Excavations at Breedon-on-the-Hill

by J. S. Wacher

In 1966, the writer was again invited by the Ancient Monuments Inspectorate of the Department of the Environment to undertake further rescue excavations on this hill-fort. By then the main quarry face was approaching the north rampart, and it was thought advisable to sample it. The rate at which quarrying has proceeded can be seen on Fig. 1, and it must remain as something of an indictment against rescue archaeology, that so little has been done to recover information. The eastern half of the hill-fort has now been lost, and, unfortunately, nowhere on the western side do the defences remain complete. The only excavations to have been carried out were those by Dame Kathleen Kenyon in 1946,1 by the writer in 1957,2 by Mr. S. E. Thomas in 1961,3 by Mr. Hebditch (for the City of Leicester Museums) in 1963-4,4 and at the present time. In sum, this represents only one full and three partial sections through the ramparts, a small trench at the west gate, which is not under threat, and the clearing of three small areas inside the fort. Some pits have also been emptied of their contents by a number of people, including Mr. John Shields, Managing Director of the Breedon and Cloud Hill Limeworks, after the topsoil had been removed as a preliminary to quarrying operations. These pits produced a fair quantity of pottery, much of which has been included in this report. It can hardly be claimed that the archaeological potential of the site has been fully realised. Neither can it be said that the threat was sudden, nor that the Breedon and Cloud Hill Limeworks have objected to excavation. In the past, as now, they have always given the fullest co-operation and have frequently assisted excavations by providing labour and equipment, while the personal interest of Mr. Shields has always been most encouraging and gratifying. The fault lies squarely with archaeologists, among whom the writer must be numbered, for the little that has been done.

Once again, therefore, the writer would like to record his grateful thanks to Mr. Shields and his company for permission to excavate, and for many kindnesses shown during the excavations. He would also like to thank Mr. A. P. Baker, for acting as assistant supervisor, Messrs. C. Long, F. Munton, and G. Pearson for their invaluable work as labourers throughout the duration of the excavation, and also the numerous volunteers who contributed their time and energy.

THE EXCAVATIONS

A single trench (E.I), 82 ft. (25 m) long and 8 ft. (2.4 m) wide was cut across the north defences of the hill-fort, some 130 ft. (39.6 m) from the east
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edge of the road leading to the church. The rampart here survived to a height of 5 ft. (1.5 m) above the present surface of the interior; there were also clear indications of the counterscarp bank (Figs. 2, 3).

THE EARLY PALISADE
In 1957, evidence was obtained to suggest that the rear of the rampart on the eastern side had been revetted with a series of posts placed in individual pits. Certainly, pressure from the rampart had been exerted on the posts, and, at that time, it seemed highly unlikely, given the evidence, that a rampart had been erected in front of an existing palisade.

In the present trench, however, the matter was resolved, since the posts were found not to be in contact with the rampart, but were situated a short distance behind it. Moreover, the tail of the rampart had here been revetted with massive boulders, which in places overlay the post-pits, so that there can be no doubt as to the correct sequence. If considered superficially, it might seem odd that the bank was erected in front of, rather than behind, an existing palisade, for it is clear from the 1957 section that the palisade was still then functional. But when the nature of the rampart is considered, it is obvious why such a course of action was taken. On the north side, and to a lesser extent on the east, the main core was made up of massive boulders, some estimated to weigh more than a ton. The labour involved in raising these from the ditch to the bank must have been considerable, without the added work of passing them over a high palisade, or of making frequent breaches in it to allow access. So, by constructing the rampart in front of the palisade, not only was the work less laborious, but also the hill-top would have remained secure behind its fence while the defences were strengthened.

The posts of this early palisade were placed the same distance apart, approximately 2 ft. (0.6 m) between each pair, as on the east side. Three were encountered within the eight-foot width of the trench. Each post had been placed in its own funnel-shaped pit cut through the old ground surface (layer 26) into the rock underneath. Since they were cut in rock the profiles of the pits were very irregular, but they were approximately 3 ft. (0.9 m) in diameter at the top, tapering to about 2 ft. (0.6 m) at the bottom, which was about 2 ft. 6 in. (0.75 m) below the contemporary surface. Dark, chocolate-brown soil and lumps of rock had been packed into the pits to support the posts; the filling was scarcely distinguishable from the old ground surface. The posts, or their residual stumps appear to have rotted in position, as was suspected in 1957, and the sockets could be distinguished from the packing by the fewer lumps of rock which they contained and by the looser nature of the soil. The posts were somewhat irregular in shape but were about 9 in. (0.23 m) to 1 ft. (0.3 m) in diameter.

THE RAMPART AND DITCH
The rampart had been erected over a layer of stony, dark, chocolate-coloured soil (layer 26), which has been referred to above the layer varied from 2 in. (5 cm) to 6 in. (15 cm) in thickness. Above it, a heap of similar material had been piled near the front of the rampart (layer 31), which seems to represent
the stripping of the topsoil in the area of the ditch. The main body of the
rampart above layer 31 was almost entirely made up of layers of large and
small rock rubble, presumably obtained from the ditch. Layer 25 was most
remarkable, being composed, as already mentioned, chiefly of very large
boulders. A curb of similar boulders had been used for the rear revetment.

The front of the rampart, as noted on the eastern sector, had again been
revetted with a timber palisade. The posts had, here also, been inserted in a
continuous trench, approximately 2 ft. 6 in. (0.76 m) wide and of similar
depth. They had been packed round with a mixture of soil derived from the
old ground surface and lumps of rock (layer 14). Unfortunately, it was not
possible to distinguish more than one post-socket, by a preponderance of
stone in a “pipe” descending vertically through the packing material. Con-
firmation was obtained from the fact that layer 13, deposited on the berm
after the rampart had been erected, stopped short at this “pipe”, as against
the front face of the palisade.

It was also interesting to observe that the main rubble core of the rampart
(layer 25) stopped abruptly on the south lip of the palisade trench. The inter-
vening space between the rubble and the posts had been packed with much
looser and smaller pieces of rock.

It would seem therefore that the main rubble core had been put in place
before the palisade trench had even been dug, presumably for the same
reason as that given for explaining why the rampart was erected in front of an
earlier existing fence and not behind it; the size of the boulders and the
difficulty of hoisting them over an unnecessary obstacle, be it a fence or a
trench in the ground. Once the boulders had been moved, however, the
palisade could have been put in its place, the space between it and the core
filled with loose rubble and the rampart augmented with a series of layers
made up of small pieces of rock mixed with much limestone dust (layer 21)
and some rock mixed with reddish, sandy clay (layer 5). At one point, which
can be seen in the west section, another dump derived from the old ground
surface had been made at the tail of the main rubble core (layer 25) and was
sealed by layer 21; it is not possible to say from where it came.

It should be mentioned that in this sector, no sign of secondary work, or
even of repairs, was observed, as had been so clearly seen in the 1957 section,
where a turf revetment had replaced the rotted timber palisade at the front
and additional turf had been piled against the rear. Their absence in the
present trench would seem to suggest that they represented a local repair at
the point where they were observed in 1957. The sequence seen by Dame
Kathleen Kenyon in 1946 was also different, although her trench was not far
south of that cut in 1957. She did, however, postulate a two-phase rampart on
the evidence of a turf-line, admittedly somewhat exiguous, separating the
main rubble core from the upper layers. Again, this might be seen as a repair,
rather than as a wholesale heightening of the rampart. Such had not been the
case on the north sector.

It is probably best, therefore, if the rampart is seen as a single-phase work,
which was maintained in good condition over a period of time, rather than as
a two-phase work with a time gap between each phase.
The ditch in the sector uncovered in 1966 was extremely irregular in profile, partly due to the unyielding nature of the rock and partly due to the fact that, during its digging, the excavators had broken through into a pot-hole. This, apparently, caused further work to stop, so that, within the width of the eight-foot trench, the depth varied from a little over 7 ft. to over 12 ft. from the top of the berm. Some very large boulders, weighing up to 2 tons or more, had been left in the ditch, it being, presumably, beyond the capabilities of the excavators, either to move, or to break them.

The lower levels of the ditch had become filled with sandy rubble of varying size, with in places an admixture of brownish loam (layers 23 and 24). Above this, especially in the entrance to the cave, there was a thick wedge (layer 22) of loose, smallish rubble with one or two larger rocks, and containing very little soil. Above this again was a thick layer of brownish-red sandy loam with many large and small stones (layer 9), which appeared to run down from the crest of the rampart (probably equal to layer 10). This layer seals the palisade-trench and post-socket filling and appears to be derived from weathering of the front of the rampart. In the area of the ditch, layer 9 was sealed in turn by a thick wedge of tumbled rock (layer 8), which contained many large fragments, and which terminated halfway up the south slope of the ditch. These stones would seem to have come from a disturbance, or collapse, of the front of the rampart core (layer 25), possibly caused when the large boulder, seen in Section BC, was dislodged. However, there must remain a strong possibility that the boulder was too large ever to have been incorporated in the rampart.

THE COUNTERSCARP BANK

North of the ditch, and piled directly on the old ground surface (layer 11), were the remains, little more than a foot high, of the countercarp bank (layer 12). It was composed of small pinkish rubble with a good deal of "fines" incorporated. It had been partly revetted on the north side by a low stone curb, on the outside of, and against which, the old ground surface had continued to grow.

Most interesting of all, however, was the discovery, partly sealed by the countercarp bank, of two shattered and disarticulated skeletons. Skeleton I appears to have lain with its head to the north and the recovery of other bones in their approximately correct positions relative to the head, would confirm it. Another body is indicated by further skull fragments (skeleton II) appearing beside the first, roughly on a level with its waist. It is unfortunate that these remains have been mislaid in the Ancient Monuments Laboratory; consequently no report on them can be published.

A miniature bronze shield, of a type normally associated with Iron Age religious enclosures, was found with this jumbled bone. Dr. Ian Stead has kindly contributed a note on it (p. 6).

DATE OF THE IRON AGE DEFENCES

Unfortunately the present section yielded very little stratified pottery. Only one small scrap came from the old ground surface (layer 26) beneath the rampart, while two more came from the main rubble core (layer 25). All three fragments
were typical of the Breedon Iron Age wares, but had no other distinguishing features. The largest group of Iron Age pottery fragments came from the post-rampart layers 16 and 17; the group included one rim fragment but also two sherds of late medieval glazed ware. Consequently the pottery adds nothing significant to what has already been deduced about the date of the Breedon defences.\textsuperscript{11}

The cultural affinities of the people who first fortified the hill-top have already been extensively discussed.\textsuperscript{12} It is, therefore, only necessary to reassess the fortifications, now that it is known beyond doubt that the first phase was a free-standing palisade.

The phase I palisade has now been identified on the north side, and on the east side north of the 1946 excavations. It was not seen in that same year in the trench dug at the west entrance, although it is conceivable that the trench lay behind its line. It seems likely, therefore, that the line of this palisade, in most places, closely follows that of the tail of the rampart, later erected in front of it for reasons already given on p. 3; but at one or two points in the circuit, notably in the centre of the eastern sector, the two lines appear to diverge from one another.

The height of the palisade cannot be easily established but the depth of the post-holes, when considered with the diameter of the posts, would surely preclude a height greater than about 8 ft. (2.4 m) above ground level, as, above that height, the structure would have become increasingly unstable.

It is not, as yet, possible to suggest a firm date for the erection of these first defences, but there seems no reason why they should not be attributed to the early days of the settlement, perhaps around the middle or end of the second century B.C., at a time when the East Midlands was coming under increasing pressure from Iron B immigrants approaching from south and east. Certainly there is an overlay of B culture at Breedon, as Dame Kathleen Kenyon suggested,\textsuperscript{13} which has now received some further confirmation by the finding of such a vessel in a rubbish pit in the interior of the fort.

The strengthening of the hill-top defences by the construction of a substantial rampart, ditch and counterscarp bank, would seem to have occurred, as has already been suggested above, while the earlier palisade was still functional. The life of timbers placed directly in the ground would probably not be more than fifty years or so, unless an extensive series of replacements took place, for which there is no evidence. That being so, it might be concluded that the new defences were erected too early to have been the reaction to Belgic penetration in the East Midlands. Since, however, it is probably now correct to assume that the counterscarp bank was contemporary with the main bank and ditch, the date of the miniature bronze shield must provide a \textit{terminus ante quem} for the date of construction. According to Dr. Stead, the earliest certain date at which they appear is the first century A.D.

Moreover, it now seems certain that the fortifications, once erected, were kept in a state of readiness. Such evidence as there is for the carrying out of local repairs on the east sector would seem to point to the decay of the revetting timbers at the front of the rampart. If so, the rampart must have been in existence for up to twenty-five years or more before repairs had been carried
out. A continuous total life-span of about a hundred years might, therefore, be postulated for both phases of fortification.

**POST-IRON AGE FEATURES**

A single chip of Central Gaulish samian was found in layer 6. Two small fragments, one with a streak of green glaze, of early medieval pottery were found in layers 16 and 17 behind the tail of the rampart. Layer 16 also produced a small sherd more characteristic of the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries. Another late-medieval sherd came from layer 15. Layer 6, in addition to the samian fragment also produced sherds of early and late medieval pottery (fig. 8) and a larger fragment of a heavily fired roofing tile.

The only structure of post-Iron Age date to be noted was a massive dry-stone wall, 5 ft. (1.5 m) thick at the base, which was situated on the crest of the rampart. It was set in the layers which had accumulated there as the result of erosion (layer 20). No firm indication of date was found, although the wall contained two brick fragments, one a broken piece 5 in. (12.7 cm) long from a brick 3 in. (7.6 cm) wide by 2½ in. (6 cm) thick. Two courses of masonry survived on the south face of the wall but only one on the north. It seems probably to have been a wall put up when the field to its south, known as the Market Stead, was enclosed in 18??.

**THE FINDS**

*Objects of Metal (Fig. 4)*

1. Miniature bronze shield found on the surface of layer 11, together with a small leather thong. Dr. Stead has kindly contributed the following note: An oval model shield, 72 mm long and 36 mm wide, cut from a thin sheet of bronze. It has a raised central oval boss, about 15 mm long, with a perforation on each side to attach a handle. Now in two pieces, with the break through the centre. Its identification as a votive object is supported by the presence of similar pieces on the sites of Roman-Celtic temples at Frilford, Berks., and Worth, Kent. The Frilford shield is also oval, about the same width (35 mm) but shorter (59 mm); it lacks a handle and is not perforated. From Worth there is one complete shield (No. 1), almost rectangular, with a circular boss and two widely-spaced perforations – one housing the remains of a rivet; half of another – broken across the centre like the Breedon example – with damaged outline, distorted boss and two perforations for the handle (No. 3); and part of a third with damaged outline, circular boss and no perforations (No. 2). The only other British example comes, like the Breedon find, from a hillfort – Hod Hill, Dorset. Its present whereabouts is unknown, but a published illustration shows that it had an oval boss with *spina* and a handle still in position. Similar bronze model shields are also known from the continent – including a large collection (130 complete examples found in 1969–70, and others from subsequent seasons) from a temple in the Bois du Flavier, Mouzon, Ardennes, France. It is also worth noting a model shield made of chalk, which was found with chalk figurines at Garton Slack, North Humberside. The Breedon and Frilford shields,
with oval bosses, and more particularly the Hod Hill example which depicts a *spina*, may well be modelled on La Tène shields. But the Worth examples with circular bosses, especially the complete rectangular specimen, are more likely to represent Roman shields. The model sword found with the Frilford shield resembles Roman rather than La Tène patterns, and indeed these pieces have been more closely dated than the others under consideration, for they were found in a Flavian context. The Hod Hill shield was a stray find, and the stratification of the Worth shields was not published in detail, although their context was accepted as pre-Roman by both R. A. Smith (who dated them to the eve of the conquest) and Hawkes.19

2. A lead weight (?) picked up from the quarry surface south of the present section after the overburden had been stripped. Weight 363 gms. Date uncertain, but probably medieval or post medieval. (Fig. 4).

*Objects of Stone* (Fig. 5)

1. Part of a saddle quern from layer 1: the underside of the fragment was projecting through the turf on the front slope of the rampart.

2. Part of an unused saddle quern from layer 16.

3. Part of a saddle quern from the quarry surface south of the present section.

Dr. R. J. King, of the Department of Geology, University of Leicester, has kindly contributed the following note on these querns:

1. Fine-grained slightly ferruginous and micaceous sandstone with strings of pebbles; mainly of vein quartz, but also of very fine-grained dolomitic cemented siltstone (c.f. Triassic skerry). Closely resembles sandstone units of the Building Stones Formation (Lower Keuper) which crop out along the northern boundary of Charnwood Forest and, in the north, along the Trent in the region of Castle Donington. Cement siliceous but calcic in places.

2. Current bedded, ill sorted and slightly micaceous arkosic sandstone, containing abundant clasts of microcline. Almost certainly of Millstone Grit facies resembling lithologies from a number of localities in south and central Derbyshire.

3. Ill sorted slightly ferruginous silica sandstone, with sparse feldspathic fragments. Quartz grains up to 1.1 mm in diameter, but majority much less; all well rounded to sub angular. Siliceous cement. Closely resembles Millstone Grit facies.

All three querns could have been made from glacial erratics belonging to the Northern Drift.

**THE POTTERY by Jane M. W. Fox**
The pottery (Figs. 6, 7) consists of a collection of sherds, from Breedon-on-the-Hill itself, which have been excavated in a number of rescue excavations during the 1960's. Some of the sherds were picked up by quarry-men, from the quarry-surface, and the rest was excavated from the ramparts and the interior of the fort. The pottery has been analysed according to fabric, in the
hope that this will provide a fairly impartial classification. The resultant groups have been listed in order of fabric coarseness, except for the first group which typifies Breedon-Ancaster ware as defined by Kenyon (1953)\textsuperscript{20} and Cunliffe (1974).\textsuperscript{21} The pottery, so analysed, falls into three main classes:

A – Consists of thick-walled pottery with a fine fabric and large grit. (Groups I, IV, V).

B – This class has a sandy fabric. (Groups VI, VII, VIII).

C – Consists of high-quality wares with burnished walls or decorated surfaces. (Groups II, III).

In the classes, as a whole, there is a marked lack of sharp carinations or cordon- ing, and it is only in the finer wares that there are any well-defined shoulders. The decoration consists of random scoring, often near vertical and some of it being very deep, on the body with a few rims slashed so as to represent cabling. Most of the sherds have a smoothed surface and some have burnished faces. The fabrics, in general, consist of a sandy clay, fired to a dark colour, though there are some finer clay fabrics gritted with coarse fragments of quartz. The rim shapes show a wide variety of forms, the widest range of rims being in group VII.

The pots appear to be a local development from the preceding Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age (LBA/EIA) pottery with little external influence being applied from the rapidly changing areas of southern and eastern England. The Breedon-Ancaster wares appear to have belonged to a backwater beyond the main areas of development, but gaining the odd impulse from them from time to time. The three main classes seem to point to the pots having been manufactured over a longish period; A being the earliest, followed by B and then C. B probably lasted most of the time with A being replaced by C. The pots appear to have been manufactured mainly between the fifth and third centuries B.C. In the following discussion Cunliffe’s\textsuperscript{22} groups of pottery will be used as a basis for discussing the origins and parallels of Breedon-Ancaster wares.

As has been stated above, the pots appear to be a local development from the situate pots of the LBA/EIA showing their very degenerate profiles, but there appear to be some influences from the east England-Chiltern-Midlands groups. In the south and east angular bowls come in, but the main groups, such as West Harling-Staple Howe,\textsuperscript{23} and Kimmeridge-Caburn,\textsuperscript{24} have a substratum of coarse jars, which have fingerprinting on the shoulders and cordons and, most important, on the rim, which could represent an incipient cabling. Several sites belonging to the West Harling-Staple Howe group show a number of similarities, in shape and decoration, with Breedon-Ancaster wares, but they also have other features which are not present, thus implying the borrowing of ideas by Breedon-Ancaster potters. At West Harling\textsuperscript{25} the pottery consisted mainly of angular pots with crushed flint grit added to the fabric and there was much horizontal finger-printing, usually as bands and often on cordons, but there was also cabling on the rims formed by grooves or finger-prints. At Hunsbury,\textsuperscript{26} coarse wares predominate, but there are a few burnished, globular bowls with a fine geometric decoration and also some plain burnished bowls. Some of the pots have finger-prints and also incipient cabling. The coarse pots are gritted with shell and have a variety of rims, the
commonest an overhang, and flat bases. Fengate pottery\textsuperscript{27} has angular, geometrically-decorated pots, but it also has a little incipient cabling.

Thus it can be seen that Breedon-Anchester ware has some affinities with the southern-Chiltern/eastern-England groups of pottery, but only a few of the traits appear, usually in a degenerate form. The grooved decoration is thus, probably, a smoothed-out version of the geometric decoration and the angularity of the southern-Chiltern/eastern-England forms. Breedon-Anchester wares are thus, probably, later than these sixth century types and are matched by the fifth-to-third century wares of England, especially those of the Upper Thames-Chiltern-eastern England wares from Long Wittenham-Allen’s Pit, Chinnor-Wandlebury, Darmsden-Linton, and Fengate-Cromer groups.

In the fifth to third centuries, vases carnées and vases piriformes appeared in eastern England and the Thames valley and were only dimly reflected in the surrounding areas. Breedon-Anchester wares do not have these angular forms, but some similarities point to there being a common ancestry and movement of ideas for the pots of east England. Breedon-Anchester wares are basically a coarse-ware group and have, as already noted above, a number of resemblances with the coarse wares of the Upper Thames-Chiltern-eastern England groups. In the Long Wittenham-Allen’s Pit group\textsuperscript{28} there are parallels with the shallow tooling of smoothed and burnished bowls and also with the shape of the coarse jars. The Chinnor-Wandlebury group provides, however,\textsuperscript{29} probably the closest parallel for the burnished ware, such as the rim sherd, No. 10, with the triangular decoration, as this form of decoration occurs in the group, along with plain black burnished wares. Darmsden-Linton\textsuperscript{30} has similar forms to bowls, Nos. 16 and 43, as well as deep-grooved decoration while in the Fengate-Cromer group\textsuperscript{31} there is shallow grooving and finger-printed rims. Thus it can be seen that Breedon-Anchester wares developed alongside these groups even though they retained their distinctions and the main link with the other groups is a common ancestry, with ideas flowing fairly freely between them.

Within the Breedon-Anchester area this new collection of sherds can be shown to have many parallels with previously found pottery. Group I has parallels with the pot which was found at Market Harborough,\textsuperscript{32} as it has similar finger-printing on the rim and is grooved. Group II has parallels with the Harston pottery\textsuperscript{33} as this too was gritted with shell, which was shown to have come from the local Lias clay, the shell being from the bivalve Ostrea liassic\textsuperscript{a}, which is found in the Lias clay there. Group VII has parallels with the Loughborough pottery;\textsuperscript{34} both have a wide variety of rim shapes and are gritted with sand, but Loughborough pottery is greyer in colour and has a sharper (geologically speaking) sand grit. These few parallels show this newly-discovered pottery to be part of the Breedon-Anchester Group as originally defined.

\textit{Group I}

This group consists of typical Breedon-Anchester ware, being thick walled, circa 12 mm, and of generally coarse fabric. The fabric is a silty clay with angular fragments of quartz grit, 4 \times 5 mm in some pots, though usually smaller grit or sand was incorporated. It is fired to a dark brown colour often with a blac-
brown surface. The exterior is generally smoothed and some sherds show burnishing; the interior is also smoothed except for a couple of sherds. Most of the pots are plain but some exhibit the typical random grooving on their sides. Most of the sherds are body sherds and they frequently show marks of the burnishing instruments.

1. A number of sherds which join to form a large pot of typical Breedon-Ancaster type. A large part of the rim has been reconstructed giving a diameter of 140 mm. The rim is rounded and thickens outwards; on the flattened upper surface there are finger impressions spaced circa 10 mm apart which form a pie-crust decoration. The neck is upright and burnished, with no decoration, and it curves gently into the body of the vessel. The main decoration starts circa 50 mm below the rim and consists of a number of shallow, wide, slanting grooves made on the side of the vessel by a flat-toothed comb. This decoration starts on the poorly-defined shoulder and continued down to, it may be assumed, just above the base. The fabric is a silty clay which has a number of pieces of grit in it, most of which are only visible in the breaks or in the interior face. The cross-section shows a reduced core with a thin, 2 mm thick, oxidized layer on the faces of the sherds; the black burnished exterior seems to be just a very thin layer on the surface.

2-4. Three flat wall sherds. The walls are 13 mm thick and have a black colour, except (2) which is more oxidized. The fabric consists of a silty clay with a number of quartz fragments as temper. The wall faces have been smoothed and, on the inside, brush-like marks can be seen. On the outside, deep vertical grooving can be seen, which was made by a sharp instrument, probably a comb with pointed teeth.

5. Body sherd, coloured brown, the fabric shows very little grit and the interior face has been smoothed. The exterior face is covered by a decoration of shallow grooves mainly running down the sherd in a slightly out-of-the-vertical direction. Crossing them are three small pairs of horizontal grooves, thus implying the use of two different combs in the decoration, a many-toothed comb and a two-toothed comb, both with flat and striated teeth ends.

6. A body sherd with an oxidized interior. It has a hard fabric which is composed of pure clay with a fine sand temper. The surfaces were smoothed and on the exterior surface is a decoration consisting of a number of very shallow grooves, which were made by a round, single-toothed instrument. There is also a possible grain mark on the exterior.

7. A base fragment of coarse fabric, lacking large pieces of grit. It is brown in colour except for some black patches on the interior face. The walls are smooth and there is a sharp angle between the base, which is flat, and the walls. The angle is formed by the pot having been placed on a flat surface when being made and the sides smoothed down on to it.

8. A number of related body sherds. The fabric is coarse and the pot is black in colour. The inside has been burnished and the exterior has been smoothed. The decoration is formed by a single broad, rounded groove, with very shallow scratches, parallel to, and on one side of it.
**Group II**

This is a group of fine pottery, with a black colour and all the sherds are burnished on the exterior, some of them showing the marks of the burnishing paddle. The interior face is smooth and sometimes has red, oxidized, patches. The fabric consists of a fairly pure clay with a little sand used as temper and is evenly-fired through the section.

9. A rim fragment, with 10 mm thick walls and a thickened rim, with an angular appearance. The exterior surface showed broad burnishing marks and there is a shallow groove on the exterior facet of the rim.

10. A rim fragment of dark brown colour. The rim is rounded and passes down into a short upright neck which then curves into the body. On the body is an arrow-shaped decoration of very shallow grooves, the left-hand groove being wider and with brush-like marks at its base.

11. A well-burnished black rim sherd, with 9 mm thick walls. The rim is flat topped and square, and passes down into an upright neck which slopes gradually into the body. The basal break of the sherd reveals the method of construction. The pot was made of flat sausages of clay built on top of each other, each upper roll being smoothed down over that immediately below it, so giving the upper a U-shaped cross-section on its lower side. The U-shaped section can be seen at the base of this sherd.

12. A rim fragment showing a square rim on a small upright neck which curves into the body. This sherd has a slightly greater sand content than the average and has oxidized patches. The exterior shows faint broad burnish marks.

13. A rim fragment with a very silty clay fabric. Consequently the clay had a laminated structure and the interior face had flaked away. The exterior is well-burnished. The rim is rounded and has a slight overhang on both sides. The neck is short and upright and curves sharply into the body.

14. A body sherd, 9 mm thick. It is black in colour on the exterior but passes through a dark brown in section to a red-brown on the interior. The sherd is decorated with a number of very shallow grooves, mainly oblique to vertical; close study of them revealed a number of very fine striae which gives the impression that the grooves were made by impressing grass blades into the soft clay before firing.

15. An angular rim fragment, the rim being formed by an outward bending of the body wall. The surfaces are smoothed and the pot is black in colour.

16. A complete profile of an open bowl. It is black on both the exterior and interior but brown in section, turning red towards the rim. The exterior has been well-burnished and marks of the burnishing tool can be seen. The rim is rounded and thickened on the outside; the neck is short and upright, and curves down into the body which has a broad curving shoulder. The base is flat and rises vertically to meet the body.

**Group III**

The sherds are mainly red-brown in colour with some black rim sherds. The colour difference may be due to the probability that the pots were fired upside
down in a bonfire and so the rims were more reduced as they were nearer the heart of the fire. The fabric is generally of fairly pure clay with only a little grit used for temper. The exteriors are always smooth and the interiors are also often smooth. There is some deep grooved decoration and also two rims which show fine cable decoration.

17. A rim fragment from a vessel of 80 mm diameter. This has a smooth interior and exterior and was red in colour at the bottom of the sherd but passing into black 6 mm below the rim. The rim was rounded above a very small upright neck which curved smoothly into the body of the vessel. On the body are three horizontal grooves.

18. A rim fragment which has a red, oxidized, colour turning black towards the rim. The neck is a thin upright extension of the body walls and ends in a rounded rim. The basal break shows that the manufacture was by means of a series of superimposed sausages, since the break has a smooth U-shaped section, unlike the rough breaks of the side.

19. A rim fragment with a black exterior. The exterior profile is rounded from the neck down to the body, but on the inside it shows angular changes relating to the neck/rim/body parts of the sherd. The sherd has a fairly sandy interior face, although the exterior face has much less sand visible on the surface.

20. A base fragment with a diameter of 65 mm; flat with flaring walls. The fabric consists of a silty clay with some pieces of grit. The interior is not smoothed but the exterior has a fine clay surface which has been smoothed. Shallow grooving can be seen on the sides curving up from round the base and the main basal sherd has a finger print on it. One body sherd shows grooving in three directions, made by a round-pointed, two-pronged instrument.

21. A highly decorated rim fragment. The fabric is of fine clay showing finger-smoothing internally and burnishing externally. The rim is rounded and overhangs externally; it is on a short flaring neck which curves into the body, and has a smooth curve for the shoulder. The rim has deep grooving on its upper surface forming a cable decoration; the body is also heavily grooved by a sharp instrument, the grooves mainly running in a horizontal direction. Another groove defines the underneath of the rim, which is 65 mm in diameter.

22. A rim fragment of similar type to 18, except that it has a much redder colour on the exterior, and a reduced core. It has a very similar profile to 18 except for the rim itself, which is squarer and has a more pronounced overhang; the latter is marked by two grooves on the underside. The grooves, although much wider on the rim than on the body, form a cable decoration. Those on the body are similar and form more widely-separated horizontal lines with some vertical lines.

23. A plain rim fragment, of a brownish-yellow colour. The rim is formed by flattening and squaring off the top of the pot. It surmounts a small upright neck which fades into a very shallow, curved body. The surfaces are smoothed and the break shows a more reduced centre.
Group IV
This group of pottery has a sandy clay fabric with a number of large quartz fragments, $4 \times 3$ mm, which have been used as temper. The surfaces are smooth and the cross-section shows a black, reduced, core with red-brown to black exteriors. The sherds are plain, except for some pieces which have very small scratches on their outer surfaces.
24. This is a rim fragment which is uniformly red-brown in colour across the break. The rim is a crude rounding of the end of the vessel wall and is not a horizontal surface. The sherd appears to be part of a slightly-flaring bowl.
25. This is very similar to 23, but it thins much more towards the rim, giving a sub-angular rim. It has a black exterior and is brown across the section.

Group V
This is a small group of pottery which has a dark brown colour and thick walls (a maximum of 10 mm). The walls are smoothed and the fabric consists of clay with angular fragments of quartz, circa $4 \times 3$ mm, as temper.
26. This has a grey-brown exterior and a black interior, with a fairly sandy fabric. Decoration is composed of parallel deep grooves, made by a sharp instrument.
27. A rim fragment, which is flat on the top and has rounded corners with the neck; the latter is upright and thickens towards the rim.
28. A rim fragment, which has a black exterior face and a red interior. The neck flares slightly and thickens towards the rim, which is the same as 27. The neck curves smoothly into the shoulder.

Group VI
This group had a yellow-brown to dark brown coloured fabric with about 25\% sand in the clay and no large pieces of grit. Most of the sherds are plain with only the marks of the smoothing instrument on the exteriors. The interiors also had smooth surfaces. Most of the sherds are body sherds of maximum wall thickness 10 mm.
29. A rim fragment of yellow-brown colour with smooth faces. The walls thin towards the rim which is rounded and has a groove on top. The neck is small and upright and passes into a curving shoulder. The decoration occurs below the neck and consists of a number of grooves made by a rounded instrument, curving from a horizontal direction diagonally down the sides of the vessel. There are also some fine scratches below the shoulder. The rim diameter is 66 mm.
30. This has a more reduced core (i.e. it is darker in colour) and the fabric also has a much coarser sand ($2 \times 2$ mm) used as a temper. Decoration consists of a number of grooves made by a pointed instrument, the original sharp profile of the grooves having been eroded away to give a more rounded look.
31. This has a less sandy fabric than usual and very smooth surfaces. The main groove is very deep and was made by a blunt instrument.
Group VII
This is a largish group, which is generally black to brown in colour with a sandy (40–50%) fabric, and very friable. There are a number of rim shapes and the sherds are undecorated except for a few grooves, which are of manufacturing origin.

32. A rim fragment with some small grit, \(2 \times 1\) mm, used as temper. The sherd is mainly red in colour with some black areas on the outside. The rim is square and passes directly into the body, which curves inwards.

33. A square rim on a short, slightly flaring, neck. The walls are well smoothed and the pot is black in colour.

34. A rounded rim on a short upright neck. The neck thickens into the body which has very slack shoulders.

35. A rim fragment with a short upright neck thickening towards the rim; the latter forms an incipient overhang which is uneven due to finger impressions on both sides. The outside is light brown and the inside dark brown and also sandier.

36. A rounded rim on a flaring neck, which thus forms a sharp angle with the body. The sherd is black in colour.

37. This is composed of two rim sherds from the same pot, of rim diameter 60 mm. It has a black colour and a sub-angular rim which passes into a short upright neck. On the body of the vessel there is a series of very fine, mainly horizontal, scratches which were formed by a sharp instrument.

38. A square rim on a short, upright neck which passes down into a body with a slack shoulder. The rim is slightly thickened giving an overhang on the outside. The sherd is dark brown in colour.

39. A rim fragment, black in colour. The rim is square and surmounts an upright neck, which then curves sharply out to the rounded shoulder; the main part of the body is vertical.

40. This rim fragment is rather similar to 39, but it has a pronounced overhang on the inside and the shoulder is slackier.

41. These rim fragments are very coarse in fabric and have even coarser sand used for temper. The rim itself is marked by a thinning of the walls to an upright neck which then bends outwards to the rounded rim. The shoulder is very slack and the pot is black.

42. This is a very crudely made vessel; the rim is simply a crude rounding of the ends of the walls. In the fabric of the sherd there is a large lump of sandstone, \(6 \times 8\) mm, just below the rim on the outside. The body shows diagonal marks of fingers, by which the surface was smoothed.

43. These fragments form a nearly complete profile of a pot. The rim diameter is 100 mm and it consists of a rounding of the top of the short upright neck. This then curves into the body of the vessel which has a pronounced but smoothly-curving shoulder. On the body, below the shoulder, is a pronounced finger impression which points downwards. The pot wall thins to about half its normal thickness in the centre of the depression and there is also a slight bulge on the interior. This impression could represent some form of decoration; otherwise the walls are smooth and plain.
44. This could be the base of 43, as it is the same colour, dark brown, and has the same fabric. It is flattish with a rounded angle.

**Group VIII**

This group comprises a small collection of sherds with a very sandy fabric, (up to 50% sand) with a red, oxidized, colour. The sides have been smoothed and there are no large grists; some of them are very friable.

45. A rim fragment with a diameter of 139 mm. The rim is angular and has a slight overhang on the outside. The neck curves down to the shoulder, which is marked by a sharp angle, whereas, on the inside, the profile consists of a smooth curve.

46. A rim fragment of similar profile to 45 but without the overhang. The rim has deep grooving on its top, which forms an incipient cable decoration.

47. A rim fragment with a diameter of 93 mm. It has an atypical fabric in that it is hard and well-fired and in section is blue-coloured, except for the outermost 1 mm which is orange-coloured. This is the only sherd of its kind and it could have been imported to the site. The rim is flat and there is a short upright neck which passes smoothly into the gently curving body profile.

**Daub**

There were two pieces of daub (48 and 49). These are naturally of indeterminate date.

48. This showed the impressions of 2 wattles on one side, the other side having a rounded surface with striations running up and down. The breaks were well rounded. It was made of fairly pure clay fired to a red-brown colour.

49. This had the impressions of 2 wattles and sharpish breaks round it. The exterior surface had been smoothed flat and was red in colour. The main fabric was black in colour and of fairly pure clay.

**Roman Pottery**

Only three pieces of Roman ceramics were recovered from the site. These consisted of a very small fragment of Central Gaulish samian (15 mm × 8 mm) and two pieces of tile (50 and 51).

50. Flanged edge of a roofing tile. It was made of a pure clay with very few inclusions and had a smoothed upper surface, the lower surface being rough. It was 13 mm thick and pale red-orange in colour.

51. A similar piece to 50 except that it is smooth on all surfaces and has a higher flange at the side. The clay is much sandier and has bits of quartz grit in it. It is bowny-red in colour.

**Medieval and Later pottery** (Fig. 8)

This was undecorated except for glazing on the surfaces and the pottery was divided up into groups, based on the type and quality of the glaze and the fabric.

**Group A**

This consisted of a group of early twelfth to thirteenth century bowls, with sagging bases and a white to buff coloured fabric, which was composed
of pure clay with a quartz sand temper. The sherds were poorly glazed with a green glaze.

52. A basal sherd in white fabric which showed wheel-marks on the inside. The exterior had a yellow-brown glaze with green flecks which covered the surface thinly. The underside was unglazed and the diameter was 130 mm.

53. A rim fragment which showed traces of an orange glaze on the outside. The fabric was poor and there were some large quartz inclusions.

54. A base fragment with a diameter of 110 mm and with a distinct sag. The fabric was white and there was a small patch of green glaze on the underside of the base.

55. A base fragment which had a white exterior with an orange inner surface, the latter showing splashes of a brown glaze.

Group B
In this group one surface of the pot is covered with an even glaze. The fabric is fairly variable but it generally consists of a pure clay with a little grit for temper and is white or pink in colour. The bases are flat.

56. A basal fragment of a pot, 135 mm in diameter, with the exterior showing signs of wheel manufacture. The interior surface has an orange glaze and projecting grit on the interior base. The grit is a fine-grained sandstone.

57. A basal fragment with an interior glaze which shows wheel-marks on both surfaces.

58. A jug handle which has a pink fabric with an orange glaze covering the handle on the three outwards-facing faces.

59. A handle of white fabric with a green, overall glaze.

Group C
This consists of a group of well-glazed wares of the late sixteenth to early eighteenth centuries. They have generally a pure clay fabric of pink colour, but in some cases the fabric has been fired grey and to almost a stoneware hardness. The pots are mainly glazed on the interior with an orange/brown glaze, but the earlier pots have a green glaze.

60. The rim of a bowl. It has a white fabric with a blue core. A green glaze covers the interior and the rim, but not the exterior. There is a band of brown glaze on the inside, perhaps a decoration, just below the rim.

61. A thick-walled fragment showing the side and base of a pot. It is made of a pure pink clay with few grit inclusions. The base is flat, 110 mm in diameter, and is thinner than the sides while the pot is glazed on the interior with an orange glaze. It is of late seventeenth to eighteenth century date.

62. A basal fragment showing pink exterior faces with a blue core. It has a green glaze on the interior, reaching 14 mm up the sides. It is of sixteenth century date.

63. Part of a chafing-dish. The walls of the vessel are thin and the fabric is grey and stoneware-like. Protruding above the rim and outwards from the exterior wall is a lug, which has a central sandy core, while the flange
at the top has radial grooves in its upper surface. The lug passes smoothly
down to merge with the body of the vessel. The whole vessel is covered
in a good, even green glaze. It is of sixteenth to seventeenth century date.

64. A basal fragment, 70 mm in diameter, with a white exterior and a pink
interior. The fabric has a fair proportion of grit and the interior is covered
with a dark green glaze.

Group D
This is a group of pottery with a red to brown colour and with a fabric com-
posed of a silty clay having a maximum of 30% shell grit. Most of the fragments
consist of thin-walled (8 mm thick) body fragments and no decoration was
seen; the walls had smooth surfaces. This group is probably of early medieval
date.

65. This is the only rim fragment of the group. It is thick (15 mm maximum)
and is wedge-shaped. It is sharply flaring and joins on to a thin body wall.

Group E
This last group consists of mainly eighteenth to nineteenth century pottery of
mixed fabric. In general the fabric is pink in colour and is composed of a pure
clay with quartz grit (66 and 67 being typical). Some sherds had a blue colour
and were more silty. There was also the greater part of a tile which was cindery
in texture and colour, and part of a nineteenth century pot with a brown clay
fabric and a smooth black glaze on the exterior.

66. A body sherd showing a finger impression and an applied cordon, pre-
sumably marking a shoulder. It had a brown exterior with a pink interior
face and a pure clay fabric.

67. A small fragment of a base which showed a smooth exterior face, the
interior face having been lost by flaking. It had a marked ridge round the
base which was flat. The fabric was of a pure clay and was pink in colour.

68. A basal fragment of a nineteenth century pot. The fabric is pink in colour
and is composed of a pure clay. The base is flat and the walls are vertical
showing a groove at the exterior junction of the base with the walls. The
interior of the pot was covered with an opaque black glaze which had
chipped off in places.

The medieval and later pottery seems to back up the literary evidence of the
occupation of the hillfort until the dissolution of the monastery in 1536, as
most of the sherds appear to be earlier than that date. But the later sherds
seem to show the continued use of the hill in more recent times for a variety of
purposes.

THE SOILS (by H. Keeley, Ancient Monuments Laboratory, and P. Taylor,
Institute of Archaeology)
Sixteen samples were submitted for examination. The samples were treated in
a similar way to those from the 1957 excavation (Bick, 1964) and results and
specific descriptions are given in Table 1.

\[ H = \text{high}; \ M = \text{medium}; \ L = \text{low}. \]

Sample Series I were taken through the crest of the rampart. The colours
indicate low levels of organic matter at the top and quite high iron contents. No sample contained many roots. The texture was constant throughout the series, but stoniness varied. Organic matter content appeared to increase from I to IV. The high organic content of the lower sample (E I, 26) indicates a turf stack or line, over which has been placed material from the adjacent area, low in organic matter.

Sample Series 2 were taken through the rear of the rampart. Sample V (E I, 1) showed evidence of a higher organic matter content than the other samples, with a good crumb structure. Calcium carbonate contents decreased from V to X but the texture of the matrix remained constant. Iron content was fairly constant in samples VI to X. The distribution of organic matter and iron with depth indicates a typical soil profile, but the acid-soluble material follows no obvious pattern.

Sample Series 3 were taken through layers behind the rampart. Sample XI (E I, 2) is not typical of a soil layer being artificial in part. Colour (reddish) was constant below this, indicating high iron content. Texture was constant and calcareous content showed no obvious pattern. Organic matter content decreased from XII to XIV, as would be expected in a soil profile, but increased again in XV (E I, 17) and XVI (E I, 26) possibly indicating the presence of turves.

THE CHARCOALS (by Miss Carole Keepax, Ancient Monuments Laboratory)

E I, 11
Wood Field maple (Acer campestre) twig
E I, 18
Oak (Quercus robur)
Hazel (Corylus avellana)
Lime (Tilia vulgaris)
Probably hawthorn (Crataegus sp.)
All fragments
E I, 19
Lime (Tilia vulgaris) { fragments
E I, 25
"Possibly fabric"
No fibrous structure, but of organic nature.
Lime (Tilia vulgaris) fragment
E I, 27
Field maple (Acer campestre) fragment
E I, 26
Poplar (Populus sp.)
Hazel (Corylus avellana)
Oak (Quercus robur)
All fragments

ANIMAL BONES
A small number of animal bones were found in the course of the excavation. There were not enough to draw any statistical conclusions and
consequently they have been omitted, but a full list of identifications has been deposited with the finds in Leicestershire Museums.

Notes

2. Antiq., XLIV, 122–42
3. Information from Mr. S. E. Thomas
4. Information from Mr. Max Hebditch
5. Antiq., XLIV, 126
6. Ibid., 125
7. T.L.A.H.S., XXVI, 20; Antiq. J., XLIV, 122
8. Antiq. J., XLIV, 125
9. T.L.A.H.S., XXVI, 20
10. This pot-hole seems to be part of a system known on the north side of the hill as Hobb's Hole. Dr. Trevor Ford and Dr. R. J. King from the Department of Geology, Leicester University, examined the interior of the cave, but reported it blocked not far from the entrance: see Trans. Cave Research Group of Great Britain, VII, part 2, 115.
13. T.L.A.H.S., XXVI, 66. But see also the qualification in D. W. Harding, The Iron Age in Lowland Britain (London, 1974), p. 193; the random scoring on the pottery is there attributed to the Midlands Iron B.
15. Antiq., VIII, (1928), 79–81, and fig. 11; British Museum, Reg. Nos. 1938, 5–7. 157–9. The boss of No. 2 is off-centre to the width and might not be central to the length, but it could still have been intended to represent a shield with central circular boss rather than the more complex form suggested by R. A. Smith
16. Antiq., II, (1922), 97–9
17. Gallia, XXIX, (1971), 281–2, and fig. 9
18. R. M. Butler, ed., Soldier and Civilian in Roman Yorkshire, (1971), 32–4, pl. 4, d
19. Antiq., VIII, (1928), 81, and XX, (1940), 116
20. T.L.A.H.S., XXVI, 17–82
21. B. Cunliffe, Iron Age Communities in Britain (London, 1974), 389
22. Ibid.
23. P.P.S., XIX, 1–40; T. C. M. Brewster, The Excavation of Staple Howe, Scarborough (Scarborough, 1963)
25. P.P.S., XIX, 1–40
30. Ibid., XLVI, 31; Antiq. J., XLVIII, 175–91
32. T.L.A.H.S., XXVI, 17–82
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>AM No.</th>
<th>Texture (matrix)</th>
<th>Colour (Wet)</th>
<th>Stoniness</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Iron Content</th>
<th>Acid Soluble material % (matrix stones removed first)</th>
<th>Loss on ignition of acid insoluble material (i.e. organic matter content)</th>
<th>Site Ref. No.</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Series I</td>
<td>Loam</td>
<td>5YR 4/3 (reddish brown)</td>
<td>Common (½ cm to 4 cms) angular</td>
<td>Matrix stones crumb aggregate; roots present but rare, slightly calcareous</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L (4.2)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E I 20</td>
<td>Sample 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loam</td>
<td>5YR 4/4 (reddish brown)</td>
<td>Very common, i.e. forming most of the sample (½ cm to 4 cms) angular</td>
<td>Structureless; calcareous</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H (22.8)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E I 24</td>
<td>Sample II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loamy Sand</td>
<td>5YR 3/4 (dark reddish brown)</td>
<td>Rare (1 cm to 3 cm)</td>
<td>Structureless; calcareous; roots present but rare</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M (8.3)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E I 31</td>
<td>Sample III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Loam</td>
<td>5YR 3/4 (dark reddish brown)</td>
<td>Present (III: I and II); (up to 6 cms)</td>
<td>Crumb structure (I); non-calcareous; roots absent</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L (2.1)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E I 26</td>
<td>Sample IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loam</td>
<td>7.5YR 3/2 (dark brown)</td>
<td>Common (up to 2 cms)</td>
<td>Well-developed crumb structure; slightly calcareous; roots common</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M (9.5)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E I 1</td>
<td>Sample V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series II</td>
<td>Loam</td>
<td>5YR 3/3 (dark reddish)</td>
<td>Very common (½ cm to 5 cm)</td>
<td>Crumb structure calcareous; roots present but rare</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H (16.6)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E I 5</td>
<td>Sample VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM No.</td>
<td>Texture (matrix)</td>
<td>Colour (Wet)</td>
<td>Stoniness</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Iron Content</td>
<td>Acid Soluble material %</td>
<td>Loss on ignition</td>
<td>Site Ref. No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>(matrix stones removed first)</td>
<td>of acid insoluble material (i.e. organic matter content)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>2.5YR 3/4 (dark reddish brown)</td>
<td>Very common (up to 5 cms)</td>
<td>Structureless; calcareous; roots very rare</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H (20.4)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E I 24 Sample VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E I 31 Sample VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>5YR 3/2 (dark reddish brown)</td>
<td>Common (up to 4 cms)</td>
<td>Structureless; non-calcereous; roots small and very rare</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H (23.1)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E I 30 Sample IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loam</td>
<td>5YR 3/2 (dark reddish brown)</td>
<td>Extremely abundant (up to 6 cms)</td>
<td>Structureless; calcareous; roots absent</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L (5.1)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E I 26 Sample X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak crumb structure; non-calcereous; roots present but rare</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H (22.1)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E I 2 Sample XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Series III**

<p>| Sand    | 5YR 3/2 (dark reddish brown) | Bulk of sample made up of reddish stained angular pebbles and a black &quot;cindery&quot; material | Structureless; calcareous; roots absent | H | H (22.1) | L | E I 2 Sample XI |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM No.</th>
<th>Texture (matrix)</th>
<th>Colour (Wet)</th>
<th>Stoniness</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Iron Content</th>
<th>Acid Soluble material % (matrix stones removed first)</th>
<th>Loss on ignition of acid insoluble material (i.e. organic matter content)</th>
<th>Site Ref. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Loam</td>
<td>5YR 3/3</td>
<td>Common (up to 2 cms)</td>
<td>Well-developed crumb structure; slightly calcareous; roots absent; occasional small fragments of “cindery” material</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>7 (2.1)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E I 4 Sample XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abundant</td>
<td>5YR 3/3</td>
<td>Abundant (up to 4 cms)</td>
<td>Weak crumb structure; non-calcereous; roots absent</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L (2.1)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E I 15 Sample XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series III</td>
<td>Common (up to 4 cms)</td>
<td>Crumb structure slightly calcareous; roots absent; contained small bone</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L (4.4)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E I 16 Sample XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Loam</td>
<td>5YR 3/3</td>
<td>Common (up to 2 cms)</td>
<td>Weak crumb structure; non-calcereous roots absent; contained snail shell</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L (1.1)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E I 17 Sample XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abundant</td>
<td>5YR 3/3</td>
<td>Abundant (up to 2.5 cm)</td>
<td>Very weak crumb structure; slightly calcareous; roots absent</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M (11.9)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E I 26 Sample XVI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. Breedon-on-the-Hill (Reproduced by permission of the Ordnance Survey. Copyright reserved)
Fig. 4(a). Metal objects (1:1)

Fig. 4(b). Metal objects (1:1)
Fig. 5. Stone objects (1:4)
Fig. 6. Iron Age pottery (1:4)
Fig. 8. Medieval pottery (1:4)
Plate 1. The northern defences looking east.

Plate 2. West section through the bank seen from the rear.
Plate 3. Tail of the west section of the bank showing post-holes of the early palisade to the rear.

Plate 4. Palisade trench at the front of the bank, looking west. One of the large boulders forming the front of the bank can be seen on the left.
Plate 5. Post-holes of the early palisade and the stone curb of the bank beyond.

Plate 8. The skull area of Burial I.
Plate 6. The ditch, looking south-east.
Plate 7. The ditch, looking north-west, and showing the entrance to the pot-hole.