-west. Although numerous magnetometry anomalies had been highlighted in the geophysical survey, the four evaluation trenches and subsequent topsoil strip failed to locate any archaeological deposits (Jones 2008, 20).
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PROJECT AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

The aims of the project were to record archaeological remains to be affected by the proposed development; to establish the location, extent, date and significance of the deposits, to define the quality and state of preservation of these deposits, and to produce an archive and report of the results.

A single field measuring c. 200m x c. 150m was subject to controlled stripping of topsoil and overburden using a JCB mechanical digger. One archaeologist (the author) was on site at all times to monitor the machine during the controlled strip. This resulted in the identification of archaeological deposits in two areas within the field. Following consultation and advice from the Senior Planning Archaeologist from Leicestershire County Council, as advisor to the planning authority, these two areas were subject to full archaeological excavation.

The few animal bones recovered were highly fragmented and offer little to the interpretation, while the cereal remains from the environmental samples were also
of a low density. These reports can be accessed on the Index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS; http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/library/greylit/query.cfm) or at the Leicestershire Historic Environment Record (Speed 2010a).

EXCAVATION RESULTS

Located in the north corner of the field, evidence was revealed for settlement activity dating to the early to mid first-century AD. This comprised a large rectangular enclosure with an easterly-orientated entrance-way, internal structures and associated features. Just to the south of this a linear ditched boundary – orientated east-west – was located, and close to this were numerous small pits and other features. In the southern area of the field, evidence was revealed for further settlement activity.

Fig. 3. All archaeological features from Cadeby.
Settlement chronology (with Nicholas Cooper)

Few of the archaeological deposits were related stratigraphically, making the phasing of activity problematic. The majority of the activity is dated to between the early and middle decades of the first century AD, up to c. AD 60 or 70, based on the pottery assemblage being mainly a 'transitional' ‘Belgic’ style. There is also some evidence for slightly earlier first century BC activity.

A total of 245 sherds weighing 2,156g and with an average sherd weight of 9g was retrieved from the excavated features. The average sherd weight is not atypically low for a rural assemblage, but the material is generally abraded with most shell content leached out probably due to acidic burial conditions. As a whole the assemblage can be dated to the first half of the first century AD and comprises a range of fabrics typical of the transition between the Iron Age and Roman period, including some still incorporating inclusions characteristic of the Iron Age (granite) and grog, shelly and sand-tempered fabrics predominantly used to manufacture vessels in a ‘Belgic’ style.

The ubiquity of ‘transitional’ grog-tempered and sand-tempered fabrics used to produce vessels in the ‘Belgic’ style, predominantly carinated jars and bowls with burnished external surfaces and decorated with cordons, indicates that most of the assemblage dates to the early and middle decades of the first century, perhaps up to c. AD 60 or 70. Only one context [183] produced a group of sherds likely to date later than this, including the only vessel in what might be termed a diagnostically ‘Roman’ fabric, a fine greyware jar in a ‘Belgic’-style corrugated form. The other diagnostic vessel was a narrow mouthed jar in a sandy off-white/buff fabric. This context might therefore date after c. AD 70 when greywares became more common, but the absence of any samian tableware from the assemblage as a whole, albeit a rural one, would tend to support the idea that it does not extend much later than this.

The earliest date for the assemblage is not easy to pinpoint exactly, but the ‘Belgic’-style vessels which are characteristic of it will not date before the beginning of the first century AD, as the Gallo-Belgic imports from the Continent did not get to Leicester before the final decade of the first century BC (Pollard 1994, 75). Whilst the presence of handmade fabrics containing inclusions typical of Middle to Late Iron Age scored ware (Elsdon 1992) indicate that two pits [184] and [186] extend back into the first century BC, the fact that they are loosely associated with ‘Belgic’ forms from other contexts probably indicates that all are broadly contemporary and that these fabrics continued in use up until the Conquest.

Enclosure ditch and entrance

Three sides of a rectangular-shaped ditch were located in the northern part of the field (Fig. 4). The ditch ran for a total length of 116m, with a 5.3m gap on the north-east corner, and enclosed an area of 1,660m². The ditch was c. 2.5m wide, although it was much wider at the entrance (3.36m) and narrower along the west-side (c. 1.8m). The depth of the ditch varied, being at its deepest (1.36m) at the
entrance, while along the eastern and southern sides it was c. 1m deep, and along the west side it was as shallow as 0.68m. The ditch continued northwards beyond the limit of the excavated area.

The ditch was excavated in eight sections – each 1.5m in width – along the length of the ditch, at the corners and at the entrance. There were at least two phases to the ditch, a primary cut being formed by broadly concave sides and a pointed base. Its form did alter along the course of the ditch (see Figs 6 and 7). At the entrance the ditch had gradual, concave sides that broke into much sharper, almost vertical, sides. The primary fills in the base consisted of thin silty deposits – likely formed by wash from the natural sands and gravels. These thin silty deposits were present along the length of the ditch. The ditch was later re-cut, with a more concave form throughout and a flat base. The lower deposits within this cut again consisted of thin silty deposits. Overlying these were a series of dumped deposits, which were more frequent and complex around the entrance way and along the eastern-length of the ditch. Elsewhere, the deposits were more straightforward, consisting of more generic grey-brown clay-silts, with low levels of organic residues. Pottery or other material artefacts were only recovered from excavated sections at the entrance to the enclosure (see Fig. 9), and close to it. Slag from the enclosure ditch consisted of partially vitrified sand and fuel ash, which

Fig. 4. Plan of enclosure.
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Fig. 7. Enclosure sections.
probably came from a kiln or similar structure. The rectilinear form of the enclosure, and the pottery recovered, is similar to other contemporary settlements – such as the latter stages of the ‘aggregated settlement’ at Humberstone (Thomas 2011).

The entrance to the enclosure was on the north-east side (Figs 5 and 8) and was 5.3m wide. The ditch was at its deepest and most well-defined at the ditch termini. Extending from the end of the southern ditch terminal was a 6.4m long curvilinear gully with sharp, almost vertical, sides and a flat base, measuring 0.65m wide and ranging in depth from 0.18m at the east-end, getting deeper at the west-end to 0.64m. The ditch contained a single deposit of mid- to dark grey-brown silty-sand. At the west-end the gully took the form of a large post-hole that respected the very edge of the enclosure ditch, containing a very similar deposit to the remaining stretch of the gully. Sherds from a single pottery vessel (an early-mid first century jar) were found in three locations – at the terminal of the gully, in the base of the post-hole and in the final upper fill of the enclosure ditch terminal. This appears to represent a primary deposition of material, perhaps a deliberate placement of the vessel.

**Structure 1**

Within the enclosure a series of linear slots, post-holes and other related features were located to the west of the entrance (Fig. 10), which probably represent the remains of two structures – either buildings or livestock enclosures. Apart from
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Structures 1 and 2, there were few other features within the enclosure. In the south-western corner was a large sub-circular pit, while in the north-western corner were two further pits.

Structure 1 consisted of three elements – foundation-slots and post-holes – forming a broadly rectangular shape (Fig. 11). These consisted of a long slot on the south side [18], smaller slots and post-holes on the north side ([19], [119], [121], [123], [125], [149]), and a further slot and post-hole on the east side ([163], [173], [175]). Centrally-placed between them was a hearth [72].

Feature [18], a linear slot, was orientated north-west to south-east and was 11.8m in length, while its width varied from 0.45m to 0.63m (Fig. 12). It had broadly concave sides with a flat base. This may represent evidence for a foundation slot for a structure. The backfill contained fire-cracked pebbles and fragments of stone. Eleven sherds of early to mid-first century AD pottery and four fragments of burnt daub were also recovered, along with a residue of slag – a hearth bottom-type fayalite from iron working. At its south-eastern end a further three small features ([30], [32], [34]) were located adjacent to [18]. Feature [30], located on the north-side of the slot, was sub-ovoid, 1.42m long, 0.5m wide and
0.2m deep, and had vertical sides and a flat base. Feature [32] was on the south side of the slot, and measured 1.32m in length and 0.23m in depth, being cut by [34] on the south side. Feature [34] was of a similar length and depth, and was 0.6m in width. Both features had relatively steep sides and flat bases. Although uncertain, it is possible that [18] cut [32] and that the three features were the remains of substantial post-holes, with [32] being replaced by [34], indicating multi-phase and possible long-term use.

Located 4.8m to the north-east, a further group of features were positioned approximately perpendicular to slot [18]. These consisted of two segments of rectangular-shaped slots ([19] and [119]), both with vertical sides and flat bases and three post-holes ([121], [125], [149]). Slot [19] was 1.43m long, 0.56m wide and 0.34m deep, within which were numerous fire-cracked pebbles, while [119] was of similar proportions – measuring 1.54m in length, 0.74m width and 0.17m
Fig. 11. Structure 1 – plans and sections.
in depth. A sherd of early to mid-first century AD pottery, along with a fragment of burnt daub, was recovered from this feature. This cut into an earlier post-hole – [123], measuring 0.46m in diameter and 0.4m in depth. Slot [119] was cut by another post-hole [121], 0.66m in diameter and 0.24m in depth, adjacent to which were two much smaller post-holes – [125] and [149].

A further group of three features located 5.3m east of [119] complete the form of Structure 1. These consisted of a roughly-formed slot [163] and two post-holes – [173] and [175]. Slot [163], measuring 3.26m in length, ranged in width from 0.5m at the south-end to 1.2m midway and was 0.25m in depth. It had concave sides with a relatively flat base and contained a yellow-brown sandy-silt. It was probably cut by post-hole [173], a sub-circular feature measuring 0.7m × 0.66m, and 0.25m in depth, while a further post-hole lay immediately to the south [175].

Centrally placed between the three groups of slots and post-holes was a sub-ovoid feature [72] (Fig. 13), measuring 1.5m by 1.06m. The southern part of the feature was 0.5m deep with sharp almost vertical sides, while on the north-side it was just 0.15m deep with a substantial number of well compacted fire-cracked pebbles, spread more loosely on the west side. This feature may be evidence of a hearth that has later been cut through and reused as a large post-hole.

The form and positioning of the linear slots indicate that they are likely to be structural, perhaps to hold sill-beams for a timber structure. Alternatively, they could be evidence for post-in-trench or stave construction, although there is little evidence to support this theory. The various slots and post-holes are clearly
multi-phase, indicating continued usage and repair of the structure(s). Given the orientation of all three groups, they are all probably associated, and Structure 1 probably represents a single rectangular building measuring c. 12m × c. 5m with a centrally placed hearth. The location of Structure 1, being slightly off-centre within the rectangular enclosure, also suggests that it is a building.

**Structure 2**

Structure 2, located 5m west of the enclosure entrance, consisted of two parallel slots and clusters of small pits and post-holes (Figs 14 and 15). The northern slot was 8.88m long, and consisted of two combined and interconnected features. Feature [98] was 3.8m long and 0.5m in width, connected to a wider (0.81m), and longer (5m), feature [100], which appears to have been re-cut numerous times. [98] survived to only a shallow depth, ranging from 0.06m to 0.14m, while [100] was deeper at 0.28m. Two sherds of early to mid-first century AD pottery and 10 fragments of burnt daub were recovered from feature [98]. The southern slot was 7.5m long and also consisted of two combined and interconnected features, lying 3.9m south of the northern slot. [86] was 1.3m long and 0.28m wide, connected to which was [92], a wider (0.4m) and longer 6.2m feature. [86] was 0.1m deep, with sharp sides and a flat base. [92] was deeper at 0.16m, and also had sharp sides and a relatively flat base. Both contained fragments of fire-cracked pebbles with a notable concentration in the centre of [92]. Lying just to
Fig. 14. Plan and sections of Structure 2.
the south of slot [100] were seven small post-holes, three in a line on the east side and four on the west side. These formed a rough square and may be the remains of a small internal structural feature within Structure 2. Close to slot [92] were a further three post-holes. A larger post-hole [138] was positioned immediately to the north-side of the slot. Like Structure 1 the form and positioning of the linear slots indicate that they are likely to have served as foundation-slots for a timber structure.

Linear ditch and other features

Located c. 12m south of the enclosure was a 150m long linear ditch [046], c. 1.5m wide and ranging in depth from 0.25m at the eastern end to 0.45m at the west end (the varying depths are probably due to more plough truncation in the upslope west-end of the field). Seventeen sherds of early to mid-first century AD pottery were recovered from this ditch. There was a break in the ditch with a gap of 2m probably for an entrance. Located close to this were two parallel gullies, similar to those forming Structures 1 and 2 within the enclosure, both c. 8.5m long and 3.5m apart. These features could represent evidence for a structure, although they lack accompanying post-holes. Close to the ditch, running along its course, were scattered pits with occasional sherds of pottery of early to mid-first century AD date.
Southern area

In the southern corner of the field further archaeological features were identified and recorded. The main cluster of features consisted of two parallel linear slots [177] and [207]. [177] was 4m long, 0.61m in width and 0.15m deep, with concave sides and a flat base, while [207] was slightly smaller at 2.3m long, 0.45m wide and 0.07m deep, and contained a single sherd of early to mid-first century AD pottery. Two fragments of a kiln bar were recovered from each of the features. At the north-end was a post-hole that contained a fragment of a small rotary quern of Roman date. A further post-hole lay at the south-end of the gully. Close to [177] was an oval pit, which contained 57 sherds of early to mid-first century AD pottery. Both [177] and [207] were orientated in the same direction (north-west to south-east), and were positioned c.5 m apart. They are similar to the foundation-slot structures within the enclosure to the north, and the parallel slots [188] and [201] close to the linear ditch. These slots may represent the truncated remains of a structure.

About 12m south-east of gullies [177] and [207] was a clay-lined pit – [183]. As it was located on the very edge of the excavated area, partly beneath a bund, the full plan of the feature could not be obtained. The pit was oval, measuring at least 1.2m long, 0.8m wide and 0.3m deep with sharply defined sides, within which was a sequence of five deposits (Fig. 16). The primary fill (197) consisted of a mid-grey compacted clay, mixed with a very small amount of silt c. 0.04m thick which lined the entire feature. Partly overlying this – in the base of the pit – was a thin (0.02m) silt layer (200). Partly pressed into or imbedded into the clay lining layer (197) were fragments of at least 10 kiln bars. On the north side these were layered on top of each other, stacked so as to radiate outwards, while other kiln bars were on the south and east sides. These would have originally been used for stacking pottery inside a kiln and have subsequently been reused within this clay-lined pit. Overlying the kiln bars and silt layer (200) was a large mixed deposit of mid-orange-grey silty-clay, 0.1m thick (198), containing small charcoal flecks and very small fragments of kiln bars and fired clay. Overlying this was a thin charcoal-rich silt (199) while the final (upper) deposit was a mid-grey silty-clay (182). This was presumably a dumped backfill deposit post-dating the use of the kiln, within which were three fragments of burnt daub and 48 sherds of early to mid-first century AD pottery. A few cereal grains were recovered from (182) and (198), the low volume of material recovered indicating that their presence is probably incidental from the scatter of domestic waste elsewhere in the area. Although not entirely exposed, the presence of the kiln bars, a fired clay lining and charcoal fills may suggest it is the remains of a kiln.

Two pits – [184] and [186] – were relocated c. 100m south of the linear gully [46]. The larger of the two was pit [184], which was circular, and measured 1.2m × 1.1m and 0.4m in depth (Fig. 17). It had vertical sides and a flat base, and was filled with a large proportion of small- to medium-rounded pebbles, many of which were pressed into the side of the pit, with a notable absence of pebbles in the centre perhaps indicating post-packing. A near-complete handmade pottery
A vessel had been placed inverted on the base of the pit. This may be slightly earlier in date (i.e. extending back to the first century BC) than the majority of the pottery assemblage from the site. A further vessel (an Iron Age handmade granitic pottery jar) was recovered from the backfill of the pit. Within the backfill, close to the base, was a complete saddle quern, while a further complete saddle quern
was at the top of the feature (seen in Fig. 17), just below the modern subsoil. Immediately next to [184] was a slightly smaller pit [186], being more oval in shape, and measuring 0.85m × 0.75m, and 0.48m deep, also with vertical sides and a flat base. Around 20 per cent of the fill consisted of medium-sized rounded pebbles, placed mainly around the edge, but also in the base of the pit. Two pottery vessels were recovered from this feature, again granite-tempered handmade late Iron Age vessels possibly from the first century BC like the pottery from pit [184]. The two pits are completely isolated from the other archaeological features and appear to represent two substantial post-holes with evidence for post-packing. The placing of the broken quern stone fragment over the backfilled post-hole [184] could represent a deliberate ritual act. Located just 6m from the limit of excavation, it is possible that they form part of a larger structure or relate to further archaeological features further south in the adjacent field beyond the limits of the excavation.

**DISCUSSION**

The late Iron Age sub-rectangular timber structures are a clear departure from Iron Age building construction. The linear slots represent evidence for bedding trenches or beam-slots for sill beams, into which timber uprights would be inserted. Post-holes either side acted to support the structure. This form of structure was needed (as opposed to ground-level beam construction), probably...
because of the loose natural sand and gravel soils, the trenches acting as a more firm foundation. Structure 1 measured approximately 11m in length and 5.5m wide, while Structure 2 measured 8m x 4.5m. Evidence for further, smaller, foundation-slot structures lay to the south of the enclosure.

The pottery evidence dates the Cadeby settlement quite tightly to the early to mid-first century AD, a transitional period where new cultural practices were introduced by the incoming ‘Roman’ population. Around this time Leicester had become an important tribal centre, and possibly an oppidum (or similar) covering 10–20 ha (Clay 1985, 29–31). The rural settlement at Cadeby lies 16km west of Leicester, c. 2km north of a minor Roman road that ran from Leicester (Ratae Corieltauorum) to Mancetter (Manduessem). Rural settlements in this transitional period are not well understood (Taylor 2006, 157), and the excavation at Cadeby, especially in view of the rectangular structures, makes a significant contribution.

Roundhouses are the most common building form of the Iron Age (Speed 2010b, 43), though post-built or foundation-slot structures of Iron Age date are known from various sites across Britain (Moore 2003, 47). They served a variety of functions, some domestic and non-domestic, and often a combination of the two (ibid, 55).

The large timber structures at Cadeby appear to have been domestic structures – this certainly seems to be the case with Structure 1, as evidenced by the central hearth. Small-scale grain processing and iron working appears to have also taken place in the vicinity of the structures. Paired buildings with living areas and associated kitchen/workshops have been interpreted for circular structures at Enderby (Clay 1992; Meek et al. 2004), and a similar relationship between Structures 1 and 2 may be suggested at Cadeby.

While these could be interpreted as livestock enclosures (see Moore 2003, 53), the presence of a hearth in Structure 1 and burnt daub fragments, probably used in building construction, in all the slots would strongly suggest domestic structures. Further similar structures, albeit smaller, were located immediately north of the linear ditch (46), and in the southern part of the field.

The structures discovered at Cadeby are a relatively rare discovery in this region, and indeed few are known more widely in Britain (Willis 2006, 112) as such there are few parallels. Locally, excavations at Normanton le Heath in 1990 located a Late Iron Age sub-rectangular structure sited within an open settlement (Thorpe et al. 1994, 26). The building utilised both post-holes and beam-slots/pads in its construction, and measured 10m in length and 5.5/7m in width (ibid, 24). Unlike the Cadeby structures, the Normanton building had a central line of posts indicating that it had an axially pitched roof (ibid, 33). As that report states, ‘the evidence for the use of sill beams has always been sketchy and badly demonstrated’ (ibid, 33).

At least two structures of closer comparison – and contemporary – to Cadeby have been excavated more recently at Rearsby Bypass (Clarke and Beamish 2008, 17, 25). One structure consisted of a pair of linear beam-slots c. 5m long and between 4.3m and 5.8m apart (the structures at Cadeby are twice this size). At one
end of the beam-slot was a post-hole, much like the examples seen at Cadeby. The structures are also dated to the first century AD by Belgic-style pottery of transitional Iron Age/Roman date (*ibid*, 25). The parallel beam-slots seen close to the long linear ditch [46] and in the southern area of the field compare well to the Rearsby examples.

Further afield, similar parallel gullies have been excavated 16 miles south at Church Lawford, Warwickshire. These have been interpreted as Late Iron Age extra-long porch-like structures attached to buildings (Palmer 2002, and pers. comm.). Structures also using beam-slot construction have been recorded at Earith Cambridgeshire (Regan *et al.* 2004, 62), located between substantial ditches within late Iron Age enclosure complexes covering several hectares. Other similar structures using the same construction methods have been recorded at Mucking (Goings 1993, 20) and Winterton (Stead, 1976, 29 and Fig. 16; Morris 1979, 114). The interpretation of this method of construction is often that of grain storage, the slots housing beams into which are joined uprights that support a raised floor capable of bearing heavy loads. The presence of cereal remains, albeit in small quantities associated with both structures, may suggest a similar function, although the hearth within Structure 1 suggests that it may have been a living area for at least part of its life.

Other activity, earlier in the Iron Age, includes possible structured deposition in the south of the area, with the deliberate placing of pottery vessels and saddle querns within pits. This presence of stone packing within these features is consistent with their having been post settings, and the deliberate placing of pottery and quern artefacts may symbolise the end of the structure’s use and its final ‘closure’. A low density of charred remains of spelt, barley and hazel nutshell were found from 10 samples (up to 2.8 items per litre of deposit). Single numbers of spelt chaff fragments suggest cereal processing in small batches on a domestic scale, resulting from food preparation.

The structure with associated kiln bars also in the southern part of the excavation may represent a pottery kiln manufacturing mid-first century pottery. Pottery production is known from western Leicestershire, including kiln sites in the vicinity at Newbold Verdon 5km to the north-east (Liddle 1981, 42).

**CONCLUSION**

The excavation of an early to mid-first century AD settlement at Cadeby has added new information on rural settlement patterns, including the relatively rare discovery of rectangular structures in this region of Britain, during the transitional period between the Late Iron Age and early Roman periods. The structures may have served a range of functions including living areas and grain storage, and the settlement appears to have lasted up until AD 60/70. Other activity in the area includes the structured deposition of querns and pottery vessels, and mid-first century pottery production.
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