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PART I: INTRODUCTION
DEFINITIONS
DEFINITIONS

This section is intended to be an explanatory one in which the writer hopes that he will make clear what he takes certain terms and phrases to mean, terms which may otherwise be ambiguous.

Beaker, Food Vessel, Urn etc.

These names above, and other pottery type names are used with capital letters to refer to pottery only. The term Beaker, for example, refers only to that pottery type and should not in any circumstances be taken to refer to a social/racial group, or indeed a culture. When such identifications are intended then terms such as 'Beaker folk' or 'Beaker culture' shall be used. Similarly the term 'Beaker associations' or any similar meaning, refers to objects found in direct association with a Beaker vessel, and does not refer to 'Beaker paraphernalia' generally.

'Beaker domestic' occurs frequently in the text and is invariably used as an abbreviation for 'found in a domestic context with which Beaker pottery is associated'. Hence 'Beaker domestic sites', comprises occupation, or possible occupation sites which have varying quantities of Beaker
pottery associated with at least part of the total lifespan of the site. 'Beaker domestic site' is not to be regarded as a living site occupied exclusively by Beaker people.

**Domestic**

The writer initially found great difficulty in deciding which of the various and many Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age sites were to be regarded as domestic. It was clear that settlement sites with house plans such as Lough Gur or Northton were not the only domestic sites and even if house plans were present the interpretation need not always be domestic: the Stanydale temple, for example is open to both a ritual and domestic interpretation, as is the building at Skara Brae with crouched inhumations buried beneath the floor. Euan McKie has even suggested a mixed ritual and domestic nature for the whole of Skara Brae (McKie, E., 1977).

The problem is more acute, however, when we look at monuments like the Causewayed Camps and Henge Monuments. Causewayed Camps such as Windmill Hill and Hambledon Hill have Beaker sherds in the upper levels of the ditches associated with ostensibly domestic debris. Could this however represent dumping as part of some ritual, as the skulls at
the base of the Hambledon Hill ditches suggest that
the ditches were more than simply utilitarian? So
although at such sites we have food remains and
broken pottery typical of a domestic matrix, if
the remains represent the debris from a ritual
feast, then the types of pottery, and indeed the
type of food, might be coloured by the occasion.
This seems especially applicable to the large
Wessex henges whose construction is at least partly
contemporary with early Beakers. The ritual nature
of some of these monuments is evidenced by their
enhancement with stone rings as at Avebury and
Stonehenge, but G.J. Wainwright would argue that
many had a secular function. Prehistory, however,
is not a discipline that readily lends itself to
firm decisions. If Wainwright is correct then
the food remains and pottery may be regarded as
totally domestic, if not then the problem stated
above for Causewayed camps also pertains here.

Other questions that had to be asked are such
as when is a 'ritual pit' in actual fact a 'domes-
tic pit', and when is a hearth beneath a barrow
to be seen as the remains of a ritual feast or
simply the camp fire of the barrow builders? Dis-
cussion with colleagues and friends predictably
did little to alleviate this problem as each opinion
varied, and many were simply 'stumped' by the predicament. The writer decided, therefore, to initially regard all finds not directly associated with a burial to be domestic, the only exceptions being sherds from disturbed barrows and where the context(s) of the sherds had been disturbed. It was at first intended to become more selective as the research progressed and once a general familiarity with the material and range of pottery from each site had been established. In the event, however, this became impossible as there was no clear distinction in the make up of the assemblages from such sites, and some of the earlier excavations made exact association and location, at best, difficult to determine. The original definition, therefore, still applies. That is, 'domestic' is taken to mean any sherd(s) and 'occupation debris' not associated with a burial or with any unequivocal signs of ritual.
BRITISH BEAKERS AFTER CLARKE
Although considerable work had been undertaken on British Beaker material since Abercromby's corpus of Bronze Age pottery, published in 1912 (see Clarke, D.L., 1970, pp.1-2 for summary) Clarke was the first to produce a full up to date corpus of material on which to base his classification, and the result was a large, two-volumed, work as massive in bulk as in its impact. Previous Beaker typologies had relied mainly on shape since Thurnam's first Alpha, Beta, Gamma classification in 1670, but Clarke used shape, decoration and motifs in a complex system of matrix analysis, a mathematical system never before applied to British prehistoric pottery. The result, however, was as complex as the method.

It was, and still is, generally assumed that the Beaker reached Britain from Europe so Clarke decided to isolate the basic European styles by an ostensibly simple method.

"In order to distinguish the peculiarly British, later, groups from their earlier European forebears, all that need be done is to remove from the total British assemblage those Beakers which can be exactly matched in Europe; since those British Beakers with features not matched in Europe must be the insular developments" (p.34).

Clarke did qualify this statement in his text but
the result was still a complicated series of seven waves of Beaker invasion represented by his

All Over Cord (AOC)
European (E)
Wessex/Mid Rhine (W/NR)
  N. British/Mid Rhine (N/MP)
  N. British/N. Rhine (N/NR)
Barbed Wire (BW)
Primary N. British/Dutch (NL/D)
groups. What argues against such a large scale invasion is, as Lanting and Van der Waals (1972) point out, that these groups largely 'do not possess any centre of gravity' (p.28) and the logical idea of group foci gradually spreading into the interior, is not backed up by Clarke's distribution maps.

Though all the groups tend to have a markedly Eastern trend, it is only really the Wessex/Mid Rhine and East Anglian groups that have any localised distribution.

Out of these seven hypothetical invasion groups there arose two basic Beaker traditions, the North British and South British Beaker. The former was a development from the NL/D group while the latter was influenced by all initial groups in a complex system of intermixing.

'Unlike the Primary Northern Dutch group, the Southern tradition does not spring immediately from an intrusive Continental
group. Rather, it represents the regional amalgam of expanding Primary and Developed Northern British Beaker groups, with the already strongly established W/NR and N/NR groups of Southern England, perhaps also integrating some surviving Ebell Beaker groups* (p.41).

The Southern British tradition is, therefore, a veritable 'pot pourri'. Criticising this and the seven wave migration/invasion theory, Lanting and Van der Waals wrote

'*...many of the influxed groups and traditions are found scattered over the British Isles. The most striking examples is the Wessex area...Here AOC, E, W/NR, a few N/NR and N2 Beakers are claimed to represent separate foreign traditions. The main Southern tradition (S1-34) is considered to have resulted from a fusion of W/NR and N2 elements, so one could conceive of this tradition at least as being homebred in Wessex. But the earliest S1 Beaker group appears to be mainly concentrated in Yorkshire and East Anglia...and to be extremely rare in Wessex. Must even the Southern tradition be an import in Wessex?' (p.26 and footnote)

The distributions, however, do not really fit Clarke's groupings, with the exceptions of those mentioned already above. For example in the map showing N4 and S4 Beakers, the N4 group does have a distribution exclusively north of the Tees - Walney Island line, but the S4 distribution extends up to Aberdeenshire and Moray. The N2 Beakers seem to have centres of gravity in Aberdeenshire and in Yorkshire, but they also extend down as far as
Hampshire with a minor concentration in East Anglia.

Lanting and Van der Waals conclude that much of this stems from the basic error of placing too much emphasis on motif. This results in geographical anomalies illustrated by finding Beakers from different traditions in the same grave group, or in direct association. Gullane is quoted as an example.

'...where three Late Neolithic Beakers were associated with the upper part of a Beaker with identical rim and neck shape, but labelled Southern British because of the motif'.

Clarke's work, is, nevertheless, extremely useful with an excellent up to date corpus which, as Clarke himself stated, increased Abercromby's corpus by 55%. It was, on the whole, greeted with a mixture of opinions. Most saw that his seven fold invasion and his groupings did not really work, or were too complicated, but nevertheless the classification was used extensively in the relevant literature, and indeed still is, despite the fact that Lanting and Van der Waals produced a different, and more plausible, scheme in 1972.

In their review of Clarke's thesis, Lanting and Van der Waals offered 'Alternative Typologies in four British focus areas', the aim of which was
to illustrate the degree of continuity in the regional developments... and not to offer the most convenient system for classification". (p. 35) Their division of the Beaker corpus into a seven stepped scheme was basically stylistic and chronological. Four focus areas were chosen, Wessex, Kent and East Anglia, Yorkshire, North East England and South East Scotland, and North East Scotland. The Wessex area was the only one to produce a complete step 1 to 7 sequence which was defined as follows.

**Step 1.** AOC with early shape and internal rim decoration

Maritime Beakers.

**Step 2.** Regional development of the above

Zoned vessels of M descent with low belly ornamentation

AOComb

AOC of developed shape

**Step 3.** Vessels with more variation in motif and slender forms

Last phases of AOC

AOComb now contracts into bands

**Step 4.** Neck emphasis. Often horizontal lines

Zone borders begin to disappear

**Step 5.** Increase in neck size and accentuation

Metopied vertical decoration
Step 5. Rich variety of motifs
cont.
Step 6. Neck becomes more cylindrical
Bell y lower. More globular
Decoration fuses into 3/4 broad zones
Step 7. Neck and body fuse
Decoration shows complete fusion of zones

A similar development but with regional idiosyncrasies, was found in the other focus areas except North East Scotland where

'We have not succeeded in arranging the Beakers from this area according to a typology corresponding with those established for the other focus areas... a certain stagnation in the development may be held responsible for this: Neither the complete contraction or the fusion of zones, nor the relative growth of the neck become dominating trends in this area'. (p.41)

Lanting and Van der Waals scheme essentially does away with Clarke's complicated series of folk movements from the continent and advocates rather a single phased introduction of the Beaker to Britain and local indigenous development from there with a more or less predominance of stylistically late Beakers the further one moves away from Southern England. This contrasts with Clarke's conclusion that the Northern series was earlier than the Southern. It also suggests a logical succession of
events in contrast to the almost frantic movements suggested by Clarke.

C.B. Burgess and S. Shennan did not attempt any Beaker classification in their article in 1976 but did offer a new and controversial idea to Beaker studies, and for this reason it is included here. In their article 'The Beaker Phenomenon: some suggestions' they dealt a crushing blow to the Beaker invasions and based their arguments on the observation

'It has long been recognised that Beakers have recurrent associations... But this does consist entirely of artefacts; there are no signs of a common social or economic system, no uniform settlement or house types, no common ritual monuments or burial traditions. Beakers frequently occur not in distinctive Beaker contexts but fit comfortably into the local setting... Furthermore, while uniformity can be discerned in the shape and decoration of the Beaker, especially at the outsets, the trend towards the development of regional characteristics is even more marked'. (p.309)

To help try and explain this, Burgess and Shennan offered the idea of seeing 'Beakers as something extra-cultural', perhaps connected with a cult that spread across Europe at this time, and

'together with the artefacts with which they (the Beakers) are regularly associated, they could be said to form a Beaker Package'. (p.309, my brackets)

Following the lead of Hodges in 1957, Burgess and Shennan look to the North American Indians for
parallels and seize on the Peyote cult which spread from Mexico to Canada, an area larger than that covered by the Beakers, where the ceremony involved a set of accoutrements, just as the Beaker has associated artefacts.

'This cult package comprised rattles, a carved staff, a feather fan, a small drum, and a crescentic altar of clay or earth. The cult often achieved such importance that alien building forms could be taken over as part of the package. We find, for example, a wigwam tribe building a tepee especially for the Peyote ceremony because the cult had been acquired from a tepee dwelling tribe'. (p.312)

Burgess then examines this against the Neolithic background with interesting results. For example, the 'Beaker burial tradition' (my inverted commas) is no longer accepted as all aspects of single inhumation beneath round barrows had probably developed in the pre-Beaker Neolithic. Similarly the development of henges and related monuments was well underway before the Beakers came on the scene, and continued to develop right through the Beaker period.

To complement Burgess's hypothesis, Shennan examined the European material and came to the conclusion

'that the Bell Beakers are not simply associated with certain local changes but with an apparent large-scale re-orientation of patterns of contact,
linking hitherto unconnected areas... Association with a cult may well be one of the reasons for its widespread distribution, but even if it is not the answer, the spread of a Bell Beaker people seems one of the less likely alternatives'. (p.326)

This cult package was a novel idea which went far towards explaining the anomalies of society at this period, and it was both welcomed and dismissed by differing prehistorians. In 1978, for example, Paul Ashbee published his 'social-archaeological narrative' called 'The Ancient British' which reverted to the view of Beaker people being marauding horde from the continent. In their review of Clarke's thesis Lanting and Van der Waals complained that when reading Clarke's account one often felt that he was dealing with hypothetical groups and Clarke seemed to regard them as people firmly fixed in the archaeological record. This criticism seems to be even more valid of Ashbee's account of Beaker warriors.

Ashbee first establishes his Beaker man with a measured description straight from a Tailor's notebook:

'three inches taller than his later Neolithic counterpart and at this stage he would have been a man apart because of his round head and rugged physique, characteristics that could only have been cultivated...involving selected mating...' (p.136)
Ashbee then suggests that they were 'like the foederati, mercenary soldiers brought into Britain in late Roman times (and) may have been invited into Wessex...' (p.137). Once Ashbee has established this idea, however, he treats it as fact, and the simile quoted above becomes a metaphor or even an unquestionable statement of fact when, on the next page, he officially christens these round headed invaders as 'Beaker foederati'. This is a trend which persists throughout Ashbee's chapter on 'the Beaker incursions' and is, in the writer's view, an unfortunate one. These foederati are then identified as archers with composite bows, and then makes the valuable observation that in graves of this period

'there are also the antler strips found with archery equipment which could be the remains of composite bows' (p.138)

This is an idea which is very valid but then a curious flight of imagination follows when Ashbee suggests that the gold lunulae possibly represent fully drawn composite bows and

'their pronounced terminals would be the bow-nocks, the panel decoration the complex bindings, and the border decorations the complex laminae'. (p.139)

Again, this possibility becomes fact when on page 145, when discussing Beaker gold work Ashbee states
'Lunulae, the spectacular sheet-gold crescents which represent a drawn, tautened, composite bow....' (p.145)

Gold sun discs or button caps with a cross radiating from the centre and with usually a circular border, plus the cross decoration on the bottom of Beakers and Food Vessels are taken to support the suggestion that Beaker people had spoke wheeled chariots, the crosses representing the spokes of the wheels. The suggestion of chariots is indeed a fair one, but the evidence cited is as strained as a composite bow would have to be before it resembled a lunula. Would it not be more likely that in a period when geometric decoration was the norm, e.g. Beaker decoration, lunulae and gold work, jet, a cross would be little more than a logical and simple way of filling a circular frame?

The supreme example of indisputable fact is seen when the general absence of Beaker houses is discussed and this extract is worth quoting in full

'The Beaker warriors were supported by domestic supply trains, waggons running on substantial disc wheels, drawn by yoked oxen. In the absence of convincing remains of Beaker houses, the possibility that such waggons were mobile houses, like Romany caravans, should be envisaged. The jointed plank mortuary houses of Beaker affinity might be funerary versions of waggon tilts or super-structures. If certain Beaker dwellings
were portable structures...substantial waggons would have been needed for their conveyance* (p.139)

Though Burgess, and other independant writers, had pointed out that single inhumation beneath round barrows probably started in the pre-Beaker Neolithic

Ashbee still sees them as a Beaker introduction and though writers would now tend towards seeing Bekkers as fitting into the existing state of affairs in Neolithic Britain, whether or not they agree with the Beaker Package idea, Ashbee still sees the Beaker warriors establishing a 'Beaker way of life' and that the 'Beaker incursions changed later Neolithic native society' (p.146)

That Ashbee makes the fatal mistake of 'pots = people' is seen when he discusses food vessels

'*...these autochthonous Food Vessel people...maintained their individuality and, in Ireland at least, outlived their Beaker patterning. They may have been auxiliaries, natives recruited initially to aid the Beaker body politic...They were allowed to adopt the Beaker mode of life and its trappings*. (p.147)

Humphrey Case's article 'The Beaker Cultures of Britain and Ireland' of 1977 has been left till last on purpose and in the full realisation that it breaks the chronological scheme that has hitherto been adhered to. Case exercises a good deal of caution in his approach and indeed admits this him-
self, but he does make great use of our expanding
Beaker chronology to define three main phases of
Beaker activity called, not surprisingly, the
Early, Middle and Late periods, and corresponding
to the schemes outlined above in the following way.

**Early**
- starting c.3,000 B.C.
- consisting of Clarke's AOC category and
  Lanting and Vander Waals step 1

**Middle**
- starting c.2,750 B.C.
- consisting of Clarke's E, W/MR, N/MR,
  N/NR, BW, E,Eng, NL/D, N2. Lanting and
  Van der Waals step 1-4.

**Late**
- starting c.2,000 B.C.
- consisting of Clarke's N3-N4, S1-S4,
  S Handled. Lanting and Vander Waals
  steps 5-7.

All dates cited by Case are calibrated and expres-
sed as years B.C. The writer agrees fully with
Case's observation that

'[Archaeological evidence is not of a kind
to be decisive in this sort of problem
for any period of pre or proto-history
(i.e. Beaker invaders or cult package).
History and ethnography give plentiful
examples of changes in material culture
having been brought about respectively
by immigration and fashion, or by these
processes working in conjunction'. (p.73,
my brackets).

He argues that the AOC Beakers of the Early phase.
are the first to appear in Britain (the AOC sherd beneath Giants Hill I, Skendleby) but seem to persist into the late phase as seen by the C14 dates from Mount Pleasant. As to the means of their arrival into Britain

'the lack of specific associations seems in favour of fashion'. (p.74)

perhaps through gift or idea exchange.

The middle phase is seen by Case to have been initiated by settlers from Europe, using the skeletal evidence and the distinctive Beaker associations on which to base his argument. He also sees the late Neolithic landmalls representing the newcomers' lust for land and suggests that metal technology may hint at Beaker specialisation.

Rich and poor graves can be recognised in the mid to late phase transition period which Case takes as representing social stratigraphy. Artisan burials contained axes, hammerstones etc., arrowheads, always associated with burials of men, probably represent the warrior class, and the exceptionally rich graves speak for themselves. The late phase is seen as a period of insular development with virtually no contribution being made by new settlers and with everything pointing to continuation. Some innovations do appear, such as round
section awls and shaft-hole axe-hammers but this can not be seen as representing new people.

Case's essay, then, is a compromise between the Cult package of Burgess and Shennan and the multiple invasions of Clarke. It bears a lot of similarity with the suggestions of Lanting and Van der Waals, especially the closeness of the two chronologies. It is also as well to exercise caution as it can be seen from the above that the same sets of evidence can be interpreted in different ways depending on one's viewpoint.

Case is probably correct in saying that small migrations and fashion were the methods by which the Beaker reached Britain and Lanting and Van der Waals have provided, in the writer's opinion, the best classificatory framework to date.
HISTORY OF BEAKER DOMESTIC STUDIES IN BRITAIN
HISTORY OF BEAKER DOMESTIC STUDIES IN BRITAIN.

This section is intended as a brief discussion of past thought regarding the domestic aspect of the Beakers, and not of Beaker typology as the latter has been briefly but succinctly outlined by D.L. Clarke (1970). In addition, Beaker schemes since Clarke are discussed separately above. Nor will sites be examined here as a separate section will be devoted to them. It is hoped that this section will show various attempts at explanation and, almost incidentally, the changes in archaeological thinking.

Beakers are, perhaps, the most studied of the sepulchral pottery types of the late third and early second millenia B.C., but it is precisely this aspect of the study on which emphasis and concentration have been placed. Last century and earlier this century domestic sites were virtually unknown due as much to the fact that they were not looked for as that they were not found or recognised. To be fair to the early Antiquaries, however, this state of affairs largely persists today but it is rapidly changing with the emphasis from barrow to settlement archaeology. The real beginning of the search for settlements, or at least the beginning of their study, can probably be taken as G. Wymann-Abbott's article
of 1910 on 'The discovery of prehistoric pits at Peterborough'. Wymann-Abbott noted that

'the settlement consisted of many pits sunk in the reddish loamy gravel ... the depth ranging from two to six feet and the diameter from three to fourteen feet'. (p.333) (footnote 1).

In two cases he observed that the saucer shaped depression was in close proximity to a V-shaped pit and that 'if contemporary the larger may have been a dwelling, and the other a store pit'.

Peterborough's fame for Neolithic settlement was further heightened by E.T. Leeds who, writing in 1922, stated that the Neolithic 'discoveries were made for the most part in pits... of the usual hut dwelling type'.

G.J.A. Baird made a brief assault on the pit dwelling theory in 1914 with the article in P.S.A.S. 'Account of the Excavation of two hut circles of the Bronze Age in the Parish of Muirkirk, Ayrshire' in which he claimed to have found two circular huts with dry stone walling, associated with Beaker pottery. The recognition, due to more parallels coming to light, that these hut circles are in fact ring cairns is really beside the point. It is more significant that Baird was actually looking for huts for these people to live in as an alternative to the pits of lowland Britain.
The idea of pit dwellings was certainly in vogue throughout the late 1920's and the 1930's. In 1928 R.C.C. Clay published 'A pit dwelling of the Beaker period at Lymore, Hants.' and J.F.S. Stone saw his "Settlement site of the Beaker period at Easton Down, Winterslow" (Stone 1933) as comprising a number of pit dwellings, but in this case, stakholes around the pits 'undoubtedly indicated an above ground wooden structure' (p.367). A year later Stone reported on the 'Peterborough dwelling pit at Winterbourne Dauntsey' (Stone 1934). Although no Beaker was found at this site it serves to show how firmly embedded the pit dwelling theory was in British archaeology since moluscian evidence showed that the area was crawling with slugs who favoured a wet environment. Pit dwellings could hardly have been comfortable in such an area.

E.C. Curwen was a firm believer in pit dwellings, and in 1934 published an example with western Neolithic associations at New Barn Down. This was complete with a hearth situated against the centre of the north wall. Curwen also put an idea, very strange to modern thought, into J.F. Stone's head which is worth quoting in full.

'The difference in shape between the pits from areas A and B raises an interesting speculation first brought to the author's
notice by Dr. E.C. Curwen. What more natural association than that the graves, or houses of the departed, should resemble the houses of the living. In other words the association "Long Barrows = Long Houses, and Round Barrows = Round Houses" is certainly warranted by the facts at present known. The long Neolithic trenches of Windmill Hill, Abingdon, The Trundle, and Whitehawk were used by the Long Barrow builders, whereas in Bronze Age and later times Round Barrows and Hut Circles became Universal.

The Beaker period is definitely transitional and it is of interest therefore to note the shortened trench-like Pits A1 and A2 and the definitely circular nature of Pit 82 and others nearby. This is also in accordance with the Lymore dwelling Pit...oval in plan with a floor 5 ft. in diameter' (Stone 1933, p.370)

Although dwelling pits are laughed at today, the idea is not totally ridiculous, Anglo Saxon Grubenhausern provide an obvious similarity, and it is by no means the writer's intention to poke fun at these admirable archaeologists, but merely to show the degree of certainty that was once practiced concerning Beaker domestic sites. The writer can also say from personal experience that in Secondary school third year in 1969, Neolithic man still lived in pits!!

There was still a paucity of Beaker domestic sites, however, and the theory of pastoralism which was become so common was outlined by Prof. V.G. Childe in 1950 in his book 'The Prehistoric Communities of the British Isles'. This was also one of the first seri-
ous attempts to discuss Beaker Society. Childe suggested that the Beaker folk were probably nomadic pastoralists which accounted for why so few domestic sites were known, and the absence of structures could be taken to show that camping was the order of the day, or at any rate, the structures were so flimsy as to leave no trace. Pits, and occupation horizons in causewayed Camp ditches were additional evidence for nomadic camping. This idea persisted and in 1955, quoting personal correspondence from Mr. Hazzeldine Warren, Isobel Smith could write about a pit at Lion Point, site 114, 'a typical cooking hole, three feet in diameter, and over one foot deep'. (p.2)

In 1957, a very important paper was published by Mr. D.N. Riley in which he reported on his Neolithic occupation site at Risby Warren in North Lincolnshire. The site lies on the summit of a ridge and was exposed by wind erosion. Fifteen pits of varying size were found, all but two of which

'were filled by sand coloured black by organic matter, in which were fragments of pottery, burnt daub and carbonised wood'. (p.42)

The surviving depth of these pits was generally six to nine inches deep, and pits 8 - 10 and 13 - 15, were all within a patch of blackened sand which had been blown from the pit fillings. It is significant that Riley made no attempt to explain the pits and
it was now realised that all Beaker settlements were rather amorphous. If a chronological jump may be made, in 1961 R. Robertson-Mackay read rather a lot into Riley's evidence, and wrote in his article on Beaker coarse wares

'Excavation has not, so far, been very successful in revealing house types. Many of the house sites consist of nebulous groups of hearths, pits and postholes... The usual type of Beaker but was probably a small temporary round hut such as the one whose remains were found at Risby Warren' (p. 99)

Certainly Riley did not claim to have a house site at Risby, and there is no apparent evidence in the excavation report. Burnt Clay daub itself is no proof. It is obvious from the first part of the quote that Robertson-Mackay does confuse 'house site' with 'domestic site' but the round hut at Risby is still fictitious. Richard Bradley, in 1970 used Risby Warren as a type site but the reason for this was its lack of structures. (see below)

In 1960 J.G.D. Clark's report on the excavation of a Mid-Neolithic site at Hurst Fen yielded much information relevant to Beaker sites. A series of pits and postholes but no recognisable structures characterised this settlement, and charcoal and fire-crazed flints provided evidence for cooking. It was suggested in the report that the structures may have been tents, or have had walls of turf, and so have left no
trace in the archaeological record. The pits were interpreted by Clark as grain storage pits as there were grain impressions on some pottery suggesting cereal cultivation. He also suggested that they may have been lined with basketry. Pits were firmly associated with storage by 1964 when Isobel Smith published her 'Note on the Distribution of Neolithic Storage Pits'. Dr. Smith began

'It is becoming increasingly evident, for most of Lowland Britain, the only traces of Neolithic settlements that are likely to be discovered, apart from surface scatter of artefacts, will be pits of the type discussed in the foregoing pages. House plans have failed to be revealed by accident, and even when diligently searched for, as at Hurst Fen in Suffolk, they have not materialised, so that it must be concluded that in this area houses were as a rule constructed in such a way as to leave no permanent or recognisable traces in the ground'. (p.367)

Although the old idea of pit dwellings had been out of favour for a while, it was only now that a real alternative was being proposed.

Positive evidence for Beaker agriculture was published first in 1961 and again in 1976 by J.V.S. Megaw from the site at Gwithian in Cornwall. Beaker pottery was associated with a two-phased round hut where finds of animal bones and querns attested a mixed economy.

In 1970, Helen Bamford presented her PhD thesis at Edinburgh University on 'Some Beaker Sites in West Norfolk and their Affinities' the basis for which was
an excavation report of the Huckwold cum Wilton site where a Beaker floor was found plus several hearths and a spread of occupation debris covering several fields. The occupation floor was a circle of 22ft. diameter and defined by stakeholes confirming what had already been suspected, that Beaker houses were, in fact, flimsy structures. Again cereal and animal remains attested mixed economy.

As it is fashionable today to give years names, for example 'the Year of the Child', the writer hopes it will not be regarded as too flippant if he christens 1970 the 'Year of the Beaker' for in this year a whole wealth of information was published regarding Beaker studies. In Current Archaeology for that year David Clarke's scheme for British Beakers was out-lined in an article called 'The Beaker Folk'. In this, little could be said for their domestic sites save that the Beaker Folk were

'basically farmers and fishermen, and over 100 of their domestic sites are known. The pottery from these domestic sites is particularly interesting for it is sometimes possible to date it by stratigraphical means'. (p.69)

This is a certain hint at the increasing amount of attention that was being paid towards domestic sites as opposed to barrows though the last sentence of the quote is perhaps a little optimistic in the majority of cases.
In the same year David Clarke’s book ‘The Beaker Pottery of Great Britain and Ireland’ was published. Dealing only with the pottery Clarke did not give a great deal of attention to domestic sites in toto but he did look at the pottery from most of them and then categorised them according to his All Over Cord, Maritime, Northern and Southern Beaker Traditions. He saw three types of vessel on domestic sites (1) fine ware of the type that was usually found in graves, (2) secondary pottery like the fine ware but usually plain or rusticated, and (3) large coarse storage vessels.

In another article in Current Archaeology for this year C. Musson wrote an article called ‘House plans in Prehistory’ which was a useful and stimulating article for house types of all pre-Roman periods. In this he attacked the blind hunting for Beaker round huts saying

‘Over the years there has grown up a generalised impression of Bronze Age huts being circular, centre posted, and relatively small. But...this is an over simplification’. (p.267)

He then shows the dangers of creating houses out of scatters of postholes, producing two separate plans for the same posthole group at Thorny Down. It almost seemed as though this advice had been followed prior to its publication as Richard Bradley published
his Belle Tout excavations and the evidence for house plans that was produced here was far from the norm. Attention to previously unthought of phenomena such as the pitching of flints produced some startling results. The now familiar pits, hearths and middens were found, as to be expected on a site of this period, but in addition seven structures, Richard Bradley now believes these features to be natural periglacial phenomena and not man-made (pers. comm.) and is preparing a re-interpretation of the site at Belle Tout, but this hardly detracts from the point made here. Namely that people were now almost abandoning the hope of finding huts whose plans were all too familiar from later periods and were now looking for different, less substantial structures.

As an offshoot from his Belle Tout work Bradley published a short but stimulating article in Current Archaeology with the rather lyrical title of 'Where Have All the Houses Gone? Some approaches to Beaker Settlement'. This was really a landmark in British Domestic Beaker studies as it was the first not to be contented with lamenting the fact that few Beaker period houses had been found but actually attempted to explain why not, and suggest other alternatives. In this article, as stated above, Bradley states that
'Risby Warren may be taken as a typical Beaker living site with which to begin....'

and he made the interesting suggestion to explain sites like Risby Warren in that

'the scatter of small nuclei about Risby Warren (Crosby Warren, Manton Warren, Normanby Park) is that continually occupied domestic complexes regularly shifted site as a result of rotting house footings and contaminated storage pits. This pattern has been described as settlement drift'. (p.264 my brackets)

Bradley also was uncertain of the idea of Beaker nomads saying

'The recognition of cereal remains and ploughed fields of this period makes this clearer: for settled arable farming implies permanent houses rather than ephemeral camp sites' (p.265)

One argument put forward for the absence of house remains is that soil erosion could destroy all but the most substantial of huts and in support the contrasting wealth of structural evidence beneath round barrows is cited where the overburden has preserved the old land surface. A valuable point.

The 'Year of the Beaker' was conveniently summarised by Derek Simpson et.al. in 1971 with the publication of his book 'Economy and Settlement in Neolithic and Early Bronze Age Britain and Europe'. This brought together and evaluated the existing knowledge of settlement types and subsistence econ-
omy of this period from archaeological and environmental evidence. In his own chapter from this book Simpson came to the conclusion that in general Beaker houses

\[\ldots\] are all circular or oval in plan and show a close similarity in ground area... The other constantly recurring feature is a pit adjacent to the hearth'. (p.143)

These pits were presumed to be storage pits and were usually found to be full of domestic material. It was also noted that their 'houses occur in isolation, or at most in pairs'. Simpson also restated Bradley's view that cereal cultivation meant permanent settlement and permanent structures. Isla McInnes in her chapter in the same book, however, stated that

'direct evidence for the growing of cereals by the late Neolithic population is scanty' (p.126)

and that

'the importance of cattle in the economy would favour the argument that late Neolithic settlements were temporary due to the seasonal pattern of movement'. (p.128)

The emphasis now seems to have changed to viewing the nomad pastoralist/crop grower aspect of Beaker settlement and economy, championed by Andrew Fleming and Richard Bradley. In 1971 Fleming published his article 'Territorial Patterns in Bronze Age Wessex' and in his conclusion he made interesting
hypotheses. He suggested that occupation may have been seasonal and that the rite of cremation may have simply been a convenient way of bringing back the bodies of people who died away from the settlement/homestead. The awl may be taken to represent leather working which in turn would imply pastoralism with perhaps a small number of people, including the elderly and infirm, left behind to tend the crops. Fleming cautiously added, however, that 'it is hard to see how pastoralism could ever be completely proved on archaeological evidence.'

Bradley followed up this theme in 1972 when he published 'Prehistorians and Pastoralists in Neolithic and Bronze Age Britain' in which he warned us not to confuse Transhumance and Nomadism. Bradley also pointed out that stock raising and cereal cultivation were clearly being undertaken simultaneously and that the lack of pits in northern Britain need not mean a dichotomy of economy, but merely that the grain may have been stored above ground. This was supported later by Ian Shepherd's publication in 1976 of plough or ard marks below the Beaker midden at Rosinish on Benbecula, indicating cereal cultivation. Bradley also pointed out that the domestic remains found in varying quantities beneath round barrows could be taken to indicate evidence for
settlement drift, as land gradually became worked out.

In his chapter on the Bronze Age in Renfrew's 'British Prehistory: A New Outline', Colin Burgess again echoed the nomadic pastoralist aspect but stressed that this should not be exaggerated because of the evidence for tree clearance at this time.

By way of conclusion, it is interesting that when Colin Burgess and Stephen Shennan put forward their idea of a 'Beaker Package' in 1976, Burgess chose the North American Indian as an ethnographic parallel for the spread of a cult package for as early as 1957, nineteen years earlier, H.W.M. Hodges wrote a largely neglected article in Antiquity with the then rather strange title of 'Braves, Beakers, and Battle-axes' in which he drew parallels from the Plains Indians to help explain phenomena in the Beaker period. Before the 16th C. the Plains Indians were, interestingly, pit dwelling agriculturists who later took to hunting and following bison herds when horses reached the north from the Spanish colonies in Central America. The different tribes had no common language but still the cultural unity was remarkable. What is interesting from the point of view of transhumance v. crop growing is that the Pawnee and Cheyenne tribes grew crops and harvested
them when they returned from the summer hunting trips, and Hodges pointed out that in the Beaker period and Early Bronze Age there was a preference for Barley which was a hardier crop than wheat and needed less tending. Hodges was already writing that the Beakers may have been intended for a ritual which would account for why they do not seem to have a long "respectable" ancestry and for the high quality of the pottery. It is a pity for Hodges that ethnographic parallels were not more fashionable in the 1950's.

Such is the state of thought up to the present. We are still trying to explain why there appear to be few living structures and have abandoned the idea that they were there but that we simply were not finding them. Bradley and Hodder could write in 1979

'...the absolute rarity of settlements, even compared with the Neolithic, suggests that settled agriculture will not provide the whole answer'. (p.97)

It is hoped that this brief summary will serve as a backcloth to the present study of a domestic aspect.
FOOTNOTES

(1) The writer intends to quote widely and freely here as this is intended as a summary of other people's ideas which, he feels, are best expressed in their own words.
CHRONOLOGY

The aim of this section is to attempt to place the foregoing in its chronological setting. We have so far talked of typologically early and late Beakers and seen that a great deal of the domestic sites, where Beakers are represented in large numbers and where they appear to be the predominant type of fine ware, are typologically late. It will be attempted here, however, to see how valid this 'typology' is in terms of C14 dates.

Introduction

The period that we are dealing with is in fact an overlap between the tradition Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age but the problem has long been where to draw the distinction between Neolithic and Bronze Age, and we have often been told that there is a great deal of continuity but have had the ludicrous state of affairs whereby either some 'Late Neolithic' wares must be seen as early Bronze Age, or else some 'Early Bronze Age' wares, such as Food Vessels, must be regarded as, initially at least, Late Neolithic, (Burgess, C.B. 1970). A Copper Age has also been an idea that has been prevalent for a long time, and 'Eneolithic' or 'Aeneolithic' was often used in the 1920's and '30's, (Chapney, H.S., Piggott, S., and Curwen, E.C. 1935). Hawkes reinstated this idea of
a Copper Age from c. 2000 - 1700 b.c. (Hawkes, C.F.G. 1960 quoted by Burgess, 1969) and this was accepted by Colin Burgess (1969) who suggested that there was indeed a technological distinction between the Copper Age and the Early Bronze Age. The existence, however, of a similar distinction between the Neolithic and the Copper Age is not mentioned and the paper deals more with the Middle and Late Bronze Ages.

In his thesis, Clarke (1970) preferred to see the Neolithic extending well into the Traditional Bronze Age (p.275) and as such was first to at least recognise the cultural continuity. Clarke suggested that there should be an Early Neolithic (3100 - 2600 b.c.), Middle Neolithic (2600 - 2100 b.c.), a Late Neolithic (2100 - 1800 b.c.) and a Final Neolithic (1800 - 1400 b.c.). In the Late Neolithic phase Clarke saw AOC and European Bell Beaker invasions and their contemporaneity with Ebbsfleet and Mortlake Wares. In the Final Neolithic, there was Clarke's second massive wave of Beaker immigrations and a 'period of maximum Beaker expansion and density' (p.275). Contemporary with this were Fingate ware, Collared Urns, Grooved Ware and 'proto-Food Vessels'. 'The period ends with the Wessex I aristocracy and new prestige equipment including early Bronze Age metallurgy' (p.275).
Clarke's final Neolithic, however, ends when Burgess's industrial phase IV is already underway, and when phase V is beginning. In other words, Arreton Down type and Acton Park type metalwork is already in use, a full bronze technology, and the period cannot be said to be Neolithic.

Clarke was certainly correct to see such strong evidence for continuity between the later third and early second millennia but what hampered him was the use of the long and well established Neolithic and Early Bronze Age labels. Colin Burgess also noted this continuation and saw ceramic types as helping greatly to elucidate the problem:

'The development of 'early Bronze Age' Food Vessels and Urns from 'Late Neolithic' ceramics is now generally accepted (and) it would appear that a) that this development can be set at around 1700 B.C., and b) that it represents a major change in sepulchral attitudes....' (Burgess C.B. 1976, p. 1).

In the same work, Burgess attempts to split away from the traditional three-age terminology and sees the late third and early second millennia represented by three 'phases' :-

Phase I traditional 'late Neolithic', c. 2200 - 1700 B.C., characterised by Step 1-4 Beakers and individual burial. Late Neolithic wares are still in use.
Phase II, c. 1700 - 1500 is seen to be a traditional phase with the advent of Urns and Food Vessels, and late Beakers represented by steps 5-7.

Phase III, dates c. 1500-1250 b.c. and sees the 'petering out' of the inhumation burials, leaving a wide variety of urned and unprotected cremations. This scheme, however, was to illustrate only the burial changes of the period and industrial phases, settlements, religious/ritual practices and so on are not taken into account.

Much of what had been said by Burgess, and Burgess and Shennan in B.A.R. 35 (see above) was restated and elaborated slightly by Alasdair Whittle (1980) with specific reference to the Neolithic. The result was a mixture between radicalism and conservatism and the three Age terminology was adhered to but Whittle stressed a very apparent gap in the Neolithic at c.2500, similar to the later 'Bronze Age Hiatus' of Burgess (1974) and then a 'Later Neolithic' similar to the Later and Final phases seen by Clarke but ending c.100 years earlier at 1500 b.c. This was based mainly on the settlement and economy of the period, and summarises well what had been tentatively put forward by many and other authors since Clarke's corpus and scheme.

Whittle's summary still adhered to the three
age terminology however, and the Late Neolithic, to traditional minds, is not valid for the latter part of it if Bronze or copper is in use. Burgess saw this difficulty and therefore divided the period 2700-1250 b.c. into four phases named after sites with comprehensive radio-carbon dates, (Burgess, C.B. pers.comm. and forthcoming). The reasons for the divisions are far more complex than can be summarised here and the writer shall just look at Burgess's idea of what is happening to the pottery styles in his new four-fold division.

**Meldon Bridge period a. 2700/2500 - 2100 b.c.** a period of small henges and other enclosures, individual burial beneath round barrows and traditional late Neolithic pottery types such as Peterborough ware, Grooved Ware, Carrowkeel Ware etc.

**Mount Pleasant Period a. 2100 - 1700 b.c.** is the period of the large Wessex henge monuments and individual inhumation, often with a Beaker, is now predominant. Henge and stone circles are now being built, and the pottery types are the same as in the Meldon Bridge period but with the addition of step 1-6 Beakers.

**Overton Period a. 1700 - 1450** is a period of small hengiform burial monuments and burials accompanied by the traditional Early Bronze Age Sepulchral
pottery types. Copper and Bronze metallurgy started in the preceding phase and in the Overton period we have the beginnings of Wessex I. The Beakers from this period are late (steps 5-6 and 7) and at the end of the period we see the rise of Deverel-Rimbury and local bucket urn traditions. Finally the Bedd Branwen Period c. 1450 - 1250 B.C. Cremation burial is now the predominant rite, usually in existing monuments, Wessex II/III and traditional Middle Bronze Age metalwork begins towards the end of the period. The pottery traditions see late Food Vessels at the beginning of the period followed by all types of traditionally EBA/MBA urn types.

The above is very much a potted summary but Burgess's scheme is basically a simple one and still adheres to old familiar dates for his divisions for example, the Neolithic stagnation at c. 2600 B.C. marks the beginning of the Meldon Bridge period, and 1450 B.C. for the beginning of the Bedd Branwen is a compromise between Clarke's 1400 B.C. and Whittle's 1500 B.C. for the end of their Final and Late Neolithic respectively. Burgess's scheme is to be commended as it attempts to break away from the tradition that tends to bog down students, and to demo-
lish the technological division that is now generally regarded as meaningless in terms of socio-political groupings, ritual/religious monuments and economy. Its faults lie, however, to the author's mind in that it is still too traditional in that it is too compartmentalised and many monument types, such as barrows (round), henge and hengiform monuments span more than one period. In short, a continuum is needlessly divided up. Unfortunate also, is the choice of names for the periods. This admittedly (admitted both by the writer and by Burgess) is a difficult problem due to the fact that so few sites from this period have comprehensive C14 lists but the use of single sites to cover the British Isles is, indeed, suspect. Burgess admits, however, that the sites are used to denote time-spans rather than to suggest 'typical' monument types.

In the Netherlands the Neolithic is divided up into Early, Middle and Late and followed by the Early Bronze Age. The Late Neolithic is characterised by the Protruding Foot Beaker, the All Over Ornamented Beaker, and the Bell Beaker cultures. There is also a strong continuity in the burial rite while, as in Britain, the Bell Beaker groups brought central European artefact types to the Netherlands. The Early Bronze Age is marked by the occurrence of late Beakers,
especially with barbed wire decoration as well as imported and locally produced Bronze artefacts. C14 dates, the Beaker period (including PFB and Barbed Wire) range from entering on 2450 b.c. to 1500 b.c.

RADIO-CARBON DATING

The graph (fig. 2a) is a plot of many of the C14 dates from Britain that are firmly associated with Beakers. The lozenges represent the central date, and the vertical lines represent standard deviations. Hence the first date on the left reads 2469±130 b.c. and all dates are in uncorrected radiocarbon years (a list of dates used appears in appendix III). This first date is from Skateraw in East Lothian (SRR 453) and for a Step 4 Beaker, and it is obviously too early, even if the date at the end of the standard deviation is considered. It is suggested in the report, however, that this date from the collagen fraction of a femur, may be influenced by the diet of the person and shellfish from the Scottish coast may have the effect of making the determination older by c.350 years. This would alter the date to 2119±130 b.c. which is still early, but more plausible (see Close-Brooks, J. 1979).

The second and third dates from the left (fig. 2a) are the AOC Beakers from below Skendleby I
long barrow (B.M. 191, B.M. 192). The Skendleby dates are the earliest C14 dates for AOC Beakers either in Britain or in Holland (Lanting, J.N., and Mook, W.G. 1977). The Dutch dates for AOC Beakers fall into the 2200 – 2000 b.c. bracket while the Skendleby dates are much more in keeping with age bracket for the Dutch PFB pottery (2450 – 1950 b.c.). Is it possible, therefore, that the Skendleby sherds are not in fact AOC Beaker at all and could they actually be type 1a or 1b PFB sherds? The sharp belly carination of one of the sherds, however, would seem to argue in favour of an early Bell Beaker shape. Case (1977) has already argued in favour of the correctness of these dates though they are not used in Pape’s histograms (Pape, W. 1979) and on the whole, the dates used by Pape seem to be rather selective.

The fourth date, from Pinhole Cave, is also to be regarded as suspect as the date was obtained from a 'bulked sample' and it is not certainly associated with Beaker (Gilks, J.A. 1974). The sites of Ballynaclilly and Mount Pleasant have been distinguished from the other dates, or at least indicated, as the large numbers of dates from both sites will obviously 'unbalance' the picture.

With the exception of the beginning and the end
of the graph, where the dates are obviously too early and late respectively, dates x and y being totally ridiculous, the dates do fall into a good and even progression and show that the 'Beaker period' in Britain lasted from c. 2100 b.c. until c. 1500 or 1450 b.c., dates that compare favourably with the chronological schemes looked at above. The dates also look encouraging when seen in histogram form (fig. 3) and compared with other countries (note that the writer has used the histograms produced by Pape (1979) for this fig.). Fig. 3 shows that the British dates start slightly later than the Dutch ones and end slightly later too (remembering that Pape's dates are rather selective, e.g. using only four from Mount Pleasant). The curve produced is, however, convincing if one envisions Beakers coming to Britain from the Netherlands, as surely they must. The French curve too, is convincing in this respect but the writer feels that the other histograms produced for Beakers by Pape are not significant due to the small numbers of dates involved.

Though the curve of the C14 chart is at first sight convincing (fig. 2a) the picture tends to alter slightly when the dates are plotted according to what step of Beaker is represented (fig. 2b).
It must first be remembered that the attribution of a particular Beaker to a particular step is at once intuitive in many cases, especially on domestic sites with few vessels reconstructable and the majority of Beaker evidence in the form of small, often unhelpful, sherds. Hence the dates with the symbol \( > \) or \( < \) may be attributed to the immediately higher or lower step respectively. The Mount Pleasant dates have been excluded, and those from Ballynagilly boxed. It is at once apparent that the curve is now much more 'ragged' especially in steps 1 - 4 but with a marked evening out from step 5 - 7. The Ballynagilly dates, attributed to step 3 because of the reported similarity of the sherds to W/BR Beakers (ApSimon, A.M. 1969), and in the full realisation that Lanting and van der Waals' focus areas do not include Ireland, form a neat group in the step 3 bracket and is in keeping with the smoothness of the plotted step 5 - 7 dates. Step 4 Beakers, however, do not fit into this curve at all and the dates range from c. 2450 - 1500 B.C. The earliest date in the step 4 bracket (Skateraw) has already been discussed above, and it is not certain that it is a step 4 Beaker that the last date is associated with (Ysgwennant). The other step 4 dates come from Scotland or the North of England, Chatton Sandyford,
Cookston Farm, Rosinish and Northton. The latter two sites may also have step 5 Beakers present although the uncertainty over what type of Beaker is represented at Rosinish stated below. That the Scottish and Northern dates are late is interesting in view of the possibility of the diffusion of the pottery into that area from the south mentioned briefly above and discussed below. The early dates from Rosinish, however, would at first seem to be incongruous compared with this idea. However bearing in mind that the Rosinish dates were obtained from Limpet shells which may have given a date as much as 350 years too old (see Skateraw above), then dates of approximately 1620 b.c. and 1550 b.c. (instead of 1970 and 1900) are much more in keeping with the other dates for Beakers of these steps, and would, in that event, be similar indeed to the dates from nearby Northton. This also compares favourably with the graph of dates in chronological order (fig 2a) as it can be seen from the list of dates that the majority of the North British dates fall into the upper half of the graph.

Before any more concrete conclusions may be drawn, however, it is obvious that a great many more OI4 dates are needed for British Beakers from
sealed contexts, and especially for step 1/2, 4 and 5 examples.

**DISCUSSION**

It has already been seen how well the British dates fit into the general pattern of those from the rest of Europe as represented by Pape's histograms (Pape, W. 1979), and especially how well the British sampling in terms of numbers of dates compares, second only to the Dutch. It has already been argued, however, that the histograms do not take into account the type of Beaker and so can be as misleading as the smooth sinuous curve of fig. 2a.

The Dutch dates have, fortunately, been published in a more informative manner by Lanting and Mock (1977). Like the British C14 determinations, there are, of course, some 'outsiders' for Dutch AOO and BB pottery but there is nevertheless a very convincing chronological progression from PFB right through to BW pottery. Taking AOO and BB together the dates fall neatly into the period 2200 - 1700 b.c. The Dutch AOO Beakers are demonstrably earlier than the Maritime type and the only 'break' in the progression is in the Early local class. There are, however, only three dates published from this class of Beaker and that number is hardly enough on which
to base conclusions. The Veluwe and late North Dutch class must be seen as being broadly contemporary. Both classes exhibit a date range of c.1950-1650 B.C. and although there is a small relatively 'early' group in the Veluwe class, there is also a small 'later' group whereas the Late North Dutch Beakers have produced more of an even 'spread' of dates. The break between the Late Neolithic and the Early Bronze Age in the Netherlands is marked by the appearance of Barbed Wire Beaker pottery although it is also realised by the Dutch that there is a definite continuum as in Britain (Lanting, J.N. 1973). A great deal of the Barbed wire pottery has very definite Beaker affinities and must be seen as a development from Beaker proper and is often found on Beaker domestic sites in the Netherlands (e.g. Molenaarstraatgraaf). If then, the BW dates are included in the Beaker range then Beaker pottery in Holland must be seen as beginning with the A00 Beakers at 2200 and ending with the upper bracket of BW dates at c.1500 B.C., a date range that compares favourably with that for Britain.

The radiocarbon dates from some of the Beaker domestic sites in Britain are interesting in themselves and are likely to support the idea of diffusion tentatively put forward so far and discussed below.
The cases in point are, of course, the step 6 Beakers from sites such as Chippenham and Fifty Farm, and the late dates for late Beakers from windmill Hill and Knap Hill Causewayed Camps, compared with the later dates for sites in Scotland such as Northton, and also possibly Rosinish (if it be accepted that the Rosinish dates may be as much as 350 years too old). Even the step 4 Beaker from Chatton Sandyford has a date too old by comparison with the step 6 Beakers from Chippenham and Fifty Farm, even when the standard deviations are doubled.

The Radiocarbon dates for Beakers in Britain would compare favourably with the Dutch dates in terms of time-span but would also tend to present a more ragged picture when grouped according to type, the comparative lateness of the North British Beakers would argue in favour of the idea of diffusion mentioned above however it is suggested that a great many more dates are needed to 'iron out the kinks' in the graph and to make more positive conclusions possible.

************
BEAKER DOMESTIC SITES
BEAKER DOMESTIC SITES

We have seen above how Beaker domestic studies have changed over the years and that the persistent themes running throughout the study were a lament at the lack of domestic sites of this period and attempts to explain this negative evidence. Strictly speaking, however, it is not a lack of domestic evidence that we have, but simply a lack of settlements and house plans of a type with which the subsequent periods have made us familiar. Indeed, evidence of domestic activity is quite common and is found in a variety of forms (see flow diagram, Text fig. 1). This section is intended to survey the evidence for Beaker domestic activity in the British Isles as surviving in the archaeological record. The writer has relied mainly on published reports and hopes that the section will show some of the difficulties of classification, interpretation and recognition that the evidence creates. No attempt will be made to list each and every site as this would simply result in a repetition of the catalogue. The writer's definition of the term 'domestic' has already been defined above.
BEAKER USE OF EXISTING NEOLITHIC MONUMENTS

1. LONG BARROWS.

Evidence for Beaker domestic activity at long barrows is normally found in the upper layers of the monuments' quarry ditches (note 1.) and only at Giants Hill I at Skendleby, is there firm evidence for pre-barrow Beaker domestic activity.

Giants Hill I in Lincolnshire is unique among the Long Barrow Class for sealing Beaker sherds in the material of the barrow and to have Beaker sherds in near primary positions in the quarry ditches (Phillips, G.W. 1936). Both sherds from beneath the barrow were abraded AOC sherds and would appear to be the earliest sherds in Britain of this type, although one must be wary of single C14 determinations. At Giants Hill I, the ditch ran almost entirely round the barrow, with two narrow causeways, and it varied from 10ft to 12ft (3.05 - 3.70m) deep but only 4ft (1.23m) deep at the lower end of the barrow. Fragments of combed Beaker came from 9 inches (23cm) above the floor of the ditch in section AB. Paint traces of hearths were found in the same section associated with animal bones, and hearths in section CD had a maximum thickness of 6 inches (15cm) and were associated with fragments of four or five combed Beakers and associated coarse pottery, ani-
animal bones (ox, pig, sheep, dog) and traces of a bronze awl, all of which points to using the ditches for at least semi-domestic purposes.

At Thickthorn Down, Dorset, Long Barrow 165a had an horseshoe shaped quarry ditch which produced Beaker pottery from the upper ditch fills (Drew, C. D. & Piggott, S. 1936). Three irregular charcoal filled pits were sealed by the construction of the barrow and Western Neolithic pottery was found in the primary silt with animal bones and flints. A sterile rainwash sealed this layer and in turn underlay a chalk loam where Beaker and Peterborough pottery were found in association. Some of the sherds are finger rusticated and one has an incised Clarkes Basic European motif 2 (Clarke, D. L. 1970 Vol. II). P. 4, from ditch cutting IX is chalk filled but also has fingernail rustication, and P5 from ditch cutting III also has a Clarke Basic European motif, but in this case it is No. 3b, that is represented.

Holdenhurst Long Barrow in Hampshire had a 'U' shaped quarry ditch which ran round the proximal end of the barrow, and was also deepest at this point (Piggott, S. 1937). A black layer towards the upper levels of the ditch suggested to Prof. Piggott that the mound had been levelled in the 17th century.
The Beaker sherds were found below this levelling and above the primary silts which contained Western Neolithic pottery. In section D VIII late Beakers were found associated with a rusticated sherd which was in a smooth fine fabric which seemed, to Prof. Piggott, to fuse Grooved Ware and Beaker characteristics. Similar Beaker fragments came from cutting IX. Most of these sherds were from an occupation level at the north west end of the ditch.

The Lambourn Long Barrow in Berkshire also yielded Beaker pottery from the upper levels of the ditches (Wymer, J.J. 1965) associated with Western Neolithic pottery, and later bucket and globular urns. Two Beaker sherds described have comb decoration in the form of herringbone, and fingernail rustication. At South Street in Wiltshire there were no burials beneath the long barrow (Smith, I.F. & Evans, J.F. 1968) and the fact that the north ditch was only half the depth of the south suggested to the excavators that the mound had not been completed. Peterborough ware of the Ebbsfleet and Mortlake substyles was associated with AOC Beaker in the upper levels of the primary ditch fill. A similar state of affairs existed at the Windmill Hill long barrow (Ashbee, P. & Smith I.F. 1960) where no burials were encountered but where Beaker and mid-late Neolithic
wares were associated in the upper ditches.

There are also some Beaker sherds from secondary positions around long barrows other than in the ditch silts, for example West Rudham in Norfolk where there was a patch of black earth and pot boilers on the east side of the barrow measuring 30 ft. (9.20 m) N-S by 18 ft. (5.51 m) E-W and a maximum of 9 inches (23 cm) thick. (Hogg, A.H.A. 1938). An extension between section I and section V, in which areas the kitchen was situated, revealed the only Beaker sherd which Mr. Hogg took to be derived from the hearth area. The sherd was decorated with horizontal incised lines, the only other datable find being a barbed and tanged arrowhead from the turf line over the primary silt of the ditch in cutting II.

2. CAUSEWAYED CAMPS.

The stratigraphy of the ditches of the early Neolithic causewayed camps often provides a mirror image to that of the long barrows with Beaker and other late Neolithic wares occupying secondary positions in the ditch fills. At Whitehawk, near Brighton, there was an occupation layer in the third ditch which appears to have been found in all three of the ditch cuttings (Curwen, E.C. 1934). Skull fragments were found with domestic debris in
cutting II, and in cutting IV there was a hearth at this level associated with mussel shells, grain rubbers, pot boilers, animal bones and some calcined human bones. Beaker sherds were found immediately overlying this layer.

At Maiden Castle in Dorset, a causewayed camp underlay a later Iron Age hillfort (Wheeler, R.B.H., 1943). Occupation layers and domestic debris occupied the middle and upper ditch silts. The Beaker horizons appear when the ditches are almost full and are associated with Grooved Ware and Food Vessel sherds. Rusticated and fine ware Beakers are both present; M.B. Cunnington first recognised that Knap Hill was a similar Neolithic camp in the excavations of 1910 and noted that in the ditches Beaker came from the upper levels, that flint cores and nodules came from the primary fill, and that there were burnt layers at 3ft. and 4ft. (0.92m. & 1.23m.) deep. A second excavation was carried out by G. Connah in 1961 and the Beaker horizon was more precisely related to layer 4 which was a layer of chalk humus and chalk rubble beneath the topsoil. About seven or eight Beakers were found in the cuttings, all represented by sherds and all are late in the sequence. The Beaker deposits here did seem to be fairly localised, and are only found in cut-
tings II and IV (Connah, G. 1965).

Abingdon in Berkshire, has also been excavated on two occasions, by E.T. Leeds (1927, 1928) and by H.J. Case (1956). Leeds mentions hearths surrounded by pebbles at different levels in the ditch. These pebbles were interpreted as floors, but pot boilers would be another explanation. Some of these hearths were kerbed and occupation debris was found in the lower and middle ditch silts. Leeds, however, found no Beaker associated with these occupation traces, and Case found very little, and that was confined to the upper levels. Again, absolutely typical.

R.A.H. Farrar (1952) briefly reported on the excavations carried out at Hambledon Hill in Dorset in 1951. He found that the ditch was 7 ft. (2.15m) deep and the fill represented two distinct periods. The primary silts contained some human remains and Western Neolithic pottery, some with lugs, while the secondary had some remaining early Neolithic pottery but mainly Rusticated, Peterborough and Beaker wares.

The causewayed camp type site is that at Windmill Hill in Wiltshire, which also produced a total of 435 fine Beaker sherds plus a further 82 coarse ware pieces. The sherds were mainly from Beakers
of the Southern tradition but in most cases that sherds are too small to be diagnostic. The three ditches at Windmill Hill were all filled in a similar way, though the inner ditch contained more occupation material than the other two. Dr. Smith was also of the opinion that the 'hearth sites' referred to by Alexander Keiller in his notebooks were in fact hearth sweepings rather than in situ hearths, as there were no traces of circumferential scorching, nor were there any trampled floors suggesting actual occupation in the ditches. More reasonably, the ditches were considered to be rubbish dumps.

The infant burials in the ditch may have some ritual significance or may simply represent a colder attitude to death and burial, especially infant mortality which must have been very high, than exists today. The stratification of the ditches is confused in the inner and middle ditches and it is only in the outer one where the upper deposits are clearly separated. Windmill Hill pottery was found in the two lowermost layers and dated to 2570±150 b.c. (B.M-74). Layer 3 had fresh Windmill Hill sherds incorporated which suggested that the camp was still in use, but at the top of this grey-brown slow silt, at the junction with the layer representing the weathering of the ditch sides, layer 2, were Beaker
sherds. Layer 2, already mentioned, has exclusively late Neolithic and early Bronze Age pottery and a charcoal sample gave a C14 determination of 1540±150 B.C. (BM-75).

**3. HENGE AND HENGIIFORM MONUMENTS.**

These have been included under the Neolithic section as their origins lie in this period, but the writer is aware that they should more correctly be assigned to a Transitional period.

**3a. HENGE MONUMENTS.**

Henge monuments are a field monument characteristic of the later Neolithic/Early Bronze Age transition, beginning in phase I of Burgess's scheme (Burgess, C.B. 1976), and are normally found on light agricultural soil, and they vary considerably in size, from the massive monument at Avebury to small ring ditches (see below). The ritual purpose of the Henge monuments has been inferred from their external banks and internal ditches, generally considered not to be a defensive feature, the general lack of house sites within them, and their tendency towards lithicisation in the Beaker period, again a feature not overtly utilitarian. On the other hand, however, there are vast quantities of domestic refuse - charcoal, waste pottery, and food remains - from the ditches of these monuments, especially the
larger monuments such as Avebury, Mount Pleasant, and Durrington Walls (Smith I.F., 1965, Wainwright G.J., 1979, Wainwright, G.J. & Longworth, I.H. 1971 respectively). The obvious explanation for this is to follow the same explanation used for the causewayed camps such as ritual feasts and/or seasonal meeting places and in which case we may envisage the henges taking over the role of the causewayed camps, and chronologically this is quite acceptable. Current thought suggests that we must not regard causewayed enclosures as having a single uniform purpose (Smith, I.F. 1967) but perhaps we ought to regard the henge monuments in a similar light. G.J. Wainwright suggests that these monuments, especially the larger enclosures, were of a secular nature and says:

'As recently as 1971.... I was not prepared to regard large enclosures with external banks as serving a utilitarian purpose.... I would not now regard the Late Neolithic earthworks as anything but secular'. (Wainwright G.J. 1975).

As always in prehistory, the truth probably lies somewhere between the two extremes of this religious/secular argument. In this study, however, the pottery from the Henge ditches will be treated as domestic.

The first real published information regarding
the excavation at Durrington Walls is the pipeline investigation of 1950-51 and the small scale excavations the following year by Stuart Piggot, A. St. J. Booth, and J. F. S. Stone (Stone et al. 1954) Late Neolithic pottery and occupation refuse was found in a double row of postholes which were thought to pre-date the south bank and ditch. In the 1952 excavations these post-holes were re-located and the domestic nature of the refuse was confirmed with a few scraps of Beaker appearing among the other Late Neolithic wares.

In the 1966 excavations (Wainwright, G. J. 1968, 1971) a sub-rectangular timber monument was found 200ft. (61.54m.) south of the henge and which was found to have late Neolithic pottery and domestic refuse in the post-holes. A similar occupation layer was found to extend beneath the bank on a fossil soil and probably matches that found in 1952. A hearth was located on top of the ditch silts above which was some rusticated Beaker sherds and some Ebbsfleet pottery. In the 1967 season (Wainwright, G. J. 1968, 1971) Grooved ware and Beaker sherds were found in the primary ditch silts with occupation debris which was more concentrated towards the ditch terminals. Beaker was also associated with Grooved ware in the post-holes of phase I and phase
IIa of the Southern circle. In the hut, an oval area 43ft 6ins. by 37ft. (13.38m. by 11.38,.) defined by stake holes and occupation debris, may in fact have been a midden as was suggested by Dr. Wainwright from the amount of food or domestic debris that was found. Beaker sherds were associated with this structure. Finally, in the Northern circle, necked Beaker sherds and Grooved Ware were again found associated with the phase II structure and the facade. In all, seventy one sherds of Beaker and related pottery were found during Wainwright's excavations at Durrington Walls and possibly represent between twenty seven and thirty eight individual vessels. Two possible AOC rims came from the platform area and combed sherds came from the platform and the midden, but none show diagnostic-ally early traits. Late incised Final Southern sherds were found in the ditch silts (layers 4 and 5) and from the midden, and rusticated sherds were also associated with the midden and hearths in the ditch fill.

At the great circle at Avebury, Beaker pottery is fairly rare (Smith, I.F. 1965). Four small sherds were found above the packing in stone holes 45 and 46, and an undecorated base sherd came from stone hole No. 41. Seven weathered Beaker sherds,
however, were found in the stake holes around stone hole D and seem to represent three vessels. They seem to represent fairly early Bell Beakers and were sealed by the clay used to pack the stone hole.

A cross hatched Beaker sherd was found as a surface find near stone No. 46. The sherds from the primary ditch silts are all weathered and are identical with those from beneath the bank which are all Grooved ware or Peterborough sherds or else in a peculiar sandy fabric. Unweathered sherds were found in the secondary silting and indicate late Beakers and sherds of a Bronze Age nature rather similar to Collared Urn, and which was originally thought to be Peterborough ware.

Despite the vast amount of report, discussion and pure speculation published about Stonehenge, little has been published in the way of detailed excavation report, far less pottery report. Beakers appear at the Stage II monument, the erection of the Bluestones, and have been found, though in an unstratified position, in the Y and Z holes (Newall, R.S. 1929). Prof. Piggott gives us an insight into the stratigraphy by saying that Grooved ware was stratigraphically lower in the ditch than the Beaker sherds (Piggott, S. 1936) but the pottery sequence at this unique and important site is not at
all clear, and a full discussion is eagerly awaited. W. Hawley, reporting on the 1925-26 excavations at Stonehenge (Hawley, W. 1928) paints the picture that Beaker and Bronze Age sherds were found in the middle and upper layers of the ditch in most or all of the sections, as well as from inside the horse-shoe structure of the monument, but little is illustrated and there are no section drawings.

The site of Woodhenge, near Durrington Walls, is a similar Henge with an internal post setting not unlike the timber circles at Durrington Walls or the Sanctuary. As with most Wessex henge monuments Grooved ware was the most common pottery type but there was also the usual occurrence of Beaker. This seems to have been found in a secondary position, however, but exactly where in the ditch silts is not clear from the report (Cunnington, M.E. 1929). At the Sanctuary on Overton Hill, briefly mentioned above, Beaker sherds were found in the stone and stake holes (Cunnington, M.E. 1932). A possible Beaker sherd was found 2ft. 6ins. (77cm.) deep in hole No. 3. in the 6ft. (1.85.) post ring, and a Beaker rim sherd with horizontal comb impressions was found in stonehole No. 29. in the outer stone circle.

In Somerset at the hengiform monument of Gor-
so y Bipy (Dobson, D 1934) domestic debris was found in the ditch terminal to the east of the 12ft. (3.70m.) wide causeway. This matrix consisted of dark earth, charcoal, animal bones, worked flint and Beaker sherds associated with rusticated ware. The cuttings suggested that this occupation debris went all round the ditch and was not restricted to any one point. One Beaker was reconstructed to form a Final Southern Beaker. The occupation, however, was more intensive in the north east of the site (Jones, S.J. 1938) but portions of the same pot were found to have considerable vertical and horizontal distributions, indicative of the material having been dumped there on mass from an occupation site nearby. When analysing the pottery, W.F. Grimes (in Jones op.cit.) estimated that c.100 Beakers were represented and that they all belong to a single unbroken occupation with abraded and fresh sherd both appearing, though they are all from fairly late Beakers.

In the highland zone, the role of the Henge appears to have been taken over by the stone circle, though henges, of course are not unknown in this area (e.g. Fife and Northumberland). At Lundin Farm near Aberfeldy in Perthshire (Stewart, M.E.C. 1966) a setting of stones was found to have been
set into a 'U'-shaped trench in the central area of which were sherds of an abraded AOC Beaker. Also in this area were Collared Urn sherds which were carbon encrusted and thought to have originally formed a domestic vessel, so Mrs. Stewart suggested that the mound may originally have been formed from hearth sweepings.

The recumbant stone circle of Old Keig in Aberdeenshire was excavated by Prof. Childe in 1932 and 1933 (Childe, V.G. 1933, '34). Prof. Childe found a grey clay layer, perhaps an old turf line, over most of the area, and pre-dating the stone circle, and from the lowest level of the clay layer came sherds of Beaker pottery with combed herring-bone decoration which Childe interpreted as being associated with pre-construction occupation or, at the latest, the pottery of those responsible for the construction of the monument. A similar circle was excavated at Loanhead of Daviot, also in Aberdeenshire, by H.E. Kilbride-Jones in 1934 (Kilbride-Jones, H.E. 1935) with Beaker again found in the immediately pre-monument levels, two Beaker sherds being found beneath the central ring cairn. A further Beaker sherd was found beneath the paving in the area of the recumbant stone, and a third sherd was found in the hole of the eastern flanking stone.
A coarse Beaker sherd also came from the pit dug to hold the recumbant stone.

The finding of Beakers associated, to some extent, with hengiform monuments also extends to Ireland in the case of the stone circle at Grange near Lough Gur in Co. Limerick (O' Riordain, S. F. 1951), a monument which is, in effect, an earthen and rubble bank with a revetment of standing stones, the tops of which are roughly level with the top of the bank. Two hearths were found on the old ground surface beneath the prepared gravel floor with a third beneath the bank on the south side. Associated was some domestic Lough Gur Class II pottery and a spread of charcoal and occupation debris. The Beaker sherds, some of which were undecorated, all came from the interior of the circle associated with some Lough Gur Class I and II wares. No less than six Beakers were represented.

RING DITCHES

When one comes to ring ditches one is immediately faced with the question ritual or domestic, or, indeed, a combination of both, like causewayed camps, each serving a slightly different purpose.

Also, do they differ significantly from causewayed camps and henge monuments in any other respect bar size? The nature of the finds from these
sites is very similar, usually a scatter of sherds to a lesser or greater extent, associated with charcoal and domestic rubbish, if with anything at all. The sherds are often small and abraded, vessels are rarely reconstructable, and for argument's sake will be treated as domestic here. Only pure and simple ring ditches will be considered in this section and those similar monuments that are found beneath round barrows will be considered in the section on round barrows below.

A fingernail decorated handle in Beaker-like fabric was found in the ditch of site III at Barton Hill farm in Bedfordshire (Dyer, J.F. 1962) but this was the only Beaker-like sherd found among a considerable amount of Collared urn pottery in the upper and lower ditch silts. Collared Urn was also the datable pottery found with a horse-shoe shaped turf structure within the ditch which the excavator interpreted as another type of mortuary enclosure, though the reason for this is obscure and a purely domestic purpose need not be ruled out. An interesting idea was put forward to explain the presence of seeds associated with Urn pottery in the ditch on the west side of the ring ditch, namely that they were to be used as cooking herbs. Again indicative of the ring ditch having served a domestic purpose.
The Oxford region is especially rich in these monuments (Case 1963, in Hamlin, A. and Case H.J., 1963) though the finds from excavated examples are generally poor. At Stanton Harcourt, near but not directly associated with the ring ditches, three abraded Beaker sherds were found near an inhumation, but were not thought of as being associated with the burial as the breaks were old and abraded. A sherd with comb impressions and in a state similar to the three just mentioned, was found bearing the same relationship to burial No. 3, as the above bore to burial No. 1. One small sherd of probable Beaker was also associated with ring ditch 2 and located in cutting III. On site I at Cassington in Oxfordshire, Peterborough and Beaker sherds were found in the primary ditch silts (Case H.F. 1963, op.cit.). Mr. Case also stated in the report the very feasible theory that some ring ditches may be domestic though the lack of an entrance causeway does not rule out this interpretation as a bridge of planks could be used. This would be more realistic from a protective point of view, ruling out the need for a gate. The lack of structural evidence need only mean that any existing buildings were of a flimsy nature, or perhaps of turf, and have not survived ploughing, a fate that has befallen most
of the monuments of this class. The comparatively small amount of domestic debris on these sites perhaps suggests seasonal occupation, perhaps the camps of transhuming herdsmen.

Still in Oxfordshire, at City Farm, Hanborough (Case H.J. et. al. 1965) site 3 consisted of an external bank and internal ditch enclosing a cremation cemetery with abraded necked Beaker sherds coming from cutting IV in the secondary silting of the ditch (Layer 3). Most of the cremations were associated with Collared Urn sherds, including one dug into layer 3 in cutting III, and pit 3:3 yielded a sample which gave a C14 determination of 1490±60 B.C. (Gr.N - 1686). Site 4 was probably a two-phased monument with an outer and inner ditch, the outer one the earlier, and there was evidence of deliberate dumping of domestic material directly on top of the primary silt of the outer ditch. Sherds of necked Beakers came from both the primary silt and this dumped material. In the inner ditch, which had originally been revetted, there also necked Beaker sherds in the primary silt, layer 5, in the dumped material, layer 4, and also in layer 3, the silt above the layer of domestic debris. Cremations in pits 4:5 and 4:6 were associated with collared urns and material from the revetment in the inner ditch.
provided a determination of 1510±65 B.C. (Gr.N. - 1685).

ROUND BARROWS

Round barrows can not be regarded as purely sepulchral monuments as so to do would wrongly isolate them from similar monuments such as ring ditches. They may also serve some boundary mark function.

Ditches are commonly associated with round barrows, either beneath or outside the mound, and which must have served more than just a quarry ditch purpose, rather like the long barrow ditches mentioned above. These ditches were sometimes also used for dumping domestic remains, and, in some cases for holding secondary burials.

Extensive occupation debris was found beneath the round barrows at Chippenham in Cambridgeshire (Leaf, C.S. 1936). It is possible that the monument that Mr. Leaf describes as the Early Bronze Age barrow was in fact primarily a domestic site over which the barrow was later raised. At this site an irregular interrupted ditch had been dug to a shallow depth with domestic rubbish being found in this. Clearly post-dating the ditch was a chalk ring inside which was a horse-shoe setting of posts,
all of which were presumably quite small as they did not penetrate far into the ground. The contracted inhumation was on the old ground surface, not in a grave or cist, and was accompanied by a stone battle axe and a three riveted bronze dagger. Fires were found beside holes b and c with animal bones and pot boilers around them. Domestic animal bones were scattered around the area of the excavation associated with late and rusticated Beaker sherds. It is possible that the posts and the chalk ring, which was not really very substantial, represented support and anchorage for some kind of flimsy tent or shelter. What Mr. Leaf describes as the Late Bronze Age Barrow at the same site and in the same report was surrounded by two ditches, concentric and more regular than that of the Early Bronze Age barrow, the inner of which was broader and deeper than the outer. The chalk bank in this case was hexagonal rather than circular. The central burial was a cremation beneath an inverted collared urn, and there were six secondary burials. Bones of pig, ox, sheep and dog were found suggesting domestic activity on the pre-barrow site, as well as Beaker and rusticated pottery, barbed and tanged, leaf and petit tranchet derivative arrowheads.
In the later excavations at Chippenham barrows three, four and five were excavated (Leaf, C.S. 19-40). In barrow three the central burial was an unaccompanied cremation, although an empty Collared Urn was found in the mound material. A sherd of rusticated ware, some undecorated Collared Urn, and some scattered flints were found on the Old Ground Surface. More concrete evidence of occupation comes from beneath the large barrow No. 5. The central grave held a contracted inhumation which had possibly been covered with a gravel mound. A posthole circle was found inside the bank of the barrow, possibly for a palisade, and a second large concentric ring inside this. Inside the area delineated by the bank of the barrow was found a series of hearths, Nos. II-IV, VIII and IX representing Beaker occupation. Neolithic pottery was scattered over the hearths associated with both fresh and abraded sherds of late Beakers and which formed a fairly even spread over the old land surface beneath the sandy and slight central mound. The writer has argued that these post and stakehole circles do in fact represent a hut beneath the barrow, of some considerable size (Gibson A.M. forthcoming Proc. Cambridge Arch. Soc.). In this report the sequence of the hearths that is postulated is not
convincing and on consideration it is now thought that they represent simply areas of more intense burning when the hut was destroyed and collapsed. The re-interpretation of the site as a hut is still maintained, however.

Martlesham Heath in Suffolk has been quite prolific in providing evidence for Beaker domestic activity beneath round barrows. The first mound of any relevance to be excavated yielded evidence in a somewhat enigmatic way (Maynard, G. & Spence, H.E.P. 1949). The 100ft (30.77m) diameter barrow lacked a central interment, but the central area produced an oval 14ins by 8 ins. (35.6cm. by 20.3cm) of dark sand which was, perhaps, a deposit of occupation material placed after the area had been stripped but prior to the erection of the mound. A hearth was located 11ft. (3.38m) north north west of the centre, and \(\sqrt{2}\) 1ft. (30.5cm) in diameter. 20ft. (6.15m.) from the inside of the mound on the south east sector was a scatter of rusticated sherds with vertical and horizontal panels of fingernail impressions. One sherd was quite fine with a flat rim in 'Beaker coarse ware' fashion which the excavators thought to have represented the remains of a Beaker burial though no other traces of this remained.
A circular ditch and eccentric barrow mound was excavated at Avebury, barrow G 55 (Smith, I. F. 1965.1) and both Windmill Hill and Early Bronze Age sherds were found in the middle silts of the ditch, the primary cremation being associated with three beads, a copper alloy awl, a pigmy cup, and sherds of a Collared Urn. Beaker pre-barrow occupation was represented as a scatter of material, and a series of pits. Western Neolithic, Grooved Ware, Peterborough ware, and Beaker sherds appeared in the plough soil over the area. Fifty four sherds of Beaker from the site represent approximately six early and seventeen late vessels with a further twenty three indeterminate Beaker sherds. Seven pits were attributable to the Beaker occupation, but only pit No. 3 contained any Beaker sherds. The excavator suggests that these pits are probably storage pits and that pits Nos. 3 and 3a show some evidence of having been lined, and also that some antler from the site may be for hoes and so be further evidence for former agriculture on the site.

A group of twenty nine barrows on Snail Down, Eversleigh, was excavated in 1953 and 1955, and some of the barrows covered rather a lot of evidence for pre-barrow activity associated with Beaker pottery (Thomas, G. and N. 1956). A pit, for ex-
ample, located beneath Site I was interpreted as a ritual pit but there is not apparent reason for preferring this interpretation to a domestic one. The pit was found to contain carbonised material, and beaker sherds were found in the same horizon beneath the bank of the barrow, on the north west side. On site II, Beaker scraps were found on the floor of the ditch and in a tree hollow beneath the bank. Site III consisted of a turf mound and produced the most abundant Beaker evidence from the site. Many sherds of early and late Beakers were found in the ditch and in the turf mound associated with some Grooved ware, and rusticated ware. The primary interment was an urned cremation. This no doubt was derived from a stake hole complex on the site but no recognisable structures have yet been recovered from this complex. (A detailed pottery report by D.L. Clarke and the writer is presently with Nicholas Thomas and is awaiting inclusion in the final report of the excavation. (Clarke, D.L. and Gibson, A.M. forthcoming.))

The situation is no different in Ireland where, for example, two barrows were excavated at Ballingcoda and consisted of a bank and ditch enclosing a circular area 6m. in diameter. There were no signs of either structures or sepulchral remains in either
area. Charcoal and burnt stones, however, appeared in a spread around the centre of Barrow I with two hollows 35cm. deep in the south east quadrant. On site II, charcoal spreads were again noted (MacDermott, M. 1949) and stone axe chips were found in the south east quadrant. The charcoal spreads formed part of an extensive stoney area where Western Neolithic pottery (Lough Gur Class I) and Beaker were found in association and a stone setting indicated the site of an hearth over a pit filled with charcoal and pottery. A second pit was filled with burnt bone, and, as was postulated above regarding the Chippenham barrow, these barrows at Ballingoola may have primarily domestic monuments. The bones from the site imply domestic activity with ox, pig, dog and goat/sheep being identified. A thumb nail scraper and a barbed and tanged arrowhead were found among the flint work.

At Arreton Down in the Isle of Wight there was a comparatively simple mound in that it had no surrounding bank or ditch but there was a very definite occupation spread beneath (Alexander, J. Ozanne, P.C. and A. 1960). This Peterborough and Beaker occupation spread was much greater in extent than the area covered by the barrow and the area excavated but much had vanished due to eros-
Animal bones in the domestic scatter included pig, cattle, sheep/goat, red deer, otter and wild cat. There were also traces of human bone that were not derived from the burials. Beaker sherds were found in this horizon, in the undisturbed areas of the mound material (rabbit interference was considerable), and from a pit to the north west of the barrow. The sherds are by no means classical Beaker and true Beaker is very much in the minority. What is very interesting, however, is that some Beaker-decorated sherds are in the same fabric as the Mortlake ware and so probably represent a degree of Hybridisation which is, on the whole, quite rare.

At Reffley Wood in Norfolk several thousand sherds were found beneath the round barrow representing quite extensive Beaker activity (Robertson-Mackay, R. 1961). No structural evidence was noted but it is worthy of note that the burials were again urned cremations, a frequently recurring burial form in barrows sealing Beaker occupation. At Harpley, in the same county, Beaker scraps were found beneath a barrow that had almost totally been ploughed out (Lawson, A. 1976). Two Beaker sherds and a barbed and tanged arrowhead were found at the base of the ploughsoil outside the limits of the
mound, but layer No. 5. held sherds in three different fabrics, including, notably, Collared Urn. It is difficult to determine, however, whether the Beaker sherds are to be regarded as firmly associated with this pre-barrow pottery.

**CAVE SITES**

The evidence for caves having been lived in in this period is rare or ambiguous. Some were clearly used as rubbish dumps, but whether this was 'ritual rubbish' in the words of Anne Ross (in Megaw, J.V.S. (ed). 1978), or domestic, is again open to debate and various interpretations, and so should we really regard the pottery from these sites as domestic proper or to be coloured by its ritual nature? The writer feels that a 'sitting on the fence' view is called for and regards the evidence in this essay as showing domestic rubbish being dumped in a convenient spot, perhaps dedicated to a hearth or earth deity. Here, knowing not, the temptation to delve into the realms of speculative fantasy must be avoided.

The numerous Mendip caves served as shelters and living areas for prehistoric man throughout the prehistoric period and even into Romano-British times, as at, for example, the Chelm's Combe shelter (Balch, E.E. 1926), where the occupation dates
from the Mesolithic through into Roman times. Beaker pottery and domestic refuse was found associated with later Neolithic pottery at the 4 ft. (1.23 m) level in the cave's floor deposits. Similar stratification was found at Cockles Wood Cave in Somerset (Hickling, M.J.L. and Seaby, W.A. 1951). Grooved ware, rusticated ware and necked Beakers were found. Fragments of human bones, however, were found amongst the domestic debris and this again raises the question of burial or sacrifice, or even cannibalism.

The Derbyshire caves have also been popular habitation areas. At Pin Hole cave in Creswell Crags (Gilks, J.A. 1974) excavation was carried out in 1924-1938 but the results were reported by an independent. Hearth sweepings and sherds were discovered in the cave and charcoal yielded a C14 determination of 1960±120 b.c. (BM-436). Beaker came from this level, associated with hearths, and from the one below it and had another date of 2170±140 b.c. (BM-437). Collared Urns were also found and it should be noted that the dates were obtained from bulked samples and so may not be as accurate as might be. Also in Derbyshire, Foxhole cave produced Neolithic and Beaker pottery in association at the entrance (Jackson, J.W. 1951). Faunal re-
mains were comprised of some domestic and some wild animals so showing stock rearing and hunting were going hand in hand. No stratigraphic evidence appears to be published about the Whaley rock shelter in Derbyshire (Radley, J. 1967) except that Peterborough Beaker and Grooved ware sherds were found without any traces of burial.

In Rydale in Yorkshire, the Windypits also seem to have been used for the dumping of domestic debris, if not for actual habitation. Beaker was found on a ledge 30ft. (9.23m) down in the Slip Gyll pit and at Antofts Windypit food refuse, Beaker pottery and portions of seven or eight skeletons were found (Mitchell, W.R. 1957). At Sewell's cave in West Yorkshire there were two main occupation levels. The upper one was Romano-British and the lower yielded Beaker and Peterborough sherds and contemporary flints (Raistrick, A. 1936).

A prehistoric occupation level but with no apparent stratification in it was located at the Potter's cave, Caldey in Pembrokeshire (Lacaille, A.P. and Grimes, W.F. 1961). Two groups of Beaker pottery were found in this matrix. Similarly at Rudh's an Dunain in Skye (Scott, L. 1934). The cave is 100ft (30.77m) above the level of the beach and a maximum of 15ft. (4.62m) wide by 9ft. (2.77m) deep. Beaker
sheards and flints occupied the lowest deposit in the cave.

**MISCELLANEOUS DOMESTIC ACTIVITY WITHOUT ASSOCIATED STRUCTURES**

1. **PITS**

These are either storage pits or hearth pits or rubbish pits, or, again, the old friend 'Ritual' raises its ugly head. Interpreting the pits as storage pits has become very fashionable, but, however, have any evidence, apart from analogy, in the way of grain remains etc., and it may be that their function is, in fact, quite different. The pits are often difficult to interpret, and one rarely knows how much of the top of the pit has been lost as a result of ploughing or what slight associated structures or features have been lost in the same way. However, when a pit is found either in isolation, or in a group, and is filled with ostensively domestic rubbish, then the writer feels obliged to label the feature a domestic one.

Perhaps the best known pits of this kind were not so much excavated as salvaged from working gravel quarries and much more evidence than remains must have gone unrecorded. The pits were on a promontory on the Fen edge and varied from 2ft. to 14ft. (92cm. - 4.31m) in diameter, and 2ft to 6ft (0.62cm
-1.85m) deep. The smaller pits tended to be steep sided and flat bottomed, and while the larger ones are either shallow and flat bottomed, or deep and 'V' shaped in section. Wyman-Abbot seemed to think that there was at least one hearth pit and one storage pit in the group. The pits produced a mixture of large and small pots and domestic debris in the form of flint flakes, charcoal, and animal bones. Pit No. 7, for example, was 12ft. (3.69m) in diameter, hemispherical in section and with a maximum depth of 4ft. (1.23m). This had a black layer 8 inches (20cm.) from the base on top of the primary silt and resting on a gravel floor. Most of the sherds were from Beakers which varied considerably in size, the largest being 11 inches (28cm.) high x 9 inches (22.9cm) diameter at the rim. Neolithic Peterborough was also found in the pit, and just to the north east, a smaller pit contained an upright Collared Urn but there was no trace of any associated burial. This raises the question of whether or not the urn was being used for storage.

A survey of the Wyman-Abbot collection at Peterborough museum (note 2,) reveals that most of the Beaker pottery is fine ware. There appears to be some of the Peterborough at the Institute of
Archaeology in Gordon Square but nowhere near the amount that seems to have originally come from the site. Rusticated sherds are very much in the minority, and it is tempting to see the site as a cemetery rather than a domestic site, but this clearly does not agree with the evidence. The size range, of the pottery, however, is in keeping with that found on domestic sites.

Further pits were found at Peterborough by E.T. Leeds (Leeds 1922). Again Peterborough ware, Beaker and urn sherds were found but this time there is a definite reference to a series of burials so it is not known how much of this discovery is to be regarded as domestic. Beaker was also found at the recent excavations at Peterborough directed by Francis Pryor, and these are obviously from domestic contexts. Pit F3 in area X was oval measuring 1.20 m. by 74 cm. and 26 cm. deep, with steep sides and a flat base, and it was filled with sherds, charcoal and flints. The pit had been back-filled soon after excavation as it showed no trace of weathering. Pit F4 in area VII was circular, and 44 cm. in greatest depth and contained sherds, bones, charcoal, flints, pot boilers and carbonised hazelnuts and acorns. This too had been back-filled, and both pits probably represent typical rubbish.
pits.

At Blackenall Field near Pewsey in Wiltshire a small pit was located in a spread of domestic material associated with Beaker and Peterborough type flints (Annable, F.K. 1977). In the fill of the pit Beaker was associated with Peterborough ware, two bone pins, a discoidal flint knife, waste flakes and both burnt animal and human bone. This would be a perfect domestic matrix if it were not for the human bone which immediately makes sepulchral, ritual and cannibalistic interpretations viable. Here the pit was 3 ft. (92cm.) in diameter, and 2ft. 4 inches (71cm.) deep it was dug in the chalk, and was filled with dark earth and charcoal. Four sherds of Beaker, including two bases from different vessels, thirty rusticated sherds, and twenty struck flakes, one of which was worked into a scraper. As at Blackenall Field, burnt bone was found and this included a human skull cap on which the areas of burning were restricted leaving patches of unburnt bone. The skull had obviously not been the result of a poor cremation, but had been deliberately charred or, dare we say it, cooked. In any case the pit can not be regarded as a burial one.

Pits are rare in the Highland zone, probably
mainly for topographical reasons, and a series of burial and domestic pits was found at Kirkburn in Dumfries (Cormack, W.F. 1964). Beaker sherds were found in six pits as well as Food Vessel, Urn sherds and sherds of later Neolithic impressed wares. With exception of pit No. 24, none of the pits show direct sepulchral evidence and may well be domestic.

Beaker users are responsible for similar a-structural occupation in Ireland as at the passage graves of Newgrange and Knowth. At the former site (Wijngaarden-Baker, L.H. 1974) work is still in progress on the Beaker domestic pottery (note 3) but the excavation is complete, and the occupation area was scaled and consists of pits and hearths but no house plans. The site is obviously domestic with 98% of the bones found coming from domestic animals of which cattle and pigs are predominant, and there are also some horse bones. Some of the pits on the site seemed to have been used for the storage of carcasses and C14 determinations of from 2100±40 B.C. (GrW - 6344) to 1935±35 B.C. (GrN-6342) were obtained from the settlement. At the Knowth passage grave which is still being excavated by Prof. Eogan two areas of Beaker occupation had been located by 1976 (Eogan, G. 1976). Thirty eight pits were associated with the Eastern concentration,
but again there was no structural evidence. Unlike Newgrange, however, there were no animal bones found and domestic activity is not entirely unequivocal. More Beaker concentrations are coming to light around Knowth (Eogan, G. 1979 pers. Comm.) so these may change the picture somewhat.

2. HEARTH SITES

Hearth sites rarely occur on their own and are most commonly found associated with pits, sherd scatters or underneath barrows. At Edgintonthorpe in Norfolk, for example, there was an extensive occupation site of some 150 acres on which Western Neolithic, Peterborough, Grooved ware and Bell and necked Beakers were all found (Clarke, R.R. 1957). A living hollow was found in 1851 with rusticated pottery, a discoidal knife and both a barbed and tanged and petit-tranchet derivative arrowhead. There were two adjacent and ostensibly associated hearths containing only oak charcoal.

In the same county, at Huckwold cum Wilton evidence for Beaker occupation took the form of floors, hearths, and scatters of sherds (Bamford, H. 1970). Three hearths and an occupation floor were found on site 93, field 616, and hearths were also found in field 613 at sites 62, 63, and 69. Site 23
also revealed a small hearth group on excavation. Organic remains from the site indicate a mixed economy with domestic animals comprising ox, sheep, and pig, and wild animals such as red deer being represented by the bone evidence, and traces of barley representing the cereal.

Hearths were also found at Butley in Suffolk, in 1949 at the Big Mount Field (note 4). The hearths were all inside a roughly circular enclosure about 18ft. (5.54m) across and delimited by a slight bank of stones. The hearths were represented by shallow hollows about 8 inches deep (20.3cm) and 3ft. (92cm) in diameter. They were filled with sooty earth and sherds of late and rusticated Beaker came from all four hearths, three of which were on one side of the enclosure, and the remaining one was in the possible entrance on the other side.

Site 114 on the Lyonesse surface on the Essex coast is also a hearth site which was reported on by I.F. Smith (1955). The 'cooking hole' is typically about 3ft. (92cm) in diameter, and 12ft. (30.5cm) deep. It contained sherds of barbed wire Beaker and fingernail rusticated pottery. Flints in
the form of nine small cores, thirty seven chips, and four thumb nail scrapers were also associated and other finds consisted of ox bones and a boar tusk.

3. SHERD SCATTERS NOT ASSOCIATED WITH HEARTHS OR FITS.

One of the most amorphous types of evidence for domestic activity is a simple scatter of sherds which has already been met with above when looking at round barrows and ring ditches. The small, often abraded, nature of the sherds, however, and in extremely favourable examples, the association with food remains and worked flints, makes a domestic interpretation the most plausible. Heacham and Snettisham in Norfolk seem to be virtually type examples (Clarke, R.R. 1957). At the former site, the finding of some Beaker fragments lead to a small excavation which revealed an extensive scatter of flints, predominantly of a Neolithic type, plus Beaker and Rusticated sherds. At Snettisham, the situation was similar with some Beaker fragments found amongst a scatter of flints.

An amorphous spread is also the nature of the finds from the Scottish sand dune sites though a great deal of caution must be exercised here as the sherds are seldom found in a context that could be
regarded as stratified due to wind and rain erosion of the sand and the undercutting of habitation layers as happened at Glenluce. On the islands of Coll and Tiree, for example, there are frequent references to charcoal, food remains and prehistoric pottery, but there is seldom any further elaboration (Beveridge, E. 1903). Beakers are also found in the lower levels of shell middens at Sana Bay in Argyll (Lethbridge, T.C. 1927), mainly AOC Beakers associated with barbed and tanged arrowheads. Some shell and comb impressed Beakers and some polished stone axes have also been found in the area. (Ritchie, J.N.G. 1970).

Much of this material must come from middens that have been eroded and which are, on the whole, rare, especially in the Lowland zone, and which have been included in this section as often stratification in them is limited if present at all. Such a midden was found to underlie a medieval floor at Tusculum near North Berwick, containing numerous Beaker and Neolithic sherds, flints and food bones, (Cree, J.E. 1908). Finds of a similar nature were found on the Archerfield Estate at Gullane where shell middens covered an assortment of Beaker sherds (Curle, A.G. 1908).

The evidence is almost identical from the
Irish Sandhills (Collins, A.E.P. 1959) where the dunes suffer badly from erosion and so most of the finds are from surface collections and are completely unstratified. There seems to be some stratification at Dalkey Island near Dublin, but the Beaker sherds do not seem to have been associated with any structure. The report is confusing, however, and the exact stratigraphy is difficult to interpret, (Liversage, G.D. 1968). At Rockbarton Bog in Co. Limerick there was also a spread of Beaker material, this time inland and so resembling more the sites at Snettisham and Neacham. At Rockbarton, Beaker was found in one of three ash spreads indicative of a kitchen site, but with no associated structural evidence (Mitchell, G.F. and O'Riordain, S.P. 1943).

**STRUCTURAL EVIDENCE**

Little more evidence for houseplans of the Beaker period has been found since Derek Simpson reviewed the evidence in 1971 (Simpson, D.D.A. 1971) but they will still be looked at here for the sake of completeness.

In the Cornish peninsula, a circular hut of the Beaker period was found at Gwithian (Megaw, J.V.S. 1976). Beaker pottery was found at site XV
in layers 8 and 7: in the former Beaker appeared in a domestic matrix which was used to fill the postholes of phase I hut after it fell into disuse. This house was then enlarged. The phase I house of layer 8 is a simple structure of individual posthole construction consisting eight postholes making up the outside wall, of which two form a porch, and a central roof support. On the south side there appears to be a bulge in the wall, possibly to accommodate the off-central hearth which stands in a place that would have been occupied by a post had the hut been truly circular. This seems to have been a small alcove or cooking area. There were twelve associated stakeholes inside the hut but they do not appear to form any recognisable pattern. The phase two house is more complex and is of ring-groove construction, at least in part, with the northern part of the wall formed by two concentric stakehole rings about 30cms. apart, possibly filled with turf, rather like the hut circle excavated by R.W. Peacham (Peacham, 1961) at the unenclosed platform settlement at Green Knowe in Peebleshire. The hearth is central in this later phase, the entrance has changed from west-south west to south-south east. The entrance is marked by two large postholes in the end of the bedding trench, and it has a small exter-
nal porch consisting of two large postholes and a wall of stakes.

At Easton Down in Wiltshire a Beaker settlement was excavated by J.F.S. Stone (Stone, 1933). Beaker was found associated with Western Neolithic and Peterborough pottery with no apparent differences in stratification at the nearby flint mines, but the main area of occupation was centred around a number of 'pit dwellings' an interpretation that was then fashionable. The pits are surrounded by stake holes, probably intended to secure covers, and were probably storage pits later utilised for the disposal of rubbish. Between pits 7 and 8, however, a line of straight (?) bedding trench was found and a small rectangle of trench coming off the main line and measuring 9ft. by 6ft. (2.77m x 1.85m) and this may have been part of a living structure. Area 10 is also associated with Beaker pottery and may also represent a structure, this time of individual post-hole construction. The structure at Downton in Wiltshire is very ephemeral and represented only by a hearth and some postholes which may possibly represent a shelter or a permanent structure of a very flimsy nature (Rahtz, P.A., and ApSimon, A.M. 1962.1). There are associated pits and pot-boilers attesting cooking activities
on the site, but there is no other recognisable structure plan.

In Yorkshire, Neolithic occupation was found in a natural hollow at Beacon Hill on Flamborough Head (Moore, J.W. 1964). Beaker pottery came from the upper layer, the lower having purely late Neolithic pottery, associated with a small hearth and a small oval setting of postholes, possibly representing a hut or shelter. Similarly at Rudston. Wold in the same county, an oval patch of charcoal impregnated soil around 30ft. (9.23m) in diameter, and 2.5 - 6 inches (6.4cm - 15 cm) thick (Manby, T.G. 1975). Pits were associated but no postholes, though it could mean that this was a floor area for a structure of turf, or a tent etc.

Structure plans of this period, as indeed for proceeding and succeeding periods of prehistory, are much more concrete in North Britain due to the more frequent use of stone as a building material. This is obviously more durable, and, in the North, more readily available. This is shown by a site such as Northton in the Outer Hebrides, which, though making use of stone in its house construction, is still fairly flimsy when compared to such buildings as the Shetland stone houses, and the Orkney settlements of Rynyo and Skara Brae. Northton can perhaps
be seen as a highland zone equivalent of such lowland occupation floors as that at Fulkwold cum Wilton. Two stone structures were located at Northton, (Simpson, D.D.A., 1976, 1966), the better preserved of which was an oval setting of dry stone wall 28ft by 14ft. (8.62m by 4.31m) with a partially excavated floor to give more depth. The suggestion that it may have been originally roofed by such as an upturned boat has been made. A hearth, pit and central posthole were unearthed inside the hut. The second structure was not so well preserved and seemed to be smaller, but it too was orientated SW-NE. It consisted of a 'D'-shaped dry stone walled feature and may have originally been like the one described above, but with a partition and with much of the original stonework later robbed.

Mention must also be made of the stone houses in Shetland, which, if not exactly producing sherds of Beaker, do often have pottery associated which is very similar to Beaker, some of it closely resembling the material from Northton, and must be closely related to Beaker. The Stanydale 'Temple' is a substantial stone walled, pear-shaped structure, with a 10ft, 6 inches (3.23m) long entrance passage and internal measurements of 39ft, by 22ft. (12m. by 6.77m) with some internal, possibly corbelled chambers.
Two large internal postholes probably supported a ridged roof. Hearths were found inside the structure with some associated coarse pottery and some Beaker fragments. No bones were found inside so a sepulchral interpretation was ruled out by the excavator (Calder, C.S.T., 1950). A ritual purpose was envisaged by Calder because of a similar lack of domestic debris. It could be, however, that the inhabitants were just scrupulously clean. The nearby house at Stanydale is a similar stone-built structure with a small possible cooking area outside. Again Beaker sherds, though somewhat coarse, was found in a layer of ash covering the floor (Calder, C.S.T., 1956). It is possible that this coarse Beaker is to be regarded as the Beaker related pottery, but not true Beaker, mentioned briefly above. The similar structure of Benie House at Whalsey (Calder, C.S.T., 1961) had a small annexe or forecourt forming a two-roomed plan. There was a near central hearth and the associated pottery comprised fingernail rusticated ware and the same Beaker-like pottery as from Stanydale. A nearby field system may be associated with the structure.

At Monknewtown in the Boyne valley in Ireland an earthen enclosure was excavated and found to contain an occupation spread centred on a house site.
(Sweetman, D.P. 1971, 1976). The occupation spread was marked by the dark charcoal impregnated earth with two hearths in the upper levels. There was no stratification in this and Beaker sherds from the same vessel were distributed throughout the layer. The house site was marked by a shallow artificial scoop in the gravel with thirteen postholes and a more or less circular hearth with seven small vertically set slabs or kerb stones on the south east.

The Beaker structures at Knockadoon by Lough Gur in Co. Limerick are by far the best known in Ireland (O'Riordain, S.P. 1954), but current opinion in Ireland is that O'Riordain's stratigraphy is inaccurate and that Beaker very probably penetrated all layers at Knockadoon (NOTE 5). On site C at Lough Gur there was continuous occupation over a large period of time, with Beaker and Lough Gur Class I pottery found in association. A series of pits and trenches probably represented round huts, the pits were between 10 inches (25.4cm) and 2ft. (61cm.) deep, and they were prolific in finds. They also occurred within a posthole spread which was identified as houses by the excavator. The walls were formed by a double row of stake holes with the intervening space filled with turves or
rushes etc. The southernmost house also had some stone wall-footings. Both houses had internal hearths. Another round house was found at site C in the 1949 season of excavations and produced similar evidence as mentioned above, though in this case the house was of individual posthole construction and probably only had a single wall rather than the double one of the other houses.

On site D, Beaker seems to have been associated with houses II and III which also appear to have been contemporary. House II is an oval structure of individual posthole construction and strongly resembles the stone structures at Northton. This again had an internal hearth. Beaker was also found in the upper levels in the rectangular house at site F. This house measured 27ft. by 21ft. (8.31m by 6.46m) and the east side was defined by a rock face. The stone wall of the building was not, on the whole, faced and probably only acted as footings for a wall of turf and probably never stood much higher than the surviving height. There were two hearths inside the house and one below the wall. It was suggested by O'Riordain that it was this hearth below the wall that was of Neolithic date and responsible for the Beaker sherds, and that those found in the upper levels of the house were, in fact, residual.
All the houses so far mentioned have been fairly small structures, large enough to accommodate a small group only but it is possible that larger structures may have existed and it is with this in mind that we must return to Chippenham Barrow 5 mentioned already above. Beneath this round barrow was found a double ring of stake holes of c. 4 inches (c. 10.2cm) in diameter, and 3 inches (7.6cm) deep. About eight feet within this (c. 2.46m) was another ring of larger posts, this time 9 inches (22.9cm) in diameter and 6 inches (15.2cm) deep. As was noted by the excavator, these postholes may have originally been deeper as subsequent ploughing had destroyed much of the upper part of this layer. Mr. Leaf (Leaf, C.S. 1940) drew parallels from Holland for these stake circles. It is possible to see these stakeholes, however, as representing a hut of considerable dimensions. This was at first recognized by the writer (Gibson, A.M. forthcoming in P.C.A.S.) by the large postholes to the north-east, numbered as hearths I and VII in Mr. Leaf's plan. Dimensions of the postholes are not given in the report, but they could be about 1m. across judging from the published plan, and this suggests large entrance posts in the outer stake hole circle. The inner circle of larger
posts is also quite irregular and seems to show evidence of replacement of some of the posts as there appear to be some double postholes. The writer, therefore, sees the Chippenham circles as a hut circle about 40ft. in diameter (c.12m). The outer wall was of paired stakes which perhaps supported a wattle and daub wall or a turf interior, with the inner posthole circle representing the roof supports. The fact that the size of the hut is un paralleled in this period does not make its likelihood any less possible as large houses of the Neolithic are only just beginning to come to light such as that at Balbridie (Selkirk, 1980). Large huts of similar diameter are also known in the Iron Age, and it is unlikely that the carpentry techniques used would have differed much.

**SUMMARY**

The above survey of the evidence for Beaker domestic activity in the British Isles really serves to show that Beaker domestic sites are unclassifiable. Neolithic sites and ritual monuments attracted Beaker users and domestic matrices of this type are commonly found. The division between domestic and ritual, however, is a tenuous one and is one that probably can never be completely resolved.
Spreads of sherds occur in a variety of places including in association with pits and hearths, and under barrows, and the most concrete evidence for domestic activity must be the midden evidence in northwest Scotland. 'Domestic', however, has been taken to mean all sites that are not unequivocally ritual or sepulchral and so pre-barrow spreads are not seen as necessarily the result of some pre-construction ritual feast and other such frequently used explanations. A pattern that seems to emerge, however, is that the users of Beaker seemed to settle in any area that was probably already open; causewayed camps, henges, long barrows and so on. At henges, they seem to arrive at varying stages in the development of each individual monument, and no house types or distinctive monuments are exclusively associated with Beaker. This argues strongly against any movement from the continent in any way but by trade or fashion. Another observation is that barrows seem to be raised at varying distances from settlements. This can be either quite far away where only a couple of sherds are represented suggesting the result of field manuring, closer to the settlement when pits and hearths are found, and directly over a settlement, perhaps when it was abandoned and when settlement drift might
have been practiced, or else it may represent the burial of the person's house and belongings in the same mound. Such seems to be the rite at Chippenham 5. The evidence presented above is also found in non-Beaker contexts, for example hearths associated with non-Beaker late Neolithic pottery, or with later forms of Early Bronze Age pottery again showing that the Beakers fit into the existing pattern rather than bringing their own ideas with them, or at least ideas that show themselves in the archaeological record.

***************

FOOTNOTES

(1) The term 'quarry ditches' is used here for convenience only. The writer is aware that the function of those ditches may be more than simple quarry ditches but such discussion is outside the scope of this thesis.

(2) I am most grateful to Martin Howe of Peterborough museum for his most generous help while looking at the Wyman-Abbott material in that museum, and to Francis Pryor for his advice and help.
(3) I am grateful to Prof. M.J. O'Kelly and to his research student Miss Rose Cleary for their help and kindness when examining the Newgrange material.

(4) This information was obtained by an unpublished typescript by S.E. West 'The Archaeology of the Butley Region' and housed in Ipswich museum.

(5) I am grateful to Dr. Raftery of the National Museum of Ireland and to Prof. O'Kelly for this information.
VOLUME 1: PART II

THE EVIDENCE.
BEAKER DOMESTIC POTTERY IN NORTH BRITAIN
The chief characteristic common to most Beaker domestic sites in the North is their general unhelpfulness towards understanding the Beaker problem. A domestic site is usually little more than a collection of sherds found in a pit, or a midden, or simply stray finds, and in those collections the Beaker element may be either large or small, represented by hundreds of sherds or by only one amongst other pottery types. A midden is obviously useful for palaeoecological study, or artefactual study, but well excavated examples of this type of site are rare and often they are situated in coastal sand dune areas where stratigraphy has been destroyed by wind erosion - the Fin Dune site at Glenluce being an example (McInnes, I.J. 1964). Despite large middens such as Rosinish which seem to show extensive occupation over a considerable period of time, Beaker houses still do remain elusive. The corpus of Beaker houses brought together by Derek Simpson (1971) is still very much up to date and any additions to the corpus would be few. Settlement archaeology of this period, however, is still fairly new in Britain where the emphasis has tended to lie on barrow excavation and this bias
must obviously have coloured our picture.

In fact, Beaker domestic sites are not nearly as rare as is generally thought. Recent and intensive field work in the Outer Hebrides, for example, has produced a number of new, and what will probably prove to be large, midden sites and already creates a bias on any distribution map. Similarly in Northamptonshire extensive field work in the parish of Brixworth has located a number of Beaker domestic sites recognised from the flint work (Martin, P. and Hall, D. 1980). These domestic sites also seem to 'pop up' when not expected - or at least not looked for specifically - for example on the Iron Age settlement at St. Germain's (Watkins, T. 1978) on George Jobey's site at Kennel Hall Knowe where pits containing Beaker sherds were found under a rectilinear settlement of the Iron Age/Romano British period (Jobey, G. 1977) and in Ireland a pit containing a single Beaker sherd was found beneath the entrance of an Iron Age ring fort at Ardcooan in Co. Mayo (Rynne, E. 1956).

Several large question marks hang over these sites, however, not the least being when is a site domestic? 'Ritual' is a word that most archaeologists like to think that they avoid but is still one of the most frequently used explanations and
this is made particularly annoying by the fact that concrete evidence for ritual rarely survives in the archaeological record and a pit may be ritual, domestic or even both. A storage pit, for example, when used for the last time may have been the subject of a ritual and pottery found in it may be influenced by that ritual. On the other hand, it may be used simply as a domestic rubbish pit. It may seem that the writer is trying to make his own difficulties here but this not the case as all pits have been included as domestic - in fact a guiding maxim of 'domestic pottery equals any pot not found directly associated with a burial' has been largely adopted with minor modifications - and this is only mentioned as a word of caution.

The flow diagram (fig.54) is intended to show what could and might have happened to a Beaker during its period of use as a result of both accident and intention. From the whole Beaker repertoire vessels may have been made specifically for domestic or non domestic use. It may also be that some fine ware vessels used on a domestic site were later chosen for a non-domestic use namely burial or ritual and these are usually fine ware vessels. The domestic vessels are found on domestic sites in the main and these are characterised by hearths, middens, pits or
house/cave site, or by a combination of all four, however, also present on these sites, especially middens, may be the sherds of fine ware vessels intended for ritual purposes but broken before use. Stray finds can be both fine and coarse ware vessels derived from all sources (footnote 2). There is an added problem, however, in that the supposed ritual sites may be entirely domestic and, of course, vice versa.

Once the questions of locations and definitions have been surmounted - or at least brushed aside, - another problem that forces a halt is morphology. There are basically four types of site, a hearth site, a House/cave site, pit sites, and midden, but as the lower part of fig. 1 shows they can all occur individually or in a combination, Northton, for example, having all present on the one site (Simpson, D.D.A. 1976) though admittedly the pit and the hearth are inside the house. There are also scatters of sherds found without any trace of midden material, especially in Southern Britain, which are usually completely amorphous. These have been considered to be the remains of refuse scattered on fields as part of a manuring, or simple cleaning out, process, and so they have been included under the midden heading.
This article, however, is more concerned with the pottery from domestic sites rather than the sites themselves and so no attempts at site descriptions have been made with the exception of a short summary in the catalogue. A rough guide to the amount of pottery from each site is shown on the location map (fig. 6.) The reference to 'estimated numbers' for sites in the Hebrides refers to the midden sites found but not as yet excavated. A handful or so sherds may actually have been recovered but it is obvious that a great many more will lie in the undisturbed areas. The open circles referred to as 'presumed sites' are sites where Beaker may have been found but where the report it dubious, and where the find is usually an old one.

In the following survey the sites will be divided up into four categories, sand dune sites, ritual sites, pit sites and cave/structures and middens. The Hebridean middens will be included under the last title. As has been said above any attempt at morphology will of necessity be unsatisfactory but it is hoped that this one will perhaps raise fewer problems than might other possible divisions.
ARCHERFIELD

This is the first of the sand dune sites to be looked at, and it comprised, on discovery, of three shell middens from which Grooved ware and Beakers were recovered (for refs. see the catalogue). The majority of the Beaker pottery would appear to have come from the second midden while Grooved ware predominated in the first and there seemed to be an equal mixture of the two in the third. Cord and comb impressed Beakers are both present and though exact numbers are difficult to estimate possibly 20-30 vessels are represented. Of the coarse ware, or Grooved ware vessels, there are perhaps the remains of ten - fourteen individuals, and one sherd would appear to represent a food vessel as it has an internally bevelled rim decorated with two whipped cord maggots (fig. ARC. 4:40). The fabric of all the Beaker sherds is really quite fine though the thickness varies slightly from sherd to sherd (compare fig. ARC 1:3 and fig. ARC. 1:38) but even the thicker sherds are quite in keeping with the fabric range of Beakers in Northern Britain. All the combed sherds seem to be from zone decorated vessels and none can be assigned to AO combed Beakers. It is possible that some body sherds such as fig. ARC. 1:25,26,38 may be from AO
combed Beakers with contracted decoration, but there is no evidence to suggest that this is especially likely when the evidence for zoning is so strong. The combed Beakers seem to have three distinct neck forms. The first is a slightly flaring neck (figs. ARC:1:1 and 2, ARC 3:11) bearing in mind the uncertainty of reconstructing neck angles from such small sherds, the second would seem to be straight upright cylindrical necks (fig. ARC 1:13, ARC 2:9) and finally a slightly bulbous neck turning inwards slightly towards the mouth and almost ovoid in shape (fig. ARC 1:5, 20, ARC 2:4). The zones of decoration would seem to have contracted fully so that two broad zones are present per vessel (fig. ARC 1:13, ARC 2:4, ARC 3:11) though it is only possible to say this for certain in the cases of the reconstructable vessels and fig. ARC 2:8 may show that this total contraction is not invariably the case. The individual motifs are mostly to be found in Clarke's motif group 1 (Clarke D.L. 1970) with filled chevrons from group 4 and one example of Clarke's group 3 No. 27 concertina motif. They seem to represent step 5 or 6 of Lanting and van der Waal's scheme (1972), the ovoid neck being extremely common in step 6. Very interesting is the complete breakdown in decoration of ARC 2:4.
where the filled triangles overlap needlessly and dramatically. The horizontal comb lines also appear to be rather half-hearted.

Of the AOC Beakers only five rims are present, three of which have three or four internal cord lines (ARC 3:12, 13, 15, ARC 4:1). All have narrow but nevertheless distinct, undecorated zones beneath the rim but this feature is much less certain on ARC 3:16. Sherds ARC 4:3 and 8 would suggest that the bellies of the vessels were rather bulbous as opposed to the angular European Bell Beaker shape of many AOC Beakers but again there is no contradiction in the sharp angle of ARC 3:10. Sherd Nos. ARC 4:9, 12 and 19 all suggest that the AOC Beakers had contracted decoration rather than All Over decoration sensu stricto. The base sherd ARC 3:8 has paired cord lines in a way similar to some Dutch Beakers but it is uncertain whether this is paired or plaited cord. Vessels ARC 3:6, 7 and 17 with internal cord decoration are interesting. The fabric is hard, fine and well-fired and the outer surfaces appear to be completely undecorated. Their straight sided profiles bring to mind some vessels from Newgrange in Co. Meath (footnote 1) where, as at Archerfield, the fabric colour varies from red to black, and grey is common. The shape is completely
alien to Beaker forms and is more in keeping with
the Grooved ware tradition and the vessels are per-
haps to be regarded as closer to the Grooved Ware
element from Archerfield than to the Beaker element.

The Grooved Ware element is really quite small
by comparison and represent about 11 vessels, exclud-
ing the three last discussed. Three of these sherds
are simple rounded rims (ARC 4:29-31) and four are
base sherds. The fabric is at once discernible from
the Beaker sherds by its darker colour and generally
coarser texture. ARC 4:39 is a typical Grooved Ware
rim. Unfortunately the section has been reversed
and the cordons should be internal. Another rim
sherd with horizontal mouldings is illustrated in
the original report. The rim diameter of ARC 4:29
is not at all certain due to the small size of the
sherd, but the base sherds ARC 4:32 and 34 seem to
show that the Grooved Ware vessels were quite large.
The restorable Beakers ARC 2:4 and ARC 3:11 are much
larger than the majority of the other vessels as
represented by the other Beaker rim sherds but it
should be remembered that when dealing with hand
built pottery a pot may in effect have several dif-
ferent diameters at the rim and rim diameter charts
only give us a rough estimate. One sherd (ARC 4:38)
has an (?) accidental) fingernail impression.
What is unusual about this assemblage is the total lack – with the exception of the sherd just mentioned – of fingernail and tip decoration, or indeed, any sort of rustication whatsoever. This form of domestic ware is generally rarer in Scotland and Northern England than in Southern Britain or the Netherlands but its total absence is quite unusual on a site of this period. There is also a great deal of unity in the size ranges of the vessels which would not be out of place if found in a grave and there is not the size range that one would normally expect to find on domestic sites. Even the Grooved Ware sherds are not as large as some vessels from domestic sites elsewhere.

**HEDDERWICK**

Like Archerfield, Hedderwick is situated on the Lothian coast and also has a Grooved Ware element but the assemblage would appear to be earlier as there is not such a pronounced contracted zone element as there is at Archerfield. There is also some Peterborough pottery present here, and the fingernail rusticated ware is more obvious at Hedderwick.

Of the comb decorated sherds only five appear to be from zoned vessels and one (HED 2:29) would suggest that the zones were not fully contracted and perhaps step 3/4 Beakers are represented. None of
the sherds are really informative as to form though HED 2:29 would appear to be a body sherd from a bulbous bellied vessel and HED 2:31 would appear to be the lower part of a rather sinuous neck. This suggestion, however, is rather tentative. The other combed sherds would appear to be from AO combed vessels, especially HED 3:4 and 42. No evidence for the contraction of the decoration is noticeable and none of the rim sherds really has any positive evidence to suggest that there are any undecorated bands below the rims, with the exception of HED 2:30 which has a cordoned rim and interestingly combines comb decoration outside and below the cord with cord decoration on the inside of the lip. The external comb decoration would also appear to have been executed with a short curved comb. It may be possible that HED 2:32 may also have had an undecorated zone beneath the rim as it has three internal combed lines characteristic of AO Combed Beakers. The rim of this vessel is also interesting as it is everted and almost rolled. This might suggest that the pot had an ovoid body.

Much of what has been said about the AO Combed sherds is also true of the AOC pottery. There is no evidence for the contraction of the decoration into zones and the evidence would suggest that some
vessels have no undecorated zone beneath the rim (BED 1:11) while others may have a slight one (BED 1:33). Few of the body sherds can be said to be diagnostic. BED 1:28 suggests a smooth profiled neck as one would expect on European Bell Beakers and the rim profiles of BED 1:32 and 33 are also in keeping with this idea. The estimated rim diameters of both the combed and corded Beakers would suggest small vessels of a size and degree of fineness to be at home also in sepulchral contexts.

If we assume that the corded and combed vessels were fine wares, it is interesting to note that the fingernail decorated sherds appear to come from slightly large vessels. This is well illustrated by the rim sherd (BED 3:40) and also to a certain extent by fabric thinness (BED 2:34, 35). The fingernail decoration is mostly in the 'crow's foot' motif of paired fingernail impressions though individual impressions are also present and often in the paired decoration the impressions are too far apart to call the motif 'crow's foot' sensu strictu.

In addition to this type of secondary ware there is also an element of undecorated ware. BED 2:42, for example, may have been undecorated though the sherd is badly abraded and BED 4:3 almost certainly was undecorated though in this drawing the
angle may be slightly too pronounced. **HED 3:15** could either be from an undecorated pot or else from an AO or AO Combed Beaker with an undecorated zone beneath the rim, and **HED 2:53** is from an undecorated vessel with a cordoned rim. The size would seem to suggest that these vessels resembled the fine wares but were possibly of secondary importance.

From the pottery seen by the writer at the National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland the non-Beaker element on the site would appear to be quite small and represented by both Grooved Ware and Peterborough types. The Grooved Ware is represented by only two vessels (**HED 4:1** and 2) and would appear to be from small bowls, **HED 4:1** having a rather globular appearance and **HED 4:2** being slightly more straight sided. The fabric of these vessels is coarser than that of the Beakers, as one would expect. The Peterborough element is larger than the Grooved Ware one and is typical of the impressed pottery of this tradition. Stabbed decoration presents itself as short thin impressions (**HED 1:5** and 7) and as small circles (**HED 1:3**). Twisted cord decoration on rim bevels is present in two cases; the first (**HED 1:8**) comprises five (?) encircling cord lines on a flat internal rim bevel, and the
second (HED 1:10) has five twisted cord lines in a semi-circle motif on top of a rounded rim similar to vessels from Ford in Northumberland (Gibson, A.M., 1978, fig. II.1). HED 1:6 would appear to be from a cup, or at any rate a small bowl with an inturned rim and flat internal bevel. The fabric of this sherd is very coarse with large pieces of filler breaking the surface. Sherd numbers HED 1:2 and 9 are both decorated with whipped cord decoration. The impressions on HED 1:2 are coarse and widely spaced and there is little evidence of internal fibre impressions so it is possible that gut or sinew was used and not cord. Similarly, cord was doubtless not used for the very fine impressions of HED 1:9 and a fine wool or hemp thread is much more likely.

The whole assemblage is quite typical of a domestic site of this type with fine and coarse areas both present and with a fair admixture of both Beaker and other pottery types. The assemblage is also datable to step 3/4 of Lanting and van der Waal's scheme which would make the fingernail pottery quite early in the sequence as this is generally regarded as being a later phenomenon.

TUSCULUM, NORTH BERWICK

The third of these sand dune sites on the
Lothian coast is Tusculum where two middens were found close together stratified below and protected by a medieval floor. The pottery occurred in a matrix which contained a great deal of charcoal, though only one hearth was found, and food bones and antlers. The pottery from both middens is very similar indeed and has been treated here as the same assemblage. The only point of note is that the combed sherds came exclusively from Midden I.

The cord decorated sherds are all from AOC Beakers both with and without cord decorated bands below the rim. There are very few base sherds. The fabric of the AOC Beakers is invariably fine, the rims simple and rounded or else slightly flattened — with only a few exceptions — and cordon beneath the rims are present but not common (four or five). Sherd Nos. TNB 2:21, 22, 28 and 33 suggest that the AOC decoration has contracted so that there has been an undecorated band round the belly of the vessel in keeping with the undecorated band round the rim, though the two are by no means exclusively associated. None of the sherds would suggest that the vessels were any more than small fine ware vessels.

The comb decorated sherds are from both zoned and all over combed vessels. The AO combed Beakers
would all appear to have an undecorated band below the rim and there is one example of a sherd having both internal and external combed lines. There are no other formal features. The comb zoned sherds are decorated exclusively by cross hatching or herringbone motifs both found in Clarke's European motif group. Though little evidence survives to indicate the form of these vessels they would not appear to be later than step 3 or 4.

There are also some fingernail and other impressed sherds. TNB 1:22 has herringbone motif fingernail impressions just below the rim and would also appear to have had a cordon. TNB 3:16 has incised decoration, and TNB 3:17 would appear to have been undecorated save for a row of small fingernail impressions immediately inside the rim. Of the undecorated sherds only one is almost certainly undecorated (TNB 1:37) and appears to be from a small cup or bowl. The others could be from AOC/combed sherds with undecorated zones beneath the rim. If they are undecorated then they still resemble the small fine AOC sherds and must be regarded as Clarke's 'secondary ware'. The only sherd that is possibly not from a Beaker is TNB 3:19 a rim sherd with lattice incision and diagonal cuts on an internal bevel. The type of vessel represented, however, is unknown.
ROSS LINKS

Most of the Ross Links sherds have been illustrated by J. Tait (1965) and so only a small number of sherds have been drawn by the writer (fig. ROS 1) but the similarity of the sherds to the sites already described is at once obvious. The twisted cord decorated sherds illustrated by Tait are virtually all rim or base sherds which would in no way be out of place at Hedderwick, Archerfield or Tusculum. The fine fabric and small size shows that they are to be regarded as fine ware and appear quite early in the Lanting and van der Waals step scheme. The majority have an undecorated zone below the rim and encircling cord lines are also present as internal decoration. Tait's Nos. 3, 4 and 6, however, have no undecorated band and so a date of step 2/3 is suggested. Not enough of the comb decorated vessels survive to allow us to pontificate. Chevrons appear to be the most common motif though some of these are, more strictly speaking, herringbone formed by short lengths of comb which give almost oval impressions similar to maggots. Tait's No. 21 suggests that the zones may have contracted while No. 22 seems to point at an AO combed Beaker and that the chevron at the bottom has been added almost as an afterthought. There are condoned rims
present, one has a high cordon giving an almost collared effect to the rim and occurs on an AC sherd. Another sherd has a cordon more in keeping with those already seen at the other sand dune sites but in this case the decoration is unusual. There is a band of \( \text{cm} \) below the rim before the horizontal comb lines begin but that space is not undecorated as might be expected, but instead is filled with faintly impressed whipped maggots arranged in a close herringbone. The same technique is crossed on the interior. This must be seen as a borrowing from native pottery decoration as it is too early to be derived from Dutch 'Barbed wire' Beakers and in addition, whipped decoration is well established in Britain and Continental parallels do not need to be searched for. Linked to this sherd is a base sherd (Tait No. 16) which has maggot decoration faintly visible at the bottom of the wall. It would appear that the walls of this vessel were quite upright in contrast to the splayed bellies of the other sherds, although too little survives to allow any degree of certainty. The third comes from a vessel decorated with single random fingernail impressions. This vessel is also slightly larger than the others but is still probably correctly reconstructed by Tait as a European Bell Beaker.
In all, Ross Links is another early assemblage, if anything slightly earlier than those already seen, and has close parallels with the Scottish and sand dune sites in the north, and with sites in Yorkshire to the south. It is indeed a convenient and well placed link.

**TENTS MUIR AND BRACKMONT MILL**

The last of the two large sand dune sites on the Eastern coast are in Fife, at Tents Muir and Brackmont Mill. The pottery from both these sites - which lie very close together - has been admirably written up already but unfortunately it has not been possible 'to define the extent of individual sites with any precision' (Longworth et al. 1966, p.92). The most noteworthy aspect of this site is the fantastic range of traditional Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age pottery types, from Grooved Ware and Peterborough through Beaker and Food Vessel, to Collared Urn, Food Vessel Urn and Cordoned Urn pottery. As Longworth et al. point out, a lot of the pottery may be from disturbed burials and the true extent of the domestic activity cannot be known for certain. It is, however, likely that the majority of the sherds do come from domestic contexts.

The Beaker from these two sites would again appear to be early in the Lanting and van der Waals
step scheme the majority coming from AOC, AO combed and early zoned Beakers. The haphazard, careless decoration of TM 2:10 may point to a slightly later element as may the blurred comb/incision of some other sherds (TM 3:25, BM 2:53, 54). Both these criteria, however, are not necessarily indicative of sequence. The small size of the sherds makes positive identification difficult, but there would appear to be some filled chevron decoration present (BM 2:29, TM 1:28, TM 2:25) and the fringed motif of Clarke's North British Beakers can be seen on BM 2:25.

CULBIN SANDS AND FINDHORN

These two sites lie close together on the coast near Elgin. Like the last two mentioned, the extent of the occupation is unknown and cremation burials are mentioned from both sites. Domestic activity, however, may be attested by the finding of hearths and shell mounds at the Culbin Sands, and 'Bronze Age Pottery' is recorded from the dunes at Findhorn.

The Culbin Sands pottery at once differs from the other coastal sand dune sites so far surveyed in that none of the sherds traced by the writer are from AOC or AO combed Beakers, but all are from comb zoned Beakers though some blurred comb/incision
is also present. CUL 1:13 shows definite North British characteristics as defined by Clarke (1970) with the fringe motif both above and below the zone. Vertical herringbone is also present as are multiple running chevrons (note that CUL 1:1 has been mounted incorrectly). CUL 1:9 is certainly combed, but the comb is unusual in that it had widely spaced teeth pushed in at a slight angle to the clay. In fact, the impressions almost seem to have been made individually by a sharp pointed stick or something similar. If this is the case, then the decoration must have been extremely carefully done.

CUL 1:10 and 11 may in fact be Beaker/Food Vessels — an ungainly term which only warrants use due to its descriptiveness — or rather an example of the 'grey area' between two classic forms. If the rim angle has been wrongly reconstructed — and this is always a possibility when dealing with small sherd assemblages — then a Northern Tripartite vessel with a rather slack profile may be envisaged. Similarly No. 11 with vertical (?) fingernail) incision has more of a Food Vessel appearance than of a Beaker. CUL 1:5 has deep, well-defined parallel grooves and is not unlike the fine variety of Grooved Ware though it is equally likely that it may in fact be from the accentuated neck of a Beaker.
FRESWICK SANDS

This is the most netherly of the East coast sand dune sites and the pottery bears a strong resemblance to that from Culbin and Findhorn in the total absence of AOC and AO combed Beaker sherds and the predominance of comb zoned and incised sherds. Urns seem to be represented by sherds such as FS 1:2, a heavy and undecorated base sherd, and also FS 1:29, the bottom of an undecorated collar. The heavy rim FS 1:28 may also represent an urn as might FS 1:6.

Like Culbin, combed multiple running chevrons are a popular motif (FS 1:7) as is combed or incised herringbone (FS 1:11,16,20) and horizontal grooving is also present, combined in one case with diagonal grooving (FS 1:1). This would appear to have come from an open bowl and is probably more at home in the Grooved Ware tradition than in the Beaker.

Pigernail decoration is present, though the numbers are small (FS 1:8, 18) and the undecorated sherds all appear to be from straight sided jars, with the exception of the possible Urn sherds already mentioned, and the shape, decoration, and fabric range all point towards a neat domestic assemblage and the range of pottery one would expect to find on a domestic site.
Dune sites of this type are not as common on the West coast of Scotland (with the exception of Hebridean Midden sites which are described below) though the reason for this need be no more than the varying amounts of field work. Apart from Glenluce, the western sites do not appear to produce the same quantities of pottery as do the east coast middens.

**WALNEY ISLAND**

At this site there is a small amount of Beaker and Grooved Ware pottery but there is little stratification and even the exact provenance of a lot of the pottery is unknown. Most of the sherds were found as a result of surface collection and a great deal of the total collection is coarse bucket-urn pottery which appears typical of the pottery of the second half of the 2nd millennium and later periods in North Britain. Urn or Peterborough Ware is found represented by sherds with cord maggot decoration and the few Beaker sherds that are recognisable have parallel incised lines though the sherds are too small to be able to tell what motif(s) are represented.

**COLL AND TIREE**

These two islands have been headed together because of the general uncertainty as to the find-
spots of the pottery on both the islands. The only pottery seen by the writer was that in the National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland and it has not been possible to examine the material at Kelvingrove or in the hands of Mr. Robertson-Mackay of the D.O.E. Clarke, however, reports that European, Fingernail decorated and AOC sherds are all present and that over two hundred sherds have been recovered in all. The AOC sherd illustrated by Clarke has the cord contracted into zones and the fingernail sherd also illustrated has vertical rows of impressions and a sharp angle below the rim. Zone decorated sherds are among those in the National Museum of Antiquities and both herringbone and (?) running chevron motifs are present (COL 1:2, 13-15). It is possible that COL 1:10 may represent an AO combed Beaker with contracted decoration. The other sherds are probably from Early Bronze Age types and stabs, reed impressions and incision are among the decorative techniques.

SANNA BAY

This site lies on Ardnamurchan point and has also produced a large number of sherds from basically unstratified contexts the majority of which sherds now appear to be in the museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge. The majority of the sherds
have AOC decoration, combed sherds are present but they are not common and it is not possible to say whether they belong to A0 combed or to zoned Beakers. There are also, however, about ten or fifteen shell-impressed sherds. Shell-impressions usually give an effect very similar to comb impressions but with one smooth curved side and the other serrated. Shell impressions are quite common in Scotland, especially the north west, and it is interesting to note these as the first examples to be seen so far in this survey.

SHENALTON SANDS

This site lies near Greenock and has also produced evidence of Beaker domestic activity, but not many sherds of Beaker are known to the writer. Mitchell (1934) reported Beaker from the site and suggested that the sands may in fact prove to be a midden of the same type as Glènluce. Smith (1895) illustrated some sherds from the sands and one sherd would appear to be a sherd of AOC decorated Beaker. Smith also mentions 'hand built pottery' and 'finger imprinted pottery' found at Stevenston Sands and Airdrossan on the Ayrshire coast as well as a great many Neolithic-Bronze Age flints in the area so it may also be that these sites represent other coastal middens.
GLENLUCE

Collection of pottery and flints from the sand dunes of Luce Bay has been going on for a very long time indeed and it may be that the pottery that survives from the site in our museums is in fact a small fraction of the total that has been recovered, and again, it has only been possible for the writer to examine the sherds in the National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland. This is compensated for by the fact that the pottery has been well documented by Lela McInnes (1964). By far the majority of the Beaker sherds are from AOC Beakers, but despite that there is a great deal of variety among the sherds from this class itself. The coarseness of the cord, for example, varies considerably from very coarse (GLE 1:4) to very fine indeed (GLE 3:35) and from densely applied to very widely spaced (GLE 3:27 - 3:32). On some of the rim sherds it is fortuitous that any of the cord impressions have survived at all and so saved us from the error of assigning them to undecorated vessels (e.g. GLE 1:19). This, of course, leads one to wonder whether one has indeed been correct to assign previously seen undecorated rim sherds to completely undecorated vessels and underlines the difficulties of interpretation inherent when dealing with sherd evidence. The size range
of the AOC vessels as suggested by the sherds would also seem to vary quite considerably; GLE 1:5 would appear to be from a large vessel considering the thickness of the fabric and the straightness of the profile, while GLE 1:22 and GLE 2:1 would seem to be from very small vessels. However, the uncertainty of the rim diameters is again stressed. The majority of the AOC rim sherds would appear to have a blank undecorated zone just below the rim and sherds such as GLE 2:2, GLE 4:32 suggest that there might be an element of contraction of the cord decoration. Here again there is variation, however, and the width of the undecorated zone can vary and reach up to 4 4 cms. (GLE 1:19). There would seem to be no factor other than the personal choice of the potter, accountable for the number of cord lines on the interior of the rim, or even for their presence at all. They do and don't appear on vessels with an undecorated zone (GLE 3:17, 1:19) on vessels without an undecorated zone (GLE 1:11, 1:8), on vessels with a cordon (GLE 1:22, 2:7) and on vessels without a cordon (GLE 1:21, 7:46). Cords are quite common on the Glenluce pottery, some sherds even having two, but the cords do not seem to affect the cord decoration at all as the decoration may begin above, below, or well below the cordon,
and as already mentioned there appears to be no connection between the presence of a cordon and the presence of internal cord lines. The cordon may have been functional, or else decorative in its own right.

The profiles of some vessels that are apparently AOC Beakers would suggest that they are in fact from small hemispherical bowls rather than from vessels with Beaker shape (GLE 1:3, 4, 6 and 8, GLE 8: 5, 6 and 8). Again, one obviously runs into the difficulties of correct rim angle reconstruction when dealing with small sherds, but the shape does seem to be a recurring one. It is interesting to note that on at least some of these vessels the cord is either loosely wound round the vessel so that the resulting impressions are widely spaced (GLE 1:4) or else there would appear to be a gap in the decoration after a comparatively small number of cord lines, (GLE 1:3, 6 and 8). The characteristics suggest that (?) round based) hemispherical bowls are present and that they are undecorated save for a 5 cms. of twisted cord decoration at the top. GLE 8:6 and 8 may be undecorated examples, and it is interesting to note that none of these vessels have internal decoration. Isla McInnes puts these vessels into her Class I of the pottery from Glenluce (op.
o i t, 1964) (e.g. her Nos. 70, 71, 72) and points out their association with carinated bowls and western Neolithic pottery at Burnt Dune. This is interesting as it provides a link with existing Neolithic pottery traditions for the use of AOC decoration and a C14 determination for this material from Burnt Dune would possibly prove most interesting. It should also be noted, however, that some Beaker sherds were found among 'the pottery exposed before the excavation' of the site (ibid p. 41) though no Beaker sherds were found in the excavation.

The comb and shell impressed Beaker may be looked at together as shell is virtually a ready-made comb as far as the Glenluce Beaker is concerned. All motifs used are quite simple, either herringbone, interrupted herringbone, or cross hatching, and they appear to occur in broad zones of typical European Bell Beakers to use Clarke's terminology, (esp. GLE 9:1, 3-5, and 18). Small chevron fringes are also present (GLE 9:14 and 19) belonging to Clarke's motif group 2. It is interesting to note the internal cord decoration on the combed decorated sherd GLE 9:1, a mixing of techniques that is really quite rare. There would seem to have been three types of comb used. Firstly one with small rectangular teeth (GLE 9:1, 13, 14 etc.), one with rounded and widely
spaced teeth (GLE 9:2), and lastly one with closely spaced needle-like teeth (GLE 9:6-8). It is only the first type of comb mentioned and the shell edges that are used on Beaker pottery. The round-toothed combs appear to have been used on pottery of a Food Vessel fabric. Shell is also used to decorate the coarse, later Neolithic impressed ware from the site (GLE 9:9).

On the later Neolithic impressed ware the variety of the decoration is quite large. Whipped decoration occurs on five sherds both in maggot (GLE 10:6 and 9) and in more elongated impressions (GLE 10:11-13). The material that was whipped also ranges from very fine (GLE 10:13) to very coarse (GLE 9:9). Other decorative techniques include a triple-triangle stamp (GLE 10:2), small bone impressions (GLE 10:1), round point impressions (GLE 10:3, 16, 18, 28), and incision (GLE 10:5 and 7). Fingernail decoration does not appear to be common but is, nevertheless, represented in a fine fabric.

**RITUAL SITES**

**OLD KEIG**

In his excavations at the recumbant stone circle of Old Keig Childe found a grey occupation layer, possibly representing trampled sub-soil in his opinion, stratified below the main construc-
tion phase. Beaker pottery came from this layer but in small amounts and in very small sherd. It seems to have been associated with straight sided 'cooking pots', plain undecorated coarse ware vessels, well-fired but in coarse fabric, labelled class II ware by Childe.

**LOANHEAD OF DAVIOT**

At this recumbant stone circle two Beaker sherds were found beneath the central ring cairn, one sherd in the central pit, and some sherds were found in the stone holes and beneath the recumbant. This would suggest that Beaker was at the site at the period of the monument's construction and the sherds may well be derived from a nearby settlement site. The 'Early Iron Age' pottery from the site that is mentioned in the report has not been seen by the writer, but it is probable the same as the 'late Bronze Age' pottery from Old Keig and is in fact Neolithic flat rimmed ware (D.D.A. Simpson, pers comm.). Both cord and combed Beaker is represented at the site and a probably minimum of five vessels are present. The sherds are all too small to give any indication of form but of the AOC rim one has an undecorated zone and the other is decorated completely to the lip. Sherd No. KH 1:10 may be from a small bowl as it has diagonal cord impres-
sions on the rim exterior, more typical of small bowls than of Beakers.

**LUNDIN FARM**

The evidence for domestic activity from this site is probably from the mound material and the site consists of four standing stones around a central cairn. The fragments of an AOC Beaker were found in a hollow in the cairn material and their abraded nature would suggest that they were not broken *in situ*. The vessel, however, is virtually complete, or at least a profile survives. Fragments of collared urns were also found and it should also be pointed out that some deposits, albeit small, of cremated bone were also located in the mound material, charcoal, the Urn with carbon encrustations, and the Beaker suggested to the excavator that the cairn was made up from domestic debris, with at least some hearth sweepings.

**BALBIRNIE**

Balbirnie is similar to the last mentioned site in that it is difficult to decide whether to assign this to the ritual or domestic categories when examining the pottery that was recovered. The site consisted of a stone circle with a central cairn and a sherd of Beaker was found on the old ground surface. Sherds of collared urn were found
throughout the mound material, and again it may have been at least partly composed of hearth sweepings or domestic rubbish. Grooved ware was associated with phase one of the site which is interesting as Grooved Ware seems to be increasingly associated with domestic activity. The Beaker sherd is in a buff coloured sandy fabric, is fine and well-fired and is decorated with six horizontal lines of incision or blurred comb impressions, and two groups of similarly made diagonal markings. It would appear that the vessel was similar to the reconstructable Archerfield vessels and had zones that were almost fully contracted. This is a tentative observation, however, based entirely on the distribution of the lines over the sherd, and the narrowness of the oblique zones.

The urns from the site are both collared and cordoned types and twisted cord and incision would appear to be the most commonly used techniques. Two sherds, however, have toothed comb impressions (report, Nos. 13 and 23) made by a type of comb already seen at Glenluce (GLE 9:2 and 7) having sharp, round, and closely spaced teeth as opposed to the generally square or rectangular teeth of most Beaker combs.
PIT SITES

KIRKBURN

At this site in Dumfrieshire a series of pits - both burial and domestic - were found on a small knoll, and western Neolithic, Grooved Ware, Beaker, Food Vessel and Urn pottery were all found at the site. The domestic features seem to be the result of two distinct phases and when western Neolithic and Beaker pottery are found in the same pit, the two can not be regarded as associated (Cormack, n.s., 1964, p.128). Nine pits included Beaker pottery and when treated as a whole the Beaker would seem to represent an early assemblage, though the material is all represented by small sherds, and no Beaker is reconstructable. It would appear, however, that we have another AOC / comb assemblage. Report No. 6a is a rim sherd from an AOC Beaker with the cord having been applied in short lengths. The cord extends right up to the rim and there are two cord lines visible on the interior. No. 6e is a belly sherd of a similar Beaker and has a sharp profile suggesting a European Bell Beaker form, and it also would appear to show that the decoration extends over the whole of the vessel. The case is perhaps the opposite, however, on fig. 7 in the report. Figs. 7a and b are rim sherds from AOC.
Beakers with internal decoration and with a gap - albeit small - beneath the rim. Sherd 7d is also a sharp belly carination of an European Bell Beaker shaped pot but does have an undecorated zone. One small body sherd has combed decoration consisting of three horizontal lines, and two parallel lines that converge with the last three. It is not certain whether this represents a zoned sherd or whether AO comb decoration has been carelessly applied. There is also a small element of fingernail decorated pottery present, sherds of which were associated with both the cord and the comb decorated sherds. There are no sherds of this rusticated ware that suggest the shape of the vessels, and all of them are body sherds. The decoration consists essentially of paired fingernail impressions, neatly done in apparently vertical rows. One sherd (fig. 6d in the report) combines single sloping impressions with an incised line and figs. 6i and 7g are both too small to say for certain whether the impressions are single or paired, or random or motivated. One sherd has deep impressions (fig. 7h), apparently linear in arrangement, made by fingertip rather than nail.

HOUSE SITES, CAVES, AND HEBRIDIAN MIDDENS

Most of the pottery from the Hebridean midden
sites is unpublished because they are comparatively recent finds (see catalogue). The only site to have some of the pottery published in drawing form is Rosinish on Benbecula. The site at Rosinish consists of a 'U'-shaped structure and an extensive midden. The midden has been excavated in a series of random squares with 1m. sides and little is published about the 'U'-shaped structure except its location. In addition, little of the pottery has been illustrated so all in all the amount of information available about the site is limited (footnote 3). The excavator reports that the Beakers represent step five Beakers (Shepherd, I.A.G. 1977) but the published drawings are too few and too undiagnostic to say this for certain. The presence of a cordoned AO combed sherd (report fig. 11:3.1), albeit in a thick fabric and with an uncharacteristic shape, and the presence of shouldered jars (fig. 11:3.2) should be noted. Fingernail decoration is also present both on its own, and also combined with comb decoration. Incised decoration, not unexpectedly appears to be common at the site.

NORTHTON (footnote 4).

This is the first of the house sites to be looked at. Two houses were found in Northton, one being very much ruined, and the other being fairly
complete at ground level ( *fig. 7* ). Both houses were oval in plan and partially dug into the ground, the surviving wall being little more than a revetment. There were two distinct Beaker levels, but the pottery from the two would not appear to differ greatly. Several thousand sherds were recovered and are capable of being the subject matter of a thesis in their own right. The writer has been able to see the vast majority, however, and has drawn a sample with no attempt at reconstruction to show the nature of the evidence. Some of the drawings are reproduced here. A source also used by the writer is an undergraduate dissertation by Richard Langley at the University of Leicester (Langley, R. 1978, footnote 5), who worked on Layer VII, the lower Beaker horizon. As a result, the discussion of the Nortonon pottery is limited to Layer VII. The assemblage is difficult to date stylistically due mainly to the material consisting of small sherds and also due to the same problems encountered by Lanting and van der Waals in their Northern Scottish focal area (Lanting and van der Waals, 1972). From the neck sherds and reconstructable profiles, however, (Simpson, 1976, Langley, 1978) and from the zoned decoration present, the sherds are best seen as step 5 or later. The carbon 14 determina-
tions from the site are also in support of this.

The most common decorative technique from both levels is by far incision. Some of this may, indeed, be blurred comb but any change in numbers on account of this would doubtless be insignificant. Undecorated sherds come next in the sequence followed a long way behind by comb, shell, stamped, fingernail and lastly corded sherds. Fingernail pottery is completely absent from the upper Beaker level (for exact figures see Langley R. 1978).

The incised decoration varies considerably in both execution and composition. The composition of the decoration is nearly always in zones or horizontal lines (NOR 1: 1-3, 19 etc., NOR 5: 1-9 etc.) but, as with combed sherds, the small sherds with apparently horizontal comb lines could be from zoned vessels. Sherds such as NOR 5:9, however, would seem to suggest that there may be an element of AO incision. There are also vertical incised lines which might show that metoped decoration is quite common at the site (NOR 5: 25-27), and the decoration is all comprised of herringbone, diagonal lines and cross hatched decoration within a vertical and horizontal incised framework. The execution of the decoration also varies considerably, often the lines are finely incised and close together (NOR 5 25-27)
and a thin sharp point would have apparently been used, but the width of the incisions is very variable and broad, widely spaced decoration is also found (NOR 5:9, 6:12, 5:61 etc). The coarseness of the decoration does, however, seem to be often linked with the thickness of the pot (see below). Though these incised lines may look different, it is not necessarily the case that we have to envisage the potter having a wide range of sharp points at his disposal. The bone combs from Northton have a scapula shape with teeth at the broad end and a point at the sharp end. Few if any, of the combed sherds from Northton would appear to have been made by these combs, even allowing for the shrinkage of the pot after drying and firing, but it is possible that the combs could be dragged along the vessel walls and so produce a series for roughly parallel, but not equally wide or equally spaced, incisions. The sharp end of the comb is also capable of producing incisions of different width (fig. 8, 27). For example, if one holds the comb with the teeth in a vertical lines and scores the pot with the pointed end, the groove will be broad. If however, one scores the vessel with the teeth held in a horizontal position then the incisions will be narrow. Obviously a variety of impressions can be made by rota-
ting the vessel through 90°.

Comb and incision are often combined on the same sherd (NOR 5:63, 6:12 etc.) and the motifs used, despite the comparative paucity are quite varied. Herringbone, filled chevrons, short vertical or slanting impressions, and horizontal lines are all present. A few vessels would appear to have been decorated entirely with comb. The impressions made with the Northton combs, if pressed directly into the clay, are thin and crescentic and deeper in the centre than at the ends. The shape, however, is a very utilitarian one and gives best and even results if 'rocked' over the surface of the pots. It is also very easy to overlap the comb and so form a continuous line. The curved toothed edge is also very useful for producing the short impressions as if comb half the length of the original had been used and such as are common on many of the sherds. The Northton combs are, indeed, most useful decorative utensils. Shell impressions are next in frequency after comb but they should perhaps best be considered with the comb and the shell should probably be regarded as only a ready made comb. According to Langley, (op. cit.) cockles (Cardium Edule) and limpets (Patella Vulgata) were both used at Northton, despite its comparative scarcity at that place at that
time, and so it must have been preferred for its more pleasing impressions which resemble comb closer than does the limpet. The motifs used correspond to those in comb and incision.

The size and thickness of the vessels varies very considerably indeed. NOR 1:36, for example, is very thin and typical of Beaker fine ware in the area, while NOR 6:12 is at the other extreme though this sherd still does not represent the maximum thickness that these vessels can achieve.

Bases in the upper Beaker level reach 11cm. in diameter, the majority being between 7 and 9 cms. and the rims in the same level vary from 10cm. to 22cm. with one outsider at 29.5cm. The majority of rims lie between 12 and 16cms. (Langley op.cit. table 10). The coarseness of some of the pottery, and the large size of some of the vessels, suggests that we are not looking at true Beakers. The element of Beaker is, certainly, a large one, but it is suggested that the Beaker element is not 100% of the whole. Fig. NOR 6:12, for example, is one of a large number of sherds with a thick fabric and coarse decoration which may have a rough Beaker profile if reconstructed, but the fabric is uncharacteristic even for potbearers. It is obviously to be expected that Beakers will vary considerably in
size, fineness and 'quality' as they are spread over such a large geographical area and certainly many potters must have been at work, but on the whole this is not really evident in Britain, and with regard to dimensions, decoration and fabric the most outstanding characteristic of the Beaker class of pottery is its general homogeneity. Some of the pots from Northton seem to have very slack profiles, with often little distinction between neck and belly, and some sherds may even suggest a bucket-shaped or cylindrical vessel. Some necks also have unusual shapes, some of which are featured in Langley's plate 7. We have short everted necks decorated externally and internally which bear more resemblance to pottery from Rosinish and Kilellan Farm than to true Beaker (see below). Broad _external_ rim bevells are also present and some rims have not so much as a cordon on the outside, but more of a flange as on some Roman flanged bowls. There are also examples of some strange conical vessels which appear to be unknown/unrecognised on other Beaker sites.

**RUDH' AN DUNAIN**

Beaker sherds were found in the lowest occupation layer at this small cave on the Isle of Skye (fig 9) and seems to be associated with some coarse combed Food Vessel pottery. The two
Beaker rim sherds (ROS 1:9 and 10) appear to be from very similar vessels, the decoration being combed and consisting of herringbone interrupted by four horizontal lines. The extent of the decoration suggests that the zones have fully contracted. ROS 1:15 shows a clear undecorated zone and may suggest that the process of contraction is not yet complete; ROS 1:19 may be from an undecorated vessel as the fabric is typically Beaker and there is no evidence for combing or cording on any of the sherds. ROS 1:18 is in Beaker fabric and decorated with (?)reed impressions, probably used, in this case, as a form of rustication. The other two combed sherds (ROS 1:8 and 16) are both in a coarse fabric and the comb(s) used have had large square teeth. This will be discussed below. The other sherds illustrated here would appear to have come from the Beaker level but are not Beaker in character. The incision of ROS 1:11, the circular point or comb of ROS 1:17, and the heavy rim of ROS 1:12 would be more in keeping with Pood Vessel or similar types. ROS 1:14 is interesting as it has a slight 'groove' just before the change of direction suggesting a neck and a belly profile similar to pottery from the Shetland houses (see below).
KILELLAN FARM

The earliest structure at Kilellan appears to have been a covered drain. Over this, and after it had been filled up, a circular area defined by upright and horizontal stones and an area of paving became the focal area. Over this were other small enclosures. The excavator thought that these areas were too small to represent a living area or hut but suggested a specialised use such as shellfish preparation, especially in view of the vast number of shellfish shells.

The pottery from the site is incredibly varied, and intricately decorated. A representative amount has already been illustrated and described (Burgess, C.B. 1976). The Beaker element amongst the Kilellan Farm pottery is small and would comprise in the main AOC vessels (Burgess, op.cit. fig. 10:8,12-14). The application of the cord is rather haphazard on No. 12 with a diagonal line breaking the horizontal ones, but it is more careful on Nos. 13 and 14. Burgess also suggests that his No. 10:8,16 may also be a Beaker but he is uncertain of the identification. Certainly, the incised interrupted herringbone finds parallels in Beaker pottery but the decoration only begins at the belly of the pot, which is unusual for even domestic Beaker. A large element of the Kille-
Ian Farm pottery comes from a hitherto largely unrecognised class in Scotland, the shouldered jars. Both decorated and undecorated examples are found and the sizes vary considerably. Burgess suggests that these vessels may have had rounded bases, perhaps more for a utilitarian reason — that is use on a sand dune site — than 'Neolithic' affinity or ancestry.

Incision and shell impressions are the most common decorative techniques, shell seeming in many cases just to be a convenient form of naturally made comb (KIL 2:12-15), and shell and incision are frequently combined (KIL 2:3-9). Multiple incisions of a type found and seen at Northton are not present at Killellan Farm. Twisted cord is found on the Beaker sherds as already mentioned, and is also present on some of the shouldered jars (KIL 2:17 and 20), and internal decoration is especially common. An Irish/Scottish tripartite vessel (Burgess fig. 10:9,20) is interestingly decorated with a large square comb of the type noted above at Rúdh an Dunain.

**SHETLAND STONE HOUSES**

The Shetland stone houses have produced a great deal of pottery often of a type peculiar to themselves and which is often difficult to categorise or date. The quantity of the pottery housed in the
National museum of Antiquities of Scotland proved too great to allow the writer detailed study but it is a subject to which he would hope to be able to return.

The most detailed pottery from these house sites is that by Dr. Henshall (in Calder, C.S.T., 1956) on the pottery from house I at Ness of Gruting. Dr. Henshall writes 'it is difficult to assess the degree of influence from Beaker pottery at Gruting' (p.383, op.cit) and this is a comment with which the writer would whole-heartedly agree. Sherds such as HD 951,938,1419 would appear to have Beaker influenced or derived 'S' shaped profiles, and sherds DD 1351,1352,919, are also interesting as they have a slight groove between the neck and the body emphasising the change in direction which has already been noted at Rudh and Dunain. Some of the fabrics are certainly fine enough to be Beaker and some everted and cordoned rims would also agree with this (HD 1367,1368 and HD 1370,1371). Chevrons and herringbone are the most common motifs employed and there are none of the horizontal incised lines common, for example, at Northton, with only one or two exceptions. Incision is still the most common decorative technique, however, and in this aspect resembles Northton to a large extent.
The combed decoration present is all executed by a large square-toothed comb of a type used on the Food Vessel sherds at Kilellan Farm and Rudh' and Dunain.

Some sherds of Beaker were also found in the western posthole of the Stanydale 'Temple' and appear to have been from an AOC vessel and also to have been associated with coarse pottery. Miss Henshall also mentions coarse Beaker pottery from the Stanydale house and shell impressions are also mentioned by Dr. Henshall among this pottery though none appear to be illustrated.

**INITIAL OBSERVATIONS**

Not all the sites surveyed in the catalogue have been surveyed above, but the reasons for this are straightforward. Dalldies and Lochill, for example, have produced a very small amount of relevant pottery and from which no conclusions could reasonably be drawn. Similarly some of the newly discovered Hebridean midden sites have had no pottery published and are very recent finds, and thirdly sites such as Skara Brae and Rinyo have produced a great deal of Grooved Ware pottery but very little Beaker (footnote 6) and to discuss the pottery fully would present a very biased view and unbalanced picture. The catalogue entry does, how-
ever, acknowledge them as possible Beaker domestic sites.

What is at once apparent is the gradual deterioration in the pottery from south to north. The Beaker, especially the AOC, AO comb, and comb zoned pottery from the sanddune sites to the south of the area are all exceptionally fine, appear to have 'typical' Beaker profiles, that is a varying 'S'-shaped profile, have generally well-executed decoration and a fine fabric. Even the rusticated ware bears more resemblance to fine ware than to coarse, using 'fine' and 'coarse' simply as descriptive terms to illustrate the fabric. Any coarse pottery on these sites would appear to be later Neolithic impressed ware, Grooved Ware, or part of the range of pottery from Food Vessel through to urn wares similar to the funerary types. At sites such as Kilellan Farm, however, Beaker is by far in the minority of the pottery and instead there is a tendency towards typical and atypical Food Vessel, Urn and jar forms ostensibly stylistically post-Beaker in date. Even the Beaker from this Islay site is not certainly Beaker, but simply fine pottery with AOC decoration.

By the time Northton is reached the Beaker is very degenerate, even allowing for differences in
clays, the use of peat for a firing fuel, and other possibilities. There certainly is a great deal of typical Beaker represented at Northton and a lot of the other pottery has definite Beaker affinities but some of the large incised vessels are really quite far removed from accepted Beaker shapes and fabrics, even among potbeakers. We have also seen that some of the neck forms, rims and thick fabrics of some of the Northton vessels bear a certain resemblance to some of the jars from Kilellan Farm and it would be very nice to find a settlement of this period equidistant between Northton and Islay to see whether this similarity is fortuitous or whether it is indeed a western phenomenon. A full publication of the Rosinish pottery is also eagerly awaited so that meaningful comparisons can be made between the two neighbouring settlement sites.

By the time we reach the pottery from the Shetland Stone Houses, there is only a vague resemblance to Beaker forms. Sinuous 'S'-shaped profiles and incised decoration are both present and are similar to some of the Northton pottery. Certainly the motifs and decoration are even more degenerate at Ness of Gruting I, but there are certain similarities nevertheless.

The use of shell would also appear to be simi-
lar to this 'degeneration' of domestic Beaker. Shell is used but is not at all common on the Beaker and associated pottery in the south of this area such as Hedderwick and Glenluce. The use of shell is far more frequent at Kilellan Farm and indeed is the dominant decorative technique and at Northton too the use of shell far outnumbers comb impressed sherds. Such is also the case in the Shetland Houses. Though the use of shell does appear on the Hebridean Neolithic pottery, its occurrence is indeed quite rare and it is, for example absent on the pottery from the pre-Beaker levels at Northton. When it does occur on native Neolithic pottery it is probably still broadly contemporary with Beaker pottery in the area and possibly represents Beaker influence. Certainly the shell impressions are pleasing and can possibly be regarded as simply naturally made combs. It should also be noted that the back of a cockle shell, that is the convex side, can also be used to produce horizontal multiple 'incisions' though again their actual use would be difficult to prove. It is interesting, however, that the use of shell impressions is predominantly western and northern in distribution.

It is possible to see the diffusion of the Beaker pottery into the North of this area from the
South and becoming more and more integrated with local styles the further North and West they expand. The culmination of this diffusion is, of course, Orkney and Shetland where it is difficult to tie down the Beaker characteristics and where it would appear that people were actually making Beaker 'imitations'. If seen on a distribution map, it is obvious that the east coast of Scotland and Northern England yields 'better' and more 'typical' Beaker pottery in greater numbers than the west coast and the centre of Northern Scotland is a virtual lacuna of both domestic and sepulchral Beaker. This of course coincides with virtually every other distribution map in Scottish prehistory and to take an obvious extreme, the Agricolan advances in Scotland coincide beautifully with the Beaker spread. This is not totally a useless comparison, however, as the reasons why the two coincide are obvious. Namely the coastal plain of eastern Scotland and lowland Scotland are agriculturally far better than the isolated coastal patches on the west, and, to the Romans at least, were much more economically viable. To what extent there were connections between the east and west is difficult to judge and really must remain a matter for conjecture. Certainly the location map
and the maps in Clarke's second volume (1970) have no known Beaker find spots in the Grampian massif so we may assume that any contact was presumably limited and was confined to major passes, such as the Great Glen, and to the northern coast and the southern and central lowlands.

Any examination of Beaker diffusion could not, however, stem simply from an examination of the domestic pottery, but should also take the sepulchral Beaker into account, and for this the corpus of Clarke is greatly relied upon. It must be remembered, however, that the finest, and so not necessarily representative, vessels may have been chosen for burial. Clarke Nos. 1008 and 1009 (footnote 7), for example, are from Moray and Angus and show the slack profile of many of the vessels from sites looked at above such as Northton and Ness of Gruting I and the decoration is also rather 'slack' and degenerate. Similarly No. 952 from Lanark has a cylindrical neck of a type again seen at Northton, and also a bulbous body. More important, however, is that this vessel also has the now familiar incised chevrons, cross hatching, and herringbone. Incision and herringbone is also visible on vessel No. 723 from Morary, and a rim type seen at Northton, especially with the profuse decoration is illustra-
ted on a rather squat vessel from Aberdeen (No. 1476). A small squat vessel, very similar to those from Shetland is No. 701 from Argyle. This list is capable of expansion but last for our purposes, are two vessels from Cumberland (Nos. 615 and 618) which are decorated with horizontal incision and herringbone. The profiles of the vessels may differ slightly from those at Northton, but the techniques and motifs are well known.

Further elaboration will appear in the general discussion below.

FOOTNOTES

1) I am most grateful to Prof. O'Kelly for letting me examine the Newgrange sherds in advance of his own publication.

2) Thanks to Roger Martlew, currently post graduate student at Leicester, for improving the logic of the original draft.

3) Although the writer has tried to include unpublished sites (up to 1977) it was unfortunately not possible to evaluate the Rosinish
3) continued....
material as the excavator refused to allow me access to it.

4) Due to the sheer bulk of the pottery involved, the writer has relied mainly on the work of Richard Langley. The writer has, however, personally drawn c.700 sherds and made notes on fabric and decoration. It is possible to give only a short discussion here, however, and point out some general observations in advance of full publication.

5) I am very grateful to Richard Langley for discussing his work with me and for allowing me to make a copy of his dissertation, the original of which is housed in the University Library, University of Leicester.

6) No Beaker is published as yet from Skara Brae, but Dr. D.V. Clarke has informed me that sherds of possible Beaker were recovered from his excavation at the site. Their identification as such, however, is not certain.
7) For ease of reference, the Clarke Nos. given here refer to the illustrations in the second volume of Dr. Clarke’s book, and are not the corpus numbers.
POTTERY FROM BEAKER DOMESTIC SITES IN
SOUTHERN BRITAIN
PRELIMINARY NOTE

Note on the location map of Southern Britain (fig. 10).

The map would at once appear to argue against the often cited claim that there are too few Beaker domestic sites: there are far from few dots on the map. This is not, however, the case as some of the sites are represented only by a single sherd, perhaps below a barrow. In addition, a few stray finds and finds from Long Barrow ditches have been included. This imbalance could, perhaps, have been slightly rectified by varying the size of the dot in relation to the number of sherds found as has been done with the North British map (fig. 6), but sheer weight of numbers, especially in dense areas of settlement such as Wessex or East Anglia, would have made this impracticable.

The writer has decided in favour of calling figs. 6, 10, 14 location maps instead of the more usual distribution maps, as they do little more than show the location of known sites and represent only an unknown fraction of the total amount of domestic sites that must have once existed. The maps are also more reflective of fieldwork and survey than the true extent of Beaker settlements, and the main 'false nuclei' are as follows:
Yorkshire Wolds  largely the work of T.G. Manby.
North Lincolnshire  largely the work of D.N. Riley.
East Anglia  largely the work of Clark,
Wessex  Lethbridge and the Cambridge school generally.
Eastbourne  largely a result of the information gathered by C. Calkin.
Cheddar  intensive study over a long period, especially S. Piggott,
Oxford  largely due to explorations and excavations by the Bristol University Spaeleological Society.

It should also be remembered that the maps only show sites from which pottery has been recovered and the flint scatters and work floors of this period have not been included. A detailed examination of the many flint groups in various museums throughout the country may in fact increase greatly the amount of Beaker domestic sites. For example, a number of domestic sites of this period represented by flint spreads have been recognised in Brix-
worth parish, Northamptonshire, by P. Martin and D. Hall (1980) and their work greatly affects the distribution of such sites in the Midlands and may in fact be representative of a type of settlement drift as suggested by Bradley for Risby Warren and neighbouring sites (see above p. 30).
POTTERY FROM BEAKER DOMESTIC SITES IN SOUTHERN BRITAIN.

The types of site on which Beaker pottery has been found are already surveyed above and need no further repetition here. Excluded from this section are sites that have produced only one or two sherds but they have been included in the main catalogue. The problem with a survey of this kind is that there are so many sites to consider so for convenience they have been looked at according to type of site and not geographically.

CAUSEWAYED CAMPS

The publication of the results of the excavations at some Causewayed Camps such as Hambledon Hill, where excavations are still in progress, and Staines, for which only a short interim has been published, are eagerly awaited. At the latter mentioned site no Beaker is reported in the interim but it was also stated that the pottery was, at that time, unstudied.

At Knap Hill, Alton Pryors, not all of the cuttings produced Beaker pottery and in the areas that did, Beaker was restricted to layer 4 (Connagh, G. 1965). This layer was taken by the excavator to represent weathering from the bank and ditch sides,
and it also contained Romano-British pottery. The Beaker cannot, therefore, be regarded as stratified except in so far as layer 4 lies over the Neolithic layers dated by their Windmill Hill pottery. Few complete Beakers are represented and all are fine wares from long necked vessels of Clarke's Southern Tradition. The decoration of these vessels is all combed, the motifs are in large, broad, zones, and filled chevrons tend to be the most common decorative device. The rim sherds are simple and slightly flattened, and the one base has a slight lip which gives it a 'protruding foot' appearance.

A Causewayed Camp lay below Maiden Castle in Dorset, excavated by Mortimer Wheeler, and a number of Beaker sherds are illustrated in the report either by drawings or by photographs (Wheeler, R.E.M., 1943). Beaker was found in both the Causewayed camp ditch below the Iron Age rampart and in the ditches of the Neolithic long mound. In both instances, Beaker was confined to the upper levels. No Beaker pottery, other than that illustrated, was seen by the writer either at Dorchester museum or at the Institute of Archaeology in London, both of which institutions house material from Wheeler's excavations. Fragments of Beaker also came from the Upper Levels of a Neolithic pit inside the camp suggesting
that the Beaker occupation, or at least visitations by Beaker using people, were not confined to the areas of the ditches. All of the fine ware Beaker illustrated appears to come from fine, long necked vessels from Clarke's Southern series. All of the decoration has been executed with a comb or combs and filled losenges, chevrons and hexagons are all present. The large motifs used, and, of course, the shape, suggest that the decoration has contracted into at least two broad zones. Several different combs would appear to have been used on the pottery illustrated in the report (Plate VIII in Wheeler's report) from fine (fourth row from top, second from right) to very coarse with square, closely spaced teeth (third row from top, first on left, etc.). It is difficult to determine but it is possible that one is able to detect the use of the same (?) type of comb on different sherds and these can probably be said to be from the same vessel.

The amount of rusticated pottery present is not large according to the report. Fingernail (No. 95) and fingertip (No. 65) are both present. The latter sherd has a flat rim and the angle suggests that it comes from a (round bottomed ?) bowl. The other sherd are all straight wall sherds and give
no idea of the shape of the vessel that they come from. Beaker was associated in the ditches with later Neolithic Peterborough and Grooved Ware sherds. The Peterborough sherds are at once recognisable by their impressed decoration, and appear to represent vessels in the Mortlake style and possibly also the Fengate.

The Beaker from the ditch of the Neolithic long mound at Maiden Castle, however, is much different in character and is a tentatively earlier assemblage. Four sherds (Wheeler, 1943 plate XXIV) appear to be from combed Beakers with zoned decoration but the others are probably from AOC or AO combed Beakers, some sherds suggesting that the decoration may have contracted. As such the material resembles strongly the pottery assemblages already seen above on some of the Scottish sand dune sites. No sections of the sherds are produced in the report so that we can only guess at the profile of the sherds by the shadows on the photographs. The typical 'S' shaped profile of the AOC Beakers, however, would appear to be represented, but this observation relies greatly on intuition. What is also noticeable about the sherds in comparison with those from the ditches of the Causewayed Camp is their state of preservation. The sherds from the long mound ditches
are far more abraded and weathered than those from other parts of the site and it is also more difficult, from the photographs, to recognise individual vessels. This suggests that the sherds were derived from a settlement and had obviously been exposed for a while and not been rapidly buried.

Only a small amount of Beaker was recovered from the excavations at Offam Hill (Drowett, P. 1977) and the excavator regarded them as all from the same vessel, a vessel of Clarke’s W/UK class with decoration consisting entirely of zones of horizontal combed lines. The profile was difficult to reconstruct due to the small size of the fragments. It would appear from the report that this was the only Beaker vessel found during the excavations and it came from high up (layer 2) in the ditch fill.

Rather more Beaker, however, and of a rather more coarse and abraded nature, was found at the Causewayed Camp of Whitshank near Brighton (Curwen, E.G. 1934). Occupation layers are mentioned in almost all the ditch sections but the Beaker appears only to have come from Ditch III, cutting IV where the occupation debris associated with a pit and hearth had slipped into the partially filled ditch. Late Neolithic impressed ware appear to have been associated with the Beaker, but they were also found
in all sections of the ditch associated with corresponding 'occupation layers'. The majority of the Beakers appear to be from comb decorated zoned vessels though there is also an element that suggests multiple horizontal lines of comb or incision (Curwen, *op. cit.* Nos. 65 and 68). The rim sherd No. 55 is also interesting. It appears to be from the rim of an AO combed vessel decorated by a coarse comb with circular teeth and it has both a splayed neck and a cordon. Of the zoned vessels, the majority seem to be from vessels with narrow and simple zoned decoration such as ladder patterns or herringbone. The decoration is, however, rather crudely and carelessly executed. Much also seems to have been applied with a coarse blurred comb or incision. The fingernail rusticated sherds vary considerably in fabric quality, from fine thin sherds (No. 46) to rather thick and coarse ones (No. 54). Random, linear, single and paired fingernail decoration is all present and the individual impressions can either be vertical, horizontal or sloping. Three rims are present, one appears to be a narrow neck from a bulbous vessel (No. 63), another is a slightly everted rolled rim (No. 64) and the third is cordoned (No. 54) but fairly upright. Among some of the later Neolithic impressed pottery is one with a very fine
whipped decoration appearing either as maggots (WHI 1:3) or else in longer lengths (WHI 1:5). This is a fine whipped decoration that is obviously not cord and is also met with at other domestic sites (see below, Appendix II).

Windmill Hill is generally regarded as the type site for Causewayed Camps and has produced 435 fine ware sherds and 82 coarse wares from the Beaker class. The pottery has also been well written up by Isobel Smith (1965) and needs no further treatment here save a short survey by way of completeness. Smith reports that the sherds were abraded and small suggesting that they had been exposed for a while before being covered over by the ditch silts. They all came from a high level in the ditch fill, not far below the present turf, and, as at Knap Hill, it would appear likely that this layer cannot really be regarded as stratified as again, Romano-British sherds appear in it. It is only possible to say in consequence that the Beaker sherds are all later than the primary Windmill Hill sherds and that they are secondary to the site. This is particularly important to note when we look at the types of Beaker present. Firstly, there is an element of AO decorated Beaker, both corded and combed, which appear to have contracted decoration and an un-
decorated band below the rim. The cord decoration is rather coarse on Smith's No. P.294 and brings to mind the small late Neolithic bowls from Elenpace (see above). All over incision, or at least zones of multiple horizontal lines, may also be present in the case of P.293. P.295 and 296, are both from comb decorated vessels with multiple horizontal comb lines defining the zones and the zone filling consists of simple oblique lines and cross hatching. A cordoned rim from an undecorated vessel (Smith P.301, my fig. W.H. 1:12) and a cordoned rim with fine fingernail impressions (WH. 1:2) may also be associated with this group and so we have an assemblage that is similar to some sand dune sites from the north of the country. The second group of Beakers are all from long necked and rusticated vessels (Smith, 1965, fig. 35 P.302-315) and one sherd appears to be from a handled vessel (P.305). The other comb decorated sherds are from vessels with broad zones and motifs. Reed impressed Beaker, or fabrics stamped with a circular device, is also present, and, despite the fine fabric, this should probably be regarded as rusticated ware. The fingernail rusticated ware is also predominantly cordoned (WH 1:15) and some bring to mind the late 'Pothekers' of Holland which often have contrasting neck and body decoration. The
fabric thickness among the rusticated sherds varies considerably (WH I). Mortlake, Fengate and Grooved Ware are also found in the same levels as the Beaker pottery, as are collared urn sherds. Windmill Hill and Ebbsfleet sherds appear lower down in the ditch silts. The similarity of some of the coarse Beaker grooving and that of the Grooved Ware sherds should be borne in mind (compare P.315 and P.281).

LONG BARROWS

What has become the virtual type site for the Earthen long barrow class of monument is the site at Russell's Lodge (Ashbee, P. 1966) but unfortunately for our purposes, no certain Beaker sherds have been recovered from the site but only a few rusticated sherds were found in layer seven in the South ditch. Ashbee suggests that they may represent rusticated Beaker-like pots. All the rustication appears to be pinched fingernail, either paired, single, or arranged in rows to give a cordoned effect already noticed at Windmill Hill.

Rather more Beaker was found at Giant's Hill I and II at Skendleby in Lincolnshire, again, with one noticeable exception, from the upper silts of the ditches (Philips, C.W., 1936 and Simpson, D.D.A. pers. comm.). The exceptions are the two famous sherds of AOC Beaker which come from beneath the
mound itself at Giant's Hill I and were not regarded as intrusive by the excavator (SKE 1:3 and 4). An angular profile for this vessel is suggested by SKE 1:3. The other sherds are all small and from necked Beakers with comb and fingernail decoration. Chevrons, both open and filled, appear to be the chief motif. The Beakers from Giant's Hill I are associated mainly with 'hearth' in the ditches but it is difficult to know whether they are to be regarded as true hearths or as the patches of charcoal that result from hearth sweepings from a nearby settlement such as Isobel Smith suggests for Keiller's hearths' at Windmill Hill. Perhaps they are true hearths as Phillips suggests that the areas round about are trampled. The Beakers, about six or so are represented, are all in the form of small and abraded sherds.

The familiar stratigraphy was also present at the Holdenburh long barrow in Hampshire near Christchurch (Piggott, S. 1937). Early Neolithic pottery was found in the lower ditch silts and Beaker, Peterborough and rusticated wares in the upper ditch. Most were from an 'occupation level' in the north west end of the ditch but it must be remembered that the ditches were not totally excavated. Most of the pottery appears to have been illustrated in
the report and seems to come from a variety of vessels (Piggott, op. cit. fig. 6). One fine rim of a Mortlake vessel is illustrated and is decorated with a fine whipped maggot decoration, too fine to be cord, and probably whipped thread (see appendix II below). There is also a rim sherd of a groove-rusticated vessel with a large flat rim decorated with fingernail impressions and incised crossed lines. There are also slight grooves or cordons that run horizontally across the vessel wall and are decorated with fingernail impressions that slope in alternating directions. This can perhaps best be regarded as a rusticated vessel from the Grooved Ware tradition. The Beaker sherds are all rather abraded but represent vessels from Clarke's Southern Tradition but too little survives to allow any attempt at reconstruction. Metoped, fringed and filled chevron/hexagon motifs appear to be present.

There was a long history of activity at the Kilham long barrow in Yorkshire from Mesolithic to Early Bronze Age (Manby T.G. 1975) but the Beaker sherds were confined to the upper levels of the eastern ends of the quarry ditches. The sherds from this site contrast with those from the other sites of this class that have been looked at so far, with
the exception of the bank barrow at Maiden Castle, in that the pottery is virtually all from AO Beakers. There are three rim sherds illustrated in the report and although one has the actual lip missing, enough of it survives to allow fairly positive identification. Two of the sherds had an undecorated zone beneath the rim, while on the third there is a slight gap, but it is not really wide enough to warrant the title of an undecorated zone. Only one of the sherds has evidence for internal cord decoration, only one line is visible, but perhaps as many as three may originally have been present. Two of the sherds (Manby, op.cit. figs. 20 and 22) show traces of plaited cord, a technique that has not been noticed before in this survey and which is quite rare on domestic sites in Britain but which is not unparalleled in Britain and the Netherlands. There is also an undecorated base sherd among the pottery also a sherd with incised herringbone decoration, and a small sherd from what may have been an AO combed Beaker. Generally, however, the sherds are too small to allow positive identification of form or motif, and it is not possible to say whether the base sherd, for example, is from a decorated or undecorated vessel. The assemblage compares well with Ross Links and the Scottish sand dune sites
mentioned above.

The Beaker from the South Street long barrow was not extensive but again came from the upper silts of the ditch (Ashbee, Smith and Evans, 1979) and the sherds represent only a few vessels: one AOC, one AO combed (?) with the decoration executed with a small comb with rounded teeth, an incised zoned vessel, one rusticated sherd with triangular stabs and finally a vessel with stabs filling zones defined by parallel horizontal comb lines. What is interesting, however, is that a close study of the environmental evidence as revealed at the excavation shows that in the Beaker period there was land clearance and cross ploughing which suggests intensive and permanent settlement in the vicinity of the barrow as opposed to the traditional view of 'Beaker visitors'.

Other sites are, of course, listed in the catalogue and the above sites will suffice in this brief survey of the evidence for Beaker domestic activity from long barrows. What is noticeable however, is that stylistically early and late sherds are both found in the upper ditch silts (Kilham and Maiden Castle = early, Giant's Hill I and Holdenhurst = late) and in every case, except the AOC sherds from Giant's Hill I, the Beaker sherds are
secondary to the site. The numbers of the vessels represented by the sherds also tends to be rather few suggesting no intensive occupation on the site though the environmental evidence from South Street shows that intensive settlement was not far off.

Cave and Rock Shelters

There are three main concentrations of cave and rock shelter sites, the Windy pits in Yorkshire, the Derbyshire caves such as at Creswell Crags, and the Mendip Caves around Cheddar. The last mentioned, being the farthest South, shall be looked at first.

It is very probable that the material from Boa Swallet in Somerset was actually from a cave site though it is not at all certain as the site excavated was in fact a spoil dump from earlier mining activity (Taylor, H. 1964). The pottery must all be regarded as unstratified but nevertheless it does represent a coherent group of long necked Beakers plus a few rusticated sherds. Few, if any, of the fine ware sherds would be out of place if they were found in graves. Filled and multiple chevrons, and filled lozenges are by far the most common motifs used and ermine filled zones are also quite common and most of the Beakers would appear to have had broad zones of decoration. Two handles also suggest an element of Southern Handled Beaker. Both handles
are decorated with comb lozenges though both examples are still very different. The rusticated sherds are all finger rusticated and represent a maximum of about five vessels. Paired fingernail, arranged in horizontal rows, both on its own and combined with comb decoration, are both present, as are single nail impressions, though they tend to be uniformly arranged rather than randomly spread. One sherd has raised pellets on the surface which recalls to mind some of the raised decoration on some of the Dutch 'Potbokers'. About twenty vessels were probably recovered from the excavations at Bos Swallet which would appear to indicate that a substantial settlement may have been destroyed. It is interesting, however, that nearly all the vessels are fine ware ones.

The amount of Beaker recovered from the Chelm's Combe rock shelter was not nearly as great as from Bos Swallet (Balch, H.E. 1926). Romano-British, Early Iron Age, Neolithic and Mesolithic layers were all encountered and Beaker was found, not unexpectedly, in the top of the Neolithic level. Most of the Neolithic pottery came from Early Neolithic round bottomed bowls so it would appear that there had been a considerable gap in the occupation before the arrival of the Beaker users unless, of course, stylis-
tically early Neolithic bowls had a long life in this area. There is no reason from the report, however, to assume that this was the case. The illustrated Beaker sherds represent only three vessels. The first would appear to be an undecorated vessel with a slack profile and an externally bevelled rim. R.C.C. Clay, in his pottery report, mentions that the sherd is grass wiped. The second is a flat rimmed sherd from what would appear to have been an AO comb decorated vessel. Not enough survives to be certain of this identification but eight comb lines are represented on the sherd and this does seem too many to represent all but an AO combed vessel, or at least one whose zones consist entirely of horizontal combed lines. The third Beaker mentioned in the report is, in fact, very degenerate, if indeed it is a Beaker. The fabric is certainly Beaker-like, it has a slightly everted rim and a general 'flower-pot' profile. The decoration is confined to the upper portion of the vessel and consists of running chevrons executed in twisted cord decoration. The decoration and shape does in fact bear a strong resemblance to some of the layer 8 pottery, associated with Beaker, at Gwithian in Cornwall (Megaw, J.V.S., 1976).

At the Cockles Wood cave at Nettlebridge in
Somerset, Beaker, Grooved Ware and rusticated pottery were found in a layer of domestic refuse (Hickling and Seaby, 1951). This domestic layer, however, also contained fragments of cremated human bone so that the ritual/domestic nature of the deposit is at once questionable. The Beaker found was from a necked Beaker decorated with a coarse comb, and the upper part of the vessel was decorated with horizontal lines bordering a zone of filled chevrons. The lower portion had a zone filled with cross-hatching, and below this vertical herringbone. The Grooved Ware sherds are all probably from the same or similar vessels and are decorated with parallel (?) horizontal grooves, closely spaced, and giving the pots a ribbed effect. The rusticated sherd has fingertip decoration consisting of single impressions arranged in horizontal lines. The angle of the fingertip impressions in the two rows present changes in each row so that a type of horizontal herringbone is produced. The fabric of the sherd is thin and hard.

Peterborough Ware, Grooved Ware and Beaker were all found at the Whaley Rock Shelter in Derbyshire (Radley, J. 1961), and all were apparently from the same level. The Beaker sherds are not numerous but appear to represent three vessels, all fine ware,
and with blurred comb or incised decoration. The motifs employed seem to be filled lozenges/hexagons, chevrons, and horizontal cross hatched zones. There are also two rusticated sherds from the site, one with paired fingernail impressions arranged in vertical rows, and the other with single fingernail impressions also arranged in rows. The fabric of both sherds is fine and hard. The two Grooved Ware sherds are from similarly decorated bowls, but almost certainly from different vessels. The necks appear to be inturned, and the grooves are, in fact, shallow incised lines, very closely spaced. The Peterborough sherds seem to be representative of local variants of Ebbsfleet to Fengate styles. Fingernail incisions are used to decorate the 'Ebbsfleet' vessels, impressed and incised techniques on the 'Mortlake' vessels, and maggott and stabbed decoration on the 'Fengate' rim.

The pottery from the Yorkshire Windy nite is, indeed, quite varied (figs. WIN 1-3). There is, first of all, an element of ACC Beaker and undecorated ware similar to pottery from the northern sand dune sites, and some of the cord is finely applied (WIN 2:2 and 3) while in other examples it is altogether more haphazard (WIN 2:1). Undecorated zones beneath the rim and on the vessel body, and internal
cord decoration are also present (WIN 2:4, WIN 2:1 and 11). Unusual is a sherd of cord decorated pottery with interrupted cord decoration and with a fringe of small circular stabs (WIN 2:7). The undecorated vessels represent both bowl (WIN 1:3) and Beaker (WIN 1:1) forms. Small hemispherical bowls may also be present (WIN 1:7) and the small jar (WIN 2:5) is doubtless later. The large vessel (WIN 1:5) is unusual in that the decoration is broken into zones of horizontal, though haphazard, round toothed comb impressions, a type of decoration that is most commonly found on small Collared Urns. The comb would appear to have had only five teeth. The shape of the vessel, as far as can be reconstructed from the sherds, is a slack profiled Bell Beaker. A similar, though not so squat, profile can be reconstructed for WIN 1:2 which also has rather strange decoration. It would appear to have been decorated with a specially made stamp or else represent a type of Barbed Wire decoration where some material such as gut or twine appears to have been stretched over, in this case, a round object. The decoration would appear to have been all over. The handled Food Vessel (WIN 2:9) is in keeping in date with the small undecorated Collared Urn (WIN 2:6) and this, the Beaker, and the ACC sherds all suggest the visiting
of the sites over a long period. The settlement at Sewell's Cave would appear to be similar to, if earlier than, the settlement at the Windypits. AOG Beaker was found there (Raistrick, 1936) but it was associated with late Neolithic impressed pottery, probably locally equivalent to the Mortlake style.

HENGES AND RING DITCHES

It is now that we leave the Early Neolithic monuments and cave sites that we run into difficulties of site classification as there is now a tendency towards great variation in the types of monument that were being constructed. The grouping of henges and ring ditches will be unsatisfactory in many ways especially with the increasing ritual/domestic argument that pertains to a great many of the monuments in this category. It is also here that we get an increasing overlap in the type of domestic site such as ring ditches being found associated with hearths and domestic spreads beneath round barrows.

A thin seam of charcoal was found near the base of the inner ditch at Armishall (Clarke, G. 1937) and may be the remains of occupation debris for it contained small, often abraded, sherds of rusticated pottery (fig. A 1). There was no real Beaker found at the site but it is possible that
the rusticated sherds are the same as those types of rusticated vessel associated with Beaker wares at other sites as the fabric is fine and the rustication is all of a type seen before at sites mentioned above. The mixing of paired fingernail and single fingernail on A 1:11 is unusual in the writer's experience except when dealing with contrasting neck and body decoration. The shape of this wall sherd, however, suggests the belly of a vessel of Beaker or similar shape. Fingernail and tip are both present and the finger tip has often been pushed deep into the clay so that a wave has been pushed out to form 'pseudo-plastic' decoration (A 1:5 and 6). The angle of one rim sherd (A 1:7) suggests either a bowl or a slightly inturned neck.

Late Neolithic pottery was found at site D at Barford in Warwickshire (Oswald, A. 1969) in a ring ditch with many internal post holes and pits. Pottery and occupation debris, however, was rare and so Oswald suggested that it could have been a cattle compound and that the timber avenue could represent a droveway. Pryor, however, at Fengate has shown that cleanliness does not necessarily preclude domestic activity (Pryor, F. M. 1978). The Beaker from Barford is scarce but comprises of small sherds from an incised Beaker. Only three horizontal incised
lines survive. The sherds came from a pocket of charcoal in the ditch fill and the shape of the deposit suggested to the excavator that it had been bagged. This, however, might suggest a ritual deposit rather than a domestic one as the writer does not really believe in Neolithic 'bin liners'!

The ring ditch at Brantham Hall was excavated in 1925 but the Beaker from the site was not published until 1974 (Gilmour, R.A. 1974). The Beaker burials inside the enclosure suggest that the function of the site was, at least ultimately, sepulchral, but there were sherds of a small ovoid Beaker in the ditch itself. This Beaker had combed ladder motifs and there was also a sherd decorated with comb filled chevrons.

A small amount of pottery also comes from the ring ditch No. 4, at City Farm, Banborough but little in the way of 'classic' Beaker was found (Case et al., 1965). The hesitation to call this Beaker domestic ware, however, is interesting as the problem would not arise had we a few sherds of undoubted Beaker on the site. It is possible that this is a concrete example of an idea that has been put forward for along time, namely that this is the typical domestic pottery of the period but it is only called Beaker domestic ware because it is the Beaker ele-
ment that is the readily identifiable one. It may be possible that CFH 1:11 is from an incised Beaker but this is by no means certain. CFH 1:1 is also crudely decorated if, indeed, it is from a Beaker. The other sherds are all of types already seen to be associated with Beakers: the undecorated pottery (CFH 1:2 and 3), the stabbed ware (CFH 1:8), and the fingernail impressed ware (CFH 1:4, 5, 9 and 10). The very fine whipped impressions on CFH 1:6 and 7 must be seen as stemming from Peterborough decorative techniques though it is too fine to be considered as whipped cord (see below, appendix II) and it is too closely wrapped to warrant the Dutch name 'Barbed Wire' which is used to describe virtually any whipped decoration. It is very similar to a sherd with fine whipped decoration from Marden (see below).

The most important sites of this class that have yielded Beaker pottery from domestic contexts are the large henges of Burrington Walls and Mount Pleasant but the pottery from both sites has been well written up by Ian Longworth so that any attempt at discussion here would simply be a reduplication.

**OTHER ENCLOSURES**

This heading includes somewhat of a 'hotchpotch' of sites that may represent enclosures of
the Beaker period but that are not regarded as henge sites or ring ditches by the writer. They should, however, probably be regarded in the light of some of the large Wessex henges which Wainwright would now regard as purely secular (see above, p 60).

The first site to be considered under this heading is Barnby Howes in Yorkshire (Ashbee and ApSimon, 1957) where barrow II proved to be, in fact, a natural hillock of boulder clay and a 'displaced kerb' was located, but this was actually a rectangular stone setting of approx imately 20m. by 15m. A line of postholes ran round the inside of this and there was a hearth situated in the north eastern part of the enclosure. An entrance may have been in the south east corner where the stones appear to open out to form a small passage or porch though it is also possible that this may be a result of plough damage. The Beaker from the site is not at all plentiful and only the virtually complete corded Beaker was seen by the writer at Whitby Museum. The other sherds illustrated in the report have been reduced to such an extent as to render the drawings useless. Such a lot remains of the Corded Beaker that it may well be from the 'robbed grave' in the enclosure. It was found, however, among the stones of the kerb. Other sherds, including fingernail rusticated sherds, were
found among the kerbstones and in patches of charcoal. If the internal pit is, in fact, a 'robbed grave' then the enclosure may well have been funerary in function and the hearth, ritual. It is certainly improbable that the area was roofed. The corded Beaker has decoration right up to the rim but it still has an undecorated zone at the belly carination which serves to underline the unreliability of the undecorated rim zone representing a contracted AO decorated Beaker and so forth. There is also internal cord decoration on the vessel and the fabric is fine and hard. There are only two rusticated sherds that are identifiable from the illustrations. The first is a rim sherd with a slight hollow on top giving it a 'Y'-shaped section and the fingernail impressions would appear to be single and in a horizontal row (report fig. 8, No.2). The second sherd is slightly larger and is a wall sherd with a generally straight profile and the fingernail impressions appear to be considerably more haphazard (report, fig. 8, No. 3.). One small sherd would appear to have two horizontal combed lines (fig. 6. No. 11).

Bell Beaker revolutionised British Beaker archaeology as here was real evidence that 'Beaker people' lived somewhere! Beaker pottery was associated
with an enclosure and house types (Bradley, R., 1970).

Richard Bradley would now see the majority of the house plans as periglacial features and not man-made but the enclosure itself is still firmly associated with Beakers of Clarke's East Anglia type (pers. comm. from Richard Bradley). Much of the pottery from Belle Tout is far from the Beaker 'norm' and indeed the main criterion of Clarke's East Anglian class is the degenerate, or rather strange, profile of the Beakers. The majority of the pottery comes from fingernail rusticated, undecorated and ribbed or cordoned vessels, the combed and incised sherds are very much in the minority and the assemblage would appear to be late in the sequence. As has been already stated, rim angles are difficult to reconstruct when dealing with small sherd evidence but it would appear that the ovoid shape of the reconstructable vessel (BEL 1:4) is not alone amongst the sherds (BEL 1:3,6,8). Some flaring rims are also present suggesting, though by no means proving, conventional Beaker shapes (BEL 1:1,2,7,9 etc.). The combed lines on some sherds may suggest AC combed decoration but this is most unlikely in view of the other types of vessel present. BEL 3:9 is from an azoned vessel with cross hatching placed between two and three horizontal lines. The motif itself is a
basic one, but as such is likely to have had a long
life. Three rims with incised decoration are from
similar vessels with everted rims (BEL 3:3, 5 and 6)
but the rims are also flattened internally to form
an internal bevel (footnote 1). The stabbed and
internally bevelled rim (BEL 3:1) is similar to
pottery in the southern Food Vessel tradition and
it also seems to the writer that it is with Food
Vessels that the 'ACC' sherds have their closest
fabric parallels.

It is obvious from the illustrations that the
fingernail pottery uses a variety of various
impressions, both single and double, and both random
and linear. It also varies considerably in the
density of the impressions (compare BEL 1:5 and 1:4).
What is immediately noticeable from the sections,
however, is the comparative fineness of the fabric
and of the almost delicately made impressions. There
are no examples of the thick fingertip impressions
that has already been seen in the South and especi-
ally at sites such as Chippenham V, and it would
appear to the writer that the pottery is more simi-
lar to rusticated Food Vessel and so is in keeping
with the corded and cordoned pottery. The true
course ware of the site is represented by thick, un-
decorated bases (BEL 2:25, 27, 30 etc.) and the base
angles suggest both splayed and upright profiles of urn-like vessels.

There was a roughly circular enclosure of app. 18 ft. (5.54m) in diameter and delimited by a bank of stones at Butler in Suffolk (West, S.E. unpublished). Four hearths were found in the interior of the enclosure, all, apparently, associated with Beaker pottery, or at any rate, rusticated sherds. The enclosure was probably still visible in the late Bronze Age as it seems to have acted as a landmark to a Smith who buried his hoard there. The pottery consists mainly of coarsely decorated late Beaker and fingernail decorated pottery but it is not certain whether the large biconical rusticated vessel illustrated by Clarke (here, fig. BUT 2) is from the same site or not. The fine Beaker is in a very thin fabric and decorated with comb and incision/blurred comb. Filled hexagons appear to be the favourite motif but chevrons filled with oval impressions (BUT 1:16) and combed vertical herringbone (BUT 1:16) are also present. Necked vessels are suggested by the motifs and also by the profiles of sherds BUT 1:1-9, 18 while a slack profile would seem to be the case in BUT 1:16. Evidence of a thinned and inturned neck is found in BUT 1:9. Fingernail and fingertip decoration are both present
at the site and the thickness of the fabric among the rusticated vessels varies considerably (compare BUT 1:2 and 184). Random single and paired fingernail impressions are both present and appear to be combined with cords in at least one case (BUT 1:5). BUT 1:21 is a rim sherd from a rusticated vessel and has a flat rim and external lip. The fingernail impressions would appear to be regularly spaced. The assemblage is again late.

Another possible enclosure, though much more well-defined by a large bank and deep ditch, is Corsay Bishbury in Somerset (Jones, S.J. 1938). This site has a bank and internal ditch reminiscent of a Class I henge, and had an overall east-west diameter of 190ft. (58.46m.) and an overall north-south diameter of 200ft. (61.53m). The actual flat internal diameter, however, was only 63ft. (19.38m). The bank and ditch of the enclosure, however, are unlike a henge — with the exception of the large Wessex enclosures — in their irregularity and the changes in direction are angular and abrupt. The monument is certainly not at all a true circle. A layer of occupation debris on the site contained flint, pottery and animal bones. The pottery included some later Neolithic bowls (GB 1:7 ?), but the majority of the sherds were from Beakers, and
it is stated in the report that perhaps as many as one hundred vessels are represented. A large number of restorable vessels were drawn in the report and so any figure referred to here without the prefix GB 1:... refers to the figures in the excavation report. The majority of the vessels are from late, necked Beakers often with a severe constriction between the neck and the body (No. 9, 22) while others tend towards a rather more slack profile (Nos. 6, 24, 26) though the neck is still very much present. The size range would also seem to vary considerably (compare Nos. 10 and 12). There are, predictably no AOC or AOS-combed Beakers present and incised decoration is quite rare. Also rare are narrow zoned vessels (no. 26) and the one example illustrated still does not have an early shape. The decoration is in generally confined to two or three broad zones (e.g. Nos. 5 and 6). Filled chevrons, triangles, and lozenges are the most common motifs used and there are also large metopes enclosing filled chevrons or vertical and horizontal herringbone. The decoration on some of the pottery is degenerate (No. 29) where the comb impressions are very haphazard and Nos. 30 - 31 appear to have decoration that is more akin to the Peterborough tradition than to the Beaker. The profile of base angle No. 32. sugg-
est a wide flaring belly and a very large vessel.

Not a great deal of the rusticated pottery was illustrated in the report and few of the sherds hint at the form of the vessels. Paired fingernail impressions seem to be the most common rustication motif (GB 1:9) and both horizontal and vertical motifs are present. The angle of the rim GB 1:9 and its fine fabric suggest that it may have had a Beaker-like shape (see for comparison, however, the possible reconstruction of a similar rim, though this time with body sherds, from Buckwold cum Wilton fig. Hew 2:20).

Not enough Beaker comes from the enclosures at Broome Heath or Rams Hill to warrant their inclusion here, but a circular enclosure was located at War Ditches near Cambridge (Lethbridge, T.C. 1949). Though this has been shown to be a hillfort (White of 1962) Lethbridge found domestic refuse in the primary silts of the ditch and included sheep bones and rusticated pottery. The sherds illustrated in the report seem to show that undecorated, rusticated, and incised sherds are all present. The rim sherd (fig. 3a) has fingernail impressions arranged horizontally and in rows giving the sherd a ribbed appearance. The rim is flat. One wall sherd has vertical rows of paired fingernail impressions and one base sherd has a 'Y'-shaped incision (fig. 3b), perhaps the base of a
chevron. Lethbridge suggested that the undecorated base sherd may be from a Food Vessel.

**PITS**

As will be seen from the catalogue a great many more pits have been found than have been described here, but few individual pits have produced Beaker in large quantities. For example, a pit was found at Astron in Northants (Potts, W. 1910) which yielded some Peterborough pottery. The only possible Beaker sherd was represented by a single undecorated base. Also at Blackpatch (Annable, F.K. 1977) a small pit was found in an area 30 by 6m. Flint seemed to be abundant, but actual pottery was rare.

Five pits were found at Boscombe Down (Stone, J.F.S., 1936) near a Deveral Rimbury enclosure. Two pits were actually joined together forming a hollow 10ft (3.05m) long by 4-5ft (1.23 - 1.54m.) wide and 1 - 2ft. 6 ins. (0.31 - 0.77m.) deep. The pits seemed to be associated with Stakeholes though the nature of the chalk made this observation uncertain. The Beaker illustrated in the report is not a large amount. There is one rim, simple, rounded and slightly everted, bearing three comb lines on the exterior. There is one small sherd with incised cross-hatching suggesting a filled motif, and a large
sherd of fingernail rusticated ware. This sherd has a rounded profile and the fingernail impressions are neatly executed and form two horizontal lines across the (?) top of the sherd. The occurrence of pits below Deveral Rimbury sites is in fact quite common, for example Bishops Cannings Down and Dean Bottom (G. Ingell, C. ) and Itford Hill (Burstow and Holleyman, 1957), and it is probably a relationship that warrants further investigation.

A pit of the Beaker period was found at Gainsborough Road in Bury St. Edmunds (Edwardson, A.R., 1955). The pit was around 4ft. 4ins. (1.33m.) deep and 3ft. (0.92m.) in diameter. Sherds of fine and coarse Beaker were found, plus flints, charcoal, and a human skull cap which had been scorched in places, certainly not cremated, and this suggested that it had either been used as a cooking utensil or lamp, or even that it had been cooked. Two bases are badly illustrated but appear to be from fine ware Beakers, one with cross hatched filled chevrons, and one with short, horizontal impressions. A small biconical Beaker, as reconstructed by Clarke, (BSE 1:4) was also found, the decoration consisting of cross hatching on the upper part and alternating filled and open chevrons on the lower, cross hatching being used as the filling device.
resenting two rusticated vessels were also recovered from the pit and both vessels have been reconstructed by Clarke (BSE 1:3 and 5). The first is a biconical vessel like the fine ware one just mentioned, and is decorated with circular and triangular stabs arranged in vertical rows, on the upper part, and paired fingernail, also arranged in vertical rows, occupies the lower portion. The second is a necked vessel and the decoration is almost a reversal of that on the last mentioned. It has paired fingernail arranged in vertical rows on the neck, a row of triangular impressions below this, a band of similar but more square impressions follows this, and finally there are vertical rows of bird-bone-like impressions. The decoration on both rusticated vessels is neatly done.

Some pits have recently been discovered at Caistor by Norwich during sand quarrying (R. O’Donaghue, pers. comm.) from which some very interesting pottery has been discovered (CBN 1). In addition to the pottery illustrated here there was a Beaker sherd with three vertical combed ladder motifs between two horizontal lines. The decoration, however, was too close together for it to be regarded as simply metoped, and was more strictly narrow vertical zones. The material illustrated here all
comes from Pit I with the exception of CBN 1:3 which is from pit II. The Beaker fabric is restricted to CBN 1:1, 2 and 9, and while CBN 1:5 is also in a fine fabric, it is not typical of Beaker and the 'decoration' on this sherd is probably also accidental. The Motifs on sherds CBN 1:1 and 2 have been executed with a comb in the normal Beaker manner and the narrow chevrons have been filled with oval impressions presumably made by a blunt oval point. The decoration reminds one of slashed Grooved Ware cordons and it may be that this pot represents Grooved Ware motifs in Beaker techniques and fabric. The profile of the pot would also appear to be odd with a 'sinewey' 'S'-shaped profile of a Beaker but with the dimensions of a straight walled Grooved Ware vessel. The fingertip decoration on CBN 1:6 is probably accidental and may have been made during the process of manufacture. CBN 1:4 is in fine fabric very similar to Beaker ware but the pottery is black throughout, and the decoration is typical of the Grooved Ware tradition with horizontal grooves on the exterior, and fingernail 'nicking' on the rim. The grooves on this vessel and on CBN 1:9 are typical of a range of pottery found on domestic sites. The grooves are too broad to be classed as incision, but are not to be regarded in every case
as true Grooved Ware. They probably represent an element of hybridisation. There is also an element of coarse pottery from this site consisting of undecorated wares with large opening agents which often protrude throughout the surfaces of the pottery, and bears a close resemblance to Urn fabric. The fabric is red on the exterior and black interior.

When isolating sherds in such a way as in this study it would have been equally correct (?) to have labelled the above site a Grooved Ware pit as that type of pottery was also found in it. Such is the case at Carnaby Top Site 12 in Yorkshire which was labelled a Grooved Ware pit by T.G. Manby (1974) because this was the style of pottery that he was interested in in that work. The pit, however, also included Beaker sherds and so is labelled a Beaker pit by the present writer.

The three features at the site - one of which was a pit 3ft. by 2ft. by 2ft. 6ins deep (0.92m. x 0.62m x 0.77m.) and the other two, lines of swallow holes - all produced similar pottery and it will be all looked at here as a single group. The Beaker pottery from the site falls into three groups, corded, combed, and incised. The corded Beaker appears to be from AOC vessels and there is no evidence to
suggest undecorated zones beneath the rim or on the belly carinations. One sherd has internal cord decoration consisting of three encircling cord lines and below this a motif of running chevrons executed in twisted cord, an unusual motif. Another smaller rim sherd has traces of two horizontal cord lines, but is undecorated internally. Both these rims are slightly everted. The one comb decorated Beaker sherd is a body sherd from an apparently AO combed vessel though the sherd is fairly straight sided and there is no evidence for the form of the vessel. One rim sherd is everted and has an external cordon in the manner of many of the sherds from the Scottish sand dune sites, but above this cordon are two lines of impressions possibly executed with a small comb with four rounded teeth. The decoration is also rather haphazard. Comb lines are also to be found on two other rim sherds. One has a Grooved internal bevel and one line of comb on the outer surface and is classed as Grooved Ware by Manby. The other rim has an undecorated internal bevel and one line of combed impressions on the outside. It is possible that this is also from a Beaker or perhaps a comb decorated Food Vessel. The incised sherd are equally small but one base sherd is decorated with fine horizontal incised lines and
a small body sherd exhibits four of the same. A larger sherd would appear to be a rounded belly sherd and has both incised horizontal lines and incised filled chevrons.

There are also Peterborough sherds from the site, one with twisted cord impressions and another with a 'T'-shaped rim with incision on the top and the third is an undecorated rim sherd with an internal lip. The grooved ware is also represented by three sherds in addition to the comb decorated sherd mentioned above. One is a rim sherd with two slashed cordons on the outside, and one of the same on the inside. The other is a body sherd with two stabbed lines resembling somewhat coarse and carelessly executed combs. The associated flint industry is extensive and the majority of the implements are scrapers. Barbed and tanged Petit Tranchet and simple tanged arrowheads are also present but in very small numbers.

Perhaps the most famous of the pit sites that have produced Beaker pottery are at Fencate in Peterborough and far more Beaker pottery exists than was published in the excavation or subsequent reports.

The collection is the result of salvage operations by Wyman-Aubott during gravel quarrying at
Fenrige, and so, due to the usually hasty nature of the material's recovery stratigraphic details are usually missing (Wyman Abbott, G. 1910). Several different sites were explored during these operations so that the collection comes from several different provenances and gravel pits on the Fen edge, but it has unfortunately been impossible to prove the sherds in any more detail than from Fenrige, since the collection was already in a confused state when obtained by the museum. It is, however, known that some Beaker sherds were recovered from Williamson's Pits, but how much and which sherds, are unknown. The subject of this report, therefore, is a large, unstratified collection of pottery from the Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age Transitional period, from roughly the same region on the Fen edge, and obviously it is only the pottery itself that can be discussed.

The Wyman-Abbott collection of Beaker pottery at Peterborough comprises over 350 sherds, of varying sizes, of fine and rusticated wares, all of which have been drawn by the writer, except in the few cases where more than one sherd are demonstrably from the same vessel, then only the most informative sherd or sherds have been drawn. All rims and bases have been illustrated as well as a representative
collection of wall sherds.

As can be seen from figs. 1-17, the size of the sherds varies considerably from about 7cms. square to little more than thumb-nail size, the average being about 3cms. square. The fabric varies slightly in colour from buff through pink to light brown, only occasionally grey, on both surfaces; is unburnished and sometimes has some slight grit protruding, as in the case of fig. 16-17, fig. 19-21, or else has a slightly pitted surface (fig. 18-19). On the whole, however, the surfaces are smooth. The fabric itself is filled with medium sized to finely-crushed shellwhitch appears to be the only added tempering. Small amounts of natural flint, quartz, haematite and fossiliferous limestone are also visible in thin section but appear to have been already in the clay. The fabric is quite fine, hard and well fired and even the generally coarser rusticated pottery does not have large sized grits and has an almost identical appearance under the microscope to the fine wares.

The fabric and appearance of all the sherds was very similar indeed, and the group is incredibly homogeneous, which made the task of sorting the pottery into individual vessels virtually impossible. This was attempted but with success only in a very
few instances, particularly among the rusticated sherds where the fabric differences were still very slight but nevertheless significant. In this instance, there were found to be about 25 or possibly 30 vessels. On the basis of the amount of sherds and in view of the way in which the fine ware sherds greatly outnumber the coarse ware, that is, rusticated, an estimate of about 50 or 60 fine Beakers would be a conservative one. Perhaps someone with more time and a more sensitive eye than the writer would be able to view the sherds more profitably.

The bar graph (fig. 11) of formal traits present among the sherds shows that by far the most common are convex belly sherds, with convex neck and rim sherds following a close second and third respectively. There are 29 base sherds and a modest nine cordoned sherds and three sherds with both neck and belly traces. One sherd appears to be from a straight neck just below the rim, but the dotted lines imply that there may be more of these among the formally featureless sherds of which there are 29190.

A break-down of the 36 rims on the second bar graph (fig. 12) shows that simple rounded rims are the most numerous with inturned rounded rims and cordoned rims occupying the bottom ring.

Few sherds are large enough to display more
than two motifs so the diagram of frequency of motif combinations does work quite accurately. This operates by reading across. For example, cross hatching occurs on its own 97 times. Fingernail impressions between horizontal lines (fourth from bottom) occur once with cross hatching and zones of short horizontal impressions, twice with metoped decoration, and three times on its own. The motifs are not very varied, and on the whole fairly simple, the most elaborate being the metoped decoration (fig. Figs 3-4), and the fine all over decoration of fig. 6. Excluding, temporarily, the rusticated sherds, most of the decoration is formed by impressed comb, fingernails are sometimes used in the case of fig. Figs 1-3, and also fingertips (fig. Figs 4-10), in conjunction with comb or incision, and while blurred comb is quite common, incision in the strict sense is not (fig. Figs 6:16, 7:17). Corded decoration is altogether absent. The rusticated sherds are mainly fingernail decorated, with the decoration consisting of pinched, paired impressions (fig. Figs 5:5, 5:16, 6:4, 6:8). Single rows of fingernail impressions are also present (fig. Figs 6-9), and other rustication techniques include stabbing (fig. Figs 6:15, 6:9), cordons, and incision (fig. Figs 6:6). It is possible that fig. Figs 6:6 may be a sherd from a Food Vessel, but it would be
somewhat rash to make a positive identification in view of the minute size of the sherd.

The motifs used all fall into Clarke's Basic European Southern British and Metope or panelled groups (groups 1, 4 and 5 respectively), (Clarke, 1970), the metope decoration appearing to be Clarke's motif No. 38. In the Basic European group, motifs 1-5, and 7, are all included in the Fengate material, and in the Southern British group motifs 29, 32 and 34 are all employed. Despite the Basic European motifs present, there are few, if any, early Beakers in the group, the exception probably being fig. F.1.2.1 and fig. F.1.2.2, which are the only sherd that have zones of medium width, as well as early motifs. The rest of the sherd are late, and can be placed in Lanting and Van der Waal's steps four or five. (Lanting and Van der Waals, 1972). This is difficult to say for sure in view of the nature of the evidence and lack of complete vessels, but there are traces of accentuated necks and metope decoration which are indicative of these steps.

The cylindrical neck and globular body of fig. 1:1, and the two broad zones of decoration are even later features, and assign this vessel to step six.

The sherd are unusual in that they do not show the same amount of variation that is common among
the pottery assemblages from Beaker domestic sites in the Fen area where rusticated sherds are usually present in greater proportions, and where there is often some unclassifiable material among the pottery. With the exception of the rusticated ware - yet even this is comparatively fine - and of a few large vessels such as fig. Fen 1:7, and fig. Fen 3:5, all the Beaker could quite happily be sepulchral. No mention, however, is made of skeletal material being found with the Beaker, and although they were salvaged and not excavated _sensu stricto_, Wyman-Abbott does mention animal bones and so it is likely that human bones would be noticed too, and it is extremely unlikely that they were simply missed, as in this period of excavation the emphasis was very much on graves. The broken nature of the pottery is also evidence in favour of the pits being receptacles for refuse of a domestic nature. It is, of course, possible that the pits were of a - dare it be said - ritual nature, and that breaking the vessels was an essential part of the ritual, especially in view of the high percentage of fine wares, perhaps to some kind of hearth deity. The matrix of such pits usually resemble, at least in part, hearth sweepings, but to interpret this further would be to run into the realms of speculative fantasy.
Weathering, usually the main characteristic of domestic rubbish has only affected a few sherds, and so most of the material must have been covered up soon after breakage. Generally on domestic sites there is a large proportion of abraded material, especially as is to be expected, among midden material or if the sherds are from a domestic scatter. The Grooved Ware sherds from the recent excavation at Fengate (Pryor 1978) are certainly abraded, but they had probably been on the surface for a considerable time in Prehistory. The pottery found by Wyman-Abbott had been tidily dumped.

This material compares favourably with that recently discovered at Fengate, which is, if anything, in a slightly poorer condition than that in the museum, but this is probably due simply to more extensive weathering. The rusticated pottery is rather more coarse than the Wyman-Abbott material, and more typical of the coarse varieties of finger rusticated pottery common among Petterborough assemblages, often confused with the rusticated ware in Beaker fabrics.

'Hut' is used only in its widest sense, especially at Fifty Farm in Cambridgeshire where a circular 'floor' c. 26ft. (c. 8m) was suggested to be
the actual area of occupation (Leaf, C.S. 1935).
This diameter compares favourably with the possible 'enclosure' at Butley, also in East Anglia, but the lack of sufficient evidence means that the significance of this comparison should not be over emphasised. Leaf also suggested that there may have been two periods of occupation at Fifty Farm but this was simply due to some of the pottery being more abraded than other sherds and not due to any stratigraphic evidence. The flint and bone recovered from the excavation of the site would appear to confirm that the area was indeed domestic as of the one hundred and sixty one flint artefacts, one hundred and eighteen are scrapers and four are arrowheads, and the bone include ox, pig, sheep/goat, and red and roe deer. Many of the bones are broken and some are gnawed by animals. Human bones are also present, though in small quantities, represented by the jaw and tibia of a middle aged man. This, however, should not really detract from the domestic nature of the site.

All the pottery from Fifty Farm is late in the Beaker sequence and the majority of it is finger rusticated ware (FF 1 - FF 6). There is also some undecorated ware, some urn forms, and on the whole the fine ware is represented by comparatively few sherds. The decoration of the fine ware is either
combed or incised, the motifs are predominantly large filled chevrons, hexagons or losanges, and the larger sherds would suggest large necked vessels with broad zoned decoration. An element of handled Beaker is also present (PP 7:22 and 24). Two unusual sherds are represented by PP 7:23, and they are unusual in that they combine a basic Beaker shape and typical Beaker combed decoration, with 'false relief' decoration formed by impressing a triangular or sub-triangular point into the clay forming, in effect, a raised zig-zag. This is a form of decoration most commonly found on Food Vessel pottery from Lincolnshire northwards, and especially on Irish Bowls and vases though it is also found on the Yorkshire Vase type. Its occurrence on Beakers is very rare. PP 7:10 may be a type of Collared Urn and the fabric and the twisted cord decoration would certainly agree with this. Some of the randomly stabbed sherds (PP 7:2, 8 and 9) are also out of character with Beaker pottery. The fabric is indeed fine but the decoration is more in keeping with Food Vessel and related types. Although not all of the Beaker from the site has been drawn by the writer what is nevertheless apparent is the overwhelming fingernail and tip rusticated ware and also the amount of variation within this class.
itself. Fabric, for example, varies from very fine (FF 1:2 and 26) to very coarse (FF 5:28, 6:5 and 10), and virtually all conceivable types of fingernail and fingertip decoration is present. For example, there are single random nail impressions (FF 4:30 etc.) and linear single impressions (FF 4:3 etc) and the impressions may also be vertical, horizontal or both on a single sherd, fingerpinched cordons are also visible on some sherds (FF 6:1, 10 and 15), It is interesting, however, that all the reconstructible rim diameters are from small vessels, especially when large vessels are so obviously present, though again it must be remembered that calculation of vessel diameters from rim sherds, especially in hand built pottery, is risky and should be regarded with a great deal of caution. Sherds such as FF 1:8 and FF 2:10 suggest that at least some of the vessels may have had a Beaker shape but it is not at all clear from the rest of the rims what shape the vessels took. Some large potbeakers, however, are probably present and also possibly some coarsenated vessels (FF 6:18). From the vast amount of rusticated ware, the often degenerate Beaker shapes, and careless Beaker decoration, it would appear that we are dealing with a very late, almost final, Beaker assemblage and so the C14 determination of 1850±50 b.c.
(BM 133) would appear rather early for this site (see above, chronology).

The hut at Chippenham V is much larger than any other known Beaker structure in Britain and has more in common with huts of a later period at sites such as West Brandon or Pimperne Down. Our knowledge of huts of this period, however, is so scanty that lack of parallels should not be regarded as evidence against, especially when large hut sites of the later Beaker period are postulated in the Netherlands, albeit rectangular (Vlaardingen, for example).

The fine Beaker pottery from the 'hearth's below Chippenham V has been well written up and drawn by C.S. Leaf in the excavation report (Leaf, C.S., 1940) and all the fine pottery would appear to be from necked vessels with broad zoned decoration, and apparently late in the sequence. It remains only to look at the coarse pottery.

The majority of the pottery is coarse rusticated sherds, very different to the Beaker material in character. Finger pinched cordons are most commonly found as in sherds Nos. 44-49 inc., usually only horizontal, but vertical and horizontal ribs may sometimes be combined, Nos. 8,17,35. In the case of sherds No. 2 and No. 4, a large horizontal cordon has been applied and covered with fingertip
impressions, in such a way that a collar has been formed. The body of No. 2 is probably truncated like an urn or Fengate ware, while that of No. 4 is probably hemispherical. These cordons are really quite common on Grooved Ware (Wainwright and Longworth, 1971) and this is also true of the applied knobs on Nos. 39 and 42, which are common to the Ringo style of Grooved Ware. The finger impressed decoration is commonly formed by the whole tip being impressed into the clay as in No. 27 and 72 and so a tear shaped ridge of dislodged clay is often formed on one side of the depression.

Finger nail decoration is also quite common but not quite so frequent as finger tip (Nos. 30-34, 80, 82-3). The fabric of these vessels is also finer and harder than the other sherds, and so they are probably more related to Beaker ware than the vessels described above. Incision is found on only three sherds, the Beaker ware mentioned above, and the later Neolithic rim sherd No. 77, found beneath the gravel bank of Barrow 5. Cord decoration is present in only one case, No. 85, possible from a Collared urn as the fabric is thick and coarse.

A structure may possibly be represented at Rudstone Hold as an oval 'floor' was found (2nd field west of reservoir, Manby, T.G. 1975). An oval patch
of charcoal filled soil was found at 30 ft. (9.23 m.) in diameter. The floor was slightly sunken, which is perhaps why it had survived ploughing, and three pits were found within its limits, and perhaps it represents a tent site or even a structure with turf or flimsy walls the evidence for which has been destroyed by ploughing and also, not all of the perimeter was excavated. Amongst the pottery, Grooved Ware, Peterborough, and Beaker sherds are all represented the last mentioned being very much in the minority. The Beaker sherds, in as far as one can be certain from such small sherds, would appear to be from stylistically early vessels and basic motifs are present on Manby's fig. 11, No. 20 and fig. 11, No. 22. Fig. 11, No. 23 also has a fringe motif.

The flint industry is also quite varied, but the only characteristically Beaker artefact is a single barbed and tanged arrowhead. A 'Petit tranche' and a 'petit tranche' derivative arrowhead, a lozenge arrowhead, and a plano-convex knife all represent the 'native' element. In addition were found a total of thirty nine scrapers.

The above is by no means an exhaustive list of Southern Beaker 'house' sites, and Gwithian, West Heslerton and so forth have been excluded due to either the pottery being quite well published or
else not sufficient information being published.

**MISCELLANEOUS DOMESTIC SITES**

Under this heading come a mixture of sites which probably also make up the majority of the evidence for Beaker settlement, but which are usually fairly amorphous spreads of pottery and domestic debris. Sometimes only one or two sherds may be present which probably represent field scattering as part of a manuring process. Again, not all sites can be looked at in detail in this section, and well published sites or sites producing little pottery have not been included here.

A classic occupation spread comes from the pre-barrow surface at *Arratton Down* in the Isle of Wight (Alexander, Osanne and Osanne, 1960). The entire area of occupation, however, was not uncovered, and an unknown amount of it had been lost due to erosion. The usual charcoal and animal bones were present in the domestic matrix. The site is unusual in that the vast majority of the sherds were Peterborough Ware, including flat bases (report fig. 7, P36). The Beakers occur in small numbers and are uncharacteristic in that the pottery is in the same fabric as the Peterborough Ware and is recognisable in the main by its decoration only. P46 would seem to have a sinuous profile not unlike the ovoid pots from East
Anglia and the South East and horizontal decoration would appear to be common. Both a rectangular and a round toothed comb seem to have been used. The homogeneity of the Beaker and Peterborough fabric raises the question of Beaker imitation (see below) by people acquainted with Beaker forms and decoration, but not fully with the minutiae of manufacture.

A group of four closely spaced hearths were found in the interior of the Balkbury Camp hill-fort (Wainwright, G.J. 1969) and were associated with a small number of Beaker sherds and rusticated ware representing in all about four vessels. The fine ware vessel is a necked Beaker but appears to have had a slack profile as reconstructed by Dr. Longworth. It has been decorated with a coarse rectangular toothed comb and the filled triangle motif is used. The decoration has been carelessly executed and fine ware must be used in only a comparative sense. Associated with this was a large coarse ware vessel but with a fabric almost as thin as the fine vessel, despite the 'coarse ware' label. The sherds seem to represent a shouldered or globular vessel with alternating undecorated and finger-raised cordon zones. It is perhaps to be seen as a potbeaker similar to contemporary vessels in
the Netherlands though the undecorated zones are unusual. One undecorated rim was also found and it had a fine fabric and possible traces of a cordon or carination below the rim, but the sherd is too small to be certain.

A fine stratigraphical sequence of Beaker pottery came from the Brann Down sand cliff in Somerset (ApSimon, et al., 1961) and was associated with occupation deposits. Layer 6a was the earliest stratigraphically that produced Beaker, all of which was Bell Beaker, associated with Grooved Ware and Peterborough sherds. The restorable Beaker (report No. 7) probably had a more angular profile that has been reconstructed but nevertheless it is still of early European Bell Beaker type, and very similar from Christchurch in Hants. It is, however, unusual in that it has twisted cord decoration defining the zones, though the filling decoration is, in fact, combed. Perhaps this is because the maker of the vessel was more at home making encircling lines with a long length of cord rather than a short comb. Associated with this was a fingernail decorated vessel of Bell Beaker shape, and perhaps also a single sherd of ACC Beaker. From layer 7 and the base of layer 6 later necked Beakers were recovered and which seem to
have wide zones of decoration and using filled motifs such as triangles and hexagons. Fingertip and nail sherds are associated as well as pottery with deep grooving. Fine Urn pottery, which continued the fingertip and grooved decoration, was found in the layer above.

A casual hearth of the Beaker period was found at Stenson in Derbyshire (Fowler, M.J. 1955) and was represented by an elongated patch of charcoal, burnt bone, waste flint and heat cracked stones. Sherds of about ten Beakers were represented in all, and the fine ware vessels appeared to be from late vessels. One vessel, represented by six illustrated sherds had metoped and filled motifs, including chevrons, executed in square toothed comb. A second vessel, represented by a base sherd, exhibited one horizontal incised line. Of the fingernail decorated sherds, at least three appear to be from zoned vessels. One has two lines of crossed fingernail impressions, one has paired fingernail between incised lines, and the third has paired fingernail below the rim, followed by oblique single impressions between two horizontal incised lines, and single vertical nail impressions in turn below this. Horizontal paired fingernail decoration is visible on one sherd (Report fig. 3, C1) and linear paired im-
pressions are visible on what would appear to be a coarse vessel. Another rusticated sherd is decorated with roughly linear triangular stabs. A final sherd appears to be decorated with very fine whipped decoration though the exact motif is difficult to determine (report, fig. 2. 3a). Such a fine whipped decoration is also met with at sites in Yorkshire, and at Marden in Wilts, (see below, appendix U).

A peculiar spread of occupation material was found in the West Kennet Avenue at Avebury (Smith I.F. 1965). The site is strange in view of its situation and also by the fact that by rights it should be over, or cut by, the stonehole for stone 30a. This, however, is not the case and excavation showed that there was, in fact, no stone 30a at all. The Avenue, therefore, had respected the occupation. This could mean, therefore, that it was a ritual or taboo site rather than an ordinary settlement, and the pottery may be coloured in consequence. Windmill Hill, Grooved Ware, Peterborough and Beaker sherds were all present on the site, but Peterborough Ware by far outweighs the rest. This is interesting as Peterborough Ware is frequently found on Causewayed Camps and in Chambered tombs such as West Kennet, and later gives rise to the main burial
types (Food Vessels and Urns). In contrast Grooved Ware seems to be more commonly found in domestic contexts (e.g. henges of Wessex, Skara Brae etc.) and at this site is represented by a few sherds only (see below). Beaker from the site is also rare and the one sherd illustrated by Smith is a base sherd with filled chevron motif. It probably represents an early vessel, but it is difficult to be sure of this.

**INITIAL OBSERVATIONS**

The above is a brief survey of the type of pottery found on the types of domestic site, under consideration in this study, from South Britain. What is at once noticeable is that the majority of settlements are late, as in the North, and early Bell Beaker settlements in South Britain are really quite rare. Also noticeable, with the exception of Yorkshire, is that AOC domestic sites, and sand dune coastal sites are rare in Southern Britain. The latter may be due to the Isostatic/Eustatic tilt, but the stylistic rarity is rather more difficult to explain. Furthermore, there would seem to be no difference between the fine, necked, vessels found in graves, and those found on domestic sites suggesting that in the latter part of the Beaker
period fine ware domestic pots were being chosen for burial. This does not preclude the vessels still having some prestige value, however, albeit in a 'remnant sense'. With regard to the rusticated ware, this is seen to take a variety of forms though fingernail and tip decoration is by far the most common and would appear to increase in frequency the typologically later the Beaker settlement is. The fabric of the rusticated ware also varies considerably in itself, from fine to coarse, the decoration varies from finely impressed fingernails to coarse fingertip and raised cordons. Vessels of the Dutch 'Potbeker' type are rare on British sites in so far as close and direct parallels are concerned, but, as it to be expected, there are a great deal of local variations of the type, called potbeaker here to distinguish the British variant of this Anglo-Dutch type. The development and rise of rusticated ware may be linked with the individual and somewhat parallel developments of necked British Beakers and the Dutch Veluwe Beakers.

Also noticeable is the frequent occurrence of more than one pottery on the same site and Beaker often occurs with Grooved Ware and Peterborough Ware, or with stylistically later forms such as Food Vessel and Urn. Also, while the 'native' elements tend to
be found on different sites to a certain degree — for example, Peterborough Ware in Causewayed camp ditches and long barrow ditches and so on, and Grooved ware occurs on settlement sites and in Henges — Beaker pottery seems to bridge all gaps and 'unifies' the other styles, as it is found on virtually all categories of site.

These are only initial observations on the pottery from the South of Britain and a full discussion including the North British and Irish Material appears below.

***************

**FOOTNOTES**

1) N.B. the drawings BEL 3:5 and 6 have been mounted incorrectly and the right hand elevation on both sherds, is in fact the interior of the vessel.
THE BEAKER DOMESTIC POTTERY FROM
IRELAND
THE BEAKER DOMESTIC POTTERY FROM IRELAND

The Beaker pottery from Ireland differs considerably from that in the other parts of Britain in style, and, not unexpectedly, it is more insular in its development (Madden 1976). Irish Beaker is, in fact, similar in many ways to some seen in Scotland in that it appears almost to be 'Beaker imitation, than Beaker proper. The type of site on which the Beaker occurs, however, especially domestic site, does not differ terribly from Britain in that structures are few and generally pits, hearths and amorphous spreads constitute the bulk of the evidence for domestic activity and at sites such as Newgrange (O'Kelly pers.comm) and Knowth (Sogan, 1976) where there would appear to have been intensive activity and where pits and hearths were found there were still no house plans reconstructable from the postholes. Beaker houses remain mysteriously elusive.

It is, perhaps, better to begin the survey with the best known and most often quoted Irish Beaker domestic site, that at Knockadoon by Lough Gur in Co. Limerick, a site that was once an island before the lough was drained. Beaker sherds were found in varying quantities at sites C, D, H, and I
Simpson argues that 'only site D can be claimed as a site of Beaker houses' (1971, p.135), an observation that is valid when O'Riordain's stratigraphy is examined. It is now thought that O'Riordain did not understand his stratigraphy, however, and that little weight, especially on the Beaker sites, should be attached to it (independent pers. comm. from Prof. O'Kelly, Dr. Raftery, and Prof. Bogan). If the writer understands his informants correctly, it would appear that there is a possibility that on these sites at Lough Gur that have produced Beaker sherds, then Beaker is contemporary with Lough Gur Class I and II pottery and possibly also may have been stratified in all levels and not just the upper layers. If this is the case then the opposite of Derek Simpson's comment 'the Beaker contribution to this settlement should not....be over emphasised' (1971, p.135) might apply. The argument, however, is very much an open one and the writer would prefer to adopt a view that may seem over-cautious to some, but that, due to the uncertainty of the evidence, he feels justified in using, namely that few conclusions can realistically be drawn as to the amount of Beaker influence at Knockadoon until a re-exca­
vation of selected sites either confirms or alters
Q'riordain's stratigraphy. The houses at site D at Knockadoon are both oval and similar in plan and size to Northton (Northton is slightly larger) and at site C, which may also be contemporary with Beaker in view of the discussion above, there were found three circular houses, c.21ft. (6.46m.) in diameter.

The Beaker pottery from sites C and D will be looked at here and any fig. Nos. quoted will refer to those in O'Riordain 1954. The pottery from the excavation was well illustrated by O'Riordain and a shortage of time in Dublin denied the writer the opportunity to search through all the cigarette cartons and match boxes in which the collection is at present stored. The mixture of pottery from sites C and D is very much what one would expect from a domestic site in Britain or Ireland and includes 'classic' fine ware Beakers ranging through to coarse ware, and also elements of non-Beaker pottery in this case in the form of Lough Gur class I and II, and Food vessel pottery. From site C the bulk of the Beaker pottery would appear to have been decorated with incision with combed and corded vessels being very much in the minority. There is little evidence from the pottery to suggest any motifs that may have been used but fig. 20:4 sugg-
ests that running filled chevrons were present, and fig. 20:17 also shows oblique decoration. The majority of the other sherds suggest that there was a large element of horizontal decoration present though sherds such as fig. 20:5 and 11 hint that the decoration may have been contracted into zones. Two rim sherds (fig. 20:1 and 2) are decorated with horizontal combed lines suggesting AO combed sherds, 20:1 also having internal decoration which is a characteristic of this class of vessel, and the comb(s) used would appear to be similar to those used on many other fine ware Beakers seen in Britain as the impressions are fine and rectangular and contrast strongly with some of the comb decoration on the coarser Food Vessel pottery (fig. 20:21,23) whose combed lines have been executed by a comb with large square teeth similar to the impressions found on some of the Food Vessel pottery from some of the western Scottish Beaker domestic sites already looked at above. In addition to the two types of comb mentioned above there is also a sherd that appears to have triangular decoration made by a comb with small rounded teeth of a type again seen in Britain (fig. 30:3). The sherd appears to be a rim sherd, and is not 'typical' Beaker. There is also a fairly small element of fingernail impressed
pottery from site C at Knockadoon (fig. 30:1,2, and 4). On fig. 30:1 the impressions are somewhat elongated, and on fig. 30:4 the impressions form widely spaced pairs that would appear to have been made when the vessel was upside down. The size of this latter vessel would also appear to have been quite large suggesting that there may have been a comprehensive size range in the assemblage though few of the other sherds are diagnostic enough to permit size estimations. The base sherd fig. 20:14 would suggest a bulbous (necked?) profile to at least some of the pottery.

The pottery from site D at Knockadoon compares favourably with that from site C in that horizontal incision predominates, but at site D there is more evidence for motif ed decoration and a few more hints at the form of some of the vessels. To look first at the minor decorative techniques from this site, twisted cord decoration is scarcely represented but fig 35:14 suggests an ACC sherd with both internal and external horizontal cord lines. The rim would appear to be flat. Fig. 35:13 is a simple rounded rim sherd and the decoration is again both internal and external. This time, the cord consists of short lengths of twisted cord, almost like whipped cord maggots, forming short oblique impressions.
The decoration is both internal and external and is a form more commonly found on Food vessels in England and Scotland rather than on Beakers. The distinction between incised decoration and blurred comb is, as ever, difficult to draw, especially as the writer is working from another’s published drawings and not from the originals, but nevertheless, O’Riordain reports that ‘It is notable that (the) lines are not of comb or cog-wheel and that...with the exception of one or two fragments no comb.... impressions occur on the site D Beakers’. (O’Riordain, 1954, p.394). Like site C, the incision predominantly takes the form of multiple horizontal lines, some of which are broken (fig. 36:2,3,12 etc.). A rim sherd (fig. 35:3) has both internal and external incised decoration in a similar manner to AO decorated sherds while other sherds (fig. 36:4-6) show definite contraction of the decoration. One incised rim sherd and three undecorated ones all have cords below the rim (fig. 35:9,17,18,27), a feature that has been seen to be common in Scottish assemblages. Nos. 5:9 is incision decorated on the exterior except for the ridge which is left undecorated and is thus emphasised; Fig. 35:17 and 18 are both undecorated vessels and on the former sherd the ridge appears to be not so much a cordon as a
Carination as the vessel wall is a uniform thickness. These cordons below the rims are found on other sites in Ireland as shall be seen below.

The motifs represented among the incised sherds are limited and basic. Fig. 35:12 shows Clarke's ladder pattern (also 36:29), fig. 36:25 has the ermine motif between horizontal lines, and other sherds show either herringbone or else zones of diagonal lines between horizontal incision. These diagonal lines are also detectable on the cordoned sherd fig. 35:9 mentioned above. Fingernail decoration appears to be either absent or dubious.

Fig. 37 represents the lower portion of a Beaker-like vessel and it is decorated with incised Beaker motifs. The scheme of decoration visible is two lines of ladder motif linked by groups of three vertical and parallel incised lines forming basic metopes. A patch of vertical herringbone incision suggests that at least some of the metopes may have been filled. As O'Riordain rightly points out to reconstruct this vessel as a 'classic' 'S'-profiled Beaker would result in a vessel too large to be plausible. The most likely reconstruction, therefore, is a large (hemispherical?) bowl paralleled in its basic form by some of the polypod bowls from other Irish and Dutch findspots.
Some of the 'Food Vessel and various' pottery illustrated by O'Riordain (fig. 38) is interesting in its general similarity to the Beaker sherds. It is immediately noticeable that the fabric of the sherds is much thicker and probably also coarser than the Beaker sherds, but the decoration is very similar indeed, especially the incised herringbone which is rather carelessly executed in both the Beaker and Food Vessel assemblages. Fig. 38:1 also has a cordon below the rim like some of the Beaker sherds, and 38:14 has incised filled triangles decorating the base which is also found on some Beakers in Britain. Perhaps it is best if we regard the Food Vessel as the coarse ware and some of the crudely incised Beaker sherds as intermediate between the fine and coarse ware pottery from the assemblage.

The contemporaneity of the pottery with the Class I and II pottery from the site must be regarded as uncertain. According to O'Riordain's stratigraphy, Lough Gur Class I and Class II pottery generally appear before the adoption of Beaker pottery, but there must be at least an element of overlap and a degree of contemporaneity. In view of the stratigraphical argument above, however, it is this degree of contemporaneity at site D that is an un-
known quantity. The amount of Class I pottery is, however, quite small consisting of few rim sherds and some three or so body sherds with sharp carinations or lugs. Class Ia pottery would appear to be much more common with its heavy rims and incised decoration more in keeping with later Neolithic wares as found in Britain and sand-dune sites in Ireland. Its association with Beaker pottery is not unparalleled in Ireland (Case, 1961).

More common on site D, however, is the occurrence of Lough Gur Class II ware, corresponding, not unexpectedly, to Case's Knockadoon style (op. cit). The decoration on the sherds from site D is scarce and limited. There is one illustrated example of incised lattice decoration, and possibly three examples of fingernail impressions (fig. 34:15, 16 and 20). A large number of the rims are perforated, probably a functional rather than a decorative feature, and though there are a variety of rim forms, the majority are unified in their thickening. Flat, rounded, inturned, and internally bevelled rims are all present. Clubbed and flaring rims are also present but in smaller numbers, and one wall sherd has horizontal ribs in a manner similar to some of the Grooved Ware pottery from sites such as Manham Hill in Yorkshire. Case (op. cit) sees the Class II ware
as beginning slightly later than the Beaker introduction in Ireland but being largely contemporary with Beaker pottery. In many respects it resembles strongly the Grooved ware tradition in Britain, the ribbing already mentioned for example, the coarseness of the fabric, some of the rim forms, and also the general bucket profiles of the pots. It is also interesting to note that the Class II pottery occurs predominantly on domestic sites or in domestic contexts, another similarity with British Grooved Ware and a matter that will be taken up again below.

The Beaker assemblages from sites C and D at Knockadoon are both quite early in the sequence and no late traits are immediately recognisable. All the motifs are early as is the AO decoration, and the cordoned rims are more common among early assemblages than later ones, using early and late stylistically rather than absolutely. In the absence of reconstructable pots it is difficult to attribute them to any of Lanting and van der Waals' steps, in addition to the fact that Ireland was not one of the Dutchmen's focus areas. The motifs, however, do bear a similarity to some early pottery from Wessex and so the Lough Cur assemblages above can be tentatively classed as from step 3 Beakers. Out
of characteristic for a stylistically early assemblage, however, is the vast amount of incised decoration, a degeneration of the decorative techniques that is normally found fairly widespread on late assemblages. This could suggest that a fair amount of imitation may be taking place, a possibility already seen in Scotland.

Nearby the Lough Cor area is a peculiar but well-known monument, the Grange stone circle. It differs from most monuments of this type, however, as the stones form a continuous circle, and are not free-standing as in most stone circles. Another peculiarity is the fact that the stones also form a contiguous revetment for the external bank, continuous apart from a stone-lined entrance passage. The 'floor' of the monument had been prepared and levelled with a layer of gravel and clay. Beaker was found associated with two hearths on the old ground surface beneath this clay level and, like the Beaker from the recumbant stone circles of Aberdeenshire (Old Keig and Loanhead of Daviot), seems to be contemporary with the construction of the monument. Again the writer relies on the drawings of the pottery published by O'Riordain (1951) and figure numbers refer to the original report. O'Riordain admits that not all the decorated Bea-
ker has been drawn, but does claim to have published a representative sample and it is at once obvious that the Beaker sherds differ considerably from those already seen at Knockadoon. The main difference is the use of comb at Grange which is much more frequent here, the use of cord which is not common but certainly present, and the fact that the incised sherds are in the minority - at least among the published drawings. The sherds are generally small and uninformative with regard to form. It is possible that some of the combed and corded sherds belong to AO decorated Beakers but there is clearly an element of zone-decorated vessels, with cross hatching. The depth of these zones would also seem to vary (compare fig. 6:19 and 6:23). The one reconstructable vessel is a necked Beaker with broad contracted zones occupied by filled triangles. The somewhat cylindrical neck suggests a step 6 vessel, and none of the other sherds would be out of keeping with this identification, bearing in mind the longevity of AO decorated sherds. Filled chevrons would also appear to be present among the incised decorated sherds (fig. 6:9) but also in this class are sherds with a much more haphazard decorative scheme, and with the incisions carelessly executed (fig. 6:1 and 2). Overlapping of incised lines is clearly visible on fig.
Lough Gur Class I and II are also present among the pottery from beneath the bank, as well as Food Vessel sherds, and so the assemblage is similar to that from Knockadoon. Decorated sherds, however, do not seem to be as common from the interior of the Orange circle as they were at Knockadoon site D but the vessels represented would still appear to be from large, coarse, bucket-shaped vessels. The Food Vessel pottery is decorated with incision, comb and cord impressions and both bowl and vase would appear to be present (fig. 4:1, 2 and 8). The combs used to decorate the Food Vessels again coarse with large square teeth, and contrasts strongly with the comb(s) used on the Beakers.

Among O'Riordain's 'miscellaneous' sherds from the interior of the circle are some incised sherds which would appear to be from the 'grey' area between the distinct pottery types of Beaker and Food Vessel and which possibly represent one of the coarse domestic wares. Different comb types are also visible, fig. 8:19, for example, having impressions made by a comb with small rounded teeth. Maggot decoration is also noticeable (fig. 8:25, 26) and probably comes from a Food Vessel rather than a late neolithic impressed bowl. There is also a quantity
of fingernail rusticated pottery illustrated, but again no vessels are reconstructable. As at Knockadoon sites there are, at Grange, sherds of ribbed pottery, this time with an apparently 'corky' appearance, and the ribs appear to be both vertical and horizontal in at least one case (fig. 8:8). The ribs of figs. 8:1, 2 and 8, are not as rounded as the other sherds and indeed seem to have been formed as a result of deep broad grooving, again bringing British Grooved Ware to mind.

Two important Beaker domestic sites in the Irish Republic at Newgrange and Knowth, both gallery graves in the Bend of the Boyne cemetery in Co. Meath, are awaiting full publication but the writer has been allowed to examine the sherds by the respective excavators (Prof. O'Kelly and Prof. Eogan) and gratefully acknowledges their help and co-operation.

At Newgrange, there was a clear Beaker horizon and the pottery from it can be regarded as from a sealed context. As well as a certain amount of true Beaker from the site, there is also a great deal of 'coarse' ware and non-Beaker pottery which has been illustrated here in preference to the fine ware. Fingernail impressions are not abundant from Newgrange, but are nevertheless present, and fig. NEW 1:4-6 are probably all from the same vessel, the
motif is linear paired fingernail. Random fingernail also appear on NEW 1:21. NEW 1:1 and 3 are probably also both from one pot and this would appear to have been a moderately large coarse incised vessel with incision of a type seen at Northton and at Rockwold cum Wilton. This is only one of a large series of incised pottery from the Beaker horizon at Newgrange though unfortunately the profiles of the majority of the vessels cannot be reconstructed. NEW 1:7, for example is a sizeable sherd with incised diagonal lines, probably a fairly loose lattice pattern, and the fabric is coarse but hard and brittle. The most likely reconstruction would be to see this as part of the collar from a collared urn. The internal rim bevel would also be in support of this, but it is difficult to be certain.

Finer incision also appears on sherds with Beaker fabric (NEW 2:20 NEW 4:16) but especially interesting are sherds NEW 2:11 and NEW 2:10 which are both large, coarse incised sherds very similar to British Grooved ware in fabric and decoration, and although the profiles are not reconstructable, the rim angles suggest that they might have had Grooved Ware 'bucket' shaped profiles. The flat rim of NEW 2:11 is interesting as it has a deep incised line on the top giving it a grooved effect.
The 'classic' Beaker represented seems to have basically simple motifs (NEW 3:4) such as herringbone, both double and interrupted, ladder pattern, slanting lines, and cross hatching. Few have reconstructable profiles but it would appear that the majority represent European Beakers rather than necked Beakers. It would appear therefore, that the assemblage might be an early one. Later traits are, however, also present in the form of metoped decoration (NEW 4:14) so perhaps step 3/4 Beakers are represented. In keeping with the early traits among the assemblage are several rims, slightly everted, with external cordons (NEW 2: 18, 22, 23, NEW 4:7 and 8) of a type found both at Lough Gur and at Scottish sites both surveyed above. The profiles of these vessels have only been drawn here, but both decorated and undecorated vessels are represented. Fig. NEW 2:18 and NEW 4:8 are from plain vessels, as far as can be ascertained from the sherds, while the others are combined with comb decoration. NEW 2:22 has two lines of comb decoration (horizontal) below the cordon, as does NEW 2:23. Fig. NEW 4:7 has a faint comb line both above and below the cordon and though too little of the vessels apparently survive to allow pontification, it is probable that they represent, by analogy, either undecorated or else
A few other rim forms are interesting in their unusualness. The first of these types is a fairly heavy rim with virtually a rounded external moulding, and concave internal bevel (NEW 1:13, 2:26, 4:3). The only parallels for this known to the writer from domestic contexts are those coarse urn vessels from Huckwold cum Wilton. They differ from the Newgrange types in that they are considerably coarser and larger, and are decorated with impressed techniques (see catalogue). Some Food Vessel and Collared Urns do have similar rims however, and it should be remembered that some of the Collared Urn class have a very fine 'Beaker-like' fabric similar to the Newgrange sherds. An example of both the rim form and the fine fabric is a vessel from Old Fletton and now in Peterborough Museum (Gibson, A.M. 1979).

What might appear to be a variation of this rim type is an internall pointing rim rather like a type of Urn collar (NEW 2:7, 13, 15). Again the writer is turned towards Huckwold cum Wilton for parallels. The concave profile of NEW 2:7 below the rim may suggest a profile similar to a tripartite Collared Urn (see an urn from Newark Pits, Peterborough. Gibson, A.M. 1979) or more probably Murlough Bowls but the sharp and apparently conical profile of NEW
2:13 suggests a shape more resembling a Fengate type pot. NEW 2:15 would also appear to have been tripartite.

The inturned rims of sherds NEW 2:12 and 4:5 are also unusual in the writer's experience, though Clarke illustrates some rims of this type from Germany (1970 fig. 47a and b). Liversage, however, illustrates a similar sherd from Dalkey Island (1968, p. 98 my fig. D.I. 6:12). Liversage remarks on the lack of parallels for this rim, which he classes as a Food Vessel. There are, however, other parallels among the Dalkey Island material itself (D.I. 6:22, 23, D.I. 5:12, 13 etc.) though the profile is not always so angular. The main difference, however, is that the sherds from Dalkey Island are decorated and the Newgrange vessels are both undecorated. A similar undecorated rim, however, comes from the enclosure at Monknewton (MNK 1:3) though it does not appear to be illustrated in Sweetman's report of the excavations (1976). Inturned rims of this type are, of course, common in the Irish Neolithic (e.g. Goodland bowls) though normally the pottery is decorated. These plain vessels from Newgrange, nevertheless, may be 'domestic' equivalents.

Fig. NEW 3:11 is an unusual bowl and illust-
rates well the hitherto unknown pottery forms that may occur on domestic sites. The pot is in a red-brown fabric typical of 'classic' Beaker but the flat based convex sided profile is very unusual. The vessel is also perforated on two levels. The base was presumably intended to be flat but differential expansion during firing has resulted in it being internally convex.

A strange collection of fine, dark coloured, pottery comes from beneath satellite Z at Newgrange and closely resembles Grooved Ware though the fabric is invariably fine. The vessels of this type are also unusually undecorated save for one to three shallow grooves on the inside of the rim. The bowls seem to vary in size quite considerably (NEW 2:22 and NEW 3:1 for example) and though the fabric varies in thickness, it is still generally fine. True Beaker also comes from this context. The decoration is combed, and the motifs include herringbone, cross hatching, and multiple horizontal lines with diagonal fringes.

At Knath, Beaker activity seems to have been all round the mound and not to the two areas published by Prof. Bogan in 1976 since as excavation continues, more Beaker comes to light (pers. comm. from Prof. Bogan). Not unexpectedly, the pottery bears some resemblance
to that from Newgrange. Again only a selection of the pottery has been drawn here and attention has been given to the less typical 'Beaker' pieces and associated pottery. As at Newgrange there appear to be stylistically early motifs represented such as the combed and incised zoned herringbone of KNO 1:23, 1:21, and there also appears to be a small element of AO decoration, both cord and comb (KNO 2:2 and 3). KNO 3:2 bears a striking resemblance to the tub-like bowls from Newgrange but extremely interesting is the large bucket-shaped vessel KNO 2:11 which is virtually 'classic' Grooved Ware in the Clacton Style (Longworth and Wainwright, 1971), both in decoration, including the ribs on the interior of the rim, and in fabric. This is not the only Grooved Ware vessel from Knowth, however, and another that has not been drawn here, also in the Clacton style, has a base diameter of c.20cm. There are also other ribbed sherds which perhaps originate in the Lough Gur class II tradition, as similar sherds have been seen already at Knockadoon and Grange, and again is probably related to the British Grooved Ware tradition, in the form of KNO 1:3-5. The fabric is medium to coarse in texture and not unlike some of the Urn pottery in Ireland. An element of Irish Food Vessel pottery would also appear to be present in the form of KNO 1:9-12, 2:9,12 (etc), suggesting a later
element in the assemblage and in keeping with the small element of metoped Beaker (KNO 1:22 for example) and so a very similar date for the Knowth pottery to that from Newgrange might be expected. Interesting to note is the use of shell impressions to decorate KNO 1:12, the wavy nature of which impressions would suggest that a limpet shell had been used.

An interesting range of Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age pottery comes from Dalkey Island near Dublin (Liversage, C.D., 1968). The site was an apromontory fort on the southern extremity of Dublin Bay, but low layers in the interior also yielded shell middens, prehistoric pottery and Neolithic features such as pits and postholes. Beaker pottery appears to have come from one of the two shell middens in site V, and from site II where the prehistoric features consisted of a shell midden, three pits, a shallow trench, and some postholes. Beaker also was found in some of the trial cuttings (Nos. 1,1c,3 and 4) but the details of the stratigraphy in these cuttings is very difficult to determine. The details of the stratigraphy that Liversage gives for the site shows that Beaker sherds were found immediately over, in and under the shells but little more than this can be determined. Only a very few pots are given any
detailed provenances. Both early and late Beakers appear to be represented at Dalkey and so the assemblage is, in some respects, similar to that from some of the Scottish sand dune sites on the Lothian coast. The AO decorated Beakers such as DI 4:9, are not in themselves evidence of date as attention has already been drawn to the longevity of such vessels, however, there are sherds that represent early Maritime, or at any rate European, Bell Beakers which do not share the longevity of the AO corded or combed vessels (DI 4:4, 5:2). In this case, it is possible that the AO decorated vessels are to be seen as contemporary with these early Bell Beakers, and some of the cordoned vessels may also be included (DI 1:5, 2:11). Fig. DI 1:7 may also be included in this category, but its form is quite different and it may represent pots from a 'grey area' between Beaker and Food Vessel. Necked vessels, similar to some from Scottish sand dune sites and elsewhere in Britain are also found at Dalkey Island, such as the sherd with filled lozenge decoration (DI 4:7) and the sherd with contracted ladder zone decoration (DI 4:8) both possibly from the same vessel. Some everted rims may also be associated with at least part of this assemblage (DI 5:4 and 5) but it is difficult to be certain in view of the hazy strati-
The third type of Beaker present would be classed as Beaker/Food Vessel hybrids if they were found in Britain, and the same may be true in Ireland. Madden (Madden, A.C., 1968) classifies this type as her class III Beaker noted for its generally bipartite bowl shape and the decoration which veers away from the traditional horizontal zones in favour of more vertical decoration. These criteria are certainly present among the late Beakers from Dalkey Island (DI 5:9, 6:2, 7:3 and 8, 7:1 and 2 etc.).

Among the coarser pottery from Dalkey Island, there is obviously an element of Food Vessel (DI 2:1, 5:12 - 14, 6:10 - 19 etc.) and some coarse urn-like ware (DI 2:12) but there are also vessels that are more difficult to characterise such as DI 3:15. Madden (op.cit.) sees this as a Beaker with rather coarser fabric than normal as is quite often the case in Irish Beaker, however the use of fine whipped decoration and the type of incision employed is hardly typical of Beaker whether Irish or British. The rim angle, unfortunately is difficult to reconstruct. Madden prefers to see a more flaring rim so giving a roughly necked Beaker shape. A more upright rim as reconstructed here, however, would give a shape similar to some of the shouldered jar pottery from Islay the deep internal rim decoration of which
compare very favourably with the Dalkey Island vessel as does the Beaker-like motifs of the decorative scheme, while the decorative techniques are not Beaker affinity. This parallel, however, is put forward very tentatively in view of the difficulties of reconstruction. Of the fingernail decorated pottery it is interesting to note that there is an absence of random fingernail impressions but instead both single and paired fingernail decoration appears in linear or modified form (e.g. DI 1:1,3 and 4). Some of the finger decorated sherds are obviously from Food Vessel pottery (DI 3:6 and 7).

At Rathjordan in Co. Limerick there was extensive evidence of pre-barrow domestic activity at Barrow III in the form of pits, postholes, and areas of burning (O'Riordain, 3.P. 1948). There appeared to be only one phase of occupation, and O'Riordain saw all the pottery types as contemporary. Again the pottery has been well-published by O'Riordain and fig. Nos. here refer to those of the original report. There are firstly types that O'Riordain refers to as 'Neolithic types' (fig. 5) which consists mainly of undecorated rim types, some fairly upright and some everted, the latter suggesting carinated bowls. Some rims are internally bevelled and ledged resembling some Grooved Ware traditions
and probably represent Lough Gur II pottery. Two Wall sherds and a rim sherd illustrated have carinations suggesting a (small ?) element of Western Neolithic types. One sherd with horizontal fingernail impressions and three with incised herringbone decoration did not, to the excavator, resemble Beaker or Food Vessel pottery and so were assigned to the 'Neolithic' class. It has been seen already at Lough Gur, however, and at Dalkey Island, from similar contexts and possibly represents one of the types of domestic 'coarse' ware in use at the time.

The Food Vessel pottery from the site is decorated in a number of ways seen already at other sites, especially the use of a comb with large square teeth unlike the finer tools used on Beakers. There would also appear to be attempts at zoning of this decoration, some attempts being very irregular, probably more by choice than accident (fig. 5:6, 8 - 10). Incised lines have also been employed, sometimes to delineate these zones (fig. 5:10) and sometimes diagonally in a manner frequently seen on some types of Grooved Ware jars (fig. 5:18). The three rim bevels illustrated are decorated with square toothed comb. Some Food Vessel types with well defined false relief decoration are also illustrated (fig. 5:1 - 5) and this form of decoration is combined with both incised
and impressed decoration especially the use of large square toothed comb.

The Beaker pottery is composed of very small fragments and evidence for form or for motifs used is limited. Rims illustrated are generally simple, sometimes internally bevelled, and once externally bevelled (fig. 6:21). Sometimes the bevel is reduced simply to internal thinning of an otherwise simple rim (fig. 6:2). Internal decoration is rare and only two such rims are illustrated. One has multiple horizontal lines of comb on the outside and two or three twisted cord lines on the inside. This is a combination of techniques that has been met with before at Callis Weld and in Scotland but that is generally quite rare. Apart from this twisted cord the other decorative techniques employed are either incision or comb decoration. It is possible that fingernails may have been used to execute some of the shorter lengths of incision. Motifs that are discernable comprise ermine motif, (fig. 6:7 ladder motif (fig. 6:8 and 9), chevrons (fig. 6:31) and fringes, either incised or fingernailed (fig. 6:10 - 13), and cross-hatching (fig. 6:14 and 15). The majority of the other sherds all have multiple horizontal lines of comb or incision, and a rectangular toothed and a round toothed comb have
both been used. There is nothing among the sherds to suggest a late assemblage, and the presence of AO combed Beakers is likely. The other motifs used also appear early in the sequence.

A small but interesting assemblage of pottery comes from Rockbarten Bog, about one mile from Lough Gur, where three ash and charcoal spreads were found, an associated pile of pot-boilers suggesting that the site was a cooking place (Mitchell, G.F., and O'Riordain, S.P. 1943). Pollen analysis suggested to the excavators that the three spreads were contemporary and that the site had only had a short period of use, or else was used seasonally. Beaker sherds certainly come from all the sites (I, II and III) for example ROC. 1:1, 2 and 3 respectively. The majority of Beaker, however, comes from site II where both combed and incised decoration is present, but is, in every case, simply in the form of horizontal lines. Only in one case is the horizontal comb combined with (fingernail ?) impressions forming a fringe. The fringe is on the bottom of a zone, but there is no evidence for the zone above the fringe being decorated. One sherd with horizontal comb impressions from site II has been decorated with a large square-toothed comb and may in fact be Food Vessel by analogy with other sherds decorated in this
way and seen above. The comb is certainly larger than that used on any of the other combed sherds. Two sherds from site II are also decorated with fingernail impressions (ROC 1:7) which are apparently single and random. An unusual sherd with a rim type not previously seen in this survey comes from site I and has a 'Y'-shaped section (ROC 1:4). The pot is undecorated both internally and externally and the outer surface is blackened by carbon while the inside is a 'clean' buff colour. The fabric is corky in nature and pitted with often large surface breaks. It is possible that the rim form is more utilitarian than decorative and may have been designed to act as a platform for a lid, possibly made from wood and not necessarily of pottery. In addition, a Rockbarton there is a straight sided jar, presumably flat based, with herringbone stab and drag on the rim and one line of oblique stab and drag on the exterior above a cordon c.2cm. below the externally lipped rim.

Case sees the Rockbarton pots as occurring consistently in association with Beaker (Case, H.J., 1961) and dating from c.2000-1750 B.C. consistent with the time range of Beakers. The assemblage at Rockbarton, for reasons already mentioned, would appear to be stylistically early.

A considerable amount of pottery came from the
area of a hut and its associated occupation debris at the enclosure of Monknewtown in Co. Meath, (Sweetman, D.F. 1976). Sweetman could not find any evidence of stratification within the occupation layer, often up to 60cm. deep, and so the pottery was treated, and is treated here, as an associated assemblage, and Sweetman was of the opinion that the debris represented a short but intensive period of occupation. The assemblage compares well with those looked at so far in Ireland, in that the pottery present represents a mixture of Beaker and 'native' traditions, and it can be closely paralleled with the assemblages seen at Knockadoon. There is a small element of carrinated bowl, all of which is undecorated, and there is a larger element of 'coarse ware' including fingernail impressed pottery, vessels with stab and drag decoration, and finally linear (bird bone ?) impressions. There is also some incised Rockbarten Ware with herringbone incision of which two illustrated sherds have cords below their round, simple rims. Some of this pottery is decorated with incised (ladder ?) pattern and incised zig-zags and cross hatchings are also present. These sherds can all be paralleled at Knockadoon. The difference between Beaker and Rockbarten pottery of this type, however, is difficult to recognise and
and the everted rim and external cordon of one sherd (report fig. 9:427) suggests a Beaker profile, and is not unlike the cordon rims from AOC Beakers. It may be that in some cases at least so-called Rockbarton pottery had Beaker profiles and was distinguished from true Beaker only by the decoration and its frequent crudeness. This is not always a useful criterion, however, as can be seen from the partially reconstructed Beaker (report fig. 11:291) the lower part of which especially has crude incision of a type seen on some of the Rockbarton pots already mentioned. All of the Beaker sherds are also decorated with incised lines and comb was not used at all at Monknewtown except for a very few sherds with diagonal lines made by either a round-toothed or square-toothed comb. The incised decoration takes the form of either cross-hatching or else herringbone and parallel horizontal lines. A cordoned and everted rim sherd almost identical to the Rockbarton rim mentioned above is also illustrated in the report (fig. 11:494a) but the decoration differs, and in this case consists of four horizontal scored lines below the cordon.

The coarse ribbed pottery is doubtless to be identified as class II coarse ware, but some of it is drastically unusual and differs from both the
Knockadoon and Grange styles as it is sometimes decorated with incisions, impressions, and bosses. Sweetman reports that he was not able to find any direct parallels for this type of pottery in Ireland and could only find individual traits in isolation. This is echoed by the writer but it is a phenomenon that need not really be regarded as problematic. A characteristic of the Irish pottery seen so far is its individuality and there are many forms of Beaker that are insular and 'strange' or 'hybrid' to eyes more familiar with the British material. It seems only to be expected that this individuality will extend into the domestic repertoire. The basic shape of these vessels from Monknewtown appears to be a well-known one and the decoration and knobs (which do not appear to be functional) must be regarded as 'optional extras' credited to the individual likes and dislikes of the potter. The free-range of the potter is something that is all too often given little toleration by the Archaeologist who tends to regard the prehistoric craftsmen as not being capable of producing pottery that does not conform with established typologies. Hence terms such as 'Beaker/Urn hybrid' need to be adopted. Settlement excavation, however, is showing that a large range of vessels, often combining characteri-
stics of different types of pot, were in contemporary use (see especially Kilellan Farm and Northton). Nor should it be regarded as puzzling that the Monknewtown assemblage differs dramatically from those from the nearby sites of Newgrange and Knowth as the Monknewtown assemblage appears much later than the other two mentioned, and this is supported by the date of 1860±45 B.C. which was obtained from charcoal from the hearth of the house.

The Beaker assemblages from Ireland that have been surveyed above are quite consistent in their constituents. They all, for example, have a fair mixture of Beaker, both 'classic' and degenerate, and coarse pottery such as Lough Gur II or Rockbarton ware, and sometimes also nominally later types of pottery such as Food Vessel. As in Britain, a variety of comb types appear to have been in use, such as examples with thin rectangular and with small round teeth, and invariably combs with large square teeth are used on Food Vessel pottery and are absent on Beaker wares. There is also a great deal of merging or overlap between the Food Vessel and Beaker types in Ireland. This has been recognised already from the sepulchral pottery and is also evident in the domestic assemblages. Western Neolithic ware would also appear to be a consistent constituent
of the Irish domestic assemblages and its presence has been noted at Knockadoon, Grange, Monknewtown and Rathjordan to name but four examples.

Much of the Lough Gur Class II pottery found associated with Beaker is very interesting on account of its striking similarity with some Grooved Ware pottery, especially ribbed varieties from some sites in Yorkshire, Manham Hill for example, but also in its general 'tub-shaped' form and also some of the deep concave internal rim bevels. True Grooved Ware of a type seen in Britain is rare in Ireland with the notable exception of the sherds from Newgrange and Knowth already described above, however the same tradition of 'utilitarian' heavy duty vessels can be seen in the Irish Class II ware. Of importance too are their flat bases and Beakers, Rockbarton and Class II pottery must by regarded as the origins of the flat based traditions of subsequent Irish prehistory; a role played by Beaker, Rusticated ware and Grooved Ware in Britain. Rusticated ware of a type found in Britain with profuse fingernail and tip decoration is virtually absent in Ireland but its place would appear to have been taken as the secondary domestic ware by Rockbarton and perhaps also Kilhoyle pottery. It is interesting to note that giant Beaker pottery either in the Dutch 'potbeker'
or the British styles are not present in Ireland or at least have not yet been recognised. It will be interesting to see the assemblage from Ballynagilly and how it compares with the rest of the Irish material (footnote 1).

As has already been stated above, and which will be discussed in more detail below, the Irish material, is in many ways, similar to that from the North and West of Scotland in its striking individuality and its frequent refusals to fit into any established typologies. This can perhaps be taken as an indication of a certain amount of Beaker imitation and it would certainly seem that specialist 'Beaker potters' were not working in Ireland, or if they were, then in only very small numbers. This is supported by Madden's argument that Beaker introduction into Ireland did not seem to alter the existing 'Neolithic' set up (Madden A.C. 1976), an argument similar to that of Burgess and Shennan (1976). It minimises any movement of people to a few, possibly traders, and that the pots were so popular suggests that the pottery itself was important as opposed to any tradable commodity that it might have held.

***************
FOOTNOTES

1) The pottery from Ballynahilly has not been included in this work as the excavator would not allow the writer to examine it and too little about the pottery has been published to even allow work from secondary sources.
BEAKER DOMESTIC SITES IN THE NETHERLANDS
BEAKER DOMESTIC SITES IN THE NETHERLANDS

As in Britain it has often been claimed that there is a paucity of Beaker domestic sites in the Netherlands and clearly there are only a few large sites comparable with British sites such as Northton, Bell-Tout, or Newgrange. House plans are similarly lacking in any numbers and the majority of sites are recognised as 'domestic scatters' or similar hidden sites. Also, like Britain, there are few early Bell Beaker domestic sites and the majority are datable to the later phases of the Bell Beaker culture in Holland, especially to the period of the Veluwe Beakers and Barbed Wire Beakers. Taking the place of early Bell Beaker sites, however, may be the famous PPB sites such as Zanderven, Kolhorn and Aartswoud. This is a question that can only be resolved by more intensive and detailed excavation and by a detailed programme of C14 dating. Lanting and van der Waals are forced to conclude 'So the settlement evidence is fairly negative, but for PPB, A00 and BB, all to the same degree' (1974, p.72).

It would appear from the evidence that any continuity of pottery types that would appear to
be forthcoming from these settlement sites is very tenuous, and is much the same in character as in Britain. For example, we find that Peterborough Ware and Grooved Ware are both found in association with Beaker in domestic contexts, and so we can assume that there was an element of contemporaneity in their use. Exactly what degree of contemporaneity however, is difficult to say. Examples of stratigraphy showing clear 'Neolithic' occupation followed by Beaker is rare, Northton being a notable exception, and the state of affairs is similar in Holland but in this case Vlaardingen is an exception as it provides us with a series of pottery horizons.

Another interesting site of this type is Zandwerven in the province of North Holland (van Regteren Altena, et. al. 1962) which was excavated twice, once in 1928/29 and then again in 1957/58. In the first series of excavations three occupation layers were found, Vlaardingen pottery was found in the lower layers, though it was then unrecognised, and FFB pottery was found as high as layer III which merged into the topsoil (layer IV). Re-examination of the pottery, however, showed that there was in fact also FFB pottery in layer II and in the 1957/58
excavations only one occupation layer was recognised
and this contained both Vlaardingen and PFB pottery
and the two were only distinguishable typologically.
Sherds of c.20 PFB vessels, of types 1a, 1b, and
1c, were found. Though the stratigraphy of 1928/9
was not noticed in the later excavations, it still
may have been present as a series of pits were
found in 1957/8 containing food refuse such as fish
and porpoise bones, shell fish shells and cattle
bones. It is notable that the only pottery found
in these pits was Vlaardingen pottery and PFB pot-
tery was completely absent from the site. A C14
determination of 2040±65 b.c. (Gr 2221) was obtai-
ned from charcoal from one of the pits, though the
date would appear to be too young as van Regteren
Altena pointed out.

The PFB pottery from the site is interesting
in itself. Both fine and coarse wares seem to be
predictably present, for example the fine cord
decorated ware (ZAN 1:17 and 19) and heavier vessels
with pronounced and rolled rims (fig. ZAN 1:13,14).
Fingertip decorated pottery is typical on such dom-
estic sites as Zandwerven although it is consider-
ably different from even the fine of the British
rusticated Beaker and the two clearly cannot be
connected in all but the remotest way. The finger-
tip impressions on the PFB pottery are often placed in alternating rows so that the displaced clay often forms wavy cordon along the pot (fig. ZAN 1:8 and 10). Interesting too, however, is the cordoned pottery represented by such rims as ZAN 1:11, 15 and 18, the cordon sometimes being embellished with fingernail impressions or by circular stabs. The presence of a cordon in this position on various pottery traditions of NW Europe, such as TRB, PFB, Bell Beaker, and later in the Barbed Wire and 'Pot-beker' (variations of the Bell Beaker ware suggests that the cordon may in fact be a functional device and its frequency on domestic sites should be noted.

Aartswooud is a similar PFB domestic site which unfortunately has been excavated largely in lm. strips so that little in the way of structural evidence has been recovered though some post-hole right-angles may in fact be the corners of rectangular huts (R.P.I. van Iterson Scholten, pers. comm.). Hearths seem to be scattered throughout the comparatively deep occupation layers, especially in the southern part of the site and these hearths seem to have been built on deliberately prepared clay platforms. The publication of the excavations at Aartswooud is eagerly awaited and work on the pottery is still in progress in the I.P.P. in Amsterdam. It
seems, however, that all types of Dutch PFB pottery are present on the site and that there is no difference in either their horizontal or vertical distribution though the sherd types and co-ordinates are currently being fed into a computer and subtleties of distribution may in fact be picked out in this way. The writer was only able to see a very small quantity of the Aartswoud pottery because of the amount involved and also the work in progress on it and did not personally see any Bell Beaker from the site. Interpretation of the pottery seems to be split, however as Mr. van Iterson Scholten sees some Bell Beaker represented by a few ACC sherds and incised cross-hatching. His pottery assistant, however, Mr. Munson, thinks that these sherds are probably PF Beakers and are at best hybrid PFB/BB forms (pers. comm.), a phenomenon that may prove very interesting to current thoughts on Beaker origins such as those of Lanting and van der Waals (1974). The rusticated pottery from Aartswoud is similar to that already seen at Zandwerven, though there is also some paired fingernail decoration which is more similar to the British rusticated ware though it must be emphasised that it was not possible to see all the pottery from both sites. All the pottery from Aartswoud, however,
is a rich black with smooth and often shiny surfaces. Mr. Iterson Scholten is of the opinion that this was the intention of the potter and that the colour of the pottery is not a result of the soil condition of the site.

The settlement at Anlo is interesting for the continuity at the site, from TRB occupation to that of the users of full Bronze Age pottery (Waterbolk, H.T. 1960). The TRB occupation was represented on the ground by a number of pits, charcoal from one of which giving a date of 2210±60 b.c. (GRO 1824), and these pits were filled with occupation debris in the same way as many similar pits in Britain. The PFB phase of the site, however, is much less ephemeral than normal as it saw the construction of a large cattle kraal which had at least two and probably three phases of rebuilding. This large trapezoidal kraal was probably still in use when Bell Beaker came to be used on the site, especially ACC Beaker. Five flat graves of Bell and PFB Beaker types are probably also of this period.

Other traces of occupation comprise a spread of Bell Beaker and Barbed Wire Beaker on the higher part of the site and differing in distribution from the TRB sherds. This pottery is very interesting for its similarities with the British material.
There are, for example, rims from coarse jars that would seem to have been of a considerable size. Rim types from these vessels would seem to draw to mind the undecorated shouldered jars from Kilellan Farm already looked at above. In the absence of parallels from between these two sites, and in the parallels for the shape among Dutch BW pottery, however, this similarity should not be over-emphasised and it would be ridiculous to envisage a common generic background. A characteristic that the pottery from these two sites does share, however, is the presence of an undecorated, heavy duty type of utility vessel. In addition to fine ware and comb decorated Bell Beaker—of which there does not seem to be a great deal—there is a range of rusticated ware bearing close comparison with the British sites such as that below Chippenham Barrow V in Cambridgeshire. Regular linear finger-nail impressions are common (Waterbolk, n.T., 1960, fig. 30) and there are examples of finger raised and moulded cordons of a type also found in Britain. Some apparently finer pottery from 'Potbeker' vessels was also located at Anlo.

The last Beaker phase at Anlo was represented by a small number of circular pits containing charcoal and small sherds of Barbed wire decorated pot-
tery. The sherds are typical of this type of pottery with decoration being made by both long and short lengths of whipped material. One reconstructable vessel (Waterbolk op. cit. fig. 29) has the form of neck already compared to the shouldered jars from Killellan Farm and also one line of internal twisted cord decoration on the lip. It has a reconstructed height of c.25 cm.

A similar range of pottery came from the settlement and burial site at Schipborg (van der Waals, J.D., 1962) with TRB, PFB, BB and BW pottery all being represented and probably occurring at the site in that order although it is likely that there were considerable overlaps. The Beaker settlement is, needless to say, rather ephemeral in nature but both the Bell Beaker and Barbed Wire pottery are closely comparable to the pottery from Anlo, though the amount of pottery is considerably less. The comb decorated pottery has been illustrated by Dr. van der Waals (op. cit. figs. 22 and 23) and comes from zone decorated vessels, but with contracted zones. One vessel was reconstructable and is decorated on the upper half with narrow zones filled with simple chevron decoration. This, however, has been very carelessly executed. In addition to this pottery there are sherds of fingernail
decorated ware (fig. N.003 1:24) similar in form, fabric and decoration to the British material from some sites such as Fakenham. There is also a 'pot-beker' element (report fig. 26), one reconstructable vessel having a restored height of c.25-30cm. This vessel is interesting as it has an ovoid body like many of the East Anglian Beakers, and it has an external cordon below the rim (compare 3.F. 3:4). The vessel is apparently decorated all over comprising lines of impressions made by a triangular point, a technique that is also found among Clarke's corpus of East Anglian Beakers and which is also present on a sherd from a large rusticated vessel from Fengate (Fen, l.o:12). One sherd of coarse ware from Schipborg also has close parallels with some of the British material looked at above. It has an everted rim and external cordon both carrying fingernail impressions which, other than simple decoration, give a 'squared off' appearance to both the rim and the cordon.

The Barbed Wire Beaker from the site is also similar to shapes with which Anlo has already made us familiar. The flaring neck and ovoid body of report fig. 25:59 is of a type that has already been described above, and it has interesting internal decoration in the form of running chevrons.
Report fig. 25:33 is also interesting as it has had a circular object stuck into the clay just below the rim but it has not pierced the clay completely. Instead there are holes on the outside and raised bosses on the interior lip.

It has been noted in the British Isles how small sherds of pottery often come to light in the mound material of a barrow or on the Old Ground Surface below a mound, and it has been suggested that these sherds may represent traces of a nearby settlement such as remains of material thrown onto a field by way of a manuring process. The finds of Beaker pottery from Oostwoud in the Netherlands were from a similar context (van Giffen, A.E., 1961). Dark grey ploughsoil with traces of cross ploughing - thought by van Giffen to be ritual - underlay the barrows, and under this in turn was a grey layer representing an old ground surface. The majority of finds came from this layer and comprise pottery of three basic types. There are sherds of very fine Maritime Beaker (fig. N.OOS 1:10), of slightly coarser Beaker with more developed decoration (N.OOS 1:18-20), and sherds of coarser incised or finger impressed ware (N.OOS 1:1-5). As in Britain, Maritime Beaker is very early in the Dutch Bell Beaker sequence whereas the rusticated 'pot-beker'
pottery, some complete with perforations below the rim, typical of many of this class in the Netherlands, tend to be correspondingly late. Van Giffen summarised:—

'The fact that no sherds of developed Bell Beaker types were found permits the assumption that we have here an assemblage characteristic of the earliest phase of the Bell Beakers in this country' (op. cit. p.228).

The presence of 'Potbeker' sherds, therefore, may point to either continued occupation or, perhaps more likely, at least two phases of occupation prior to the construction of the barrow.

The cross ploughing on the site was limited only to the area underneath the mounds themselves so does not constitute the remains of a cultivated field. It is likely, therefore, that van Giffen is correct to see this as representing ritual ploughing. The reason and nature of the ritual involved is obviously very subjective but in the light of the frequency of settlement sites beneath round barrows perhaps this Dutch example can be seen as an equivalent to those of Britain, and perhaps we are seeing the settlement of the living being turned into that of the dead and the ploughing perhaps represents the ritual destruction of the site.
As in the British Isles where Beaker can turn up where least expected such as below the ring fort at Ardclon, Co. Mayo, or on the Romano-British Settlement at Kennel Hall Knowe in Northumberland, so at Hans in North Brabant traces of Beaker occupation were found below a predominantly Late Bronze Age and Iron Age settlement (Verwers, J. 1972).

The Beaker pottery illustrated contains both fine and coarse ware and as an assemblage could quite easily come from one of the southern English domestic sites of this period. It compares well, for example, with some of the pottery from sites such as Fencote, Chippenham, Fifty Farm, and so on, already described above, and it bears a further similarity in that the pottery is apparently late in the sequence. The assemblage was also from a restricted area though again physical traces of settlement were absent save for the sherds themselves. The assemblage was, however, immediately noticeable and distinguishable from the later material from the site:

'Diese Konzentration von Glockenbecherscherben Fallt mit einer Scherbenkonzentration zusammen, die sich auf Grund ihrer Zusammensetzung, Farbe und Verzierung deutlich von dem in Hans gefundenen Material aus der Eisenzeit unterscheidet'.

(Verwers, J. 1972, p.9).
The reconstructable Beaker came from a grave on the site and is a later Beaker of Veluwe type, corresponding roughly to necked Beakers in Britain. The upper half is decorated with contracted zones of comb impressions while the lower part has cross-foot fingernail impressions (report fig. 8). The small sherds of fine ware actually from the settlement area seem to be from vessels similar to this one, though not with the fingernail impressions, and also seem similar to a lot of the SE British material. No. 219 for example, is similar to some of the fine ware pottery from Pengate (Gibson, A.M. in Pryor, F.F.M. 1980). Fabrics are also comparable to those in Britain:

'Die Tonware ist immer mit Sand, manchmal außerdem nach mit feinem Quarzgesteins gesättigt'. (Verwers, J. op.cit., p.9).

Of the coarseware material fingernail decoration appears to be the most common followed by fingertip impressions and there would also appear to be stabs or bird bone impressions on one or two of the sherds (Nos. 207). Heavy duty undecorated vessels, one possibly coming from a jar shaped vessel judging by the heavy everted rim, were also present in the assemblage (Nos. 209,243). The finger decorated sherds all bear a close resemblance to those from Britain with some impressions taking
the form of pinching so that raised ribs result, while others form herringbone motifs by alternating the direction of the slant of the fingernail impressions. Crowfoot impressions are also present as are deep impressions which displace the clay into small tear-shaped bumps. Finer and regular elongated fingernail impressions are also present. In short, we have an assemblage at Haps similar with such from Fifty Farm. A rim sherd, No. 207, has a flat rim and external cordon which again finds parallels in the Cambridgeshire Fens.

With the exception of a few sites such as Northington or Chippenham V the main characteristic of Beaker domestic site in Britain is the fact that they are fairly amorphous. Such is also the case at Meerlo-er Heide in Limburg (Verlinde, A.D. 1971). The settlement at Meerlo-er Heide produced a lot of pottery plus some miscellaneous postholes but nothing that resembled a hut plan or living area. Verlindde divided the pottery into five groups:-

1) thin walled Beaker (3mm - 5mm. thick).
2) thick walled Beaker (over 5mm).
3) Barbed Wire pottery.
4) thin walled 'Siedlungskeramik' from small vessels.
5a) thick walled 'Siedlungskeramik' from large vessels.
5b) 'potbeker' sherds

Verlinde admits however:

'Die Gruppen 5a and 5b sind oft nicht streng von einander zu scheiden, so dass die Gruppe 5a weniger gut erkennbare Topfenbecherscherben enthalten kann'. (ibid. p.32).

At Meerloer Beide we have, therefore, a full range of settlement pottery - a domestic repertoire - of a type with which the British material has made us familiar. There are fine ware vessels like those usually found in graves, secondary vessels less frequently found in graves, and the coarse pottery varies in degrees of coarseness and also in vessel size. Though the flint artefacts illustrated are nearly all in the form of arrowheads or points here too the assemblage is clearly domestic as scrapers are the most common artefact from the site:--

'Bei den Artefakten bilden die Schaber weitmas de grosse Gruppe, namlich 60% (Verlinde, A.D. 1971, p.34).

Some of the 'dickwandige Siedlungskeramik' illustrated in fig. 5 of the report is interesting in that it resembles much seen already in Britain especially sites producing grooved sherds and fingernail decorated sherds. Some corded decoration also seems to be present on a rim bevel
(fig. 5, No. 17) and sherds of Hilversum and Drakenstein Urns are also present though they do not necessarily represent the same phase of occupation as the Beaker sherds.

The site at Molenaarsgraaf compares with British sites such as Northton or Belle Tout in that it is a well-excavated and recorded site of considerable size (Louwe Koolema, L.P. 1974). The excavator saw 3 phases of occupation at the site and defined each thus:

1) The first people to arrive used Veluwe Beaker pottery. Some pits may be dated to this period and in them veluwe Beaker was associated with pottery with channelled decoration and with some fingernail decorated ware. House I probably dates to this phase.

1/2) Dated to this period is a cemetery with both Veluwe Beaker and Barbed Wire Beaker pottery. This phase is probably a period of overlap between the two pottery styles. Perhaps a phase when the site was not fully occupied.

2) Barbed Wire Beakers form 90% of the total pottery. House I probably abandoned and House II was constructed.

3) Settlement concentrated on the highest part of the site possibly due to a rise in the
water level. Amount of decorated pottery declines sharply.

Regarding the House plans at Molenaarsgras, Lanting and van der Waals have said:

'Although sometimes wooden posts and stakes were discovered during excavations (on Dutch Beaker domestic sites) so far no convincing house plans of the Beaker cultures were found in the coastal area, in our opinion not even at Molenaarsgras'. (Lanting, J.N. and van der Waals, J.D., 1974, p.72; my brackets).

Compared with houses from later periods with the same general plan in the Netherlands, the Molenaarsgras houses do tend to be somewhat flimsy for their size, they are unparalleled for this period, and also, Musson has shown the problems that arise from reconstructing buildings from collections of postholes (Musson, C.R., 1970). It is also interesting to read that Louwe Kooijmans (1974) did not recognise the house plans during the excavations but reconstructed them afterwards from site plans. This would suggest, therefore, that the floors of the huts, usually charcoal and ash stained, were not recognisable. The validity of the house plans must, therefore, be regarded as suspect, and Molenaarsgras may simply be another posthole and hearth site so tantalisingly common at this period on both sides of the North
Sea.

The majority of the pottery from this site has been illustrated here and in the excavation report and it is at once striking in its similarity to the assemblage from Meerloër Heide, and in the variety of the pottery. The fine ware is not abundant while coarser 'domestic vessels' predominate. Especially common are coarse heavy vessels with everted and cordoned rims suggesting a purely utilitarian function. As well as fine ware vessels of familiar type being present at this site there are also some pottery types that are relatively unknown simply because they are not the type of vessel that is customarily deposited in graves and as with Beaker pottery in Britain it has usually been the sepulchral aspect that has attracted attention. Sherds such as that on fig. N.MOL 1:11 for example, and also N.MOL 1:12 both seem to have had jar profiles, the cordon seems to be best explained as functional rather than decorative. Unusual too are the heavy sherds with a ribbed exterior such as fig. N.MOL 1:19 and report fig. 82 row G. This type of pottery is also present in Britain and here too is difficult to identify outside domestic contexts. It has been noted at sites such as Mansham Hall and Hockwold cum Wilton, and of course
in Ireland at sites such as Lough Gur where ribbed bucket-shaped vessels are common. Clearly pottery typologies for this period are biased towards the 'standard' shapes of the sepulchral pottery and there must be a wealth of other shapes that have escaped such typologies and which are to be found amongst the settlement pottery of the period. Unfortunately the forms of these vessels are rarely reconstructable. Attention is drawn to the pottery report in Louwe Kooijmans's excavation report for the complete range of pottery from the site.

The distribution of Beaker domestic sites in the Netherlands would tend to suggest that they are few and far between, but as in Britain this is a false picture and it reflects pure and simply where Beaker domestic sites have been found and in no way can be regarded as a *sensu stricto* distribution. Extensive fieldwork in the province of Overijssel by Mr. A.D. Verlinde and enthusiastic groups of amateurs for example has brought to light about 20 sites that may be regarded as Beaker domestic sites (A.D. Verlinde, pers. comm. 1980). The evidence for these comes from spreads of pottery and flint found during field walking and so the
extent of each site is unknown. The range of pottery is, however, quite interesting (figs. N,OSL 1 and 2). Looser, for example, has produced a miniature assemblage comparable to the sites already looked at above. The fine ware is represented by one or two small sherds from zoned Beakers decorated with fine incision or by fine comb impressions (fig. N,OSL 1:16, 25, 26) though it is difficult to say whether they represent developed Beakers or are in fact true Maritime Beakers. There are also Barbed wire sherds representing at least seven different vessels. The Impressions themselves vary on these sherds from finely spaced (N,OSL 1:23) to widely spaced (N,OSL 1:12) and from long lengths (N,OSL 1:17) to short lengths (N,OSL 1:24). The core of the 'barbed wire instrument' is also sometimes present (N,OSL 1:17) though not in all cases (e.g. N,OSL 1:18). Paired fingernail in the form of crowsfoot motif, or more widely spaced, and linear single fingernail impressions are both present and in the case of N,OSL 1:8, for example, there are lumps of clay present on the surface resulting from the displacement of the clay by the fingernail impressions. One sherd would also appear to exhibit a ribbed exterior of the kind discussed above (N,OSL 1:28).
In addition to these sherds there are also decorative techniques that we have not noticed before on the Dutch sites. N.0SL 1:14, for example has parallel incised lines and (?) below this a single line of oval impressions forming in effect a fringe motif. This combination of techniques is common in Britain but not, to the writer's knowledge, in the Netherlands. The decoration on N.0SL 1:15 has also been so far unnoticed on the East coast of the North Sea. This decoration consists of in effect double circular impressions. The impressions are double in that there is a raised circular area in the centre of each resulting from the use of a circular stamp with a central hole rather similar to, though smaller than, a 'Polo' mint. Obviously since the collection is a surface find strict contemporaneity cannot be proven and it is even dangerous to assume, however, the pottery here comes from one scatter only and there does not seem to be a real mixture of pottery from other periods. In addition, the fabric of the sherd does argue for the same period if not indeed strict 'association' in as far as surface finds can be associated. We also have at this site the occurrence of cord decorated pottery (N.0SL 1:10 21). It is possible that this may come from AO
or PFB pottery and from such small sherds it is virtually impossible to be able to say for certain. The fabric does, however, seem to be rather thick, and the writer wonders if the sherd N.OSL 1:10 can be from a small cord decorated bowl similar to those seen above at some of the Scottish sand dune sites? The internal bevel may also argue against the sherd coming from a PFB or AO Beaker.

The pottery from Markelo is similar with the exception that there is less fine Beaker from the collection but it too comes from one of the Overyssel surface collections (fig. N.OSL 2) (A.D. Verlinde, Pers. comm). The fine ware pottery is predominately from BW Beakers, the breaks between the applications of the stamps often being present (N.OSL 2:3) and some of them also having BW decoration combined with fingernail impressions to give almost the effect of combed zoned decoration (N.OSL 2:3-5). Some Barbed wire impressions are very widely spaced indeed (N.OSL 2:10). All the fingernail impressions are finely executed and are either paired or single and are invariably linear. This also applies to the two sherds from the one 'potbeker' from the site which also has linear and neatly executed fingernail impressions in crows-foot motif. N.OSL 2:2 is quite reaminscent of
some of the British Grooved Ware and is apparently rare in the Netherlands, at least at the sites surveyed above, and, to the writer's knowledge, at other Beaker domestic sites in the Netherlands. The fabric is quite thick, even slightly more so than some potbeakers, and the decoration consists of oblique fingernail impressions followed below by three parallel grooves and finally by at least two horizontal rows of triangular impressions.

Dodewaard is a recently excavated and as yet unpublished site which produced Beaker domestic sherds but there were no features on the site except for one or two pits and a possible hearth-pit which produced a date of 1740±35 B.C. (GrR 5934) from charcoal. Unfortunately the date cannot be firmly attributed to the Beaker occupation which causes problems regarding the sequence of the site. For example the hearth was situated near a concentration of post-holes some possibly representing a round hut. The (?)hearth was presumably associated with this possible structure but it is still difficult to say whether the hut and date belong to the Beaker occupation or whether it is to be attributed to the MBA phase of occupation in which case the wood must have been old when burnt (R.A. Hulst, pers. comm. 1980). The pottery from Dodewaard
comprises a domestic assemblage of the Veluwe Beaker period. The fine ware from the site is invariably from Veluwe Beakers (N.DOD 2:19) and some also exhibit vertical decoration in addition to the more common horizontal zones (N.DOD 2:9-12). Comb decoration however, which is the usual means of decoration, though admittedly not the only technique, is apparently absent from Dodewaard, and all the Veluwe Beakers seem to be incised (N.DOD 2:8-19) with the addition in some cases of small circular impressions (N.DOD 2:8, 9) which are of the type usually given the generic term of reed impressions but which are often made by a variety of different objects.

The coarse pottery from Dodewaard is in the majority finger decorated with both fingernail and fingertip decoration being present. Some sherds would apparently be from large 'potbokers' with two directional fingertip impressions typical of that class of pottery (N.DOD 1:30-32), but there would also seem to be smaller vessels of 'normal' Beaker size. The form of the vessels is again difficult to determine and they are virtually impossible to reconstruct from such small sherds. N.DOD 1:31, for example would tend to suggest a bulbous belly sherd from a large 'potbeker', whilst
N. DOD 1:23 would appear to be the neck sherd from a somewhat ovoid vessel, perhaps similar to, though obviously larger than the vessel represented by the rim sherd N. DOD 1:41 which has an apparently similar profile. Both these sherds seem to differ from the 'potbeker' sherds which tend to have profuse decoration whereas here these two sherds have very sparse decoration though the technique is still fingernail. The other technique used on the coarse ware is incision or grooving (N. DOD 1:27, 35, 39) which vary from little more than a ribbed exterior (N. DOD 1:35) to deep well defined channels (N. DOD 1:40). The well defined incision may in actual fact be from the secondary pottery resembling fine ware but somewhat poorer in quality. In the case of N. DOD 2:7 incision seems to be combined with oval impressions and the profile would seem to be from a bowl. Other bowls doubtless do exist in domestic contexts, whether flat or round based, but it is almost impossible to be sure from sherd evidence. N. DOD 1:4, for example is strongly curved and could be either from a small hemispherical bowl or else from a vessel with a strongly curved profile. It is impossible in many cases to be sure.
DISCUSSION

In the preceding paragraphs of this section some of the larger and better known Beaker domestic sites have been described but it is by no means a comprehensive site by site survey. As we have already seen for the British Isles, however, there is an unfortunate lack of stratigraphy in Beaker domestic sites and the nearest that we come to stratigraphy is horizontal stratigraphy at sites such as Holenaarsraat or Anlo where there does seem to be a difference in the distribution of sherds of different type. The site at Vlaardingen, more famous for the late Neolithic pottery and Culture named after it than for its Bell Beaker occupation, is one of the few sites on both sides of the North Sea where the Bell Beaker occupation can actually be placed in a deep stratigraphy. At Vlaardingen the Bell Beaker occupation was again fairly enigmatic (van Regteren Altman, et al. 1962) but consisted of a distinct layer above, and so stratigraphically later than, the layers containing the Vlaardingen pottery and PFB sherds. A C14 determination for this layer read as 1930±25 B.C. The finds from this layer include three comb deco-
rated Maritime Beakers represented by sherds only, some undecorated pottery among which were the fragments of a small almost conical polypod bowl, and a sherd of what could perhaps be a 'pottbeker'. This Beaker layer can clearly be dated to the time of the West Frisian deposits I when the Vlaardingen Culture had ended with an increase in peat growth at the end of the Wieringermeer Deposits. Perhaps associated with this phase of occupation was a roughly constructed rectangular hut with central posts, and a similar one may have stood in Cutting 9. In contrast to the idea that Beakers seem to have brought a period of prosperity, reflected by the pottery fine ware and 'aristocratic burials', the Beaker phase at Vlaardingen seems to have been very poor compared with the preceding phases. As usual with Beaker domestic sites, that at Vlaardingen tends to raise more problems than it solves:

'The absence of other rubbish leaves us without an answer to the tantalising question of the economic basis of the occupation. In view of the low density of finds and possibly the clumped C14 dates, the period of occupation must have been short. The landscape was perhaps not very inviting at the time'. (J.A. Bakker in van 't vege, J.P. et al., 1962. p.234).

Convincing house plans, or rather their absence, is another characteristic that the Dutch sites share
with those of the British Isles. The controversy over the large sub-rectangular houses at Molenaar-
sgraaf has already been outlined above and other
than these plans, the Netherlands have nothing to
compare with the Beaker houses of Northton or
Chippenham V which are admittedly conspicuous in
their own country though their validity is less
controversial than their Dutch counterparts. The
Dutch are unable to compile a list of Beaker house
sites as impressive as that of Simpson (1971) though
the main reason for this must be surely topographi-
cal. Also, one wonders how the picture may have
been changed had Aartswoud not been excavated in
1m. strips but had instead been subject to area
excavation. On both sides of the North Sea, groups
of postholes remain unintelligible and any house
plans they may conceal are tantalisingly elusive.

A similar shared problem is that so few Beaker
sites of this type have any details of phases with-
in their site structure. At Lockerbie for example
it was inferred, to the writer's mind correctly,
that there were at least two phases because of the
presence of western Neolithic pottery on the site
and the unlikelihood that this could be contemporary
with the Beaker pottery (Cormack, W.F. 1964). At
Anlo and Molenaar-sgraaf there was at least a diffe-
rence in distribution between various types of pottery, especially between Beaker and Barbed Wire pottery, which suggested to the excavators that there may be different phases of occupation involved. It must be stressed, however, that this does not infer a break in occupation and may simply reflect the change in the pottery record of a single (?) family) group as a result of their gradually evolving cultural background. It should also be remembered that there may often be purely sociological reasons for differences in distribution and indeed for contemporary use of different pottery types, and the explanation for these phenomena need not necessarily be a chronological one.

Radio-carbon dates for the Dutch Beakers do show a close resemblance to the typologies worked out from stylistic evidence and the sepulchral record (Lanting, J.N. and Mook, W.G. 1977), and in particular the clear fact that PFB pottery and Barbed Wire pottery are in the main clearly earlier and later respectively than Bell Beaker though, as is to be expected, there is a considerable margin of overlap. It should be noted, however, that at the sites of Aartswoud and Kolhorn all types of PFB have been found and there is no stratigraphical evidence to suggest sequence in the pottery record
at the sites. In other words there is at the very least a strong possibility that there was a period when all types of PFB were concurrently in use. This evidence is not strong enough, however, to be deleterious to the existing PFB typologies as the occupation at both sites does seem to have been both long and intensive.

Similarly, it has been noted that there is a strong element of Barbed Wire on most Beaker domestic sites and because the majority of C14 dates from graves for Barbed wire pottery are later than the Bell Beaker dates it has been often assumed that Barbed Wire pottery on a Bell Beaker domestic site must belong to a later phase. This, however, is not necessarily a valid assumption. It has already been stated that pottery styles just do not change suddenly but rather evolve or are slowly adopted. There is also enough overlap of the radiocarbon dates to show that there must have been a great deal of overlap between Bell Beaker and Barbed wire pottery. It is also possible that BW pottery was in use for some time in domestic contexts before it manifested itself in the role of sepulchral pottery and perhaps this may be evinced by the frequent occurrence of BW pottery on the sites looked at above. It may be possible to see
a similar state of affairs in Britain in the way of Food Vessels. It is accepted that Food Vessels develop from the traditional later Neolithic wares and their ancestry is a respectable one. Food Vessels or 'proto-Food Vessels' must, therefore, have co-existed with Beakers only to outlast them and take over their role as the funerary pottery. They must have emerged as the prestige fine ware - as must have the BW Beakers of the Netherlands - as the Bell Beaker tradition died out.

The main concurrence of the British and Dutch material must be the wealth of different pottery types and yet the paradoxical homogeneity of the assemblages. As opposed to having simply the Beaker fine ware in common there is also the range of secondary fine wares and a series of coarse ware pottery taking the form of rusticated ware, usually fingernail or tip rusticated, of varying degrees of thickness and size. As in Britain the Dutch finger-decorated ware starts before the appearance of the Bell Beaker Cultures and is found quite regularly on PFB sites such as Aartswoud or Kolhorn. Similarly in Britain finger-decoration is just one of a number of rustication techniques found on Peterborough Ware and also, to a certain extend, Grooved Ware. Obviously there are differences of detail between the
British and the Dutch material; there are for example few of the true Dutch 'pophoker' types in Britain though there are insular similarities, and there are also no Peterborough derivative types such as proto-Food Vessels or urns to be found on the Dutch sites though again BW Beaker may be seen as this equivalent. On the whole, however, the general trends do have a lot in common and a verdict of 'reserved identicalness' may safely be passed. The reason for this may largely be due to the great deal of contact between the two areas at this time and in the subsequent period as outlined in the general discussion below.

***************
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION
DISCUSSION

Problems in the study

No matter how hard we try to overcome the problem of the incompleteness of the archaeological record, this is nevertheless a problem that is very much with us in this study. Firstly, despite the large size of the catalogue, the number of large, stratified and well excavated and well published sites of this type are very few, especially when the extent of the Beaker distribution over the British Isles is considered. It has already been noted above that the apparent foci on the distribution maps are false and largely the result of more intensive field work and better localised preservation conditions, not least including such phenomena as land use history, and, in the Western Isles for example, erosion coupled with field work. Many of the sites interpreted here as domestic sites have also yielded but a few sherds from as many or fewer vessels and are largely without context. They may, for example have been found beneath a barrow or in the mound material of the same monument, but that only proves that Beaker sherds were in the area when the barrow was built and does not provide a true chronological context. Their stra-
tigraphical value is, therefore, limited save to suggest that settlement evidence on a larger scale may be lying in close to moderate proximity providing that old land surfaces have survived. Even at such sites such as West Ashby or Callis Wold (see catalogue) where the Beaker sherds were found in a clear horizon within the barrow mounds they give the impression of 'dumped' material which is, strictly speaking, out of context save to suggest the possible proximity of a settlement. It may also be possible that not all the pottery was dumped at the same time as obviously our absolute dating techniques for this period are not subtle enough to date within a year or so.

Absolute dating techniques must also be regarded with a great deal of caution as fig. 26 shows and as mentioned above (p. 43). They cannot, for example detect whether or not a settlement is truly single phased or indeed whether settlement is concatenated though statistical models have come a long way in helping to leviate this problem (Ward, G.K., and Wilson, S.R., 1978; 1981; Ottaway, B. 1973). Sometimes we are fortunate enough to have stratigraphical evidence for multi-phased sites - Northton, for example, - or even ceramic evidence for the same - for example at Kirkburn - but if
there were major phases of intense occupation within a permanently occupied settlement there would be little chance of recognising this by either stratigraphy, absolute dating, or even ceramic typology/seriation. This state of affairs could arise, for example, on a site that was continually inhabited but from which the majority of the inhabitants were absent, for possibly a year or more while involved in trading activity, or farming. Fleming's transhumance theory (1971) would leave little evidence in the archaeological record of a settlement.

The tendency to rely too hard on Radio-carbon dates, especially single determinations, should also be moderated (Case, H.J., 1977, Ward, G.K. and Wilson S.R., 1978) and the susceptibility of C14 dates to error must be remembered. For example it has recently been suggested (Close-Brookes, J., 1979) that shell-fish from certain Scottish coastal areas may already have an apparent date of up to 350 years and consequently C14 determinations from the bone collagen of animals and humans that have had shellfish as a significant part of their diet may be similarly affected. This interference may not, however, always be present. This may possibly be demonstrated at the settlements at
at Northton and Rosinish. The dates from the latter site (Shepherd, I.A.G., 1976, and appendix III here) would appear to be too old and may be affected by the shellfish theory, especially as the dates were obtained from limpet shells. The dates from Northton, however, (Simpson, D.D.A., 1976, and appendix III here) obtained from bone collagen would not appear to have been affected at all yet shellfish may have been used as animal fodder. It would be interesting to see whether a C14 date from some of the Northton shellfish shells would be any nearer those from Rosinish. In addition, the extent of the shellfish contamination is also an unknown quantity.

The pottery itself also presents us with problems partly due to the subjectivity of Archaeological interpretation, for example the question when is Beaker domestic ware domestic, and when is Beaker coarse ware in fact Peterborough ware and finally when does fine ware become coarse ware? In the majority of cases, however, the problems are the result of the nature of the evidence. The main problem, as can be seen from the catalogue illustrations is that the vast majority of the pottery from domestic sites comprises of small sherds, often little more than 2.5cm square which makes reconstr-
duction of the vessel at best difficult and often impossible. As a result we are left with fabric and a variable part of the decoration to play with. Clarke claimed that the use of shape in any classification was 'a direct inheritance from the Thurnam/Abercromby system' (1970, p.5) and Clarke broke away from this method by using decoration, style and shape. He did, however, over-emphasise the decoration and style as he felt that the shape of a Beaker was 'at least partly functional' and 'that decoration would provide a better classification than one based on shape....(because) the decorative motifs and styles are largely non-functional traits.' (ibid. p.6). It was precisely this, however, that Lanting and van der Waals criticised as the reason why Clarke's scheme did not really work (Lanting, J.N., and van der Waals, J.D., 1972). Clarke, however, did use shape too and so a classification of the sherds that form the subject of this thesis by incomplete decoration alone would do little except pure and simply classify the decoration. Clarke (op. cit.) also divided his motifs into groups, five in all, which were also seen to have a chronological distinction but again these are criticised by the Dutchmen and some of Clarke's basic European motifs are not necessarily early or basically Euro-
pean (Lanting, J.N., and van der Waals, J.D., 1972 p.24f). Another method of typology or classification was propounded for Owasco pottery by Robert Whallon (1972) in which he modified an almost 'botanical' methodology to group pottery defined by 'a hierarchical, "tree-type" series of decisions' (op. cit. p.13). This, however, has not really gained acceptance as it may be too rigorous if not controlled and in any case it depends on formal and decorative traits being present, and as we have seen, this is by no means the state of affairs with the pottery being studied here.

In some cases it is possible to reconstruct the vessel with certainty but again as the catalogue illustrations show the cases of this happening are rare with the exception of some of the rare midden deposit material from such sites as Northton or Kilellan, though even here a great deal of study is required to draw those reconstructions from their obscurity. It is far more common for tentative reconstructions to be postulated, for example at Belle Tout (Bradley, R. 1970) or at Dalkey Island (Liversage, G.D., 1968) but the trap once set is too readily fallen into and caution tends to be thrown to the wind in involuntary recklessness.

This is to say that once a tentative reconstruction
has been postulated the temptation is to regard that reconstruction as a complete vessel and to treat as fact what is in fact an hypothesis. It is, for example, often possible to forget that many of the Beakers illustrated in Clarke's corpus (1970, vol II) are in fact reconstructions, and with the increasing tendency to break away from Clarke's classification it is very possible that some of his reconstructions may benefit from closer scrutiny. Whenever a vessel is reconstructed, however, there is always a danger towards the involuntary recklessness mentioned above in that a vessel may also be reconstructed in the light of pre-conception albeit that any pre-conceptions may indeed be sub-conscious. There are still basically two 'cover-all' types of Beaker, namely the 'European Bell Beaker' with its 'S'-shaped profile and typologically early in the sequence, and 'necked Beakers' both long and short-necked which tend to represent later and indigenous development from the former type. The decoration found on some of the sherds may hint at what basic type of vessel is represented and so give a general guide-line or grounding for any reconstruction. In many cases this is valid, and indeed possibly in the majority of cases, but it is possible that some apparent
Beaker 'necks' are in fact Beaker bowls in the light of some of the Beaker bowls from Newgrange (see catalogue illustrations) and indeed from Iberia (Harrison, R.J., 1977) although the Newgrange examples are admittedly undecorated.

Where this restorative pit-fall is most dangerous, however, is when such methods of reconstruction are applied to the rusticated pottery from these assemblages. With the fine ware pottery one has at least the decoration or motifs or both to suggest a basic shape, and generally speaking fabric to identify the sherds, at least tentatively, as Beaker. In some cases the fabric of the rusticated pottery is also fine and compares well with the fine ware frequently found in sepulchral contexts. This may mean that the fine rusticated vessel is part of a Beaker assemblage but it would be misguided to regard that as a basic truism. When we are dealing with coarser vessels attributed to Clarke's tertiary rank in his hypothetical domestic assemblage (Clarke, D.L., 1974) the margin of doubt must necessarily be greatly increased. The Dutch 'Potbeker' and the British Potbeaker attest that these sherds may indeed represent large Beaker-shaped vessels presumably from the Beaker domestic repertoire, but because this is true in a number of cases it is cer-
tainly incorrect to regard a priori that all coarse fingernail decorated pottery associated with Beaker must be from large Potbeakers. It should also be remembered that some of the large rusticated vessels illustrated by Clarke (1970) as for example his figs. 906, 916 and 975, are themselves reconstructed from sherds, and their association with Beaker proper should not automatically attribute a Beaker profile to coarse rusticated sherds, a practice that happens frequently. The writer was able to reconstruct a box of rusticated sherds from Hockwold cum Wilton and now in Norwich Castle museum not as having a necked profile as was envisaged by Helen Bamford (1970) but as a small bucket-shaped pot (fig. HcW 2). This of course is still a reconstruction and must be regarded as such. The writer would not wish to suggest that his reconstruction is any more correct than previous or subsequent reconstructions but would only wish to draw attention to the possibilities, variations and the subjectivity of reconstructing a pottery vessel from incomplete sherd evidence.

Much of this error and difficulty stems from the misconception pertaining to the Beaker domestic assemblage. The misconception is a very basic one, namely that the Beaker domestic assemblage does
exist as a concrete fact. This will be discussed in more details below but suffice it to say here that a Beaker domestic assemblage is very firmly an hypothesis and its existence by no means a certainty, more a probability. What also must be realised is that even though this hypothesis may be more or less correct the notion of the singularity of a Beaker domestic assemblage may be false, misguided or an over-simplification and the make-up of such an hypothetical assemblage may be very different from its Yorkshire or Scottish counterpart (see catalogue).

Returning to rusticated pottery, the discovery of rusticated pottery in a rather coarse and gritty fabric but associated with Beaker pottery leads to the assumption that this is the coarse pottery of the hypothetical assemblage. What of the rusticated pottery associated with Grooved Ware and Peterborough Ware however? It is often impossible to distinguish between the pottery of this type from these different contexts and this of coarse is another factor that ought to be borne in mind when reconstructing the pottery. Even the flat bases often attributed to Beaker influence (Smith, I.F., 1974) need not be a significant guide line as there is, for example, flat based rusticated
ware from the Peterborough site at Driffield 
(Manby, T.G., 1957) where the Beaker sherd is 
later than the Peterborough phase, and North 
Carnaby Temple site 6, and North Carnaby top site 
19 (Manby, T.G., 1975) where Beaker is altogether 
absent though admittedly this does not preclude 
Beaker influence. Only a rigorous and extensive 
programme of 14C dates from Peterborough, Grooved 
Ware and Beaker sites, themselves hypothetical 
concepts, may help to throw light on this problem. 
Meanwhile see the 14C charts figs. 2a and 2b .

The Beaker domestic assemblage.

As we have often mentioned above, the Beaker 
domestic assemblage is an hypothesis and certainly 
not a fact. Terms such as 'Beaker coarse wares' 
(e.g. Robertson-Mackay, R., 1961) show the basic 
assumption in the existence of such a set assem­ 
blage but there have been few if any attempts to 
elaborate on the content of the concept save sweep­ 
ing statements of the type just quoted. This 
state of affairs was remedied by Clarke (1970) 
who was the first to make an attempt to isolate 
the domestic assemblage and to seriously examine 
the constituents, by defining the domestic assem­ 
blage for each of his groupings. Clarke sets the
scene for subsequent group assemblages by saying of his AOC Group:

'The assemblage of pottery as a whole has three inseparable aspects: a best ware constituting the 'typical' features of the AOC Beakers... a second... ware with similar shapes and fabric to the 'best' ware but either rusticated or undecorated; finally heavy-duty... thick-walled vessels sometimes very large (and) usually rusticated'. (p.60)

Clarke's European group assemblage has a similar make up in the domestic repertoire but Clarke uses the same vessels (figs. 123 - 126) to illustrate the large domestic vessels as he does for the AOC group. Many of the assemblages for this group are small and Clarke relies on closed grave goods to illustrate domestic assemblages, a method that must be regarded as suspect as the sepulchral purpose may well have coloured the type of vessel chosen.

With regard to the Wessex/Mid Rhine group Clarke says that 'there are no known domestic sites... in Britain' (p.88) though he cites site D at Lough Gur as a possible exception. He uses Continental sites and British grave groups to outline a possible assemblage the chief characteristic of which would appear to be bowls not represented in the previous groups in all but a small way. There are similarly no known domestic sites in Britain or
the Rhineland for the N/MR group though Clarke postulates an assemblage similar to the W/MR. The state of affairs is again the same in relation to the N/NR group though sepulchral evidence is invoked to

'complete the parallels with the domestic range known from other Beaker assemblages'. (p.122).

The assemblage of the BW Beaker group is much different in that there are a number of British domestic sites and a wide range of pottery types. As well as the fine ware there are bowls, cordoned rims, rusticated vessels including finger-pinched decoration, and huge storage jars or Potbeckers. Incised ware also seems to come into its own at this stage. The East Anglian Beaker assemblage appeared to Clarke to take over from the later stages of the BW group and large Potbeckers with fingertip and fingerpinched decoration are present as well as smaller rusticated wares. The majority of the reconstructable vessels, however, are from graves, and bowls and small undecorated vessels are rare or absent.

Continental parallels and sepulchral evidence have again to be invoked to outline the domestic assemblage of the NL/D group, a practice that must be regarded as suspect when one considers that
Lanting and van der Waals (1972) criticise the validity of Clarke's continental groups as well as his British ones. An assemblage consisting of 'large' and 'small' vessels is envisaged, however, and Clarke sees in addition to the fingernail and fingertip decoration the start of plastic decoration. There are similarly no domestic sites for N2 Beakers though it is postulated that heavy finger-rustication is present though still quite rare. The only N3 domestic site is at Archerfield and the lack of rusticated vessels and the predominance of fine ware is something that Clarke regarded as puzzling. Otherwise the make-up of a possible assemblage for this group is not touched upon. Similarly nothing is known of the N4 assemblage though Clarke wonders 'if some of the bowls attributed to the bowl food vessel group but carrying Late/Final Northern Beaker decoration may not be related to a similar bowl element in that assemblage'. (p.193)

Evidence is slightly more forthcoming with the S1 group though Clarke feels that this group 'is difficult to identify on sherd evidence'. (p.200). Lakenheath is cited as a site of this group and sepulchral evidence is also invoked, especially where large rusticated vessels are buried as accessory vessels to the fine ware. Heavy and elaborate
rustication is now present as are large vessels with plastic decoration. The S2 sites are more numerous and includes sites such as Chippenham barrow V, Swarkestone, America Farm and so on. The first appearance of handled Beakers is heralded and notable too are the numerous varieties of rusticated wares in both decoration and size. The decoration includes zoned fingernail and tip impressions, often heavy and deep, as well as frequent plastic decoration often combined with the finger decoration. Clarke sees a great deal of similarity between the assemblages of the S3 and S2 groups, and the Late Southern domestic assemblages must be regarded as a very close continuation of its predecessor. The development of plastic decoration and handled Beakers continues and runs into the S4 tradition.

As a summing up of his survey of domestic assemblages Clarke came to the rough and simplified conclusion (his own admission) that the assemblages of the S4 group were comprised of:

- 50% incised/combed S4 Beakers = fine ware.
- 25% small Beaker-shaped rusticated pots = secondary ware.
- 25% heavy large biconical storage jars = tertiary ware.
Handled Beakers are also present in the assemblage and account for perhaps 10% of the fine ware or 5% of the entire assemblage.

Clarke's treatment of the domestic assemblages does seem rather disjointed but only because he deals with each of his groups separately and also probably because his groups have been subjected to criticism. This is seen especially in his S2 and S3 groups where Clarke himself doubts the validity of the distinction due to the close similarity of the domestic assemblages and the interaction of the two groups to the point of fusion in domestic contexts. It is unfortunate, however, to the writer's mind that these assemblages are treated as Beaker assemblages and more specifically the pottery assemblages of 'Beaker peoples' and little attention is given to the interaction between Beaker and local indigenous pottery traditions such as Grooved Ware and Peterborough ware, and the local indigenous late Neolithic wares of Ireland such as the Lough Gur classes and the Sandhills wares. For example, one of the sherds that Clarke illustrates to represent the large storage jars from the AOC and European assemblages is a cordoned rim sherd from Rockbarton illustrated here as fig. ROC 1:9. Again we come into the
problem of reconstruction as Clarke would prefer to see it as coming from a large jar with an elongated ovoid profile (Clarke's fig. 125). In effect however, the sherd is not as curved as Clarke suggests but is more likely in the writer's opinion to be from a straight sided jar and indeed this same sherd was used by H.J. Case (1969) to illustrate one of a number that he took to comprise a Rockbarton style of pottery, comprising straight sided pots with flat bases (though no bases have been found) and with rims characterised by lips and a cordon just below this. The stabbed decoration was also regarded as typical of the style. The important point here of course is that Case reconstructed the vessel with a straight side and not curved as in Clarke's restoration.

Beaker effects on local traditions.

With regard to the Peterborough tradition, Clarke suggests (1970, p.268) that the main features that distinguish the Mortlake from the Ebbsfleet style are Beaker derived. These include the flat bases on some of the Mortlake sherds, the zoned and more profuse decoration, and a collared rim, though the latter would appear to be a rather peculiar claim. The techniques used, however, to
decorate the Mortlake style are still very much those already established in the Peterborough tradition and comb impressions, which one might expect to see adopted if the Beaker influence was really that great, are on the whole quite rare, at least in comparison with the impressed wares. As for the profuse decoration, this would surely seem to be a logical progression from Ebbsfleet ware. A tendency towards increased decoration is now evident in the Neolithic pottery sequence with initially light decoration on types such as Mildenhall or Abingdon ware (Smith, I.F., 1974) with slightly more varied decoration on Ebbsfleet ware including the herringbone motif that became so popular on the Mortlake style. Our knowledge of Neolithic pottery is now somewhat greater than when Isobel Smith completed her much read thesis (Smith, I.F., 1956) and we now have much more material to draw upon and as a consequence more regional styles are coming to light. In turn it is becoming more obvious that the Ebbsfleet - Mortlake - Fengate progression is now no longer so straightforward, with the possible exception of Southern England. There would also appear to be a much greater overlap between the styles and a much richer 'Grey area' between the definable styles (see Alexander, J., Ozanne, P.C.)
and A, 1960, Burgess, C.B., 1976.2, 1980). Judging from the C14 dates (fig. 4) this change to profuse decoration may have been happening at an early date, as may the flat bases, and it has already been noted that the Meldon Bridge style of Peterborough Northern pottery is at a stage of development very close to the Food Vessels of the traditional Early Bronze Age, yet the C14 dates (fig. 4 and appendix III) show that this style may have been formulating at least as early as 2600 b.c. (Burgess, C.B. 1976.2). The Meldon Bridge style was certainly in current use c. 2400–2100 b.c. dates which suggest that there were probably very few if any Beakers in North Britain at this time (compare the Beaker C14 chart fig. 2). Consequently these dates are too early for the pottery to have any Beaker influence. Towards the end of Meldon Bridge's existence one may possibly have some Beaker influence in the form of comb decoration on some of the pottery but its use does not appear to be extensive and the motifs employed are consistently Peterborough.

Much further south, on the Isle of Wight, the Peterborough settlement debris at Arreton Down (Alexander, J., Ozanne, P.C., and A., 1960) provides us with similar evidence though we are not fortunate enough to have such revealing dates for this
site. Beaker influence is not immediately noticeable at this site either, and indeed, any influencing may actually have gone the other way. The pottery is predominantly related to Mortlake and Fengate styles, with the characteristic heavy, rounded and collared rims of both styles being repressed. The decoration consists of cord impressions - both twisted and whipped - incision, stabbed decoration, finger-rustication, and bird bone impressions. Mixed in with this Peterborough assemblage are five sherds of what may be Beaker. One vessel is recognised by its ovoid 'East Anglian' profile, and the others by their combed or incised decoration. It is interesting in these cases, however, that the fabric of the sherds does not differ from the Peterborough sherds in any way but thickness and since Beaker was being used by probably the same people as were using Peterborough ware, it is also interesting to note that there are no mixing of traditions. Indeed the fabric is the only common denominator. This may suggest that the people responsible for the Peterborough ware were also 'trying their hand' at the 'new' Beaker pottery but had either not quite mastered the technique or else had been slightly careless in the manufacture of these vessels. This leads us to the
question of Beaker imitation which will be looked at below.

The earliest concentrations of Beaker in Britain appear to be in Wessex, with the exception of AOC Beakers, perhaps attracted to that area by economic factors, so what of the effect of Beakers on the Peterborough pottery from that area? One of the curious settlements in Wessex must be the West Kennet Avenue settlement (Smith I.F. 1965) where we have a predominantly Peterborough assemblage with Grooved ware and Beaker sherds also represented. Again the Beaker and the Grooved ware stand out because of their individuality and characteristic fabric and decoration. The decorative techniques used are characteristically comb and grooving respectively. Of the Peterborough pottery, Mortlake and Fengate ware are both represented so by this stage in the development of this tradition there as been ample time for interaction to have taken place though any such interaction must have been kept to a minimum at this site.

We have already stated that the Beaker in the causewayed camp ditches cannot be regarded as stratified but merely as a similar non-context to the sherds from upper silts of long barrow ditches. A similar matrix however was found stratified in the
upper fills of the chambers at West Kennet long barrow (Piggott, S., 1962). The lateral and vertical distribution of the sherds in this ostensibly domestic matrix suggested to Piggott that 'they must all have been incorporated in the filling at one time' (ibid., p. 29). Given this conclusion, it would then be logical to assume, therefore, that the pottery by, at the very least, closely allied groups, and very likely by the same people using Beaker, Peterborough and Grooved ware pottery.

The Beaker from West Kennet is early in the British sequence and suggests that if there was any interaction between different groups, it must have happened early and have been almost immediate.

The Peterborough pottery, however, does not exhibit any traits that can confidently be attributed to Beaker influence with the possible exception of the Flat bases of the Fengate style and the filled chevrons on some of the Fengate pottery.

The most distinctive Beaker decorative trait - the use of a simple device such as a comb to execute a pleasing and visually effective motif - would be expected to have been the first device to have been adopted and adapted. This does not seem to have been the case, however, and Beaker influence is kept to an absolute minimum on the Peterborough
pottery in Wessex.

Much of the Yorkshire material has long since been considered to have regional differences from that in the South (Manby, T.G., 1975, Longworth, I.H., 1969), but what of its derivations from Beaker pottery? Again there can be little evidence cited that gives concrete examples of Beaker derived traits. There is admittedly an element of zoned decoration in the form of herringbone incision sherds such as those from Carnaby top site 19 and North Carnaby Temple site 6 (Manby, T.G., 1975) but, as we have already seen, this need not be derived from Beaker. Some of the vessels from the latter site have also flat bases and yet still approach the Mortlake style rather than the Fengate. This could certainly have been derived from Beaker influence, but as a whole much of the Yorkshire material does resemble more the Peterborough ware from Scotland and North East England and this leads us back to Meldon Bridge.

When looking at the Neolithic pottery from Meldon Bridge it was seen that the C14 dates from that site were too early for Beaker influence to have had any significance in that part of the country and that the pottery bore a strong resemblance to Food Vessel and Enlarged Food Vessel, normally
thought to be post-Beaker in date. It now seems likely that some 'Food Vessels' evolved without any Beaker influence, and the Yorkshire material can also be used to substantiate this theory since some of the North Carnaby pottery (from Temple site 6) is not unlike Food Vessel in form, and may even be termed 'proto-Food-Vessel in view of their resemblance to the 'flower-pot' shaped vessels such as that from Bedlington, Northumberland (Gibson, A.M., 1978, No. 57) which even has the 'T'-sectioned rim of the Peterborough Northern pottery. There are no bases from Meldon Bridge - or at least no bases that have so far been recognised - though work on the pottery has not yet been completed. It would not be surprising, however, to find that flat bases do survive among the sherds in view of the apparently truncated profile of some of the vessels (e.g. Burgess, C.B., 1976, 2 fig. 9.7, top, fig. 9.8, bottom). This may mean that we even have flat bases on this type of pottery and that this one surviving bastion of Beaker influence may have to be demolished. This, however, is still not conclusive. There is interestingly at Meldon Bridge some finer pottery with paired fingernail impressions (ibid. fig. 9.7 bottom right) of a type often recognised as 'Beaker secondary ware' on Beaker
domestic sites.

This is not to suggest, however, that Beaker had no effect at all on the Peterborough tradition as this statement would certainly overlook such bowls as those from Mildenhall with zoned decoration in the Beaker style (Clarke fig. 44 and 45) and Appendix VI shows motifs that are attributable to Peterborough, Grooved Ware and Beaker pottery and the overlaps are apparent there. Beaker/Peterborough interaction is also visible on some of the later Food Vessel pottery such as that from Moor Lodge in Northumberland (Gibson, A.M., 1978, No. 72) which has filled lozenge decoration and Food Vessels with abundant comb decoration such as that from Roddam, also in Northumberland (Gibson, A.M. 1978, No. 46), or those with coarse combed ornament such as those from the Scottish sites such as Rudh'an Dunain mentioned above (p. 145). Though it is clear from such sites as Meldon Bridge that Food Vessels were developing in pre-Beaker Scotland without any external catalysis, it cannot be denied that some fusion of styles took place, though probably on a more limited scale than has previously been considered. Indeed, it would seem unnatural that people conversant with different pottery styles and types of decoration would not mix traditions
when traditional conformity was not dictated.

What of Beaker influence, if any, on Grooved Ware pottery? The C14 dates (fig. 4) show that Grooved Ware pottery would appear to be slightly later in genesis than the Peterborough tradition. The exception to this, however, are some Scottish sites, and in particular the dates obtained from the recent excavations at Skara Brae where the dates range fairly evenly between c.2500-1950 b.c. for both phases of the site. Flat based pottery appears to have been used from the start at Skara Brae, and at a date obviously too early for Beaker influence to have played a part in the development. Doubtless by analogy, the site at Rinyo must be similar though the single date for this site centres on c.1900 b.c. - at the end of the Skara Brae sequence. Though a Beaker was found at Rinyo it is a peculiar necked example which is rather degenerate by the standards of the more southern types. No conclusive Beaker has been found at Skara Brae though possible sherds may come from the later phases of the site (D.V. Clarke, pers. comm.). Such small and indefinite quantities coming so late in the site's history are unlikely to have played any part at all in the development of the indigenous ceramic sequence.
The cultural link between the Grooved Ware settlements does, at the moment, remain rather inconclusive with the apparent void in the Grooved ware distribution between Caithness and Fife, where Grooved ware has already become more typical of the southern varieties with, for example, some fine Clacton ware as defined by Longworth (in Wainwright and Longworth, 1971) from Brackmont Mill (fig. BM 3:17). In Northern England and Southern Scotland the Grooved ware distribution does seem to bear a striking resemblance to the distribution of Beaker domestic sites and the two pottery types are often found on the same site. Unfortunately it is not always possible to determine the degree of association between the types, especially on the Scottish sand dune sites the problems of which have already been outlined in the section on North Britain above (p. 104).

At Archerfield the midden did appear to be stratified but how much significance is to be attached to the horizontal stratigraphy is not certain. A re-excavation of the site might determine this significance. Beaker and Grooved Ware were associated in the first and third middens and some has been illustrated in figs. ARC 1-4. The Grooved Ware is largely undecorated save for some internal
lines of twisted cord decoration (ARC 3:17) but in the main large bucket-shaped undecorated pots would seem to be represented (ARC 4:31a). It would appear by the association that the same people were using both types of pottery at this site, both Grooved Ware and Beaker, the latter representing the fine ware, and the former, the coarse. Evidence for secondary ware is slim unless one considers the large Beakers represented or else the cord decorated and thin-walled Grooved Ware, the latter suggestion being the more probable in the writer's mind. It is interesting that there is none of the secondary ware as defined by Clarke (1970, 1974). If we are indeed correct to assume that the same people are responsible for both pottery types, both appearing in their classic forms it seems very strange that there is no mixing of decoration or techniques on the two types and though there is a possibility of considerable overlap between the secondary ware and the coarse pottery – if we are correct in our identification – the fine ware from Archerfield does remain conspicuously aloof.

If has already been noted above (p. 197) that the type of pottery one is studying often affects one's identification of a site. For example North Carnaby Top Site 12 in Yorkshire was labelled a
a Grooved Ware site by Manby (1974) is included here as a Beaker site and may equally be labelled a Peterborough site by a researcher interested in that type of pottery. Since all three styles are present, each identification is equally correct. Interaction between the types is perhaps more evident here. Beaker fine ware comprises three sherds of AOCombed Beaker, and three sherds of AO C ware. Three incised sherds may represent the secondary ware as it appears rather more crudely decorated than the finer pottery. Also belonging to this category is an everted rim sherd with an external cordon decorated above that feature with impressions made by a short round-toothed comb with about four teeth. The rather crudely decorated Beaker sherd with incised filled chevrons and horizontal lines may represent a fusion of Grooved Ware decorative techniques on Beaker fabric as the chevrons are not of the type normally found on Beaker pottery though if this is to be regarded as from the repertoire of secondary ware one might expect the decoration to be rather more haphazard in comparison to the fine ware norm. Other examples of possible interaction are two rim sherds with internal bevels which according to Manby (1974) are ostensibly Grooved Ware but which have combed
decoration, albeit fairly coarse, on the outside. Combing is a technique that is rare on Grooved Ware. The Peterborough ware seems less affected. A 'T'-rim of the Rudston style of Peterborough Northern ware is present as is an internally lipped sherd plus a strongly curved body sherd with diagonal twisted cord impressions.

In such small assemblages, however, the evidence can either be inconclusive or misleading, and one would expect to see more concrete evidence of interaction - or the lack of it - at larger sites such as Durrington Walls or Mount Pleasant where both Beaker and Grooved ware was found (Wainwright, G.J., and Longworth, I.H., 1971; Wainwright, C.J., 1979). The pottery from Durrington Walls is quite interesting from this point of view (Wainwright, G.J., and Longworth, I.H., 1971) and provides us with clear evidence of ceramic interaction. Looking at the Grooved Ware first, it is difficult to be sure how much of the Grooved Ware is indigenously developed and how much Beaker derived in view of the C14 dates for the site (c.2100 - 1800 b.c.). It would be interesting to know the genesis, for example, of the hyphenated filled chevrons and the incised chevrons of some Grooved Ware pots such as P438 or P219-221. Are these Beaker influenced or
indigenously developed? (see the Grooved Ware decorative motif repertoire in Appendix IV). One would suspect the latter explanation though this is unlikely to be proven until we have a more comprehensive series of Cl4 dates. The use of cord decoration inside the rim also has uncertain parentage for the same reasons. Was this derived from AOC Beakers or from the Peterborough Ware, or was it also indigenous to the Grooved Ware tradition? The cordons on some of the larger pots may also have a common generic background to the cordons on Pot-beakers. Perhaps more conclusive evidence, however, may be the occurrence of combed decoration on Grooved Ware pottery. With the exception of the coarse combed pottery from Meldon Bridge (Burgess, C.B., 1976.2) combed decoration has not been proven to be pre-Beaker in Britain.

'Indigenists' may throw up their hands in horror at these suggestions and quote basketry imitations, Peterborough connections and independent development to account for all or some of these traits, and indeed the writer would admit that these other factors may be responsible but as can be seen from the Cl4 graphs (fig. 2 and 4) it is obvious that nothing concrete can be determined until we have a more comprehensive series of Cl4 determinations.
If we admit that there may be tentative evidence for Beaker influence on the Grooved Ware from Durrington Walls, what of evidence for the opposite direction? The Beaker illustrated in the Durrington Walls report (Wainwright, G.J., and Longworth, I.H., 1971, figs. 63 and 64) does seem rather individual when compared to the fine sepulchral ware of the type. Although Classic Beaker is undoubtedly present at Durrington Walls, large sherds such as P571 do not exhibit usual Beaker decorative schemes but indeed the multiple horizontal lines on the interior and exterior of the rim suggest parallels in the Grooved Ware tradition. The 'fine comb' identified as the decorating utensil in the report does rather seem to be very fine whipped material similar to the Grooved Ware sherd from Marden (see App. and fig. 24). Similarly P.574 would appear to have Grooved Ware influence in the internally thickened rim which is also impressed and incised. P.586 is similarly uncharacteristic Beaker and the decoration combines cord and incision. The inturned rim might again suggest Grooved Ware influence. Filled chevrons are of course typical Beaker motifs but not when they are arranged in rows, one upon the other, as on P592. Two very unusual sherds P595 and 596 are
perhaps from the same or similar vessels and are decorated with closely incised double chevrons and lozenges. The sherds are also sharply carrinated though a complete profile is not reconstructable. These are probably also attributable to the grey area between Beaker and Grooved Ware.

The situation is very different at Mount Pleasant where Beaker is the most common pottery type with Grooved Ware following a close second (Wainwright, G.J., 1979). There is not so much evidence for interaction in the shape and decoration of the pottery though obviously the association of the two types at the site is itself evidence for interaction. The implications of the stratified pottery is discussed below in the catalogue, and the majority of Clarke’s groups are represented. The Beaker illustrated, unlike that from Durrington Walls, can be reconstructed in a great many cases and seem to have classic Beaker decoration and profiles, with few of the anomalies noted above at Durrington Walls. The fabric, however, varies considerably in thickness (compare P164 and P165 in Wainwright, G.J., 1979). The rusticated sherds are not as numerous as one might expect in view of the large quantities of fine ware and in the main it comprises paired fingernail decorated sherds though there is also a
heavily rusticated vessel with finger-raised cordon decoration (P.208, Wainwright, G.J., 1971). These pots, plus a few undecorated vessels, may represent what Clarke would identify as the secondary ware (Clarke, D.L., 1974) while the Grooved Ware represents the coarse pottery even although some of this is indeed comparatively fine. Small bowls such as P.113, however, do suggest a purely utilitarian vessel unlike the highly ornate Beakers or Peterborough Ware.

What of Beaker relationships with later pottery - the Food Vessel and Urn traditions? This has already been briefly touched upon above when looking at Beaker/Peterborough relationships. We have already seen that Food Vessels were developing from the Rudston and Meldon Bridge styles of Peterborough Ware at an early date and before there could have been much Beaker influence in the North. It cannot be argued any longer, therefore, that it was Beaker influence on the Mortlake style that gave rise to the Food Vessel tradition. There are still however, undeniable examples of Beaker traits surviving on Food Vessels. The major influence must be the use of combed decoration and also some of the Beaker motifs looked at above (p. 146). These motifs included filled triangles and lozenges,
and some elongated vase Food Vessels may only owe part of their shape to degenerate Beakers.

Beaker–protoFood Vessel interaction, however, is more noticeable in Ireland, where it has been noticed for a long time that there is a strong likelihood of dual origins for Beaker there, coming from both Britain and the Atlantic seaboard (Liver-sage, G.D., 1968; ApSimon, A.M., 1969; Waddell, J., 1974). This may account for both the similarities and the disparities in Ireland with the British sequence. An example of the Beaker/Food Vessel ‘blur’ in Ireland can be seen at such sites as Moneen in Co. Cork (O’Kelly, M.J., 1952) some sherds from which site are illustrated here (fig. MON. 1). As well as some sherds having a Beaker profile we also have sherds with cross-hatched incision (MON. 1:1-2) strongly suggesting Beaker influence. The vessels are all labelled Food Vessel, however, by the excavator, due mainly to their fabric. Food Vessel and Beaker fusion would also appear to have been evidenced at Ballynagilly (ApSimon, A.M., 1976) as pots with combined comb and false relief decoration were found in Beaker contexts.

It has already been noted that the stratigraphy at Dalkey Island is confusingly reported so that it is often impossible to trace the exact pro-
venance of a certain vessel. As a result the relationship between Beaker and Food Vessel at the site is difficult to determine. Again, however, fabric and decoration combine to create hybrid pots (DI 2:1,2; 3:7; 5:9; etc.). The early Bell Beakers from this site are Maritime Bell Beakers probably deriving from Atlantic Europe, while at nearby sites such as Knowth and Newgrange, the influence seems to have come from Britain. Indeed much of the non-Beaker pottery has already been equated with Grooved Ware, with classic 'Clacton style' Grooved Ware coming from Knowth (KNO. 2:11). Interesting also at Knowth is the quantity of collared pottery from the Beaker domestic assemblage (KNO 1:10-12). This collared element would appear to be smaller at Newgrange though there is still pottery from this site which is akin to Grooved Ware (NEW. 1:2,3) and also pottery merging Beaker and Food Vessel traits (NEW. 2:16, 20; 3:4, 6).

With regard to Urns, the presence of Collared material at Knowth has already been referred to, and we see that in Britain too, they are found in domestic assemblages with Beakers. It is now firmly believed that Collared Urns stem from the Fengate style of Peterborough Ware, probably in Southern Britain where the most 'urn-like' Fengate pottery
is found, but Urns did not pass immediately into sepulchral use, but instead seem to have formed part of a Beaker domestic assemblage. At Peacock's Farm, for example, there are moulded (Enlarged Food Vessel?) and Collared rims among the Beaker pottery (PF. 1:2,3,10,14) and we have similar evidence at Mildenhall Fen (MF. 2:1,2,7,12 etc.). Perhaps some of the most spectacular evidence, however, is from the large domestic complex at Hockwold cum Wilton (Bamford, H., 1970) (see for example fig. HcW. 10). Here we have a number of collared rims with internal concave bevels exhibiting a number of decorative techniques that have their origins in the Peterborough tradition. These are, for example, bone impressions (HcW 9:18,24,26), twisted cord (HcW. 10:1,2) and whipped cord (HcW. 10:3). There is even a sherd from what would appear to be a cordoned urn (HcW 7:14) and the rim angle should not shed too much doubt on the identification when the difficulty of reconstructing rim angles from such small sherds is borne in mind. It has been noted that some Urns are often to be found in Beaker fabric (Gibson, A.M., 1979, L3), that is with well prepared clay and fine hard and well-fired fabric, and such is the case with some of the Urn pottery from Hockwold. For example,
Hcw. 10:7 is in a very fine fabric and probably from a bipartite collared vessel, though this is not certain. Such is also the case with some of the collared vessels from Church Hill (CH. 1:2, 6, 9, 11) which are small and fine.

From the above we see that Britain at this time is a veritable hotch-potch of pottery styles (see the motif attribution Appendix No LV). Domestic sites act as a cauldron into which the ingredients of Peterborough and Grooved ware and all their regional variations are placed. Also included are any plain wares that existed, plus any wooden vessels that may have been used on domestic sites. The 'cooking process' itself alters the ingredients and Beaker influence is added to the stew but only in the role of a seasoning. Beakers flavour and colour the mixture but only compliment the flavour rather than drastically affecting it; they help bring out what is already there. The result is, therefore, that the pottery assemblages on domestic sites are, as we have seen, rich, colourful and varied, containing a mixture of well established styles, pots of a type that will later become familiar as Food Vessels and Collared Urns and also a wealth of 'unclassifiable' pottery representing the 'grey areas' between established pot-
tery types and also the potter's individuality.

From the domestic assemblages looked at here the interaction of the local pottery styles can be summarised by the model diagram, fig. 16. This shows the two basic indigenous traditions, Peterborough and Grooved ware with Beaker in the centre. Peterborough, Beaker and Grooved Ware may all continue unchanged outside the domestic assemblage, their form and decoration dictated by tradition (? and ritual). There is, however, complex interaction in the domestic sites though the arrows here do not mean that such exchange did take place, merely that it is possible that it did. It has, however, been seen above that such interaction did take place, as would be expected, yet this interaction is more detectable on the Grooved Ware side than the Peterborough suggesting that Peterborough ware was more 'special' and its treatment more traditional.

What are the conclusions that one can draw from this? Firstly, the frequent finding of Peterborough, Grooved Ware and Beaker in association with each other would suggest that we are certainly not dealing with different ethnic groups and it is clear that Beaker 'people', Grooved Ware 'people', and Peterborough 'people' - or even 'users' - are
one and the same. There are, however, frequent differences in the contexts of the pottery. Peterborough Ware, for example, is frequently found with burials, Fussell's Lodge, for example, and in ritual contexts such as the peculiar 'settlement' on the West Kennet Avenue. Grooved Ware, by contrast, tends to be found in domestic contexts, including as domestic the large Wessex henge monuments (Wainwright, G.J., 1975). It is interesting, however, if this hypothesis is correct, that so little Peterborough pottery is found in the Wessex henges, which are unlikely to have been entirely secular in nature, but perhaps more awaits to be found in more specialised and as yet unexcavated parts of the sites. In the light that Causewayed Camps seem to have played an at least quasi-ritual purpose, it is again interesting that Peterborough Ware is much more common at these sites than is Grooved Ware, albeit in a secondary context. The subsequent development of the pottery is also interesting and revealing in that the major sepulchral pottery of the early-mid second millennium b.c. - namely Food Vessels and Collared Urns - are both developed out of the Peterborough tradition with little external influence. The main domestic pottery of the period, however, the Cordoned Urns, which later develop
into Deverel-Rimbury and related regional urn traditions, developed from the Grooved Ware tradition. Shape reinforces this idea as the bucket and tub shaped vessels of the Grooved ware tradition are more practicable on a domestic site than are the smaller and more elaborately formed Peterborough vessels, often with clumsy and ornate rim types. Beakers seem to bridge the gap, as it were, by being both domestic and ritual in purpose.

In this light it is surprising that even more interaction did not take place within the domestic assemblages for we must envisage people making Beakers, Peterborough and Grooved Ware pottery, each for its own specific purpose. Beaker would appear to be the fine ware of the assemblage, which in turn had a special prestige value and was accordingly later selected as grave goods. Peterborough Ware continued to be used for selected ritual acts and developed into Food Vessels existing alongside Beakers and ready to take over fully as the main sepulchral pottery when Beaker declined, while Grooved Ware continued to be used as the main domestic pottery type, receiving most domestic influence from Beakers and contributing in return, later to develop into Deverel-Rimbury and related domestic urn traditions.
The Domestic Assemblages.

Clarke's paper on 'the Beaker Network, Social and Economic Models' (Clarke, D.L. 1974) in Gloc-kenbecher Symposium laid out Clarke's idea of a typical domestic assemblage comprising fine ware, secondary ware, and coarse ware, an idea already seen above with relation to the domestic assemblages of Clarke's own Beaker groups. The assumption of a three-tiered domestic ceramic hierarchy was the first hypothesis of the paper. The second hypothesis of his argument was that good potting clays are hard to find, and that Beakers are difficult to manufacture due to their fineness. This however, is not the case. Adequate potting clays are, in fact, common, and though some are admittedly better than others, the critical factor in Beaker manufacture is not clay quality, but degree of preparation. Experimental work at Leicester has shown that people who have never potted before can make an adequate Beaker after only two or three attempts. These then have adequate size, shape and degree of fineness comparing well with real Beakers, and noticeable improvements are made in subsequent attempts. It must be remembered that this was done by people who had never potted before and not by people like those in the third and second millania BC who...
have a long tradition of potting behind them. Some of the earlier types of pottery in the Grimston/Lyles Hill series, for example, rival Beaker in fineness of fabric so that the expertise to make fine ware was obviously there in the Beaker period. While local clays are usually adequate and it is comparatively easy to shape a fine ware Beaker, what certainly is necessary is the more rigorous preparation of the clay before potting can begin. All natural limestone inclusions, for example, must be removed or they might later explode after the vessel has been fired, and indeed vessels from Fengate, Callis Wold, and Snail Down that were thin-sectioned by the writer have all proved to be empty with the exception of finely crushed quartz sand, calcined flint, or grog, which have all been deliberately added to open the fabric. The rigorous preparation of the clay must also be combined with a finer crushing of the opening agents which results in the fabric being fine than coarse-gritted ware that is often a defining characteristic of other pottery types of this period. Beakers tend to have their fabric filled with quartz sand, grog, calcined flint or shell, and in all cases the fillers are finely crushed to the consistency of sand. This, of course, involves
the potter in more time expenditure and the pot becomes correspondingly more 'expensive'. Once the pot has been made, it then, of course, has to be decorated and this, especially on the more ornate Beakers does involve the potter/decorator in a great deal of work and is very time consuming. Haphazard designs on some of the poorer examples of the class, even when combed, takes very little time to execute, but some Beaker designs are very intricate, especially from sites such as Northton, and also some Southern Handled Beakers, and must have taken a considerable time to decorate.

Given this, it is clear that Beakers are obviously more 'expensive' than, say, Grooved Ware, and possibly also to a lesser extent, than Peterborough Ware where moulding and decoration would also have taken considerable time. This would certainly not rule out the possibility of professional potters at work in Britain, either supplying perpetual local needs from a fixed base, or peripatetically serving a wider area, but it would seem to suggest that there was no need for such people, or at most each unit had its own professional potter(s) in residence. This in turn seems unlikely as from the settlements seen so far — excepting the Wessex henges — it would seem that
that we are dealing with family groups at most and that the 'villages' of Deverel-Rimbury type have not yet developed. When one considers the time involved in routine but necessary tasks in prehistory, such as corn grinding, wood collecting, husbandry and so on, it is difficult to imagine a potter sitting down to make a Beaker in a spare half-hour or so. On the contrary a period would have to be set aside for potting and arrangements would have to be made several days prior to the event. Clay, for example would have to be collected and prepared, fillers crushed, and fuel collected. Clay would also be needed in considerable quantities especially for large Potbeakers or large Grooved Ware vessels. In short, potting is a very essential and time costly industry and it is likely that there would be a pot-making season, or month, when pottery might be made in bulk, (see Nicklin, K., 1979).

Clarke's other hypothesis of a Beaker fine ware - everyday ware - coarse ware assemblage can be seen to be supported by the domestic assemblages seen above, but this three-tiered system is very much an oversimplification of a complex situation. The domestic assemblage can better be represented by three sets, A, B, and C representing fine ware,
everyday ware and coarse ware respectively (fig. 15). The sets are all overlapping, however, and the overlaps represent the 'grey areas' that we have looked at above. Far from having just sets A, B, and C, therefore, we also have sub-sets A B, B C, and a small subset A B C representing vessels influenced by all three types in the domestic assemblage. An hypothetical example of a vessel from this small group may be a large vessel in a coarse fabric (set C characteristics) with fine fingernail decoration borrowed from the everyday wares (set B characteristics) arranged in motifs borrowed from the fine ware (set A).

As we have seen above, however, this three-tiered domestic repertoire is still an over-simplification as not only do we have interlocking tiers, but we must also add small and large Grooved Ware vessels and Peterborough Ware into the picture represented by sets D, E, and F, respectively (fig. 15). This would show that Beaker influenced, or was influenced by Peterborough Ware in both the fine ware and everyday ware categories, represented stylistically as set A B F, and even the finer Grooved Ware might have been influenced, this possibility represented by sub-site F D. This can go as far as subtle hybrids such as vessels com-
bining influence from a great many different vessel
types shown here as hypothetical sub-sets A B C
D, or E D E C etc. This possible interaction
compares with the flow diagram above which presents
the same evidence in a different way but which does
not convey the same complexity of hypothetical in-
teraction possibilities.

It is, of course, not necessary that all types
of pottery be present on all types of domestic site.
We have seen that some sites contain all or most
types of pottery, but some will yield only one or
two types. The reasons for this are many. Firstly
we may have located a representative part of the
settlement, and, for example, more Peterborough
ware may be awaiting discovery on the Wessex henges.
Secondly, the domestic debris may not represent a
completely secular domestic site - for example the
West Kennet Avenue. Thirdly, the domestic debris
may have been dumped as a necessary preliminary to
subsequent ritual activity, as for example, the
spread below Arreton Down. Fourthly some settle-
ments may be very short term, perhaps the equiva-
lent of shielings, so that they may only contain a
small number and/or variety of pots which were
either brought with the pastoralists or made on
the site, as for example at City Farm and other
Oxfordshire ring ditches (Hamlin, A., and Case, H.J., 1963). These are possibilities that are unlikely to make themselves evident in the majority of cases in the Archaeological Record.

The Other Domestic Assemblages.

We have seen above the theoretical ways in which different pottery styles can interact within a domestic assemblage due to the fact that the same people are using different types of pottery and are in all likelihood also manufacturing these different types. Thus, if any choice is left to the potter as an individual, he/she will obviously use devices, motifs and techniques that are aesthetically pleasing to himself so long as they are within any stylistic bounds dictated by tradition. We have seen some of the evidence for this on some of the domestic sties surveyed above and have seen that such cases are usually labelled 'hybrids'. There are, however, exceptions to this rule in the form of ostensibly 'pure' Beaker domestic sites which might be taken to substantiate Clarke's theory of a three-tiered ceramic domestic hierarchy among the Beaker networks (Clarke, D.L., 1974), though perhaps modified to the form of fig. Model
I above. The best example of this must be Gorsey Bigbury in the south, and Northton in the Western Isles.

The vast majority of the pottery from Gorsey Bigbury is from Beaker fine ware though some of it is rather carelessly and haphazardly decorated suggesting that it may best be regarded as secondary ware. There is also some rusticated ware though only a very small amount and it may be akin to Peterborough Ware. At Northton, work on the pottery is still in progress, and much of it is still sherd evidence and so difficult to interpret satisfactorily. Judging from what has been processed, however, it would certainly seem that Clarke's fine ware - everyday ware - coarse ware hypothesis would be substantiated at this site. The coarseness of some of the pottery has already been noted above and it is possible that some of the coarse ware from Northton has been influenced by some of the indigenous pottery traditions as some of it compares favourably with some of the pottery from Rosinish (Shepherd, I.A., 1976) and Kilellan Farm (figs. KIL. 1 - 5) (Burgess, C.B., 1976.1) which again has its best parallels in the native Neolithic traditions. Some sherds from Northton, like those illustrated in Langley's plate 4
seem to be influenced by Beaker only in their decoration, and even then horizontal incision has a long ceramic ancestry in Western Scotland.

While it is still possible to see traces of ceramic interaction at these sites, one still has to explain why, at these sites, Beaker is found in such overwhelming quantities. The explanations may, in fact, be quite simple. It has been seen above that the main large Beaker settlements are very late in the sequence, for example, Hockwold cum Wilton, Fengate, Chippenham V, and Fifty Farm. Early Beaker domestic sites, with the exception of ACC Beakers, are rare in both Britain and the Netherlands with notable exceptions at Brean Down, and Costwoud respectively (van Giffen, A.E., 1961), and when they are located the Beakers are found in comparatively small numbers. The quantity of Beakers found on domestic sites, however, increases through time, and the larger amounts of fine ware are found on later sites. Contemporary with this is the increase of large Beaker rusticated pots, and one must again ask the reasons for this development.

The early assemblages in Britain and the Netherlands show that Clarke’s three-tiered domestic assemblage is as yet embryonic with at most his fine ware and everyday ware being evident, and pot
Beakers are unusually absent and for this reason the association at Oostwoud must remain suspect (van Giffen, A.E., 1961). Instead, there are Peterborough sherds and Grooved Ware in Britain which are commonly associated with early Beakers in domestic contexts (e.g. Arreton Down, Brean Down). As Beakers develop, and the indigenous traditions are gradually modified, some large vessels emerge in the domestic repertoire. It is often very difficult, however, when looking at the sherd evidence, to tell whether we are dealing with Peterborough sherds or Potbeakers and hence the past need for cover-all phrases such as 'Beaker coarse wares' (Robertson-Mackay, R., 1961), to blanket a multitude of uncertainties. Certainly, few people would argue the similarity in fabrics, and the difficulties of differentiation. Their absence on early domestic sites of this type, however, may suggest the likely possibility that these rusticated vessels are in fact a cross between Beaker and local pottery. Large rusticated vessels were already present in Britain in Peterborough and Grooved Ware repertoires, only the shape of these Potbeakers need be Beaker derived. 'Potbeker' is also late in the Netherlands with the exception of Oostwoud mentioned above, but finger rusticated
Pottery is present in early Bell Beaker contexts, perhaps derived from the rusticated ware of the PFB culture.

It may, therefore, be envisaged that Beaker fine wares reached Britain first and were more or less an immediate success. The reason for this may be their contents, accompanying ritual, or simply the attractiveness of the pots themselves, an idea favoured for Eastern Europe (Shennan, S.J., 1977; Harrison, R.J., 1982). The secondary wares probably arrived at the same time and both types were adopted into the current domestic repertoires where they were modified and in turn influenced other traditions. The fine wares, were, not unnaturally, chosen for burial purposes because they were the finest pottery at that time, and possibly also there may have been a ritual connected with the pots in the initial stages of their adoption c.2100 B.C. (see time scale, fig. 29.) (Burgess, C&B., and Shennan, S., 1976). For awhile till c.1900 B.C., Beaker fine and secondary wares were at the top of the ceramic hierarchy, perhaps because of their appearance, ritual connotations, or simply their expense, and due to demand, their numbers increased so that they were indeed the commonest pottery type and their size varied as
their functions increased. Small fine wares were still selected for sepulchro-ritual purposes though other secondary wares and Potbeakers now also saw their way into graves perhaps indicating that Beaker prestige was dying out, at least in the ritual aspect. It is also likely that Food Vessels were also starting to emerge in the burial record by this time. Beakers persisted on domestic sites as a fine ware, often, in large numbers, as at sites such as Northton, Chippenham, and so on, but their role would now appear to be primarily domestic, with the successors of Peterborough ware now re-asserting themselves as the ritual pottery in the form of Food Vessels and Collared Urns. We have already seen that the Beaker influence on these pots was present but minimal and with the rise of Deverel-Rimbury and related domestic assemblages Beaker seems to die out as mysteriously as it arrived.

Sites such as Northton, Fifty Farm, Chippenham and so on must then represent the extreme flo-ruit of Beaker existence in Britain, when Beaker was enjoying its full role as a domestic pot as well as still having a ritual/prestige sepulchral value. In Ireland the situation is similar. Beaker arrived in fairly large numbers but played no
role in changing the Neolithic background either religiously or secularly. Instead, the Beaker floruit was to be seen on domestic sites alongside the already common Lough Gur Class II ware, and so on. Madden (1976) feels that Beakers in Ireland represent artefacts without a culture and that the Beaker network did not affect the 'native' societies, but arrived into Ireland in the course of normal social contacts. After a period of flowering, the Beaker declined here too, and left its mark only on the Food Vessel pottery. As in Scotland, the Large Potbeaker vessels seem to be absent in Ireland, with only a few exceptions (possibly Newgrange) and the fine Beaker adopted pure and simply as a fine domestic ware.

**Beaker Diffusion**

We have seen above that there are no real Beaker domestic sites in Britain in terms of 'where Beaker people lived', but instead there are domestic sites on which Beaker is found in varying quantities, and which later develop into sites which are predominantly Beaker and which in turn die out with the Beaker decline. All that remains as a form of Beaker ceramic survival are one or two domestic sites (for example Kilellan Farm) with
Beaker influenced pottery and Beaker traits lingering on some Food Vessels. This would all seem to argue against Beaker invaders otherwise one might expect to see a large number of early sites developing parallel to indigenous sites, but this does not seem to happen in Britain or indeed in Europe generally (Harrison, R.J., 1987, Shennan, S.J., 1977). Instead, Beaker is adopted by the indigenous groups and is used by them in addition to their own pottery. At first this takes place in a few instances only but numbers rapidly increase and indigenous development is then quick to take over. Indeed, Beakers must have been incredibly attractive to the local populations for their spread in Britain was total and rapid. So great was their popularity that Beakers soon took over as the predominant ceramic type, especially in the fine ware category, on a great many domestic sites, often giving the site the appearance of a pure Beaker site, using 'pure' to specify racial individuality. That Beakers would be aesthetically 'pleasing' to the locals is not really to be doubted but this factor alone is unlikely to account for the spread of the pottery over such large areas of Europe though it may account for the readiness of its adoption as a domestic fine ware in Britain.
A hint towards the origins of the Beakers in Britain may be Wessex. With the exception of AOC Beakers, the early Beakers do tend to concentrate in Wessex, and Lanting and van der Waal's scheme show Wessex as the only area to have a complete step 1 - 7 sequence, and in particular to have early Beakers certainly attributable to step 1. In addition, Clarke's Wessex/Mid Rhine group is one of the few groups to have a firmly defined distribution, with few being located outside Wessex and the south. This, of course, is also an early group. In fact, the Beaker in general have a markedly southern distribution centring on Wessex, until we deal with the early necked Beakers when only then does the distribution become more uniform with North Britain now firmly drawn into the Beaker network. This corresponds largely to step 4 of the Dutchmen's scheme. This of course, does not mean that there are no Beakers in North Britain that are earlier than step 4, clearly there are a great many, but it does seem that it was only at this stage that full independent development began in this area. Indeed, Beakers prior to that stage in the North are comparatively few and all appear to be southern influenced, or at least have closer affinities with their south-
ern counterparts. Yorkshire, too, has few Beakers prior to step 4 and it is only with this stage that Beaker numbers in Yorkshire show a dramatic increase and individuality.

This would suggest that Beakers probably arrived in East Anglia and spread straight to Wessex, perhaps already a religious centre important enough to attract such imports, and that Beakers then spread from there to the rest of Britain, at first in small numbers perhaps as luxury or prestige items, only to have the tradition firmly established in the North by step 4 from which point we have individual and localised traditions. To carry this a stage further, the Beakers of Northern Scotland did not appear to fall into a step scheme according to Banting and van der Waals, (1972), and the reason for this must be individual development. Most would seem rather 'degenerate' by southern standards, as for example the vessel from Bruachaig in Ross and Cromarty (Clarke fig. 733) which would be classed as having 'thick fabric' and 'degenerate' decoration. There is also the Beaker from Kilmory Knap, Argyll, (Clarke fig. 701) which has a slack profile and rather 'half hearted' decoration, and there are two vessels from Ellan, Aberdeen, (Clarke figs. 669 and 670) which have uncharacteristic Bea-
ker rim forms with what amounts to multiple internal rim bevels, and again rather half hearted decoration. The Beaker from Achnasheen, Ross and Cromarty (Clarke, fig. 593) can also be quoted in this light. These are clearly not the only examples that can be quoted as a glance through Clarke's corpus illustrations will show (footnote 1), and Beakers rather individual in character are found up the west coast from Cumbria northwards, and on the East, northwards from Aberdeen. The reason may be, of course, the difficulty of communications and penetration in all but the immediate coast in these areas. In fact, the spread of Beaker in the North can be likened to the Roman advance during the Agricolan campaigns and afterwards. This halted south of the Moray Firth, and direct Roman influence in subsequent periods was, in effect, limited to south of the Clyde-Forth isthmus. Indirect influence, however, was felt much further North than this with Roman artefacts having been discovered in some brochs outside the sphere of direct contact.

The same might suggest itself for Beaker influence in North Britain. We have 'direct' contact, i.e. strong contact, as far north as Aberdeen and the Moray Firth on the East coast, but in that area and north of it, there would appear to
be examples of 'degenerate' Beaker that would appear to be the result of indirect contact. This is probably Beaker imitation. This may be seen especially at some of the Shetland stone houses, mentioned in the North Britain section above, where pottery from such sites as Gruting and Benie Hoose seem to have their closest affinities with Beaker forms and decoration. In the outer Isles, too, Beaker influenced pottery is also found at Rosininish and Kilellan Farm, little pure Beaker from the former site has yet been illustrated, and there is only a very small amount of pure Beaker to be illustrated from the latter site. Perhaps too, some of the coarse pottery from Northton may be so classified.

Why is Beaker so numerous in the South? This is probably because the population may already have been larger in this area and so more people to adopt the new pots. Renfrew, for example, suggests a population of c.34,000 people in late Neolithic Wessex, and in his model for the area great population density is seen as being one of the characteristics of chiefdom (Renfrew, C., 1973). Wessex was already an important area at this time with large ritual monuments already in existence, as well as the large Wessex Henges. Wessex was clea-
rly already an important ritual area with probable 'international' fame if one may use the anachronism. The area must also have been very rich to be able to afford such ritual building programmes. It is ridiculous to assume that Beakers 'floated' across the North Sea, however, and obviously people must have introduced the pots to Britain. Those responsible would possibly be people coming to Wessex from the Low Countries, or else vice versa and then returning. It may be that Wessex attracted travellers from the Low Countries and the Rhineland who came as traders to this rich area and Beakers, plus their probable contents may have been brought as trade goods or offerings by these travellers. The possibility of their being 'pilgrims' should also not be discounted. Whatever the cause, an early concentration of Beakers in Wessex cannot be denied. These were at first few and prestigious and their spread gradual in the South. As Beaker numbers increased, with the start of local and more widespread manufacture, so too their distribution widened into the other focus areas of Lang and van der Waals - perhaps major social centres though subordinate in importance to Wessex - from where independent development and imitation took place. A similar type of influence/imitation may also be seen in the
South-West in the small flowerpot shaped cord decorated vessels of Cornwall (Megaw, J.V.S., 1976) though this is less certain.

So far we have talked of Beakers only in terms of comb zoned Beakers and AOC and AOcombed Beakers have purposefully been omitted from the discussion. The reason for this is that the AOC and AOcombed Beakers do seem to be an exception to the rule. Their distribution, for example, is markedly coastal and riverine (Clarke, D.L., 1970) and they do not centre in the Wessex plains in all but a minor way. Instead, we have minor focus areas, or at least concentrations, over Britain as a whole. Wessex, the Humber, central Yorkshire, the Forth Tay area, and multiple finds spots distributed over the western coast are all minor nuclei of the AOC Beaker distribution in Britain and would suggest a coastal spread penetrating in land only in important (?) religious areas - Wessex, Yorkshire, Aberdeenshire. Further coastal settlements may have been lost in southern Britain due to the Eustatic/isostatic tilt. The diffusion, however, may still have been roughly south to north as we have step 1 AOC Beakers in Wessex and the south, though they represent step 1/2 in the north. The diffusion would, nevertheless, appear to have been rapid using
coastal and riverine routes.

Case (1977) has shown that the AOC Beakers were the first pottery of this type in Britain by reason of their associations and C14 chronology, and perhaps we should see the spread of AOC Beakers as apart from the spread of comb-zoned Beaker. It has been seen in the Netherlands that there is a significant if not yet understood, difference between Bell Beaker and AOC Beakers (van der Waals, J.D., 1965; van der Waals, J.D., and Glasberge, W., 1955; Lanting, J.N., and van der Waals, J.D., 1974; Lanting, J.N., 1973) and it may be that the relations in Britain are similar. In the Netherlands it is now accepted that AOC Beakers are largely derived from PFB pottery (Lanting, J.N., and van der Waals, J.D., 1974) and indeed in Britain, the early dated sherds from below the barrow at Giants Hill I, Skendleby, are not out of character with PFB pottery though the belly-carrinated sherd may be somewhat angular for this class. It is possible, then, to see AOC Beakers coming to Britain independently of the comb-zoned Bell Beaker, probably at the end or just before the end, of the PFB phase in Holland. The coastal distribution might suggest that this spread did indeed involve some settlers. At Ross Links, for example (Tait, J.
1965) we have a virtually pure AOC/AOcomb assemblage with one or two early contracted AOcomb Beakers and some fine rusticated and undecorated pottery. The non-Beaker element at Hedderwick would also seem to be small, at least from the material seen by the writer, while the AOC and AOcombed element compares favourably with Ross Links. The pottery of this class from Glenlucet might also be taken to support this hypothesis, though the frequent lack of stratification at this site makes the evidence inconclusive.

In the areas where AOC and AOcombed Beakers are found, however, and even on the same sites — such as Glenlucet, Hedderwick, Tents Muir — despite the inconclusive stratigraphy, we would appear to have established 'native' settlements in at least close proximity to those of any new settlers. This might suggest that any new 'migrants' were well received, a notion that would seem curious in such presumably territorially orientated circumstances. Instead, perhaps it would be more plausible to envisage the opening up of extensive trade routes over the North Sea evidence for which is abundant in earlier and later periods though apparently dormant in the later Neolithic until the Beaker period. This leads us back full circle to what was being
traded and why it was so popular. Alcoholic drinks have been suggested though presumably the 'native' agriculturalists had quite a cellar to choose from.

The other possibility, if not trade, is a ritual as was suggested by Burgess and Shennan (1976) but again it is difficult to know what is ritual in view of the fact that Beakers did not alter visibly the existing traditions in Neolithic Britain.

The third possibility is the prestige value of the pots themselves, being finer than any that were in current use in Britain. If this is the case, then their adoption is surprisingly rapid, though perhaps no more rapid than culture contacts allow.

CONCLUSION

The study of the pottery from domestic sites has been valuable for giving us more insight into the 'Beaker problem' and in supporting previous hypothesis based almost entirely on the sepulchral evidence.

We have seen that Clarke's three-tiered hierarchy of Beaker domestic wares is a valid one but that it is an over-simplification of the state of affairs on domestic sites where the range of pottery is wide and full of 'grey areas' between cla-
ssic pottery styles. We have also seen that there are no pure Beaker domestic sites, with the possible exception of some of the AOC sites, and it is suggested that the AOC Beakers should be treated differently from the comb-zoned Beakers. Indeed, early Bell Beakers are rare in domestic contexts and when they are found, they are normally associated with local indigenous pottery styles. Only as time progresses do we have an increase in the number of fine ware Beakers represented on domestic sites, so that at the Beaker florescence we have sites which give the appearance of pure domestic sites.

We have also seen that domestic sites act as a type of cauldron for interaction between local pottery styles and Beaker pottery. This interaction is, however, natural, and to be expected where individual potters are at work and producing goods that they regard as aesthetically pleasing. This interaction, however, is not really extensive. We have seen that Beakers play only a small role in the development of Food Vessel pottery and indeed on Urn pottery, however on domestic sites the styles are all related and linked in their common uses and roles. There also seems to be more flexibility in the pottery from domestic sites as if domestic pottery is not dictated to by ceramic tradition to
nearly the same extent as ritual pottery.

Finally the domestic pottery does suggest that we are not dealing with Beaker migrants from Europe in any way but on a very small scale with very small amounts of people coming as traders, missionaries, or pilgrims, but instead the pottery was adopted by local people who, after all, had the capabilities to manufacture such fine ware, given a little more time and care in preparation. It then became the popular fine ware used alongside the other styles in current use. A catalyst to this initial adoption may have been a ritual or rituals unknown, or a tradable commodity. Whatever reason, their popularity was immediate and lasting.

***********

FOOTNOTE

1) Examples of other Northern Beakers with degenerate form or decorations are, Clarke's figs, 23, 26, 247, 269, 275, 276, 277, 278, 280, 310, 317, 318, 323, 450, 603, 615, 618, 654, 949, 952, 980, 990, 1004, 1008, 1009, 1017, 1018.
This work concentrates on the domestic ceramic aspect of the Beaker period in the British Isles and the Netherlands in contrast to the more often studied sepulchral aspect. The work begins with a survey of Beaker studies since Clark's work of 1970 and a history of Beaker domestic studies in Britain. The type of Beaker domestic sites frequently met with is also outlined, as is a general introduction to the chronology of the period.

The evidence is presented under the headings 'North Britain, South Britain, Ireland, and the Netherlands', but the evidence is all brought together in the discussion.

It is concluded as a result of the study that we should not be thinking in terms of Beaker People but that the indigenous population was responsible for the manufacture and use of these pots. This is evidenced by the occurrence of Beaker associated with Peterborough and Grooved ware types. We also see that Clarke's idea of a threetiered domestic ceramic hierarchy is an oversimplification of a much more complex ceramic interaction and hybridisation. It is also suggested that the introduction of the ACC Beaker into Britain should be regarded as a separate event from the introduction of the comb-decorated Bell Beaker and that the two types retained a degree of independence. Bell Beaker diffusion within the British Isles is also suggested.

Appendixes include Beaker radiocarbon dates, the techniques of Beaker manufacture, and photographs of potsherds that illustrate those techniques. There is also an extensive catalogue which presents Beaker domestic sites as a corpus and each entry is referenced, the site summarised, and the pottery described. 256 pages of pottery drawings illustrate the text and the corpus.
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APPENDICES
THE MANUFACTURE OF BEAKERS

The technology of prehistoric pottery is another subject that is worthy of PhD study in its own right and so a detailed study involving experimental archaeology and detailed measurements is outside the scope of this work. Any close examination of the techniques involved would involve the reconstruction of the methods of supposed manufacture, controlled and monitored firings and the extensive use of microscopic analysis and although the writer has taken part in a small amount of work on the first two categories mentioned above, it was for reasons that amounted to little more than idle interest. Indeed a doctoral thesis on such a topic has already been presented on the subject (van der Leeuw, S.E. 1977) to the University of Amsterdam though this does not deal exclusively with prehistoric pottery, far less Beakers. Instead, this section is intended to briefly outline the probable methods of manufacture and any problems that exist in the interpretation or that may have presented themselves to the manufacturers. By doing so, it will also outline the fundamental differences between Beaker and other contemporary pottery types. No attempt has been made to go into the technology or 'science' involved in the 'whys and wherefores'
of Beaker manufacture which have already been
looked at, albeit briefly, by van der Leeuw (op.
cit) and is also readily available in many of the
Archaeological Science text books. As a result,
this section may seem pitifully naive to many with
a more detailed knowledge of Archaeological Science
than the writer. It is felt, however, that this
form of introduction is a necessary preliminary to
the discussion of decoration techniques and motifs
in the subsequent sections.

CLAYS

Little work on the microscopic analysis of
Beaker pottery has been done or published, but it
would appear that the clays were of local origin.
The pots are fragile, more so than many other types
of prehistoric pottery, due to the thinness of the
pot walls, and this would argue against their being traded as complete vessels. The trading of clay as a raw material would also seem unlikely due to the amounts involved, or rather the quantities needed.

A small number of sherds from Gillis Wold, barrow
275, and Fengate (footnote 1) have been thin sec-
tioned by the writer but the clays have all been
fairly undiagnostic with fine quartz being the only recognised tempering agent. The only exception to this was one of the Fengate sherds which had a
small abraded (and so naturally occurring?) fragment of fossiliferous limestone. Examination of some sherds from Northton, however, have been more productive and show that the sherds do in fact seem to have had a local origin. The same would seem to be the case with sherds from the Beaker settlement at Newgrange in Co. Meath where the pottery was tempered with finely crushed Newry granite. If the pottery did travel, either as clay or as the finished article, it is unlikely to have involved large distances for the reasons already specified and if it did occur it may have been as a result of local groups visiting nearby sources of good clay for 'on the spot' manufacture and then leaving with their complete vessels and going home. Such a practice may have been performed at Stacey Bushes, for example (Green, H.S. 1976) where pottery seems to have been locally produced.

Against this argument, however, is the all too commonly known Gabbroic ware identified at Hembury by Dr. Peacock and having its origins in the Lizard Peninsula in Cornwall. If this type of Neolithic pottery 'travelled' then why not Beakers? In the Netherlands M.J. Jansma has undertaken some diatom analysis of TRB, PFB, and EB pottery, as well as other prehistoric pottery types of Holland and
reached the conclusion that the Bell Beaker pottery 'from certain findspots in the coastal region of the Netherlands was imported from the hinterland'. (Jansma, M.J. 1977. p.77). This conclusion was suggested by the lack of diatoms in the clay of the Protruding Foot Beakers and the Bell Beakers from Zandwerven and Oostwoud whose local clays appear rich in diatoms.

Many of the fine sepulchral Beakers also appear to have had the clay prepared by weathering or elutrition as the fabric is generally fine with only small particles of grog or quartz sand generally being added. This tempering is to reduce the plasticity of the clay to help in the forming of the vessel, and to reduce the amount of shrinkage - and so the risk of cracking - during the drying process.

FORMING

A vessel can either be made from the bottom up or else in effect upside down whereby the lip is manufactured first and is used at the first coil then the walls are worked up till finally the base is fixed. This latter form of construction, however, would prove difficult on a vessel with a flaring neck as many Beakers tend to have as the wet clay would tend to collapse under the weight. No wheels
were used at this period and the term 'slow wheel'
which is often taken to mean any turnable platform
is misleading. The pots would, presumably, be made
on such a platform which would be as little as a
piece of matting, cloth, wood or slate etc. and
nothing more, sufficient only to allow the pot to
be turned in preference to the potter moving around
it. It is impossible, of course, to 'throw' the
pots on such a pallet.

Assuming that the vessels are made from the
base upwards the potter has two main ways of making
the base. Firstly he could use a disc of clay and
start coiling the sides onto this base, or, on the
other hand, he could take a thick clay disc or ball
and start to raise the walls up by 'pinching' of
drawing the clay up between thumb and fingers. In
the latter method the sides will automatically start
to splay out as the clay escapes in all directions
from the pressure. It is possible that traces of these
bases can be seen in examples from Clarke's corpus
(Clarke, D.L. 1970) for example in
Nos. fig. 278. Hasting Hill, Tyne and Wear.
fig. 289. Folkton, Yorkshire.
fig. 696. Eckford, Roxburgh.
fig.1016. Methilhill, Fife.
all of which are seen to have a 'bulb' in the centre
of the base and which probably resulted from the pressure of drawing the clay up to secure the first coil, the base being untouched at the centre. It is interesting to note that these 'bulbs' are more common in Scottish and North English Beakers than in those from the South.

Once this process has been completed and a 'pinched bowl' has been produced the true 'building' of the pot begins with the use of coils on a thick walled vessel and probably rings of clay on a fine walled vessel such as a Beaker. The writer uses rings to mean single layers of clay whereas 'coils' suggests building in spirals. As the rings are joined to each other the clay tends to splay out rather dramatically as it escapes in all directions from the pressure produced by the fingers. Van der Leeuw suggests that this was probably counteracted by the use of twisted cord wrapped round the pot to act as a support and also by fixing each ring to the inside of the previous one as though trying to make a closed vessel, and then carefully squeezing the clay outwards. The latter suggestion is, of course, logical but the former is a novel and interesting idea. Van der Leeuw sees the evidence for the use of cord in this way as being the facts that 1) the cord impressions are often too deep to be
to be applied after the building of the pot has been completed because

(a) the clay would be wet and could not withstand the pressure needed to make such impressions, and

(b) the narrowness of the vessel's neck in many cases precludes the insertion of the hand for use as an anvil when applying the cord decoration.

2) the cord may also have been used as a support to prevent the thin and fine clay from sagging during manufacture and drying.

Van der Leeuw suggests that other supports such as broad reeds or leather straps may also have been used - an idea which is attractive with regard to some of the Dutch Veluwe Beakers but which is not really evidenced on British examples. The extreme thinness of some Beaker walls, however, and the fineness of the fabric in respect to tempering make the idea of a support quite attractive, at least to a potter 'learning the trade' and may explain why AOC Beakers have such a long life in Britain (Case 1974).

The smoothing out of the vessel may be done in a variety of ways. Some sort of Beater and Anvil technique was possibly used on Beakers. In
this method a hand or flat surface is used as a beater on the outside and a smooth round surface such as a pebble or pestle etc. is used as the anvil on the inside. This does not only finish off the vessel but can also be used in the forming process. It produces thin walls with a smooth finish and also helps to strengthen the bonds between the coils. Smoothing can also be done quite simply with the fingers when the clay is wet enough, but clay can also be pared off with a flint or wooden cutting tool but evidence for this on British Beakers is very tentative and the writer is not convinced of its use. Certainly some of the pottery does appear to have been wiped quite firmly and examples of wipe marks can be seen on the Beaker/ Food Vessel from Callis Wold Barrow 275.

Once the pot had dried out slightly but was still damp, final finishing touches could be made. This could include the finishing and evening of the rim which can withstand greater pressure at this stage in the process than when wet and any decoration could be applied, comb, for example, needing far less pressure to leave a successful impression than does cord. At a slightly later stage in the drying, when the vessels had become 'leather hard' burnishing could take place if re-
quired though evidence for this on Beakers is not common. An excellent example of a vessel having been burnished after the decoration had been executed is on a 'potbeaker' sherd from 362 Holland (e.g. i8). Burnishing has also been noticed on some of the Beaker sherds from some Scottish sand dune sites.

The firing of the dry vessels would almost certainly have taken place in bonfires. The true kiln was unknown in Britain at this time. The vessels would presumably have been pre-heated to drive out the remaining water in the clay and then they would be fired properly in a bonfire. The fact that few Beakers are in reduced clays would suggest that the fires were not dampened down but were left open. The hearth could either be built directly on the ground or in a small pit up to, but generally not exceeding, 50 cms. in depth. Experiments with this type of firing at Leicester show that the sides of the pit, and even the base itself, do not always show extreme burning as one might expect. The sides have dried out but suffered no colour change and so the writer wonders if any of the so-called 'hearth pits' or pits with charcoal layers often referred to in the archaeological literature are in fact the remains of these
pot bonfires. Some of the pots must have exploded during the firing due to a too rapid rising in temperature and insufficient pre-heating, and so one would expect to find wasters in the fire. Lack of wasters, however, should not be taken to mean that the hearth was not used for firing for many contain small Beaker sherds and presumably the larger pieces would be removed and used as grog. Wasters have, however, been recognised by the writer among some of the PFB sherds from the recent excavations at Kolhorn in the Netherlands (footnote 2).

It is obvious that a great deal more care must have been taken over the manufacture of Beakers than that of other types of pottery of this period. Firstly, the clay is often finer and seems to have been treated better with finer additions such as quartz sand or finely crushed grog. The large angular grit found in Collared Urn and Peterborough ware for example contrasts strongly with the fineness of the Beaker fabrics and indeed it is usually this fineness that is the defining characteristic when recognising Beaker sherds. The walls of the vessels are usually also much thinner and so must need more care in the actual building of the pots, and probably also in the firing. In all, a great deal more time must have been spent in the total
manufacture of a Beaker and so this would suggest that they must have been used by people who stood socially above the rest and who warranted 'fine ware' pottery, or else the pots themselves were special in their own right and perhaps used ceremoniously.

FOOTNOTES
(1) The writer wishes to thank Martin Howe of Peterborough Museum for allowing him to thin section the Pengate Beaker sherds, to David Coombs, excavator of Callis Wold 275 for permission to thin section the Callis Wold sherds, and to Prof. O'Kelly for information regarding the Newgrange sherds. Thanks are also due to Ann Woods of the Department of Archaeology, Leicester, for help with the thin sections and for general advice on the probable manufacturing process, and for allowing the writer to help in her experiments into pot manufacture and bonfire firing.

(2) Thanks are extended to Dr. Jan Lanting for allowing me access to the pottery from his excavations at Kolhorn.
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TECHNIQUES OF BEAKER MANUFACTURE AND DECORATION

This section is illustrated by 12 plates (figs. 17-24) and is intended as a survey of some of the techniques of manufacture and decoration for which evidence survives on some especially well-preserved sherds. The evidence cited by van der Leeuw for his suggestions that cord was used as a supporting frame for his AOC Beakers during manufacture has already been mentioned above in the introduction and it was seen that the evidence was not convincing in all the sherds either from Holland or from Britain. Similarly, the sherds illustrated here are all exceptional in that they have such evidence surviving but it is not suggested that this was how all Beakers were made and decorated. These sherds give us no more than an insight into techniques that were in use at that time, perhaps not even universally.

Fig. 17

This first plate deals with processes of manufacture. Part A of the photograph comprises three sherds from layer VII at Northton all of which show evidence for the coiling of the pottery as all the sherds have broken along the coil. The photographs used here have been taken vertically onto the sec-
tion of the pottery and the rounded coil can plainly be seen. The coil breaks have resulted from the coils not being joined properly to the preceding one, possibly due to insufficient pressure, or possibly because the clay has been too plastic. Experiments at Leicester and detailed examination of Beaker sherds has shown that the coils very often do not show in the sections of fired pottery, and firing breaks do not always occur along coils. When this does happen, however, it is due to the coils being insufficiently bonded and the result is identical to the sherds in the photograph.

Sherds B and C are both base sherds from Dutch Beakers. Sherd B is photographed in effect from the inside and it is the inside of the base angle that is pictured. Two indentations have been boxed in the photograph and are the remains of the finger-tip impressions of the potter when he has pushed out the base from the inside. This may have been done simply when the potter was smoothing off the bottom part of the vessel, or perhaps when he needed to push out the base slightly in an attempt to counter any sag in the vessel wall. It shows, however, that the pot was made 'the right way up' and not inverted during manufacture, if not decoration.
Sherd C is from the **Velsen** in the Netherlands and is the exterior face of a base sherd, in effect a worm's eye view of the pot. It shows a series of grass impressions in the base which suggested firstly that the sherd had had grass as an opening agent and that the impressions had been left when the grass burned out during firing. On examination, however, this seemed not to be the case and it appeared simply that the pot had been placed on a grassy surface to dry, possibly in the sun, or else on a bed of grass indoors if the climate was unpredictable.

Finally on this photograph, sherd D is a *Potbeker* sherd from in the Netherlands and is an inside view just below the rim of the pot. It can clearly be seen that the holes, typical of this type of Dutch Beaker, have been pushed through from the outside. The displaced clay is clearly visible round the two complete holes and a 'collar' can be seen on the right hand hole caused by withdrawing the point again.

**Fig. 19**

This photograph evidences some of the 'finishing off' techniques employed on the pottery under review. Photograph A, a sherd from a Beaker/Food Vessel from Callis Wold, shows short wipe marks on
the exterior caused when the clay has been smoothed off after the vessel has been completed. The wipe marks do not, however, blur the fingernail impressions which suggests that they were executed afterwards. This is not the case with sherd B, however, from Tents Muir where it can clearly be seen that some of the comb decoration has been blurred either by wiping the sherd at the leatherhard stage, after the decoration has been applied, or else perhaps it has simply been handled rather carelessly while still not fully dried. The former suggestion seems more likely to the writer in view of the large area affected. The wiping has been rather more extreme on sherd C from Holland. The sherd is from a 'Pot-beker' that has had pellets and ribs raised on the exterior, fingernails have perhaps been used to do this. The vessel has also been burnished, however, after the decoration had been executed. The result is a rather more severe example of sherd B already mentioned and the decoration has been blurred. The ridges and pellets have all been flattened to a uniform height, and in this case the decoration must have been executed before the vessel reached the leatherhard stage.

Fig. 19

This photograph shows methods of raising
decoration on the vessels. Fig. A is a negative form of this as the ribbed effect has in fact been made by grooving in the same way as false relief decoration is impressed. A stick or some such instrument has been used and the drag marks as the tool has been dragged through the clay can clearly be seen. Sherds B and C are both from large pot-beakers, B from the Netherlands and C from Chippenham in Cambridgeshire, both have ribs and pellets raised on the surface. The fingernail impressions that remain from the act of raising the decoration can clearly be seen below the ribs on sherd B and below the top rib on sherd C. The fingernail impressions are also visible round the pellets, especially the second pellet from the right on sherd C, and they show that the decoration was raised and not applied.

Fig. 2c

Fingernail and tip decoration takes a variety of forms, and its true texture cannot always be portrayed in drawings. A sample of such impressions is provided here and in the next illustration. Sometimes the impressions can be brave and crisp as in sherd A where the nail and tips of the fingers have been used, tip impressions on the cordon at the bottom of the sherd and nail impressions on the
rest of the body. Some of the clay has been displaced to form small crescentic mounds in the centre of each pair. This effect was apparently desired by the potters. The same technique has been used to decorate sherd D but the impressions are 'softer' and appear to have been 'smudged' after they had been made and before the clay had dried. The crescents of displaced clay are not present here and have been deliberately smoothed.

Sherds B and C exhibit a much more 'careful' impression though the word 'careful' may in fact be misleading as it may suggest that the result in sherd A and D is careless and this is not the case. It is meant simply that the potter has had to decorate sherd B and C more lightly so that the nail and only the nail was impressed into the clay giving thinner and neater impressions than those previously seen. This fine decoration is much more in keeping with a smaller vessel than the coarse fingertip decoration and may represent pottery intermediate between the fine combed ware and the large heavy potbeakers.

Fig. 2

Six more examples of finger decoration are illustrated in this photograph but still the varia-
tion of this type of decoration has not been ex-
hausted. Sherd A here is similar to sherd A on the
last figure in that the impressions are deep and a
large crescent of displaced clay often outlines the
deepest part of the impression. This effect was
obviously desired as no attempt is made to remove
it and it is, indeed, quite difficult to intention-
ally produce this effect successfully. The large
squirish impressions of sherd F are still fingernail
impressions but once the nail has been inserted into
the clay it has been rotated slightly. This action
would also help produce the ribs on this vessel.
The clay was presumably pressed up with the index
finger against the thumb, using this as an anchor,
and the impressions of the thumb nail can be seen
clearly above the lower cordon.

Sherds B, C and D all have paired fingernail
decoration. Sherd B has this decoration running in
horizontal and vertical lines while only one direc-
tion is visible on sherd C. Sherd B is also inter-
esting in that the density of the impressions differs.
The vertical impressions, for example, are quite
widely spaced while the horizontal pairs are close
together in the 'crowsfoot' motif, a name often over-
frequently given to this type of paired fingernail
decoration. Sherd D attractively combines paired
fingernail decoration, delicately executed, with the oval 'pellets' of displaced clay giving the surface a variety of oval relief and impression. Again the finer decoration appears to be from smaller vessels.

The fingernail impressions on sherd E are interesting in that they are deep but well executed, very linear, and also paired very tightly. The pairing is so close that it could not have been done by thumb and finger simultaneously, but instead it would appear that first one line and then another was done almost in the same way as herringbone might be incised.

Fig. 22

On the pottery from Beaker domestic sites, much of which, it has already been noticed, is not Beaker, a variety of whipped impressions have come to the writer's attention and a selection are reproduced here. Not all the sherds here are either Beaker or from Beaker domestic sites but have been chosen to illustrate a point and are usually good examples of the technique. On this figure, for example, sherds A and B are from Tents Muir and C is from the ditch of Skendleby II long barrow. All the sherds exhibit whipped maggot decoration formed by the impression of small lengths of whipped cord into the clay resulting in small, segmented impressions. The im-
pressions on sherds A and B are typical of this type of decoration. The impressions on sherd C are rather more elongated than is normal but they are interesting in that the left hand group of maggots show that the cord has been whipped around a hard and stiff object such as a stick or a bone, and have been impressed firmly into the wet clay.

Fig. 23

It became increasingly obvious that 'whipped cord' was, indeed, a very over-used term for this type of decoration as in many cases the whipped decoration was far too fine to be cord, and often it was tempting to see something like coiled wire having been used, if it were not for the fact that wire of this period is unknown. Sometimes the impressions are sufficiently well-preserved to show internal impressions and to leave one in little doubt that cord or string was used, for example, sherd A where the twists of the cord are clearly visible. Twists are still visible on sherd B but the cord used is much finer, however on sherd C the impressions are very fine and well-defined and no internal impressions are visible to the naked eye. The closest modern parallel for these impressions that the writer could find was sewing cotton wrapped
around something thin and hard such as a length of thick fuse wire or the needle of a set of compasses. This is hardly a good ethnographic parallel but the range of utensils in prehistory must have been large, and some point such as a fine bone needle may have been used. The evenness of the impressions on sherd C suggest that the core of the whipped material was, indeed, hard, and if the thread had been whipped round another piece of cord the impressions would have been much less regular, and such seems to have been the case in sherds D and E. Sherd E seems to be especially interesting as the material whipped is undoubtedly not cord. The individual impressions are too hard, crisp and well-defined, nor are there any internal impressions visible. Perhaps the most likely substance to give impressions like this is whipped gut or sinew. It should also be noticed that the impressions on sherd E are linear and not whipped maggots. The impressions on sherd F are similar to those on sherd E in that they are deep and crisp, and again gut or something similar was most probably used. In this case, however, the impressions are rather more regular and the (?)gut would appear to have been whipped round a rigid core rather than the flexible type used on sherd E.
All the whipped impressions on this figure are very fine indeed and would appear to have been made with something such as thread and/or cord or string. Sherd A from Callis Wold in another example of the whipping being irregular and the core flexible. A flexible core would also seem to have been used on sherd B but the whipping is rather more regular (see inset) and there are faint traces of internal impressions again suggesting a thin thread rather than gut or sinew. Sherd C is a fine Peterborough Northern rim sherd from Hedderwick on the South Eastern coast of Scotland and has been decorated with fine whipped maggots. The individual impressions on this sherd are also rather regular.

The use of twisted cord to decorate Beakers is quite rare with the exception of the AOC class and sherds A and B are typical of these All Over Cord impressions though the impressions on sherd A seem to have been more carefully made than those on sherd B. Plaited cord is not at all common on the British Beakers although the writer has seen some examples and sherds C and D are from Holland. Plaited cord impressions are at once noticeable as they
in fact look like a line of twisted cord and its mirror image. When fingernail impressions are placed horizontally and in such a close line that each impression infringes on the last then they are often called 'pseudo-cord' impressions as the chain of oval impressions resembles the magnification of a twisted cord line. In this case it would be justified to call the fingernail impressions on sherd D 'pseudo-plaited cord' as the two-directional impressions do have this effect. The technique has already been seen in fig. 21 sherd E, but in the present case the impressions are not as deep and are much more carefully done.

Fig. 26

The stabbed decoration on this photograph is little but a tiny selection of the large amount of stabbed techniques used on the rusticated pottery from Beaker sites. In sherd A a circular point appears to have been pushed at an angle into the clay so that the impression is a sloping one with a collar of displaced clay at the left-hand side of the impression. In the case of sherd B a special stamp appears to have been made resulting in these peculiar rosettes which are commonly found on Saxon pottery. Experiments have shown that this is achie-
ved by cutting several diameters across the section of a twig. A hollow reed was most likely used to make the circular impressions on sherd C, a technique quite common on Beaker pottery, and on later Food Vessel forms.

Toothed combs are by far the most common tools used to decorate Beakers and though there is an amount of variation in comb type it is very limited. Three types of comb are represented on this photograph, a large square-toothed comb (sherds D and E) typical of that found on some Scottish Food Vessels such as from Rudh'an Dunain, there are impressions made with rectangular teeth (sherds F and G), sherd G especially typical of the comb impressions found on fine ware Beakers, and finally impressions made by a round-toothed comb (sherd H) the teeth of this comb being so widely spaced that it would almost appear that the impressions were all made individually. The lengths of the combs seem to vary, but if care is taken to overlap each set of impressions, it is virtually impossible to tell where each set of impressions starts and ends. The potter has failed to do this perfectly on sherd G, however, and an overlap can clearly be seen on the seventh row from the bottom of the sherd.
Fig. 27

Much more overlapping can be seen on sherd A in this photograph, from Callis Wold. The comb used again has fine, rectangular teeth, it would appear to have been curved and to have had about eleven teeth. The comb used on this sherd was doubtless similar to those from Northton figured here as C and D, both of which have fine teeth and a curved profile and section. Despite the curvature of the combs, a straight line of impressions is nevertheless easy to obtain and the curved edge of the teeth allows both short and long impressions to be made with the same comb. The pointed end of comb C is also highly polished suggesting that it may have been used to incise pottery and a great deal of incised ware has been recovered from Northton. The impressions figured beside the combs have been made in clay that has been allowed to dry and shrink.

The circular toothed comb used on sherd B is much finer and has more teeth than that used on the previous photograph (fig. 26 sherd B). The teeth have been quite widely spaced in comparison to something like the Northton combs, and the lengths seem to be rather disjointed with no or little attempt at overlap. Just as the large square
toothed combs are frequently found on Food Vessel rather than Beaker pottery, similarly these round-toothed combs are frequently used on some of the finer urn wares.

**Fig. 28**

A very different comb to the Worthton examples was found at Dean Bottom and instead of the teeth being at the end of the utensil, here they are on the side, or more correctly, sides as this comb is in fact a double one with two rows of teeth (A). I am most grateful to Mr. Christopher G. Ingell for sending me drawings of this and comb B, and also for sending me plasticine impressions of the two. The teeth on comb A are large, rectangular and give impressions that are altogether too coarse for Beaker pottery, however, and they do not seem to fit any of the Beaker sherds recovered from the site. Comb B from Bishops Cannings Down is much different again as the teeth are at the end of the comb, and, if the comb was complete, the resulting impression would be an oval of rectangular impressions, the beginnings of which can already be seen in the corresponding plasticine impression. Such a comb may have been used to make impressions such as those on sherd D which is a fragment from a Dutch Veluwe
Beaker.

As has already been noticed above, shell impressions are quite rare on Beaker pottery but are, nonetheless, used as an alternative to comb and at Northton cockle shells seem to have been preferred with limpets used but not as frequently. Fig. E in this photograph consists of a cockle shell with impressions in dried clay that were obtained from it and a piece of shell impressed pottery from Northton. The shell impressions and the impressions in the pottery are virtually identical.

It is interesting that such a large range of decorative and manufacturing techniques can leave such tell tale marks on the pottery and they give us a valuable insight into the prehistoric potters' methods. Of particular interest to the writer is the variety of whipped techniques that were in use. Whipped cord must be a term that needs to be dropped from use except in cases when cord is specifically meant as above. Some of the coarser impressions have been made with a string-like material and in this case whipped cord is justified. In other cases, however, we have seen that threads and sinews, and perhaps even hairs were used. We have also seen that the 'quality' of the whipped decor-
tion varies from tightly whipped and neat 'spring-like' impressions to rather more crushed and irregular impressions, especially if the core used is a flexible one. The logical progression to this is, of course, Barbed Wire decoration. Barbed Wire Beakers are, of course, late in the Dutch sequence and are largely confined to the South and East in Britain. Their decoration is little more than loosely whipped impressions and Barbed Wire is a term that the writer is not overly fond of. Definitions of what is meant by the terms Barbed Wire and Whipped Cord, and arguments in favour and against these terms and others that are similar in meaning have already been put forward by others (Lanting, J.N. 1973, Verlinde, A.D., 1971, Bakker, J.A., 1979 etc.) and need no further elaboration here.

It is also interesting to note by way of a concluding word of caution that of all the Beaker combs found in Britain, none can certainly be matched with actual pottery from the site, even allowing for shrinkage during firing.
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**LIST OF RADIO-CARBON DATES USED ON FIG. 2.**

(Left to right)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Skateraw</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giants' Hill I</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Giants' Hill I</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pinhole Cave</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ballynagilly</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Newgrange</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Durrington Walls</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Newgrange</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ballynagilly</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Durrington Walls</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Earls Farm Down</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ballynagilly</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Durrington Walls</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Durrington Walls</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rosinish</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pinhole Cave</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ballynagilly</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ballynagilly</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Durrington Walls</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Newgrange</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pochabers</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ballynagilly</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF CONSTANT CONTINUED...

53) Udal
54) Cookston Farm
55) Wattisfield
56) Mount Pleasant
57) Windmill Hill
58) Brenig 51
59) Northton
60) Sawdon Moor
61) Udal
62) Monknewton
63) Mount Pleasant
64) Warren Farm
65) Yagwenmant
66) Mount Pleasant
67) Knockenny Farm
68) Balbirnie
69) Mount Pleasant
70) Knowth
71) Island Cork
72) Tallington.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age (BP ± error)</th>
<th>Repository Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amesbury G51</td>
<td>Carbonised Wood</td>
<td>3738 BP ± 55</td>
<td>BM 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antofts Windy Pit</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3750 BP ± 150</td>
<td>BM 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baalplantie</td>
<td>Charred Wood</td>
<td>3250 BP ± 90</td>
<td>Gak 3425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynaigilly</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>TAQ 3590 BP ± 60</td>
<td>UB 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynaigilly</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3960 BP ± 75</td>
<td>UB 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynaigilly</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3995 BP ± 120</td>
<td>UB 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynaigilly</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3995 BP ± 75</td>
<td>UB 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynaigilly</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3855 BP ± 55</td>
<td>UB 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynaigilly</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>4050 BP ± 50</td>
<td>UB 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynaigilly</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>4070 BP ± 80</td>
<td>UB 558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynaigilly</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3860 BP ± 50</td>
<td>UB 556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynaigilly</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3780 BP ± 70</td>
<td>UB 557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnack</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3570 BP ± 80</td>
<td>HAR 1645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenig 51</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3500 BP ± 70</td>
<td>HAR 803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatton Sandyford</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3620 BP ± 50</td>
<td>Gak 803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippenham V</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3200 BP ± 150</td>
<td>BM 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookston Farm</td>
<td>Human Bone Collagen</td>
<td>3550 BP ± 85</td>
<td>N 1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Bottom</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3770 BP ± 35</td>
<td>BM 1668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3580 BP ± 40</td>
<td>BM 1669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site/Location</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURRINGTON WALLS</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3560 BP ± 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 285)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antler Collagen</td>
<td>3900 BP ± 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 395)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3950 BP ± 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 396)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bone Collagen</td>
<td>3850 BP ± 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 397)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>TAQ 3927 BP ± 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 398)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bone Collagen</td>
<td>TAQ 3965 BP ± 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 399)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antler Collagen</td>
<td>TAQ 4000 BP ± 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLS FARM DOWN 671</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3960 BP ± 110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(NFL 77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>TPQ 3590 BP ± 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(NFL 75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFTY FARM</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3800 BP ± 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 153)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOGHABERS</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3867 BP ± 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SHR 687)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIANT'S HILL I</td>
<td>Antler Collagen</td>
<td>4410 BP ± 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 191)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antler Collagen</td>
<td>4320 BP ± 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 192)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLAND CORK</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3110 BP ± 140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D 49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knap Hill</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3790 BP ± 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 208)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOCKENNY FARM</td>
<td>Human Bone Collagen</td>
<td>3590 BP ± 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N 1240)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWTH</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3185 BP ± 255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 786)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LETCHWORTH</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3590 BP ± 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 288)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LION POINT, SITE 114</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3750 BP ± 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BM 172)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE POND GROUND</td>
<td>Human Bone Collagen</td>
<td>3570 BP ± 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(HAR 340)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beaker Associated C14 dates continued...

MONKNEWTON
Charcoal  3610 BP ± 45
          (UB 728)
          *3465 BP ± 80
          (UB 724)

MOUNT PLEASANT
Charcoal  3911 BP ± 89
          (BM 663)
Antler Collagen  3941 BP ± 72
              (BM 666)
Antler Collagen  3988 BP ± 84
              (BM 667)
Charcoal  3630 BP ± 60
          (BM 668)
Charcoal  3274 BP ± 51
          (BM 668)
Antler Collagen  3734 BP ± 41
              (BM 645)
Antler Collagen  3728 BP ± 59
              (BM 646)
Charcoal  3410 BP ± 131
          (BM 664)
Charcoal  3506 BP ± 55
          (BM 778)
Charcoal  3459 BP ± 53
          (BM 789)
Charcoal  3619 BP ± 55
          (BM 790)
Charcoal  3891 BP ± 66
          (BM 791)
Charcoal  3645 BP ± 43
          (BM 665)
Antler Collagen  3637 BP ± 63
                (BM 662)

NEW GRANGE
Charcoal  *4050 BP ± 40
          (GrN 6344)
Charcoal  3990 BP ± 40
          (GrN 6343)
Charcoal  3885 BP ± 35
          (GrN 6342)
### Beaker Associated C14 dates continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northton</td>
<td>Animal Bone Collagen</td>
<td>3604 BP ± 70</td>
<td>BM 706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northton</td>
<td>Animal Bone Collagen</td>
<td>3481 BP ± 54</td>
<td>BM 707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinhole Cave</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>4120 BP ± 140</td>
<td>BM 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinhole Cave</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3910 BP ± 120</td>
<td>BM 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playden 'A'</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3690 BP ± 115</td>
<td>BM 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosinish</td>
<td>Limpet Shells</td>
<td>3850 BP ± 75</td>
<td>GU 1064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosinish</td>
<td>Limpet Shells</td>
<td>3920 BP ± 55</td>
<td>GU 1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawdon Moor</td>
<td>Cremated bone</td>
<td>3460 BP ± 90</td>
<td>NFL 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateraw</td>
<td>Human Bone Collagen</td>
<td>4446 BP ± 130</td>
<td>BR 453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallington</td>
<td>Human Bone Collagen</td>
<td>2675 BP ± 100</td>
<td>UB 453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udal</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>3470 BP ± 120</td>
<td>Q 1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udal</td>
<td>Bone Collagen</td>
<td>3560 BP ± 100</td>
<td>Q 1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Farm</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3450 BP ± 90</td>
<td>I 7146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wartisfield</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3520 BP ± 150</td>
<td>BM 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh St. Donat's</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3250 BP ± 35</td>
<td>BM 1681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Hill</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>TFQ 3500 BP ± 150</td>
<td>BM 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysgwennant</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3023 BP ± 82</td>
<td>Birm 85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAQ indicates a Terminus ante quem for the Beaker(s)

TPQ indicates a Terminus post quem for the Beaker(s)

* indicates the uncertainty of the association of the dated material with the Beaker(s)
APPENDIX IV

GLOSSARY OF DECORATIVE MOTIFS AND TECHNIQUES
APPENDIX IV

Glossary of decorative motifs and techniques.
Beaker Motifs. (after Clarke, 1970)

Horizontal lines.

Zoned oblique lines.

Zoned ladder motif.

Herring bone and interrupted herring bone.

Zoned basic cross-hatching.

Zoned basic ermine motif.

Zoned basic zig-zag.

Zoned basic fingernail impressions.

Zoned reed impressions.

Basic metope.

Basic fringe motif.
basic grooving.

basic zoned filled hexagons.

basic zoned filled running chevrons.

basic filled chevrons

opposed filled chevrons.

zoned filled lozenges.

These motifs have been selected from Clarke (1970) as basic motifs. They are basic in that these motifs are combined or elaborated to make up the rest of the motifs in Clarke's groups.
Grooved Ware Techniques and Motifs (after Longworth in Wainwright and Longworth, 1971).

**CLACTON STYLE**

-rounded rims with internal incised decoration.

-internal plastic decoration below the rim.

-dot filled triangles, lozenges and squares.

-Multiple incised and grooved chevrons.

-opposed incised or grooved chevrons.

-oval impressions.
WOODLANDS STYLE.

incised herring bone.

applied pellets on the rim.

horizontal and converging grooving.

horizontal and converging slashed cordons.

ladder pattern externally.

applied or grooved 'knots' on converging cordons.
BURRINGTON WALLS STYLE

- Rims with conoave or vertical bevels.
- Internal incised decoration.
- Grooved concentric circles and spirals.
- Vertical plain and decorated cordons.
- Horizontal and vertical incision forming panels.
- Incised or grooved filled triangles.
- Twisted cord impressions.
- Whipped cord impressions.
RINHO STYLE

rims with stepped bevels.

continuous scalloped rims.

applied pellets.

applied roundels.

applied geometric motifs.

diagonal grooved cordons.

diagonal stabbed cordons.
**Peterborough Decorative Techniques (after Smith, 1956)**

- Twisted cord impressions in long and short lengths.
- Whipped cord decoration in short and long lengths.
- Short lengths of incision.
- Circular and irregular stabs.
- Reed impressions.
- Oval bird bone impressions.
- Paired fingernail impressions.
- Single fingernail impressions.
Basic Food Vessel and Urn Decorative Techniques (after Gibson, 1978).

incision in long and short lengths.

vertical, horizontal and diagonal grooving.

twisted cord impressions in long and short lengths.

whipped cord impressions in long and short lengths.

circular and irregular impressions.

comb impressions.

single fingernail impressions.

stab and drag impressions.

false relief.
CATALOGUE

POSSIBLE AND KNOWN BEAKER DOMESTIC SITES IN THE BRITISH ISLES
LOCATION ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE CATALOGUE.

Avebury ............. Alexander Keiller Museum, Avebury.
Aylesbury ........... Buckinghamshire County Museum, Aylesbury.
Bangor ............... University College of North Wales, Bangor.
Barrow in Furness.... The Furness Museum, Barrow in Furness.
Belfast .............. The Ulster Museum, Belfast.
Birchover ............ The Borough Museum, Birchover.
Brighton ............. The Pavilion Museum, Brighton.
Bristol .............. The City Museum and Art Gallery, Bristol.
B.M. ................. The British Museum, London.
Bury St. Edmunds ..... Mompesson Hall Museum, Bury St. Edmunds.
Cardiff ............... National Museum of Antiquities of Wales, Cardiff.
Carrisbrooke Castle .. The Castle Museum, Carrisbrooke Castle, Isle of Wight.
Cheltenham ............ The Museum and Art Gallery, Cheltenham.
Colchester ............ The Colchester and Essex Museum, Colchester.
Derby ................ Borough Museum and Art Gallery, Derby.
Devizes ............... Museum of the Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society, Devizes.
Doncaster ............ Museum and Art Gallery, Doncaster.
Dorchester ............ Dorset County Museum, Dorchester.
Harrogate .............. The Art Gallery, Harrogate.
Hull ..................... Transport and Archaeology Museum, Kingston upon Hull.
Ipswich ................... The Borough Museum, Ipswich.
Kelvingrove .............. Art Gallery and Museum, Kelvingrove, Glasgow.
Kings Lynn ............... The Lynn Museum, Kings Lynn.
Lewes .................... Museum of the Sussex Archaeological Society, Lewes.
Luton ..................... The Borough Museum, Luton.
Manchester ............... The City Museum, Manchester.
MAN Newcastle .......... Museum of Antiquities of the University and Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne.
N.M.A.I. Dublin ...... National Museum of Antiquities of Ireland, Dublin.
Norwich ................. Norwich Castle Museum, Norwich.
Peterborough ............ City Museum and Art Gallery, Peterborough.
Salisbury ............... The Salisbury and South Wiltshire Museum, Salisbury.
Scarborough ............. The Borough Museum, Scarborough.
Scunthorpe .............. Museum and Art Gallery, Scunthorpe.
Sheffield ............... City Museum and Art Gallery, Sheffield.
Taunton ................. Somerset County Museum, Taunton.
Truro ..................... Royal Institute of Cornwall, Truro.
U.C. Cork ............... University College, Cork.
Whitby ................... Museum of the Whitby Literary and Philosophical Society, Whitby.
Worthing ............... The Borough Museum, Worthing.
Catalogue

Abingdon, Berkshire


Site Causewayed camp with deep stratified ditches.

Beaker sherds from Pit D and from the uppermost layers in the ditches.

Pottery Beaker found in very small quantities with only c.5 vessels being represented. One small sherd from an incised none decorated vessel and a base sherd perhaps from the same vessel come from the ditches and a rim sherd from a Beaker bowl was found in Pit D. This sherd is undecorated. Shell gritted round base pots with scarce stabbed or incised decoration were associated with the construction phase of the site. Beaker was associated with sand and quartz gritted ware, slightly heavier than the earlier pottery and more profusely decorated with stabs and incisions as well as forms of cord decoration.

Location Ashmolean.

Achnacrocheall, Argyll


Site Chambered cairn (ARG 37) Beaker found in the mound material.

Pottery This was not abundant but represents perhaps three Beakers and stabbed and incised Neolithic pottery. Of the three Beakers two are reconstructable, especially in the upper half. One has rather open decoration consisting of filled
running chevrons often underlined by and interruped by a row of dots. The second has a more curved profile in comparison with the more angular first vessel. The decoration would appear to cover the vessel with the exception of an undecorated band at the shoulder. Open zig-zags on both halves of the pot against the incised background form Clarke's motif 32ii. Fringe motif would appear to be present on at least the lower half. A third vessel is represented by a bulbous body sherd from a zone decorated vessel. The decoration consists of a single zone of herringbone decoration bordered by a double horizontal line of comb impressions at the top and the bottom. The Neolithic pottery is typical of the pottery from the western Scottish sequence. One reconstructable Beacharra bowl was found, plus some car inated sherds decorated with oval impressions, sherds with sweeping incised herringbone decoration and two sherds from a flat based (?)bucket shaped vessel with fingernail impressions.

Location N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

AMERICA FARM, Newark, Northants.


Site Pit sites salvaged by Wyman-Abbott during gravel quarrying.

Pottery Illustrated possibly among the pottery on the 'Fengate' illustrations, PLEN 1-17.

The Wyman-Abbott collection of Beaker pottery is
mostly in Peterborough Museum, with some also at Cambridge, The Institute of Archaeology in London and the British Museum. It is also in the main little more than an unprovenanced mass of material with not even the quarry name being recorded or having survived. An attempt by Martin Howe at Peterborough Museum to provenance the pottery was frustratingly unsuccessful.

**Location** Peterborough, B.M., Inst. London.

**AMBLEFORTH MOOR, Yorkshire.**


**Site** Barrow sites of bowl type all of which provided no burial data due to earlier robbing. Barrows 3, 5 and 7 all yielded occupation debris on the CGs below the barrow.

**Pottery** Mainly forms a variety of Mid-Neolithic pottery with a lot of Grimston ware and a small element of traditionally later pottery including a possible collared vessel and one or two flat based pots. The pottery is all in a variety of fabrics and largely undecorated or else sparsely decorated. Beaker is represented by a possible sherd of fine reddish brown pottery from below barrow 5 and is undecorated, an undecorated everted rim sherd from below barrow 3 in a thin and light brown porous fabric, and two rim sherds in a fine hard fabric, again everted but undecorated, from below barrow 7. The identification of these sherds is by fabric alone.

**Location** Not located.
ANTOFTS WINDYFIT, Yorkshire


Site Cave site which has produced Beaker and other pottery in an apparently domestic matrix. Hearth found at the bottom of the pit associated with a flint knife and scraper. Portions of seven or eight human skeletons suggest that the cave may also have had a ritual function.

Pottery Illustrated WIN 1:6, 2:11, WIN 3:1 and 3:2.
The Beaker from the site is not abundant but consists of a few sherds and only one complete or near complete vessel. This is a bulbous handled pot decorated with vertical rows of paired fingernail impressions. On the handle the impressions are finer and are also crossed. In addition, there is a rim sherd from what appears to be an AOC Beaker with a rather straight neck. There are five horizontal rows of twisted cord decoration visible on the exterior of the sherd, and three on the interior. An undecorated rim sherd may be from a similar type of pot as not enough survives to suggest that the vessel was completely undecorated. There is also an everted rim from a bowl similar to the one from Abingdon above. An undecorated base may possibly belong to this vessel.

Location Scarborough.

ARCHERFIELD, GULLANE, East Lothian.

Ref. Curle, A.O., 1908.

Site Kitchen or shell middens complete with domestic pottery, and flint and bone artefacts.
Pottery Illustrated in ARC 1 - ARC 4.

Described above p. 109. Comb zoned, AOcomb and
AOCC vessels are present and the coarse ware would
appear to be Grooved Ware. Curle noted that the
coarse ware was often 'soot encrusted' whereas
the Beaker was not. One possible Food Vessel rim
also present. The writer is not certain how much
of the total coarse ware he saw in the museum, but
all the Beaker is illustrated and if the coarse
ware represents the total then Beaker represents
90% of the whole. 65% of the total Beaker is comb
decorated and 35% is cord decorated.

Location
N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

ARDAGH, Co. Mayo.


Site Iron Age ring fort. Beaker found in an earlier
pit below the entrance to the fort.

Pottery Illustrated in MISC AB 111.

Consists of a single sherd with faint, incised
parallel lines, and a sherd of similar undecorated
pottery. The fabric is very fine and appears to
have had no or very little opening agents added.

Location N.M.A.S. Dublin.

ARMINGHALL, Norfolk


Site B防护 and timber monument. The site had a double
ditch and a seam of charcoal in the inner ditch
yielded occupation debris including pottery.
ARRINGHALL continued....

Pottery Illustrated on A.I.

No Beaker was found at the site, but there was c.12 sherds of fingernail and fingertip decoration. The impressions vary from fine and 'neat' to deep and random. The rim sherd suggests a bowl or a vessel with a bulbous neck. Some of the pottery is quite fine.

Location Cambridge.

ARRINGTON DOWN, Isle of Wight


Site Barrow site (round) destroyed by rabbits and in danger from cliff erosion. A spread of domestic debris was found below the mound but a large part of the spread must have been lost due to the erosion. Fragments of human bone were also found among the food remains.

Pottery Only 9.6% of the total illustrated pottery is Beaker while the remainder is Peterborough ware with one or two sherds possibly having similarities with some grooved ware decoration. 53% of the sherds have cord impressions, 23% are incised or have fingernail impressions, and the rest are stabbed or undecorated. Formal traits might suggest that the pottery is similar to Fortlake ware with one or two resembling Grooved ware and two sherds may suggest collared vessels though with Fortlake rather than Fenestrate decoration. Two Beaker rims are undecorated. One is vertical with a slight internal bevel, and the other has a rather sinuous 'S'-shaped curve suggesting an ovoid vessel.
ARRETON DOWN continued....

P47 in the report is another vertical rim with internal bevel and has two groups of two lines each formed by comb impressions. The decoration on the body sherd P48 is very similar except that the comb used appears to have had rectangular teeth while the last described sherd was decorated with a comb with circular teeth. The body sherd P49 has a similar arrangement of decoration but is incised. It is noted in the report that the fabric of the Beaker sherds was the same as that of the Peterborough ware which suggests that the same clay was being used and possibly the same potters at work.

Location Carisbrooke Castle.

ASHBURY WINDYTT, Yorkshire.


Site Cave site.

Pottery Illustrated on WIN 1 - WIN 3 excluding the sherds from Antofts above and WIN 2.9.

The pottery from this cave is more than from the similar site at Antofts above. Combed and corded Beakers are both present as are undecorated vessels and c.14 or 15 vessels are represented, about seven or eight of which are reconstructable. Two of the reconstructable Beakers are undecorated, one having a Bell Beaker shape and the other being a straight sided and flat based bowl. Two combed vessels are also reconstructable and have sinuous 'S'-shaped profiles, one being slightly more ovoid than the other. The rather more ovoid vessel (WIN 1:5)
ASHBURY WINDPSAT continued....

is zoned and has been decorated with a round toothed comb. The other (WIN 1:2) is also zoned and the stamp used has probably been some material whipped round a sharply curved object so that the desired effect is produced. Either that or a special object has been made. The AOC vessels are all apparently from zoned vessels and the cord has sometimes been rather carelessly impressed (WIN 2:1). One vessel also has small circular impressions in one of the cord-free zones. A collared vessel (WIN 2:6) may be from this site but its provenance is not certain. Three vessels excluding the last mentioned appear to be undecorated coarse ware and not Beakers. Beakers however represent 73% of the total vessels.

Location Scarborough.

AVEBURY BARROW G55, Wiltshire (SU 10246788).


Site Pits and domestic debris found beneath a barrow.

Only pit 3 out of seven pits held Beaker sherds.

Pottery 'Bell' and 'Necked' Beakers were both found in the disturbed soil and plough soil around the barrow, representing 6 and 9 vessels respectively. From pit 3 came a sherd with a combed filled triangle and a rim sherd with paired fingernail/tip pottery.

Location Devizes
**AVEBURY, Wiltshire**

**Ref.** Smith, I.F., 1965 and refs. therein.

**Site** Henge monument with internal stone circles and a stone avenue. Beaker pottery came from the interior, often from stone holes, and from a settlement area in the avenue. The avenue also appeared to respect the settlement as there was no evidence for there having been a stone opposite 30a which should logically have stood in the midst of the settlement spread. Frits and hearths were found on the site, Beaker coming from pit 1.

**Pottery** Illustrated on Ave 1. About 100 sherds were found, mainly Peterborough sherds, but also some Windmill Hill pottery, Grooved Ware and Beaker. It is probably fair to say that the Windmill Hill pottery may be residual. The Peterborough pottery is represented by all three sub-styles and is decorated with cord, reed and fingernail impressions as well as incisions. One Beaker sherd illustrated has chevron motif on the base and is probably an early Beaker. Not all the pottery is illustrated and it could not all be traced by the writer but it would appear that about 3% of the pottery was Beaker, c.10% max. was of Grooved Ware. The Windmill Hill pottery is an unknown quantity but about 75-80% of the pottery must be Peterborough Ware.

**Location** Avebury.

**BAGMOOR, Linos.**

**Ref.** Riley, D.W. 1957.
BAGMOOR continued...

Site
Riley described this as one of the minor sites in the North Lines sand dunes. The pottery has not been traced and no more details have been discovered.

Location
Scunthorpe.

BALKIRK, Fife.

Site
Stone circle with central cairn covering a rectangular and paved 'mortuary structure'. Cairn also covered 4 cists, one containing a Beaker and another a Food Vessel. Pockets of cremated bone were found in the mound material.

Pottery
Grooved Ware as associated with phase I of the monument, and a sherd of buff coloured Beaker with horizontal incisions or blurred comb and with small oval slanting impressions was found on the Old Ground surface beneath the cairn. This may have been associated with Grooved Ware, or with the later Urns which were found scattered throughout the mound material. Some of this urn may be domestic, it is decorated crudely with incisions, cord impressions, round toothed comb and circular impressions. Collared and cordonned Urns are both present. The relationship between the Grooved Ware - Beaker - Urn is not known.

Location
N.M.A.G. Edinburgh.

BALKSBURY, Hants. (SU 350445).
BALESBURY. continued...

Site  Iron Age univallate hillfort but four hearths forcing a close group were found during the excavation and associated with them were sherds of four pots, 22 flint flakes, a PTD arrowhead, and a flint axe. The hearths had been in a slight hollow and were thus protected and not damaged by ploughing. It is possible that the extent of the occupation may have been larger.

Pottery  The fine ware Beaker is called this in the loosest possible way. It is a stem Beaker decorated with filled chevron decoration very carelessly executed and made by a very coarse comb. The rusticated vessel is a relatively fine fabric and is decorated with groups of fingernail bordered cordons. Three, with a gap of c.4cm between the top two and the bottom one, are visible on the sherd. A further rim sherd is from a vessel of unknown form. It has had a slightly everted neck and possibly a carination.

Location  No located.

BALLINGOOLIE, Co. Limerick.


Site  To adjacent barrows, both apparently without burial, covering a domestic spread. The majority of pottery came from charcoal spreads and a stoney area underneath and to the north of Barrow II. Bones of ox, pig, sheep, and dog were identified, a hearth was located and flints include a scraper and two B & T arrowheads.
BALLINGOOLA, continued....

Pottery Neolithic and Beaker types both occur together but Beaker sherds form the majority of the material. The Neolithic pottery is represented by c. 4 sherds of Lough Gur Class I and the Beaker sherds by c. 9 sherds of comb decorated ware, one showing a fringe motif. The decoration would all appear to be horizontal comb lines on these sherds. There are also some sherds probably from secondary vessels which have impressed decoration in the form of small 'V' impressions, in one case being combined with horizontal lines. Another rounded rim is undecorated on the exterior but has two lines of oval impressions on the inside forming herringbone. If all the recognisable pottery has been illustrated then Lough Gur I pottery makes up 23.5% of the total, Beaker fine ware would equal 47% and the rest made up from secondary types.

Location Not located.

BALLYNAGILLY, Co. Tyrone.


Site Extensive Neolithic settlement site with a Bell Beaker phase of occupation. Postholes, hearths and pits were found but no recognisable house plans. House plan(s) may have been destroyed by the subsequent cultivation that was carried out on the site. Different areas of occupation showed some different traits in the pottery but generally the assemblage was homogenous.
BALLYNAGILLY, continued...

Pottery  Comb impressions most common though AOplaited
cord is also present. The vessels are assignable
to Lanting and van der Waals' steps 2 - 4. Some
sherds combine comb and false relief decoration.
The writer is unable to be more specific about
the Beaker pottery from this important site but
so little has been published other than generali-
sations, and the excavator has denied access to
examine the pottery.

Location  with A.M. Apsimon, Southampton.

BALLYKENAN, Co. Down


Site  Reported as being similar to that at Downpatrick
(see below) but as yet unpublished.

Location  Not located.

BALRANALD, North Uist. (NF 716683)


Site  Hebridean midden site on the shoreline.

Pottery  Unpublished and not seen by the writer.

Location  N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

BARFORD, Warwickshire.


Site  Ring ditch site D produced occupation debris from
the ditch base. Large amount of stake and post-
holes in the interior but not enough debris to
suggest human occupation.

Pottery  The majority of the pottery is Peterborough ware
and comes from charcoal deposits at the bottom of
BARFORD, continued....

the ditch and certainly before the ditch silting was complete. Little of the pottery has been illustrated in the report but the Beaker sherds are small and apparently abraded and decorated with horizontal incised lines. The Beaker was found at the top of the ditch silts and is clearly secondary.

Location Not located.

BARNEY HOUSES, Yorkshire. (SE 830138).


Site Two apparent barrows of which one turned out to be a natural mound. The stone kerb of the western barrow had an entrance gap marked by upright jambs. The interior had evidence of fierce burning over the whole area. Small hearths found outside. The kerb could possibly be a hut wall with the hut being destroyed as part of the barrow building ritual. Eastern barrow turned out to be a natural knoll but with a rectangular stone setting with a line of postholes following the 'wall' on the inside. Could be the remains of a hut but would appear too large.

Pottery The identifiable pottery came from the Eastern barrow but has been reproduced too small in the report to be of much use. Only the large sherd of AOC Beaker was traceable for study at Whitby museum. The sherds came from the kerb of the Eastern barrow and were very abraded. The Beaker is an AOC Beaker with internal horizontal cord lines and an undecorated zone just above the
shoulder or belly of the pot. There are also simple rim sherds from undecorated pottery, a sherd with a 'Y' sectioned rim and with fingernail decoration on the exterior and a body sherd from a possible large rusticated vessel. There is also a leaf-shaped arrowhead from the site. A possible sherd of comb decorated Beaker came from the Western barrow.

Location Whithby.

BARNHAM HEATH, Suffolk

Ref. Ipswich Museum accessions reg.
Site Reported as being a 'B.A. or I.A. hut site'
Pottery Illustrated on Fig. MISC. A.B.1.
One sherd appears to be in Beaker fabric. It is undecorated save for (?) deliberate striations or abraded shallow incisions/impressions.

Location Ipswich.

BARTON BENDISH, Norfolk

N.B. The drawing of this sherd in fig. BUR. 1:5 has been included in error as the sherd was in fact associated with an inhumation.

BARTON HILL FARM, Bedfordshire, (TL 093282).

Site Three ring ditches, site II not being completely excavated. Mid-Neolithic pottery found at sites I and III, followed by Bronze Age occupation represented by Collared Urn sherds. Trenches for a mortuary structure were found at site I and a
BARTON HILL FARM, continued....

horse-shoe turf structure was found in site III.

Pottery

The majority of pottery is from the Ebbsfleet style of Peterborough Ware and is associated with the constructional phase of the monument. Collared Urn pottery is secondary and is either cord decorated or has circular impressions. A possible Beaker sherd is represented by a fingernail decorated handle.

Location


(information from K.E. Harnan).

BARDSEY, Suffolk

Ref. Ipswich Museum Accessions register.

Site No details. Possibly a domestic pit.

Pottery

The majority of the rusticated ware has been illustrated on fig. MISC. A.B.1. In addition there are also sherds from a late Beaker with filled lozenge decoration. Possibly two fine ware combed vessels are represented. The rusticated ware comprises one sherd stabbed with a near-circular point (MISC. A.B. 1:5) and the rest are fingernail decorated, either paired or single linear. One sherd also has low horizontal finger-raised cordons (MISC. A.B. 1:4) suggesting with the fine ware, a relatively late date for the assemblage.

Location Ipswich.

BERRID BRANWEN, Anglesey, (SH 36158498).

BEDD BRANWEN. continued....

**Site**
B.A. cairn below which was a certain amount of evidence for domestic activity represented by charcoal, pottery and flints (including artefacts and wasters). Twelve burial urns were found excluding the domestic sherds.

**Pottery**
In addition to the urns mentioned above there were five sherds of possible Beaker from the Eastern hollow. They are pink-beige in colour and decorated with comb impressions. Six sherds of Urn came from the OGS, and a sherd of Food Vessel/Urns from the central stone hole. The contemporaneity of these pots is uncertain.

**Location**
In view of Welsh Antiquities, Bangor.

**BEER LOW.** Derbyshire, (SK 191647) possible site

**Ref.** Marsden, B.N., 1970.

**Site**
Disturbed cairn first excavated by Bateman.

**Pottery**
Sherds of Beaker found on the OGS and in disturbed areas. It is possible that the sherds may be from disturbed burials.

**Location**
Sheffield.

**BELLE TOUT.** Sussex, (TV 557956).

**Ref.** Bradley, R., 1970.

**Site**
Enclosure site on cliff edge suffering greatly from erosion. Beaker was found beneath the enclosure bank and in primary positions in the ditch silts when it was first discovered in 1909. Number of hearths recognised by scatters of heat cracked stones and also pits filled with domestic debris. Pits seem to have had various functions.
BELLS TOUT, continued....

There also was a considerable midden outside the enclosure entrance. The house/hut sites reported by Bradley in the excavation report have since been reconsidered and rescinded (Bradley pers. comm).

**Pottery**

Illustrated in fig. BEL 1 - BEL 3. The pottery from the site is predominantly rusticated with some comb and incision decorated fine ware. Few vessel forms are reconstructable but among the fine ware ovoid or slack forms would seem to be the most common shape and this is echoed in the reconstructable rusticated vessel (BEL 1:4). The rims from finger-decorated sherds on fig. BEL 1 would also seem to suggest an ovoid profile. The fingernail impressions are all carefully executed and linear. There are also base sherds from larger coarse ware vessels that appear to be at least partly undecorated. Ribbed vessels are also present (BEL 2:26-32). A few cord decorated vessels attributed by Bradley to an AOC phase at the site are more likely to be from local Food Vessels in the writer's opinion, the rim bevels on some being more typical of this class of pottery than AOC Beakers. These sherds may be attributable to a later phase of occupation than the Beakers though the possibility of contemporaneity must not be dismissed.

**Location**

Lewes.
BEN BRIDGE, Somerset.


**Site** Circular vertical-sided pit c.3ft. in diameter. Finds other than pottery included charcoal, 136 flint flakes, a small wristguard, a broken whetstone and a possible sling pellet. Interpreted as a ritual pit.

**Pottery** About 100 sherds of pottery represented 6 Beaker vessels, a Western Neolithic pot and a possible sherd of Grooved Ware. The Beaker pottery is illustrated in figs. BB 1 and BB 2, and consists of small abraded sherds from fine and coarse ware vessels, and there seems to be an element of AO-comb decoration (B.B. 2:10) as well as zoned decoration. The sparse comb decoration on BB 1:4 may suggest that the sherds are from a secondary vessel in the assemblage. The everted and cordoned rim of BB 1:3 is a feature that has been seen on several domestic sites and BB 1:5 is another recurring type (see Newgrange). The deposition of the material may indeed be ritual as interpreted by the excavators but the assemblage would appear to be domestic and the material derived from a domestic site.

**Location** Bristol.

BEULIE HOUSE, Shetland, (HU 586652).


**Site** Shetland stone house which was thought by the excavator to have been inhabited up till the EIA but for a long time prior to that. The house is in fact oval and two-roomed. A hearth was located in the forecourt.
BENIE HOOSE. continued....

**Pottery**
The problems of the pottery from the Shetland stone houses has already been looked at briefly above, and some of it does seem to have Beaker affinities. Such are sherdas fig.7, Nos. 6, 7, 10, 11 in the report.

**Location**
N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

BISHOPS CANDINGS DOWN, Wiltshire, (SU 058666).

**Ref.**
Gingell, C., 1980 and pers. comm.

**Site**
Several Bisbury enclosure which had been apparently built on and over a Beaker domestic site. Beaker pottery formed c.25% of the total pottery found.

**Pottery**
Not published.

**Location**
With C. Gingell.

BLACKNALL FIELD, Wiltshire, (SU 1555806).

**Ref.**

**Site**
Small Beaker pit found in area where Neo/B.A. flints had been found in plough soil. Artefacts found exclusive of pottery are a discoidal flint knife, animal bones, frags of burnt human bone, waste flakes, two bone pins.

**Pottery**
No details except that the pit had Peterborough Ware and Beaker in the fill.

**Location**
Devizes

BLENDOW, Buckinghamshire.

**Ref.**
Head, J.F., 1937 and in litt.

**Site**
The top round barrow. Near the base of the disturbed barrow was found a spread of charcoal including animal bones and flints as if domestic
BLEDLOW, continued....

dumping had taken place.

Pottery: One sherd from a fine ware comb decorated vessel with cross-hatching and horizontal line zoned decoration. Associated was a sherd from an undecorated dish or bowl, flat based and in Beaker fabric.

Location: Aylesbury.

BLOWS DOWN, Bedfordshire


Site: No details.

Pottery: Sherds lost.

Location: Not located.

BOSCOMBE DOWN EAST, Wiltshire


Site: Several Eastbury enclosure. Two joined Beaker pits found outside. Similar to those at Easton Down (below) and possibly surrounded by stakes. Beaker occurred in debris layer in the pit fill. Associated with some flint flakes.

Pottery: Sherds from two or three vessels were found in the pits. The first sherd is a rim sherd decorated on the outside with three horizontal comb lines. Too little survives to identify it as an AOComb Beaker. A sherd from an incised vessel was also found, decorated with cross-hatching, a vertical and horizontal bordering line suggesting it may be from a metoped motif. The third sherd is from a large rusticated vessel. The sherd is in the main undecorated save for two horizontal rows of vertical
BOSCOMBE DOWN EAST, continued...

fingernail impressions.

**Location** Salisbury.

BOS SWALLET, Somerset, (ST 471584)


**Site** Unstratified domestic deposit dumped in a hollow after disturbance by modern mining.

**Pottery** About 20 vessels were recovered from the excavation and all must be regarded as unstratified and in a sense stray finds. The fine ware is mostly decorated with comb impressions and triangles and lozenges seem to be favourite motifs. Clarke's ermine motif 1.6 is also present. No vessels are entirely reconstructable but partially restorable vessels suggest they represent Lanting and van der Waals' step 6 Beakers. Handled Beakers are also represented by two handles and there is also an element of rusticated Beaker represented by 7 illustrated sherds. Single and double fingernail impressions are both present and there is also a sherd with fingernail decoration combined with comb impressions and a further sherd decorated with finger-raised knobs. Of the illustrated pottery rusticated pottery makes up c.24% of the whole, and fine ware makes up the rest. This figure, however, may not be real.

**Location** Bristol University.

BOTTISHAM LOCK, RIVER CAN, Cambridgeshire.

BOTTISHAM LOCK, RIVER CAM. continued....

**Site:** No details.

**Pottery:** This is illustrated on fig. BOT.1. Four sherds are represented. The first is in Beaker-like fabric, seems to have a rather sinuous profile and is decorated with incision and circular lines (BOT 1:1). The second is also probably from a Beaker and has herringbone decoration in toothed comb technique. Sherds BOT 1:3 and 4 are both rusticated. The former has large linear fingertip impressions in its rather thick fabric. The other sherd is totally different and has vertical rows of paired fingernail impressions, finely executed, and in a fine Beaker fabric recalling much of the Dutch 'Potbeker' pottery rather than the typical Beaker rusticated wares from domestic contexts.

**Location:** Cambridge.

BOURTON ON THE WATERS, Gloucestershire.

**Ref:** Dunning, G.C., 1932.

**Site:** B.A. sites found to contain an amount of Urn pottery and whipped cord decoration that resembles Food Vessel Ware. Beaker found in a trial trench to the north of the sites.

**Pottery:** Beaker is represented by a single sherd with comb decoration consisting of three horizontal comb lines defining an undecorated zone.

**Location:** Cheltenham.

BRACKMONT MILL, Fife.

**Ref:** Childe, V.G., and Waterston, D., 1942; Longworth, I.H., et. al., 1967.
BRACKMONT MILL, continued....

**Site**
Generally surface scatters of pottery in the sand dunes at Brackmont Mill and Brackmont Farm. No actual 'sites' definable.

**Pottery**
Illustrated in fig. B.M. 1 - B.M. 4. Hardly any of the Beaker from the site is reconstructable though obviously by analogy the forms of the AOC and AOGomb sherds which are well represented, can be guessed. About 58% of the pottery on a simple sherd count can be assignable to AOC vessels, 15% are undecorated and about 16% are comb decorated. Sherds of Grooved ware have also been found at the site though association is not always proven. A detailed pottery report can be read in the second reference above.

**Location**
St. Andrews University, N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

BRANTHAM HALL, Suffolk, (TM 11653345).

**Ref.**

**Site**
Ring ditch. Beaker sherds come from the interior and from the ditch silts.

**Pottery**
Illustrated in fig. B.H. 1. Of the three vessels drawn on fig. B.H. 1, Nos. 1 and 2 are the sherds found in the ring ditch by Gilmour, and the third may be the vessel referred to by Gilmour and found in the ring ditch in 1925. B.H. 1:1 is an ovoid Beaker from the ditch silts. It is light brown and comb decorated consisting of alternating undecorated and hatched zones. B.H. 1:2 is a sherd from a Beaker decorated with filled chevrons and was found in the interior of the ring ditch. Some Urn burials were also found and in some cases
BRANTHAM HALL, continued....
the Urns had fingernail decoration not unlike rusticated Beaker.

Location
Ipswich,

BREAK DOWN, Somerset.


Site One of the few stratified sites, this site yielded a layer of 'Neolithic' and 'B' Beaker pottery above which is a layer of 'A' Beaker ware, and in turn above this a layer of Urn pottery. Stone patches associated with the Urn pottery were interpreted as hut floors but there were no associated structures reported with the Beaker ware.

Pottery
Pottery from the early Beaker deposit, layer 6a consists of Beaker, Peterborough and Grooved Ware pottery. Among the illustrated pottery there is a rim sherd of (?)Peterborough ware decorated with vertical or slightly slanting rows of whipped cord impressions possibly from a small plobular bowl with internal rim. A second sherd of Peterborough Ware is decorated with herringbone of the same technique on a ribbed surface. Vessel fig. 25, No. 4. in the report was reported as B Beaker in the report but the decoration is very out of character with Beaker pottery of any type and indeed it is more reasonable to the writer's mind to see the sherds as coming from a Grooved Ware vessel with diagonal incised decoration. The other sherds with this type of decoration may be from the same or similar vessels. There seems
to be an element of grooved chevrons. The Beaker element is seen by the writer to consist of three vessels (judging from the illustrated pottery in the report). The first (fig. 25:2) is an everted rim sherd with a flattish lip from an ostensibly undecorated vessel. The second is a belly sherd from a combed vessel though the only comb visible is a single line near the top of the sherd. Two Beaker sherds from a contemporary grave are interesting for being step 1/2 Beakers and so very early. The first is a maritime Bell Beaker with a slight difference from the norm in that the lines that define the zones are made by a twisted cord while the filling of the zones is made by a toothed comb. The second vessel is rusticated with single random fingernail impressions. It is less angular than the above Beaker and has a slightly rolled rim. A sherd of AOC Beaker also comes from this layer as does a later sherd of zoned combed Beaker though this may have worked its way down from the layer above. From the so-called 'A' Beaker horizon the pottery is all either comb decorated or rusticated. The sherds are too small to allow reconstruction and motifs are difficult to determine. Cross hatching is present, however, as are filled triangles and filled lozenges. Not many vessels seem to be represented. Two rusticated sherds are illustrated. One has a ribbed exterior with incision in the grooves, and the other has paired fingertip decoration. Fingernail impressions are
combined with rough comb impressions on an un-stratified sherd. The Urn pottery from layer 6 does not appear to be all Urn but there seems to also be a fair deal of Grooved Ware (sherd fig. 27, Nos. 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 42 in the report) some being from rather bulbous vessels similar to some from Durrington Walls.

Location Bristol University.

BRENCIG 51, Denbigh


Site Platform cairn in the Brenig valley cairn cemetery. Beaker settlement found below the platform in the centre of the cairn. Burials in the cairn were urned.

Pottery The Beakers lay in a grey occupation layer flecked with charcoal. The pottery was very abraded but seems to represent 16 vessels, the majority of which are combed though some are also incised. None are reconstructable. The largest sherd has broad zones of comb decoration forming parallel and diagonal lines. This broad zoned decoration, the incised sherds and the inturned rim of one sherd point to a late date for the assemblage but the writer would be disinclined to assign it a possible step No. by analogy to the focus areas.

Location With Frances Lynch.
BRIAN HILL. Northamptonshire


Site Causewayed Camp. Early Neolithic pottery found in the ditch segments in the primary silt. Late Neolithic pottery appeared in the uppermost secondary silts.

Pottery No details published and not seen by the writer. Peterborough, Grooved Ware and Beaker pottery all appears to be together.

Location With H. Bamford.

BRICKFIELD. Suffolk


Site No details.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. NSG. 1:6-9. Three rusticated sherd with fingernail impressions. One rim sherd has a cordon below the rim delineated by horizontal fingernail impressions and with oblique impressions below that. There was no Beaker fine ware located.

Location Ipswich.

BRIGHTWELL HEATH. Suffolk.

Ref. Reid-Keir, J., 1921.

Site Barrow cemetery. Barrow No. 4, revealed a spread of flints and pottery in a circle of c.16ft. dia. meter. The spread also contained a lot of charcoal and was in a slightly dished hollow.

Pottery Some illustrated on NSG. A.B. 1:8-10. A sherd of Beaker illustrated in the report is decorated with a double row of stabbed decoration between
two widely spaced comb lines at the top and the bottom (not cord as stated in the report). There are also two sherds of Beaker with horizontal combed lines, and 2 sherds from the same vessel decorated with short horizontal lengths of comb. The three sherds illustrated here are rusticated with fingertip and fingernail impressions and one sherd with very fine impressions as if by a small fingernail or some similar point. Sherd MISC. A.B. 1:9 would seem to have been fingertip impressions giving a ribbed exterior and it may be from a large vessel.

Location Inwich.

BROOGR Howe, North Rassay, Isle of Man.

Ref. Hermode, F.M.C., 1930.

Site Cooking place above river mouth. Flint artefacts and flakes found.

Pottery 'Sherds of Bronze Age Type'.

Location Not located.

BROOME HEATH, Norfolk, (TM 344912).


Site Neolithic enclosure with internal pits. Site defined by a bank and mound forming a crescent.

Pottery The only Beaker from the site is from the interior of the enclosure and apparently unstratified. It is a sherd from an ovoid vessel with zones of horizontal barbed wire impressions. The Neolithic pottery is all of undecorated (except one sherd) round bottom bowls with or without carvings.
BROOMEHEATH, continued....
Location Not located.

BROOK HILL, Hampshire, possible site
Site Early Neolithic settlement on a peninsula in marshland. Recognised by a spread of pottery, flints and heat crazed stones.
Pottery All Windmill Hill pottery. Beaker found nearby but not associated with the settlement. The Beaker is a Bell Beaker decorated with narrow zones of slanting comb impressions between multiple horizontal comb lines.
Location Not located.

BUCKLANDS WINDYPIT, Yorkshire.
Site Cave site with domestic deposits.
Pottery AOC Beaker.
Location Scarborough.

BULFORD DOWN, Wiltshire.
Site Pit containing domestic debris.
Pottery Two sherds of Beaker were found in the pit, apparently from different vessels. Both are comb decorated. The scheme on the first sherd is as follows: three horizontal combed lines, one filled chevron, three combed lines, four vertical lines at the base. The other sherd consists of comb cross-hatching.
Location Not located.
BUYN'T FEN, SUIPEA MILL, Cambridgeshire.


Site No details. Occupation spread is possible.

Pottery Some sherds possibly from this site are illustrated on fig. BUR 1:1-4. In addition to the sherds illustrated, there are two sherds with combed herringbone, one sherd with a horizontal comb line, and a sherd with a zone of fingernail impressions bordered by comb lines. Of the illustrated sherds BUR 1:2 is probably from a Food Vessel and is decorated with elongated oval impressions. BUR 1:2 is in Beaker fabric, though slightly thick and decorated with horizontal grooves on the neck. This may be from a step 4 vessel with an accentuated neck. Unusual, however, is the comb decoration on top of the rim. BUR 1:4 is very unusual indeed. It is in a very fine fabric and has combed and metoped decoration in the style of many later Beakers. The form is very unusual, however, with a slight cordon halfway down the neck. The shape of the vessel below the neck must be conjecture, but the lowest angle might suggest a bulbous belly forming a small and squat Beaker.

Location Cambridge.

BURY ST. EDUNOPS, Suffolk


Site Pit 3ft. in diameter and 2ft.4ins deep containing dark soil with carbon flecks, potsherds, and struck flints. There was also an amount of burnt
bone in the pit, including a charred human skull cap which may have been used as a cooking utensil.

**Pottery**
Illustrated on BSE 1. The pottery consists of combed and rusticated pottery reconstructable to at least four Beakers. The first is from a large rusticated pot (BSE 1:3) decorated on the upper half with circular and triangular impressions while the lower part has paired fingernail impressions. It has a protruding foot and is generally biconical in profile. BSE 1:4 has a similar biconical profile but is from a fine ware vessel with incised cross hatching and open running chevron decoration. BSE 1:1 may be from the same vessel for it too has filled chevrons near the base but it could equally well be from a different vessel. BSE 1:2 is a second base sherd with short incisions on the lower sherd wall. The second rusticated vessel (BSE 1:5) combines paired fingernail with triangular and other impressions.

**Location**
Bury St. Edmunds.

**BUSHFOOT,** Co. Antrim.

**Ref.** Hewson, L.K., 1935.

**Site** Irish sandhill, an occupation spread and midden material.

**Pottery** Pottery not illustrated or seen by the writer. Reported as having 'well-sifted paste' and to have slip on both surfaces. Beaker may be meant but it is not at all certain.

**Location** Belfast.
BUTLEY, Suffolk

Ref. West, S.B., unpublished.

Site A small enclosure (see above p. 169) in which Beaker was found associated with four hearths.

Pottery Illustrated on BUT 1-2. There is no reason to assume that the pottery is not broadly contemporary and the assemblage is typical of what one might expect on a Beaker domestic site with fine and coarse ware both being present. The fine ware is comb decorated or incised, from step 6 Beakers, and the main motif comprises filled hexagons. Some of the rusticated pottery would also seem to be comparatively fine (BUT 1:19) with linear fingernail and tir decoration appearing on both this and the coarser pottery. Some of the fingertip decoration, whether singular or paired, is randomly applied (BUT 1:20). One rim sherd is unusual for a Beaker as it has an internal bevel and circular reed impressions on the exterior. The large biconical vessel reconstructed by Clarke (BUT 2) is similar to those from Bury St. Edmunds in shape and also in the linear motifs of the rustication.

Location Ipswich.

CAHERGILLIMORE, Co. Limerick.


Site No details.

Pottery No details.

Location Not located.
CAISTOR BY NORWICH, Norfolk.


Site Two domestic sites found during gravel quarrying.

Pottery Illustrated in CBN 1. Described above (p. 95).

Location Norwich.

CALDEY ISLAND, Pembroke


Site Potter’s cave. Occupation layer with pottery from early Neolithic ware. No apparent stratification in the layer. Beaker came from this layer.

Pottery Beaker 1. 20 fragments from a necked Beaker (step 5?) decorated with grooves at the top and cardium shell impressions on at least the upper part of the body. May have an undecorated lower portion, or at least an undecorated band at the shoulder. Beaker 2 is like the above but in a smoother finished fabric with single scattered fingernail impressions.

Location

CALLIS WOLD, Yorkshire, (SE 832559).


Site Neolithic round mound with burial platform and facaded mortuary structure. Beaker sherds and associated flints lay over the primary mound in the area of the facade.

Pottery Illustrated in C.W. 1-3. The pottery report for this site has been written by the writer (Gibson, A.N. forthcoming) and is included in typescript.
CALLIS WOLD, continued...

turn at the rear of this study.

Location With D. Coombs.

CANNINGTON, Somerset.


Site Beaker domestic pottery found during excavation of an Anglo-Saxon cemetery.

Pottery As yet unpublished. Clarke lists the pottery as two indeterminate Beakers and one with fingertip decoration, all fragmentary.

Location D.O.E.

CARNABY TOP SITE 12, Yorkshire. (TA 12256672).


Site Pit site.

Pottery Beaker and Grooved ware, see above (p. 197).

Location

CARMEDAU, Merioneth.


Site Henge monuments. No other details.

Pottery Twenty three sherds of rusticated pottery in a coarse brown fabric with fingernail decoration in horizontal and vertical lines.

Location Cardiff.

CASHELBANE, Co. Tyrone.

Ref. Davies, O., and Mullin, J.B., 1940.

Site Chambered tomb. Pottery from the forecourt area and in front of the cairn portals.
CASHELBAHE. continued....

Pottery
Illustrated in CASH 1. The pottery from the fore­court area are sherds CASH 1:1, 2, and 6, the rest of the pottery is apparently firmly sepulchral. A lot of the pottery bears certain similarities to Beaker both in the shape and the decoration. CASH 1:1 combines comb and maggot decoration in a zoned motif consisting of horizontal comb lines and maggot herringbone. CASH 1:2 has paired finger­nail alternating in direction from line to line forming herringbone, albeit widely spaced. The lines run horizontally. CASH 1:6 is from a combed Beaker with the surviving decoration consisting of short horizontal lengths of comb.

Location
W.N.A.I. Dublin.

CASSINGTON, Oxfordshire.

Ref.

Site
Pits and ring ditches similar to many in the Oxford region. Two pits provided a small domestic assemblage each.

Pottery
Illustrated on CAS. 1. The majority of the pottery illustrated here comes from pit 1 and includes the only real fine ware sherd (CAS 1:15) which is from a comb decorated Beaker apparently with stabbed decoration and filled triangle or open running chevron motif. Another comb decorated sherd is also fine and consists of a horizontal and four diagonal lines. Fine and coarse finger decorated sherds are also from this pit (CAS 1:6, 7, 11, 12)
and doubtless represent the secondary and tertiary wares of the assemblage. Undecorated ware is represented by the ribbed sherd CAS 1:9 and the fine cordoned rim of CAS 1:3. There is finally some fine pottery with incised decoration (CAS 1:10, 13).

There are a further two vessels from this pit which are partially restorable as biconical vessels, one larger than the other (CAS 1:1, 2), and which also both have a ribbed upper portion. Apart from size they only differ in that the larger one has fingernail decoration while the other is undecorated save for some (?) accidental scorings. It is possible that these represent the work of the same potter. There is less pottery from pit 2 representing only 2 vessels (CAS 1:4, 5a-e). The first is a heavy rim sherd from possibly a large undecorated pot, with a row of fingernail impressions below the rim on the interior. The second is a collection of sherds which Case has reconstructed as a biconical Beaker (third ref. above). The fabric is fine but the decoration is very carelessly executed in blurred comb with fingernail impressions near the base (CAS 1:5c). The assemblage is a classic one which illustrates the range and variety of pottery that can go to make up a domestic assemblage. There is no reason to believe that the two pits are not generally speaking contemporary. With so many vessels being represented, and with some vessels being partly restorable it is likely that these pits represent dumps (? from a single family).
CASTLEHAW, Yorkshire.


Site Pit assemblage below Castleshaw Roman fort.

Pottery Unpublished and not seen by the writer, however, reconstructed drawings are published in the above ref. Nos. 973 a - 976. There are two fine ware Beakers and three fingernail rusticated vessels represented. The fine ware vessels are simply decorated, one with comb herringbone between horizontal comb lines, and the other with interrupted herringbone between horizontal lines on the upper part, and cross hatching on the belly. All is executed in comb. Both Beakers would seem to represent step 6 vessels. Of the rusticated sherds one is from a smallish vessel with a similar shape to the fine ware vessels and decorated all over, with the exception of a clear band at the waist, with paired fingernail ornament. The two large potbeakers are very different. One is virtually bucket shaped with a cord at the waist and below the rim. It is decorated with loosely spaced fingernail impressions arranged linearly. The second large vessel possibly has
CASTLESHAW, continued...

a shape similar to the fine ware vessels but is ribbed horizontally, twice at the top, once centrally on the neck, and twice more at the waist. Faced fingernail impressions are arranged linearly on the vessel. Again we seem to have a complete assemblage represented with fine ware, secondary ware, and large storage vessels being represented.

Location B.M.

CASTLEWIDG BAY, Cornwall

Ref. Patchett, F.M., 1944.

Site Sand dune site, possibly a midden.

Pottery Three sherds illustrated CAT 1:1-3. The three sherds represent perhaps two vessels though this is not certain. The pottery is very fine and thin, especially CAT 1:3, and on all three sherds the comb used has been very fine. The sherds are abraded. It is uncertain whether these sherds represent the total amount of pottery from the site.

Location B.M.

CAT MILE CAVE, Glamorgan.

Ref. British Museum Catalogue No. FOA 156/1. SCAM.

GLAMORGAN, vol. 1. No. 17.

Site Cave site. Mesolithic, BA, and medieval occupation. Socketed axe and urn pottery date the BA occupation. Scattered human remains in the BA level.
GAT HOLE CAVE, continued....

Pottery Only one sherd from an AOC Beaker seen by the writer in the British Museum, which comes from the 19th century excavations. The sherd is fine with fairly closely spaced twisted cord decoration.

Location B.M.

CHELMS COMBE, Somerset.

Ref. Balch, H.E., 1926.

Site Cave site with a deep stratigraphy. Layer 1 at 1 ft. deep was Romano British, layer 2 at 2 - 3 ft. deep was E.I.A., layer 3 at 4 ft. was Neolithic and layer 4 at 6 - 17 ft. was Mesolithic.

Pottery The details of this stratigraphy do not seem to be accurate as Beaker pottery came from the base of layer 3 and Neolithic round based bowls were found at the top of layer 4. The Beaker material consists of a number of sherds including one partly restorable pot. This possibly has a Bell Beaker shane, an everted rim, and fine fabric. The decoration consists of running chevrons executed with short lengths of twisted cord. The shape may be Beaker like but not the decoration and it may be that this pot has been influenced by some of the pottery of this period from Cornwall. There is a second sherd from a vessel with a slightly everted rim and external rim bevel. Whether this is a Beaker or not can not be ascertained from the drawing but the thickness of the section suggests that it may be.

There are also two sherds from a combed vessel.
The one sherd illustrated in the report has a flat rim and eight lines of comb visible. The excavator suggests that the straightness in the profile of this sherd suggests that it came from a necked Beaker rather than an AOcomb vessel. This small assemblage is a rather interesting one in that it has fine Beaker and also what appears to be a Beaker imitation in the form of the cord decorated vessel.

Location
Bristol University.

| CHELMS COMBE, Wiltshire. (SU 03117005). |
| Site | Series of Neolithic ditches found which were thought to relate to a settlement though no other traces of settlement were found. Ditch 1 was 33m. long, was slight in proportions and had been deliberately infilled in parts. |
| Pottery | Windmill Hill pottery found in the base of the ditch associated with Animal bones. In the upper fill of the ditch were sherds of Mortlake, Ebbsfleet and Beaker pottery. There are no other details. |
| Location | Salisbury. |

| CHEW PARK, Somerset. |
| Site | Circular pit, c. 3ft. in diameter filled with pottery and domestic debris. Labelled as a Beaker grave in the report as at the side, outside the pit was a deposit of cremated bone. |
representing c.3 of a skeleton.

Pottery
Illustrated on CP 1. The pottery has been well discussed in the excavation report. A minimum of c.6 vessels are represented but it is more likely that there are seven vessels present. CP 1:1 and 2 may be from a single comb zoned Beaker, CP 1:3 and 4 are apparently from an ACombed vessel, and the small sherds CP 1:8 and 9 are probably from small bowls, if not the same vessel. Vessels CP 1:5 and 7 are mentioned in the report as being decorated with a broad toothed comb, but it is more likely in the writer's mind that the decoration is in fact fine whipped decoration where some hard substance such as gut has been used instead of the 'cord' that is so usually envisaged. The two large vessels are represented by three separate sherds in the illustration. The first is represented by one sherd (CP 1:16) and decorated with incised herringbone. The second is illustrated by CP 1:6 and 11 and is from a large vessel. The upper portion of which seems to have been decorated with curved grooves or scores which do not appear to be deep. This is another interesting assemblage with a range of vessels from fine to coarse storage jars as well as small bowls (?)cups).

Location
Bristol.

CHIPPENHAM, Cambridgeshire.

Ref.
Leaf, C.B., 1936, 1940; Gibson, A.H. forthcoming (b).
Site

Barrow cemetery. **Barrow 1:** The central burial was an inhumation, contracted and accompanied by a battle axe. The site started as a ring ditch and was later given a chalk ring which overlay the interrupted ditch in some places. Internal postholes suggest a horse-shoe shaped structure. Domestic animal bones were spread over the area and two hearths were associated with pot boilers. Beakers spread over the area. **Barrow 2:** Barrow with double ditch and a primary cremation below an inverted collared Urn. Scatters of domestic animal bones and other debris found, especially in the ditches. Flints included scrapers, a leaf, BeT, and PTD arrowhead, and a plano-convex knife. **Barrow 3:** The only possible domestic debris from this site was a sherd of rusticated pottery and some flints from the old turf line. **Barrow 4:** Undecorated sherds were found in the ditch, from the primary site. **Barrow 5:** The stake circles from this site have been interpreted as a hut by the writer (third ref. above). Beaker was common in the interior of the circle as well as outside. The central area was blackened and flint, food bones and pottery were abundant.

Pottery

The rusticated ware is illustrated here on CHI 1 - 4. The fine ware is dealt with by Mr. Leaf (1940). Most of the Beakers seem to be from step 6 vessels and comb impressions are combined with crescentic impressions, stamped circular impressions, and fingernail decoration. There also seems to be an element of handled Beaker and true fine ware with
CHIPPENHAM, continued...

Combed lozenge decoration. The rusticated ware has been written up by the writer (third ref. above) and is included in typescript form at the end of this study.

Location Cambridge.

CHURCH PLAIN, Berkshire.

Site Barrow cemetery with barrows B and C yielding traces of occupation. The majority of the occupation deposit was Early Neolithic but Beaker and Peterborough ware were also found in the mound material and barrow ditch.

Pottery Pottery sequence on the site from Windmill Hill to Romano-British. Of the Later Neolithic/EBA pottery, Beaker makes up 0.23% of the total, Peterborough ware 13.6%, and Grooved Ware 22.7%.

Location Not Located.

CITY FARM HANBROUGH, Oxfordshire. (SP 430111).

Site Ring ditches with Urn cremations. Beaker and associated sherds come from sites 3 and 4, from the secondary ditch silts.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. CPH 1. Fine ware Beaker is not common, and it is all quite late, perhaps from step 5 or 6 Beakers. Fine ware Beaker was found in the secondary ditch silts of site 3 and site 4, the latter site having evidence for deliberate dumping in the ditches. Associated were some coarse ware sherds some of which resemble
CITY FARM HANBROUGHT, continued....

Grooved ware (CPH 1:1) and some resembling Peterborough ware (CPH 1:8). CPH 1:7 has very fine whipped decoration resembling whipped thread or something equally fine.

Location Ashmolean.

CODFORD ST. MARY, LAMB DOWN, Wiltshire. (ST 993995).


Site Lamb down barrow cemetery with sites B and F providing possible evidence for pre-barrow occupation.

Pottery The relevant pottery from site B consists of two very abraded Beaker sherds from the burials, one from the filling of an inhumation grave, and the other from the filling of a cremation pit. Both were probably derived from a surface scatter. Both sherds are abraded and undecorated. From Barrow F Urn and Beaker sherds were scattered on the old ground surface. One collared urn may have been from a disturbed cremation as it is reconstructable as a bipartite collared urn with horizontal cord lines round the collar and an impressed design on the rim. A second urn is represented by a sherd from the collar area decorated with two oblique incised lines. Of the Beaker sherds, two, probably from the same vessel, have been decorated with a round toothed comb and horizontal and oblique lines are present though the motifs are not discernable. Another sherd has incised decoration and is possibly latticed
CODFORD ST. MARY, LAMBE DOWN, continued...

while the last sherd is from an AOC Beaker.
Coarse ware may be represented by a rim sherd with an internal bevel from what may be a hemispherical bowl.

Location D.O.E.

COLL AND TIREE


Site Various sandhill middens found on both islands but the pottery now seems to be very confused. References to pottery from specific middens tend to be very vague.

Pottery Some illustrated COL 1. Comb zoned Beakers seem to be represented as well as some sherds with comb decoration combined with oval impressions. There is also a great deal of pottery with impressed decoration typical of the late Neo/EEA impressed traditions of the area. There is also a collection of AOC Beakers from the same area but from a doubtless different findspot.

Location N.M.A.G. Edinburgh, Cambridge.

CORDESBY, Lincolnshire

Ref. Riley, D.N., 1957.

Site Sand Dune site.

Pottery Beaker and Grooved Ware referred to but no other details.

Location Scunthorpe.
COTTON WARREN, Yorkshire.


Site. Possible sand dune site but no details.

Pottery Mentioned as S4 by Clarke but not illustrated or seen by writer.

Location Not located.

CRAIKE HILL, Yorkshire. (SE 972576).


Site Occupation floor found including two hearths and a pit. Early Neolithic pottery as well as later material was found. Evidence suggested that the deposition was rapid as few of the sherds, with exception of Ebbsfleet ware, were abraded. The evidence suggested to the writer that the Grimstone ware, Mortlake pottery, and the Beaker sherds were contemporary.

Pottery Only one Beaker was represented at the site by a number of sherds which were scattered in and around the pit. The Grimstone ware is represented by a number of undecorated rim and carination sherds. One heavy rim from a Heslerton ware vessel is also present. The Peterborough ware is predominantly from Mortlake vessels but the incision and shape of some pieces suggest that they are early examples of the style. The usual techniques of decoration are employed, such as cord mappots, bird bone impressions, stabs, fingernail impressions and so on. The rims are characteristically heavy, decorated and externally bevelled. Though each rim has an individuality the general shape of each is very similar to the others. Internal
decoration is quite common. Some of the base sherds show a degree of flattening. There is also a Grooved ware sherd decorated with grooved chevrons, and a wall sherd with paired fingernail impressions which may be from a Beaker rusticated sherd. The Beaker is reconstructable as a step 3 Beaker with combed ornament in the form of filled triangles and narrow zoned decoration. There are also three encircling combed lines on the inside of the rim. If we take the Peterborough and Grooved ware to be associated with the Beaker then Beaker represents only 6% of the assemblage even when the rusticated sherd is added to the Beaker total. Of the whole assemblage, including the Grimstone and Heslerton ware Beaker represents 4.5%, Western Neolithic represents 24.4% and the remainder is Peterborough ware, 6.6% of the whole being Ebbsfleet ware.

Location Not located.

GREETING ST. MARY, Suffolk.


Site Hearths and pits found with Beaker and Grooved ware associated with them and with each other. Collared and bucket urns were also found on the site.

Pottery There are no details of this in the above ref. Clarke illustrates an ovoid vessel with Acomb decoration but with widely spaced encircling lines, and a similarly shaped vessel with triangular impressions. A third vessel listed by
Clarke is not illustrated. They would seem to represent step 5 Beakers. The percentage of Beaker to Grooved Ware is not known.

**Location** Ipswich.

**CROSBY WARREN**, Lincolnshire.

**Ref.** Riley, D.K., 1957.

**Site** Sand dune site like Risby Warren (see below).

**Pottery** The pottery illustrated by Riley is predominantly from AOC Beakers, some with and some without the undecorated zone below the rim, and all apparently of basic European Bell Beaker shape. There is also an element of undecorated Beaker, in this case with a cordon below the rim, and an element of Peterborough ware in the form of an internally bevelled rim sherd with transverse incisions on the bevel. The angle might suggest that the vessel may have been a shallow bowl. One sherd comes from a later Beaker with filled running chevron decoration possibly from a step 5 Beaker though it is difficult to be certain.

**Location** Scunthorpe.

**CUBLIN SANDS**, Moray.

**Ref.** Black, G.F., 1891; Callander, J.G., 1911; Scott, L., 1951.

**Site** Sand dune site from which pottery has been recovered as surface finds and also as a result of excavation. The pottery is often confused, however, as part of the sands has been ploughed.
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**Pottery**
The pottery is illustrated in CUL 1. Much of the pottery recovered from the site is not Beaker, nor is it domestic. Cinerary Urns for example, have been found on the site with cremations. The Beaker from the site is not classic by any means and like much of the pottery from Northern Scotland it is quite individual in nature, both in decoration and in shape. The pottery has already been discussed above, p. 124.

**Location**
N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

DALKEY ISLAND, Co. Dublin.

**Ref.**

**Site**
I.A. promontory fort on SE of Dublin Bay. Beaker came from the same general horizon in site II and site V. Associated with a shell midden in site V, and possibly also in site II. Unfortunately the details of the Beaker stratigraphy in these cuttings as well as the trial cuttings are not at all clear from the report.

**Pottery**
The pottery is illustrated in fig. D.I. 1 - 8. It provides an extremely interesting assemblage as the whole span of Beaker pottery would appear to be present from very early to very late, and from coarse to fine. The earliest Beakers are illustrated in figs. D.I. 4 and 5. There are no AOC Beakers but D.I. 4:9 appears to be an AOC comb decorated Beaker with contracted comb decoration, and D.I. 4:4 is also from an Early Beaker decorated with simple zones which consists of horizontal
comb lines and zones filled with simple oblique lines. The decoration is all comb impressed.

D.I. 5:1 has a rather more squat appearance than the last two mentioned but it is also comb decorated and decorated with zones of oblique lines and interrupted herringbone and resembles a Maritime Bell Beaker at least in decoration. There is also an element of later Beaker of a type that could also be found in Britain such as D.I. 4:7 which is possibly from the equivalent of a step 4 - 6 Beaker and is decorated with combed filled triangles. The contracted zones and the belly curvature of D.I. 4:8 suggests a similarly late vessel. The only sherd that could possibly be from an ACC vessel is D.I. 4:3 which is decorated with two encircling lines of twisted cord impressions. The cord, however, is too widely spaced and the neck angle too severe for this identification to be convincing. The rim sherd D.I. 4:6 may also be from a late Beaker with a slightly inturned neck similar to some from sites in North Britain. Another type of sherd that is seen on North British sites is the everted and externally cordoned rim of D.I. 2:11, and the horizontally incised sherds on the same fig. The rest of the Beaker sherds are typical of Irish insularity and as ever the distinction between Beaker and Food Vessel is difficult to draw. Some fine rusticated ware is present (D.I. 1:3 and 4) not differing at all from the fine ware except for the decoration,
Comb and fingernail decoration is also combined with internal cord decoration and an externally cordoned rim on a very individual sherd from quite a large sherd (D.I. 1:7). Coarser rusticated ware akin to Food Vessel and Urn pottery is also present (D.I. 1:1 and 2). The Food Vessel sherd D.I. 3:15 is interesting in the extent of its internal decoration. The rim angle is difficult to determine but the writer feels that it should be more upright than reconstructed by Liversage. The similarity of this vessel to some of the pottery from Kilellan Farm in Islay should be noted (see below). The fine whipped decoration on this sherd is typical of some Irish Food Vessel and Urn pottery. It is unfortunate that the stratigraphical details of the site were not more precise to determine the true relationship of the various pottery types at the site and in particular the chronological relationships, if any, between the Food Vessel pottery and Irish Necked Beakers such as D.I. 6:2, 7:3, 8, etc. Of the total illustrated pottery at Dalkey Island only 2.9% are from early Beaker and 28% of the vessels are fingernail decorated. There is no fingertip decoration. About 49% of the pottery has incised decoration, 21.5% has combed decoration, and 8.8% have cord decoration. Two sherds (1.9%) have shell impressions. Of the total assemblage c. 35% can possibly be said to be fine ware Beaker though it must be stressed that the
DALKEY ISLAND, continued....

definition of a fine ware Beaker is rather intui-
tive.

Location N.M.A.I. Dublin.

DAILADIES LONG BARROW, Kincardinshire.

Ref. Piggott, S., 1972.1

Site Disturbed pit in the highest point of the barrow.
A flat sloping slab suggested that the pit may
have been a grave, but there was no trace of any
burial found.

Pottery Only one sherd was found. This was a body sherd
from an incised Beaker. The decoration present
consists of two horizontal lines and traces of
three diagonal ones.

Location Not located.

DALMORE, Western Isles. (NB 214451).


Site Midden site revealed by weathering in sand dune
area. Possible area of the midden is 5m x 10m.
Shells, bones (animal) and pottery have all weat-
hered out of the dunes.

Pottery This has not been described or seen by the writer,
though the report states that among the pottery
are '24 sherds of Beaker type'.

Location N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

DALRY, Ayshire.


Site Court Hill tumulus covering a rectangular struc-
ture and a pit. The structure is a stakehole
rectangle c.45ft x 20ft of unknown date. The material of the mound may have been made up from material from an old settlement, as layers of 'burnt earth mixed with charcoal and burnt matter' were found. Included in one of these layers were flints including a flint arrowhead. Adjacent to this structure was a pit 4ft 10ins x 3ft x 3ft, 5ins deep covered by a small cairn. The pit was filled with stones and fragments of a broken Beaker but there was no trace of a burial.

**Pottery**
The pottery represents a single Beaker with comb decoration consisting of horizontal lines and herringbone zones, with a chevron fringe at the base. It also has four encircling lines of comb decoration on the interior and an undecorated external cordon below the rim. There is also a narrow undecorated zone at the belly. It is assignable to Clarke's N/HR class or possibly step 3 though the Sw of Scotland is not one of Lanting and van der Waals focus areas. The whole vessel suggests that it may be from a burial which has dissolved in the soil, though this is not certain.

**Location**
N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

**Dean Bottom, Wiltshire. (SU 147742).**

**Ref.**

**Site**
Deverel-Rimbury enclosure but a number of features, reduced by ploughing, were located and associated with Beaker pottery. A large oval pit was found.
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to have been packed with chalk rubble but which also had a dark organic fill and contained animal bones and horn cores, bone points, a bone comb (for pottery decoration), a B & T arrowhead and antler points.

Pottery

The Beaker illustrated is from a single vessel, comb decorated with four zones. These zones are filled with short oblique impressions and are bordered by three lines at the top and the bottom of comb impressions. The comb used has been short with about 8 teeth and the overlaps of the impressions are clearly visible. The Beaker is assignable to step 3.

Location

With C. Gingell.

Doves Holes, Derbyshire. (SK 078783).


Site Henge monument. Ditch contained fragments of pottery and ox bones and teeth.

Pottery 'Several pieces of late Neolithic or EBA pottery' were found in the 1902 excavations. A sherd of thick coarse fabric was found in the ditch and a second undecorated sherd of Beaker/Food Vessel. Both sherds may be allied to Beaker coarse ware.

Location Not located.

Dovercourt, Essex.


Site 'Camp site' on the submerged coast.

Pottery The pottery is illustrated on fig. DOV 1. It consists of a few sherds of incised fine ware.
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(DOV 1:20, 21) a combed sherd, and a vessel decorated with fairly narrow combed zones of crosshatching. An AOC vessel could possibly be also represented (DOV 1:22). The majority of the sherds, however, are from fingernail rusticated vessels. Fingertip decoration is absent and generally the impressions are from paired fingernails. One vessel is partly restorable (DOV 1:1) as a fairly ovoid vessel with thickened and everted rim and a slight cordon at the base of the neck. Fine ware at the site represents 20% of the whole.

Location B.M.

DOWN FARM, Wiltshire. (SU 187566).


Site Site A was a bowl barrow without a ditch. Sherds found on the OGS below the barrow, and with a hearth in the mound material.

Pottery Only three sherds were recovered, two from the OGS and one from the hearth. They are all very abraded and only tentatively identified as Beaker.

Location Not located.

DOWNTON, Wiltshire. (ST 180211).


Site Occupation site represented by Peterborough and Beaker pottery. The Peterborough area is represented by a pit and pottery and flints but no recognised living site. The Beaker area is situated in a hollow and associated with pits and
Postholes and possibly represents a shelter or even a permanent living site. On the Peterborough area, Beaker was clearly later.

The pottery from both sites is illustrated in fig. DOW 1-3. The total assemblage contains Ebbsfleet, Mortlake, Fensgate and Beaker ware. There was no stratigraphical difference between the Ebbsfleet and Mortlake styles, but the Beaker and Fensgate ware were clearly later on the Peterborough area. In the Beaker area, Beaker and Peterborough pottery were associated. Of the pottery from the Beaker area 36% represents Peterborough ware and the remaining 63% is comprised of Beaker and coarse ware. Of the Beaker material 32.5% of the pottery is comb decorated, 4.8% is cord ornamented, in this case with plaited cord similar to some of the Dutch material and also FFB pottery, 43.5% is rusticated, the majority being fingernail impressed, 10.8% is undecorated and exactly the same amount have cordons, two of which also have fingernail impressions. The combed Beaker appears to have been decorated with simple herringbone or crosshatched zones, and to have come from early vessels, perhaps step 2 or 3. DOW 2:1 are unusual in their decoration as it is so closely crammed together and the chevron motif of the first mentioned sherd is also very unusual. It resembles more a sherd of Peterborough ware from West Kennet which has very finely whipped decoration resemb-
CONTINUED... ling a fine stamp, but this comes from a small hemispherical bowl.

Location Salisbury.

DARFILL, Yorkshire.

Ref. Manby, T.C., 1957.

Site Pottery and occupation debris found in a slight hollow.

Pottery The pottery is predominantly Mortlake ware with an element of Pengate and some flat based pottery rather like Urn fabric. The Mortlake rims are typical of Peterborough Northern pottery, and the decoration is generally rather sparse. The only Beaker sherd is a single combed body sherd which appears to have herringbone and ladder motifs. It is probably from a late vessel and it was found in a layer immediately above the Peterborough ware and it not certainly associated with it.

Location Not located.

DUNDREARD SANDHILLS, Co. Down.


Site Site 9, a midden site producing pottery and food remains though largely eroded.

Pottery Three sherds were recovered from the old turf line and are illustrated in fig. DUN 1:6 - 8. DUN 1:6 is a Beaker/Food Vessel sherd decorated with at least four encircling lines of twisted cord decoration on the interior of the rim, and with comb and fingernail impressions on the exterior. DUN 1:7 is a sherd from a combed Beaker but it is
impossible to be more precise as to the type of vessel due to the small size of the sherds. DUN 1:8 is a fine sherd decorated with oval impressions.

**Location** Belfast: N.M.A.I. Dublin.

**DUNEDIN SANDHILLS,** continued....

**DUNHART, TORS WARREN,** Wigtownshire.

**Ref.** See Luce Bay, below.

**Site** Sand dune site on Luce Bay.

**Pottery** A selection is illustrated on fig. D.T.W. 1. The pottery is almost entirely from AOC Beakers with the exception of two sherds of AOC comb Beakers (D.T.W. 1:1, 3), and some undecorated sherds (D.T.W. 1:2, 4, 30, 31) though these are not necessarily from undecorated vessels and may be from undecorated zones from otherwise AOC Beakers in keeping with the rest of the assemblage. Some rim sherds exhibit internal decoration (D.T.W. 1:5, 6). There would appear to be no coarse ware sherds from the site.

**Location** N.K.A.A. Edinburgh.

**DUNSTABLE FIVE KNOLLS,** Bedfordshire.


**Site** Ditched barrow No. 5. Pottery from ditch silts.

**Pottery** Illustrated in fig. DUN 1:1-5. The pottery that the writer has been able to trace consists of five small sherds in fine fabric, and all probably from different vessels. DUN 1:1 is from a combed Beaker and the decoration consists of three horizontal
DUNSTABLE FIVE ENGLISH, continued....

lines delineating the zones and above this is a 
band of crosshatching. DUN 1:2 is similar but the 
zone is delineated by two lines and the zone fill-
ing consists of oblique lines. DUN 1:4 is also 
a combed sherd with three horizontal lines of 
comb impressions, slightly blurred, on the exterior. 
DUN 1:5 is in similar fabric and has stabs made by 
a point pushed obliquely into the clay. DUN 1:5 
is probably fine Grooved Ware decorated with three 
horizontal grooves.

Location

Some at Luton. Rest not located.

DURRINGTON WALLOW, Wiltshire. (SU 150437).


Site Large Wessex Henge monument. A section of the 
monument was excavated in advance of a road im-
provement scheme and part of the ditch and bank 
were excavated as well as two timber roofed struc-
tures in the interior. A geophysical survey shows 
that more timber buildings lie within the site but 
these have not been explored. Large quantities of 
Grooved Ware and domestic debris was recovered from 
the site, both from the ditch and from the struc-
tures.

Pottery

The pottery from the site was well written up by 
Dr. Longworth and so only a short precis is offered 
here. The vast quantities of pottery recovered 
from the site have also been illustrated in the 
report. Only one sherd of Peterborough ware was 
found at the site, a weathered rim of Northlake
Durrington Walls, continued...

ware. The Grooved ware varied considerably in quality and few were reconstructable. Generally large bucket shaped vessels were represented. Beaker was represented by 71 sherds representing between 27 and 36 vessels. Few were reconstructable. Two sherds are perhaps from AOC Beakers, and are both from the platform. The comb impressed sherds, of which there are eighteen, come from either the Northern circle, the midden, or from on top or over the platform. These sherds are from late vessels. There are also seventeen incised sherds from the ditches all from step 7 Beakers. Of the rusticated sherds there is an element of light haphazard fingernail impressions, possibly representing about three vessels. The rest of the rusticated ware is from the midden or from hearth 5 in the northern ditch section. It has heavy and deeply impressed fingertip decoration of a type commonly found on the later southern domestic sites. There is also an element of 'related pottery' which is similar to Beaker but which has individual peculiarities as one might expect in an assemblage. Of the total Grooved Ware and Beaker assemblage, Beaker represents only 7.5% of the total, and Beaker fine ware only 6.8% of the total. It must be remembered, however, that there is an element of early as well as late Beakers and it is unlikely that all are exactly contemporary. This must also be the case for the Grooved Ware from the site.
EARS BARTON, Northamptonshire.


Site Round barrow with traces of domestic activity below the mound.

Pottery There are no details except that there was considerable domestic material in the barrow material including Neolithic and Beaker pottery with some Food Vessel sherds also present.

Location Not located.

EARS FARM DOWN, Wiltshire. (SU 184419).


Site Barrow site built over traces of earlier occupation, including plough marks. The domestic sherds came generally from the berm between the mound and the ditch.

Pottery More than one phase of activity must be represented as the pottery ranges from Windmill Hill ware to Urn. Beaker is represented by 6 sherds representing possibly two vessels. One sherd is decorated with comb impressions consisting of two horizontal lines and an oblique line above them. The other sherds are undecorated and possibly come from a Beaker or Food Vessel. Four sherds of Urn represent possibly three vessels.

Location Inst. London.

EASTON DOWN, Wiltshire.


Site Occupation site of the Beaker period consisting of a number of pits and postholes, and a short
EASTON DOWN, continued....

line of what appears to be bedding trench. Pits were thought to be dwelling pits by the excavator and contained domestic debris.

Pottery

Illustrated on fig. E.D. 1. The pottery illustrated seems to be a small part of the total amount found, and there would seem to have been a lot more undecorated pottery and perhaps also more rusticated ware, but this was not seen by the writer. The fine ware Beaker sherds present are comb decorated and from late vessels with horizontal and vertical decoration, and are assignable to step 5 or 6 Beakers. There may be more than one phase represented at the site as there is a sherd of what appears to be an AOC Beaker present, (E.D. 1:13) and also some Peterborough pottery decorated with whipped maggots (E.D. 1:1 and 4) and a sherd decorated internally and externally with the same technique, but in fine Beaker-like fabric which should perhaps also be assigned to this early phase (E.D. 1:2) Secondary domestic ware is represented at the site by the restored finger-rusticated vessel (E.D. 1:3) whose shape compares favourably with the likely form of the late fine ware Beakers, and the coarse ware is represented by the large everted rim with fingernail decorated cordon below the lip. The form of this vessel is unknown, but it is possible that it may have been flat based. Some cordoned ware from smaller vessels is also present (E.D. 1:9 and 10), and finally some pottery like fine Grooved
EASTON DOWN, continued....

Ware that is decorated with broad incised grooves.

Location Salisbury.

EATON HEATH, Norfolk. (TG 209060).


Site Enclosure inside which was a number of deep pits and shafts containing generally mid-Neolithic pottery and thought by the excavator to be ritual shafts and predecessors to those known from Iron Age contexts.

Pottery The pottery is mainly mid-Neolithic in date and the only Beaker came from shaft 110. It is a complete East Anglian Beaker according to Clarke's scheme. It is ovoid and incised all over, the horizontal decoration being broken at four regular intervals by a narrow band of oblique lines. The Beaker is doubtless to be regarded as from a ritual context. It is assignable to step 3.

Location Not located.

EBBOR, Somerset.


Site Rock shelter under which was a domestic deposit containing animal bones as well as one or two fragments of human bone, charcoal, a polished stone axe and an oval flint knife.

Pottery This has not been seen by the writer nor is it illustrated in the report. 'Hand made' pottery is reported, a sherd of which was decorated. The forms seemed to suggest to the excavator that
they were from straight sided bowls, probably Grooved Ware, and the decorated sherd may be Beaker.

**Location**
Bristol University.

**EDMONTORPE, Norfolk. (TG 303302).**

**Ref.**

**Site**
An occupation site of c.150 acres in extent and includes two 'living hollows' and hearths.

**Pottery**
This is as yet unpublished and the pottery has not been seen by the writer. The pottery mentioned in the interim (Clarke, R.R. 1957) is a full sequence from Windmill Hill to Urn. Early and later necked Beakers are both mentioned as is Grooved Ware and Peterborough Ware.

**Location**
Norwich.

**EDFORDSHAM, Dorset. (SU 04631160).**

**Ref.**
Proudfoot, E.V.W., 1963.

**Site**
Round barrow with occupation traces in the turves of the turf core.

**Pottery**
Two Beaker base sherds came from the buried soil below the mound, and several minute fragments of Beaker from the mound material.

**Location**
Not located.

**EHENSIDE TARN, Cumberland.**

**Ref.**
Darbishire, R.D., 1874.

**Site**
Waterlogged site that produced a lot of Neolithic artefacts and wooden implements.
EMENSIDE FARM, continued....

Pottery  The pottery is not illustrated in the report but some of the 'fine ware' mentioned may be Beaker.

Location  B.M.

ERRISWELL, Cambridgeshire. (TL 739775).


Site  Patch of black soil revealed by ploughing. This contained food remains, pot boilers, and flint scrapers.

Pottery  The pottery is unpublished but sherds of Beaker, including 'B' Beaker are mentioned. Two sherds of fingertip rusticated ware are illustrated in fig. ERR 1: 5 and 6.

Location  Cambridge.

ERRISWELL, CHAPELBRIGGEN FARM, Cambridgeshire.

(TL 74667692.)


Site  Round barrow on the Fen edge. Beaker sherds were found in the mound material (corded sherd) and in the ditch.

Pottery  Illustrated on fig. ERR 1, 1-4. Both the fine ware Beaker sherds are possibly from early Beakers. One is a sherd of AOC Beaker with at least one undecorated zone, and the other is a combed vessel with five horizontal lines of comb visible on the sherd. This may be a step 3 sherd. There are also two sherds with fine haphazard fingernail decoration.

Location  Cambridge.
BYNCHAM, Oxfordshire.
Ref. See Cassington and City Farm above.

Fakenham, Suffolk
Site Domestic scatter.
Pottery The fine ware consists of two step 3 Beakers illustrated in Clarke and rusticated sherds from at least one and possibly two Beakers and illustrated in fig. FAK 1: 1-4. The rusticated pottery is decorated lightly with random fingernail impressions, in keeping with the early fine ware.
Location Ipswich.

Flaxhall, St. Clements, Suffolk.
Site Hearth site. No further details.
Pottery Unpublished. Beaker is mentioned.

Felixstowe, Suffolk.
Site No details.
Pottery Clarke lists at least one Barbed Wire Beaker and at least one fingernail rusticated sherd.
Location Ipswich.

Fenclate, Northamptonshire.
**FENGATE, Northamptonshire. continued...**

**Site**
The Wyman Abbott collection of Beaker comes from a variety of gravel quarries and sites but can not now be provenanced with any certainty except in a very few cases. In the recent excavations Beaker comes from pits P3 and P4 in the Padholme Rd. site, and F217, F219 in the Newark Rd. site.

**Pottery**
The pottery from the Wyman-Abbott collection consists of a very homogeneous group illustrated PEN 1-17. The pottery is all comparatively fresh, the majority is fine ware and step 5 and 6 vessels are probably represented. They are discussed in Gibson, A.M. 1980 at the back of this thesis. The Beaker from the recent excavations is residual and appears more abraded than that from the Wyman-Abbott collection.

**Location**

---

**FIFTY FARM, Suffolk.**

**Ref.**
Leaf, C.S., 1935.

**Site**
Circular floor 26 ft. in diameter strewn with animal bones, some split and gnawed by dogs. Human jaw bone also found among the debris. Of the 161 flint implements recovered, 73% were scrapers and 2.5% were arrowheads. The difference in weathering on some of the sherds suggested to Leaf that there was at least one period of occupation though there seems no stratigraphic evidence for this.
POTTERY

The coarse ware is illustrated in figures 1-7. The fine ware is similar to that from Fengate and represents probably step 6 vessels though few are reconstructable, and combed and incised sherds are both present. The predominant decorative motifs seem to be cross hatching or herringbone zones, and filled lozenges or triangles. Zones filled with stabbed decoration are also present. In addition there are also sherds from Urns (F.F. 7:10) of a type similar to those seen at Huckwold cum Wilton (see below) and sherds of what appear to be an undecorated hemispherical Peterborough bowl (F.F. 7:15).

Handled Beakers are represented by two handle sherds (F.F. 7:22, 24). There are also rusticated sherds decorated with triangular stabs (F.F. 7:8, 9) probably from the same vessel. Fine ware represents 45% of the total pottery. Coarse fingernail or fingertip decoration makes up the rest of the pottery (with the exception of the Urn and undecorated sherds representing in all 1.3%). The finger rusticated ware varies considerably within its own category. Some quite small vessels are represented (F.F. 1:8) while other sherds are doubtless from considerably larger pots (F.F. 6:10). Paired vertical, paired single and horizontal paired and horizontal single are all present as are finger raised cordons, no doubt representing large storage vessels. Some cordoned rims are represented (F.F. 1:17, F.F. 2:6) and perhaps...
also an element of hemispherical bowl (P.P. 3:14).

Few vessels are reconstructable from the sherd evidence (P.P. 1:8, P.P. 3:11) and where they are reconstructable they seem to represent secondary vessels with near traditional Beaker shape.

There may also be an element of collared vessel in the assemblage (P.P. 3:15). 11.3% of the pottery would seem to be from variously sized cordoned vessels and 4.5% from large storage vessels of this class. The remaining 44% of the whole would appear to be from secondary vessels, an amount that compares well with the fine ware percentage.

**Location**
Cambridge.

**FINDHORN**, Moray.

**Ref.**
Dunbar, D., 1929.

**Site**
A domestic site that produced worked flints including a B & T arrowhead and a small bead of copper.

**Pottery**
No details except that 'many small pieces of rough pottery' were found and that they were from flat-based pots. It is possible but not certain that some Beaker was represented.

**Location**
Not located.

**FINDON, CHURCH HILL**, Sussex.

**Ref.**
Curwen, E.C., 1937.

**Site**
Flint mine. Beaker found in the upper fill of the shaft.
FINDON, CHURCH HILL, Sussex, continued...

Pottery

The pottery is illustrated on Fig. C.H. 1.). In the shaft fill a Beaker cremation was mentioned. The Beaker associated was said to be a barrel Beaker with a cordoned rim, and this may be represented by the sherds of BW Beaker illustrated on fig. C.H. 1:8 and 10. The other sherds illustrated were found scattered through the upper shaft fill and include sherds from a large rusticated vessel also from a similar one (C.H. 1:7). C.H. 1:4 may be from a Peterborough vessel, though the sparse decoration might suggest an early type and so it should not be regarded as a firm association with the Beakers. The form of the sherd suggests a cavetto zone and a round base. C.H. 1:5 is perhaps from another ovoid Beaker or from a small Food vessel, though the former possibility is more plausible in the writer's mind. The other sherds illustrated are from collared urns, both cord and stab decorated. Some of the Urn is interesting as it is in Beaker fabric (C.H. 1:6 for example) but no fine ware other than the BW Beaker was seen by the writer.

Location

Worthing.

FLATBOURGH HEAD, BEACON HILL, Yorkshire.

Ref.


Site

Neolithic and Beaker occupation site situated in a small hollow and partly destroyed by quarrying. The Beaker layer was represented by a floor and a hearth. A series of stakeholes also delineated
FLAMBOROUGH HEAD, BEACON HILL, continued...

an oval area 0.3m wide and at least 4.5m long.
This may be a structure similar to but smaller
than the oval house II at Northton (see below).
The Flamborough structure would certainly seem
to be open ended like the Northton example. The
flints from the site are reported to be Beaker
influenced.

**Pottery**

Western Neolithic and Beaker layers were both
present but separated from each other by a sterile
layer. Some Peterborough pottery was intermixed
with the early Neolithic pottery. The Beaker
pottery was generally in the form of small abra-
ded sherds. The Beaker is generally coiled and
there is also a sherd from an AOC Beaker. The
sherds suggest an early assemblage though it is
difficult to assign them to a step. A sherd of
Grooved Ware was found above the Beaker level.

**Location** Scarborough.

FLAMBOROUGH, Lincolnshire.

**Ref.** Riley, D.N. 1957.

**Site** Sand dune site similar to Risby Warren (see below).

**Pottery** No details except that Beaker and rusticated ware
has been found. Clarke (1970) only lists FN
sherds.

**Location** Scunthorpe.

FOSBARROW, Grampian. (NJ 360592).

**Ref.** Burl, H.A.W., 1974; Burl, H.A.W. and Henshall,
FOCHABERS, continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Beaker pit found outside the edge of Foghead burial mound. A Neolithic occupation site was found below the mound.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>No details except that the remains of three Beakers were found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Not located.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FRESHWICK SANDS, Caithness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>East coast sand dune site described above (p. 125).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Illustrated on F.S. 1, described in detail above (p. 125).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUSELL'S LODGE LONG BARROW, Wiltshire. (SU 1903246).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Earthen long barrow with secondary use of the quarry ditches. Rusticated sherds came from the upper parts of the S. ditch (layer 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Illustrated on fig. FAK. 1: Fussell's Lodge 1-3. The sherds comprise fingernail impressed and pinched vessels, possibly three in number, the pinching forming raised cordons. There can not be certainly identified as Beaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Not located.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GARROWBY WOLD, BARROW 43, Yorkshire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Round barrow, 90ft. in diameter and 3ft. high pottery, oval and circular flint scrapers, ox bones and charcoal were found on the old ground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GARROWBY MOLD, BARROW 42. continued....

Pottery
Illustrated in fig. GR 1:8-10. Pottery comprised 110 sherds including seven Beakers, three food vessels and an incense cup. These were all reported as coming from the OSS.

Location Hull.

GARROWBY MOLD, BARROW 32, Yorkshire.


Site Round barrow, 46ft. in diameter and 1ft. high due to repeated ploughing. Ox bones and teeth, and boar tusks were found on the OSS as well as flints and charcoal.

Pottery Numerous sherds of at least seven vessels were found, but there are no further details.

Location Hull.

GIANTS HILL I, SKENDLEBY, Lincolnshire.


Site Earthen long barrow Beaker came from below the mound in a collection of turves and from secondary use of the long barrow ditches.

Pottery The pottery is illustrated in fig. SKE 1:1-14. The pottery from below the mound is AOC though the shape of the vessel represented is not reconstructable from the sherds, but it had an angular profile. The dates for the vessel are early for AOC Beakers even on the continent and it may be that what we have is an example of PFD pottery or an equivalent. Hearths found in the ditches had food remains associated and also fragments
GIANTS HILL I, SKENDLEBY, Lincolnshire.


Site Earthen Long Barrow. Patches of occupation debris associated with pottery and charcoal in the upper ditch silts.

Pottery Necked Beakers are also represented at Skendleby II possibly assignable to the same steps as at the above site. The Mortlake ware from the ditches appeared to have been deposited in bags of charcoal and domestic debris.

Location With D.D.A. Simpson.

GLERE LOW, GREAT LANGSTON, Derbyshire. (SK 204732).


Site Demolished barrow. Sherds were found in the material that was dumped after the demolition, with food remains and animal bones.

Pottery Beaker sherds are mentioned and Radley thought that the material was perhaps domestic rather than the remains of destroyed burials by the fact that the sherds were very abraded. Some
GLEBE LOW, GREAT LANGSTON, continued....

Sherds may not be Beaker as they are recorded as having cord decoration but are not from AOX vessels. Some incised pottery is decorated with converging lines but no proper motifs are discernable.

Location Not Located

GORSEY BIGHURST, Somerset.


Site Hengiform monument. There were no man-made internal features recognised despite clearance to bedrock. A great deal of occupation debris came from the ditch.

Pottery Illustrated in fig. 6.1. The pottery has already been surveyed above. About 77% of the pottery is Beaker fine ware or secondary ware.

Location Lost.

GORTON, South Uist. (NF 804143).


Site Sand dune midden site c.30m. long by 0.3m. deep. Beaker and quartz industry are associated.

Pottery No details except that cord decorated pottery was recovered.

Location N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

GORTGORBIES, Co. Londonderry. (G. 740252).


Site Two hearth sites associated with Beaker and other Neolithic pottery, though the main Beaker concentration lay c.31ft. to the west of the western hearth.
Pottery  This seems typical of domestic assemblages in its mixture of fine, coarse, Beaker and non-Beaker pottery. Sherd G10 in the report comes from a vessel with an upright neck and incised decoration so that it resembles some of the pottery from Scottish sites such as Northton (see below). Sherd G4 also suggests this but it has a rather more bulbous profile. The everted rim and internal decoration of G9 is also similar to some of the Northton and Killelvan Farm material. Combed decoration is rare, though it does seem to be combined with whipped ornament on G5. G6 is apparently from a fairly straight sided jar, G12 has an everted rim like G9 and G10, and G2 has an everted and externally bevelled rim which has incised decoration on the bevel only. The other sherds are all from vessels with bulbous profiles like G4 mentioned above. Cord ornament is present on sherd G3 but whether it is twisted or whipped is difficult to determine from the illustration.

Location  Not located.

Grange, Co. Limerick.

Ref.  O'Riordain, S.P., 1951.

Site  Stone circle with an overall diameter of 215 ft. and an internal diameter of 150 ft. It is surrounded by a bank, the inner side of which are revetted by the stones whose tops are generally level with the top of the bank. Two hearths were found
in the interior on the OGS. Beaker was associated with these hearths.

Pottery
Described above (p. 131).

Location
N.M.A.I. Dublin.

GRANGEFORE, Co. Derry.


Site  Sand dune site. Spreads of occupation debris. Scraper and cores found among the flint assemblage.

Pottery  Flat based pottery is recorded but the 40 or so sherds were too small and abraded for identification.

Location  Not located.

GREAT BARTON, Suffolk.


Site  No details.

Pottery  Large pot beaker with paired fingertip and nail decoration.

Location  Bury St. Edmunds.

GREAT BIRCHAM, Norfolk. (TL 771308).


Site  Sand pit site. Found beneath a round barrow.

Pottery  Illustrated on fig. GRI 1:5 - 7. Not illustrated are two sherds of fine ware both decorated with lines of horizontal comb, though not enough survives of either sherd to suggest that an AOC combed vessel is represented. In addition there are two
Continued...

Sherds with fine fingernail impressions (GRI 1:6, 7) and a sherd with horizontal incised lines (GRI 1:5). Five vessels in all are probably represented.

Location Norwich.

Green Howe, Deighton, Yorkshire. (SE 38875123).


Site Round barrow with primary Food Vessel inhumation. Occupation debris found in the mound material and below the old turf line below the mound. Hearth found below the old turf line.

Pottery Mostly Peterborough ware in the Ebbsfleet tradition though with some heavy rims approaching the Mortlake style. The decoration is all impressed or stabbed with bird bone or points. There is also an amount of finger impressed pottery very similar to the paired fingernail found on Beaker sites. Sherd 34 in the report has a flat rim and horizontal finger-pressed cordons which is very common on large storage jars from Beaker assemblages as has been seen already. The Beaker pottery came from the old turf line and so is later. Three fragments of Beaker are small and abraded. One has 6 lines of horizontal comb visible, and the others are from AOC vessels. There are two other sherds labelled as Bronze Age by Wood with oval-toothed comb herringbone or chevron decoration. These sherds have a coarser fabric than the Beaker sherds. Two others have incised chev-
FLINTY FARM, continued....
also an element of hemispherical bowl (F.F. 3:14).
Few vessels are reconstructable from the sherd
evidence (F.F. 1:8, F.F. 3:11) and where they
are reconstructable they seem to represent secound-
dary vessels with near traditional Beaker shape.
There may also be an element of collared vessel
in the assemblage (F.F. 3:15). 11.3% of the
pottery would seem to be from variously sized
cordoned vessels and 0.5.2% from large storage
vessels of this class. The remaining 44% of the
whole would appear to be from secondary vessels,
an amount that compares well with the fine ware
percentage.

Location Cambridge.

FINDHORN, Moray.
Ref. Dunbar, D., 1929.
Site A domestic site that produced worked flints in-
cluding a B & T arrowhead and a small bead of
copper.

Pottery No details except that 'many small pieces of
rough pottery' were found and that they were
from flat-based pots. It is possible but not
certain that some Beaker was represented.

Location Not located.

FINDON, CHURCH HILL, Sussex.
Site Flint mine. Beaker found in the upper fill of
the shaft.
FINDON, CHURCH HILL, Sussex, continued....

Pottery

The pottery is illustrated on Fig. C.H. 1.). In the shaft fill a Beaker cremation was mentioned. The Beaker associated was said to be a barrel Beaker with a cordoned rim, and this may be represented by the sherds of EW Beaker illustrated on fig. C.H. 1:8 and 10. The other sherds illustrated were found scattered through the upper shaft fill and include sherds from a large rusticated vessel also from a similar one (C.H. 1:7).

C.H. 1:4 may be from a Peterborough vessel, though the sparse decoration might suggest an early type and so it should not be regarded as a firm association with the Beakers. The form of the sherd suggests a cavetto zone and a round base. C.H. 1:5 is perhaps from another ovoid Beaker or from a small Food vessel, though the former possibility is more plausible in the writer's mind. The other sherds illustrated are from collared urns, both cord and stab decorated. Some of the Urn is interesting as it is in Beaker fabric (C.H. 1:6 for example) but no fine ware other than the EW Beaker was seen by the writer.

Location

Worthing.

FLAMBOROUGH HEAD, BEACON HILL, Yorkshire.

Ref.


Site

Neolithic and Beaker occupation site situated in a small hollow and partly destroyed by quarrying. The Beaker layer was represented by a floor and a hearth. A series of stakeholes also delineated
FLAMBOURG HEAD, BEACON HILL, continued....

an oval area 0.3m. wide and at least 4.5m. long.
This may be a structure similar to but smaller
than the oval house II at Northton (see below).
The Flamborough structure would certainly seem
to be open ended like the Northton example. The
flints from the site are reported to be Beaker
influenced.

Pottery
Western Neolithic and Beaker layers were both
present but separated from each other by a sterile
layer. Some Peterborough pottery was intermixed
with the early Neolithic pottery. The Beaker
pottery was generally in the form of small abra-
ded sherds. The Beaker is generally combed and
there is also a sherd from an AOC Beaker. The
sherds suggest an early assemblage though it is
difficult to assign them to a step. A sherd of
Grooved ware was found above the Beaker level.

Location
Scarborough.

FILBROUGHS, Lincolnshire.
Ref. Riley, D.N. 1957.
Site Sand dune site similar to Risby Warren (see below).
Pottery No details except that Beaker and rusticated ware
has been found. Clarke (1970) only lists FN
sherds.
Location Scunthorpe.

FOCHABERS, Grampian. (NJ 360592).
Ref. Burl, H.A.W., 1974; Burl, H.A.W. and Henshall,
FOCHABERS, continued....

Site Beaker pit found outside the edge of Boghead burial mound. A Neolithic occupation site was found below the mound.

Pottery No details except that the remains of three Beakers were found.

Location Not located.

FRESWICK SANDS, Caithness.


Site East coast sand dune site described above (p. 125).

Pottery Illustrated on p. 5, described in detail above (p. 125).

Location N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

FUSELL'S LODGE LONG BARROW, Wiltshire. (SU 19203246).


Site Earthen long barrow with secondary use of the quarry ditches. Rusticated sherds came from the upper parts of the S. ditch (layer 7).

Pottery Illustrated on fig. FAK. 1; Fuseell's Lodge 1-3. The sherds comprise fingernail impressed and pinched vessels, possibly three in number, the pinching forming raised cords. There can not be certainly identified as Beaker.

Location Not located.

GARROWBY WOLD, BARROW 43, Yorkshire.


Site Round barrow, 90ft. in diameter and 3ft. high pottery, oval and circular flint scrapers, ox bones and charcoal were found on the old ground.
Pottery
Illustrated in fig. GRI 1:8-10). Pottery comprised 110 sherds including seven Beakers, three food vessels and an incense cup. These were all reported as coming from the OGS.

Location
Hull.

GARROWEY WOLD, BARROW 42, Yorkshire.


Site Round barrow, 46ft. in diameter and 1ft. high due to repeated ploughing. Ox bones and teeth, and boar tusks were found on the OGS as well as flints and charcoal.

Pottery 'Numerous' sherds of at least seven vessels were found, but there are no further details.

Location
Hull.

GIANTS HILL I, SKENDLEY, Lincolnshire.


Site Earthen long barrow Beaker came from below the mound in a collection of turves and from secondary use of the long barrow ditches.

Pottery The pottery is illustrated in fig. SKE 1:1-14). The pottery from below the mound is AOC though the shape of the vessel represented is not reconstructable from the sherds, but it had an angular profile. The dates for the vessel are early for AOC Beakers even on the continent and it may be that what we have is an example of PFB pottery or an equivalent. Hearths found in the ditches had food remains associated and also fragments.
GIANTS HILL I, SKENDLEY, continued...

of necked Beakers, perhaps assignable to step 5 or 6. The sherd s illustrated are all fine ware Beakers and are comb decorated or comb and finger-nail combined (SKE 1:9 and 14). SKE 1:13 appears to be incised, but it is probably blunted comb. There are also coarser sherd s mentioned in the report but are not illustrated and were not seen by the writer at the British Museum.

Location B.K.

GIANTS HILL II, SKENDLEY, Lincolnshire.


Site Earthen Long Barrow. Patches of occupation debris associated with pottery and charcoal in the upper ditch silts.

Pottery Necked Beakers are also represented at Skendley II possibly assignable to the same steps as at the above site. The Mortlake ware from the ditches appeared to have been deposited in bags of charcoal and domestic debris.

Location With D.D.A. Simpson.

GLEBE LOW, GREAT LANGSTON, Derbyshire. (SK 204732).


Site Demolished barrow. Sherds were found in the material that was dumped after the demolition, with food remains and animal bones.

Pottery Beaker sherds are mentioned and Radley thought that the material was perhaps domestic rather than the remains of destroyed burials by the fact that the sherds were very abraded.
GLENELDOW, GREAT LANGSTON, continued....

Sherds may not be Beaker as they are recorded as having cord decoration but are not from AOC vessels.

Some incised pottery is decorated with converging lines but no proper motifs are discernable.

Location Not Located

GORSEY BIGNOR, Somerset.


Site Hengiform monument. There was no man-made internal features recognised despite clearance to bedrock. A great deal of occupation debris came from the ditch.

Pottery Illustrated in fig. G.E. 1. The pottery has already been surveyed above. About 77% of the pottery is Beaker fine ware or secondary ware.

Location Lost.

GORTON, South Uist. (NF 804143).


Site Sand dune midden site c.20m. long by c.3m. deep.

Beaker and quartz industry are associated.

Pottery No details except that cord decorated pottery was recovered.

Location N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

GORTCARBIES, Co. Londonderry. (G. 740252).


Site Two hearth sites associated with Beaker and other Neolithic pottery, though the main Beaker concentration lay c.31ft. to the west of the western hearth.
Pottery

This seems typical of domestic assemblages in its mixture of fine, coarse, Beaker and non-Beaker pottery. Sherd G10 in the report comes from a vessel with an upright neck and incised decoration so that it resembles some of the pottery from Scottish sites such as Northton (see below). Sherd G4 also suggests this but it has a rather more bulbous profile. The everted rim and internal decoration of G9 is also similar to some of the Northton and Killelan Farm material. Combed decoration is rare, though it does seem to be combined with whipped ornament on G5. G6 is apparently from a fairly straight sided jar, G12 has an everted rim like G9 and G10, and G2 has an everted and externally bevelled rim which has incised decoration on the bevel only. The other sherds are all from vessels with bulbous profiles like G4 mentioned above. Cord ornament is present on sherd G3 but whether it is twisted or whipped is difficult to determine from the illustration.

Location

Not located.

GRANGE, Co. Limerick.


Site Stone circle with an overall diameter of 215 ft.

and an internal diameter of 150 ft. It is surrounded by a bank, the inner side of which is revetted by the stones whose tops are generally level with the top of the bank. Two hearths were found.
GRANGE, continued....

in the interior on the OGS. Beaker was associated with these hearths.

Pottery

Described above (p. 231).

Location

N.M.A.I., Dublin.

GRANGEMORE, Co. Derry.

Ref.

Hewson, L.M. 1955; May, A. McL., and Batty, J.
1948.

Site

Sand dune site. Spreads of occupation debris.
Scrapers and cores found among the flint assem-
blage.

Pottery

Flat based pottery is recorded but the 40 or so
sherds were too small and abraded for identifi-
cation.

Location

Not located.

GREAT BARTON, Suffolk.

Ref.


Site

No details.

Pottery

Large pot beaker with paired fingertip and nail
decoration.

Location

Bury St. Edmunds.

GREAT BIRCHAN, Norfolk. (TL 771308).

Ref.

Unpublished.

Site

Sand pit site. Found beneath a round barrow.

Pottery

Illustrated on fig. GRI 1:5 - 7. Not illustrated
are two sherds of fine ware both decorated with
lines of horizontal comb, though not enough sur-
vives of either sherd to suggest that an AOCombed
vessel is represented. In addition there are two
GREAT BIRCHAM, continued....

sherds with fine fingernail impressions (GRI 1:6, 7) and a sherd with horizontal incised lines (GRI 1:5). Five vessels in all are probably represented.

Location Norwich.

GREEN HUME, DEIGHTON, Yorkshire. (SE 38675123).


Site Round barrow with primary Food Vessel inhumation. Occupation debris found in the mound material and below the old turf line below the mound. Hearth found below the old turf line.

Pottery Mostly Peterborough ware in the Ebbsfleet tradition though with some heavy rims approaching the Mortlake style. The decoration is all impressed or stabbed with bird bone or points. There is also an amount of finger impressed pottery very similar to the paired fingernail found on Beaker sites. Sherd 34 in the report has a flat rim and horizontal finger-pressed cordons which is very common on large storage jars from Beaker assemblages as has been seen already. The Beaker pottery came from the old turf line and so is later. Three fragments of Beaker are small and abraded. One has 6 lines of horizontal comb visible, and the others are from AO vessels. There are two other sherds labelled as Bronze Age by Wood with oval-toothed comb herringbone or chevron decoration. These sherds have a coarser fabric than the Beaker sherds. Two others have incised chev-
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ron decoration and are possibly also from Food Vessels. Treating the assemblage as a unit, Beaker represents 13.6%, Food Vessel represents 18%, Flat rimmed rusticated ware represents 13.6% and the Peterborough ware makes up the remaining 54.5%. It must be remembered, however, that the contemporaneity of the Beaker with the Peterborough pottery has not been proven.

Location Harrogate.

GREENLAND FARM, Wiltshire. (SU 099441).


Site Round barrow. Scatter of Beaker sherds found on the OGS just beyond the periphery of the mound.

Pottery The pottery from the Beaker spread consists of about 60 small crumbs and sherds. Thin incised lines occur on one or two sherds, and possible fingernail impressions on three examples. There are further undecorated sherds and perhaps three vessels are represented.

Location Not located.

GRIMES GRAVES, Norfolk.


Site Flint mines. Floors often found in the upper layers of shaft fills.

Pottery Illustrated in fig. GRI 1:1-4. Beaker is rare but these rusticated sherds may be of Beaker date and affinities.

Location B.M.; Norwich.
GWITHIAN, Cornwall.


Site. Extensively settled site from Neolithic into M.B.A. Beaker comes from sites X and XV and in particular it is associated with a circular hut of double stakehole and bedding trench construction. This is phase II of the hut and was preceded by one of similar proportions but of individual posthole construction.

Pottery The fine ware Beaker from the site is all early comb-zoned Beaker assignable to steps 2 and 3, though this is tentative due to the small size and abraded nature of the pottery and the fact that not vessels are reconstructable. Associated with this were flower-pot shaped vessels in similar fine hard fabric but with cord and comb ornament in the form of chevrons and broad triangles between horizontal lines on the upper part of the vessels. The fabric and the decoration, especially the use of comb, would suggest that this probably represents a local copy of Beaker ware in an existing pottery tradition. The pottery from the later level is very similar though bearing closer similarities with Trevisker pottery, but a remnant of Beaker influence is still visible in comb and zone decoration.

Location With C. Thomas.

HAMELEDON HILL, Hampshire.

Hambledon Hill, continued...

**Site**
Causewayed camp with outlying earthworks.

**Pottery**
Unpublished. No details. Apparently all from secondary contexts.

**Location**
With R. Mercer.

Harborough, Derbyshire.

**Ref.**
Brailsford, J.W., 1957.

**Site**
Cave site, no details.

**Pottery**
No details except that Peterborough ware, Grooved Ware and Beaker have all been recovered from the site.

**Location**
Birchover.

Harpley, Norfolk. (TF 762279).

**Ref.**

**Site**
Round barrow, totally destroyed by ploughing. Large posthole and pit found below the mound.

**Pottery**
Some B.A. fabrics from below the mound on the OGS. Two sherds of Beaker from the same horizon but outside the limits of the mound. The Beaker sherds were small and undiagnostic. One had incised lines visible on the surface.

**Location**
Norwich.

Hastings, Sussex.

**Ref.**

**Site**
Possible shell midden.

**Pottery**
No details except that Beaker sherds were recovered.

**Location**
Not located.
HAYLAND HOUSE, MILDENHALL, Suffolk.

Site Round mound appearing to be a barrow but proving on excavation to be a cooking site with a layer of pot-boilers. Beaker is secondary on the site.
Pottery Illustrated on fig. H.N. 1. The primary pottery on the site is early-mid Neolithic. The Beaker pottery from the site is not abundant but does form a complete assemblage with fine and coarse wares all represented. There are two sherds of combed Beaker, a wall sherd and a base sherd, both probably from the same vessel. Fig. H.N. 1:12 may possibly be from an AOC sherd, but perhaps a Food Vessel is more likely. Associated with this fine ware are several sherds of finger rusticated ware, generally fine fingernail impressions (H.N. 1:22, 23) indicative of an early assemblage, however there are also two-ribbed sherds, one with finger raised ribs which should be typologically later and which is, no doubt the best sherd for dating the assemblage. There is also a large quantity of Urn pottery from the site (H.N. 1:3, 4, 6) which may possibly be contemporary with the late Beaker. The Beaker element on the site consists of only 6 vessels.
Location Cambridge.

HEACHAM, Norfolk. (TF 674367).
Site Scatter of sherds and flints including leaf arrowheads and scrapers as well as flakes.
Illustrated on fig. HEA 1:1-5. Not all the pottery was traceable by the writer. Beaker and rusticated sherds are reported from the site. The Beaker seen by the writer consists of a sherd with traces of five horizontal comb lines (HEA 1:2) and another small sherd with combed cross-hatching. The rusticated ware consists of fine fabric with fingernail impressions both single (HEA 1:3,4) and paired. HEA 1:5 comes from a rounded rim with no decoration visible but so little remains that it cannot be said to have been undecorated. HEA 1:1 seems to have come from a vessel with a cavetto zone and small fingernail incisions seem to have decorated this area.

Location Norwich.

HEATHERLEA, SOUTHBOURNE, Hampshire.


Site No details.

Pottery Unpublished and not traced by the writer. Calkin records pottery of the Beaker period with stabbed decoration and Clarke lists a large number of fragments from at least one FN Beaker.

Location Christchurch.

HEDDERWICK, East Lothian.


Site Sand dune site on the Lothian coast. Occupation layer revealed by wind erosion.
HEDDENWICK, continued...

Pottery  Illustrated on fig. HED 1-4. Pottery described in detail above, p. 113.

Location  N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

HIGH WHEELDON CAVE, Derbyshire.


Site  Occupation deposit found at the entrance to the cave. Wild and domesticated animal bones were found.

Pottery  Beaker is illustrated on fig. HEA 1:6-7. Peterborough ware and Beaker are both reported from the site. The Beaker sherds are small and apparently from the same vessel, or else two very similar. Decoration consists of horizontal combed lines, and on two sherds there are also small circular (?)reed impressions. Late Beakers are suggested. There are no details of the Peterborough ware nor is strict association proven.

Location  Not located.

HOCKWOLD cum WINTON, Norfolk.


Site  Beaker activity at Hockwold comes from a number of individual sites which together show extensive occupation of the area. These sites are as follows:

Field 616, site 92 (TL 69418756) was a circular occupation floor with three hearths on the west side. Some stake holes may represent the remains of a wall. The floor covered a (?)drainage gully.
which had been filled with brushwood to level it.

Pottery from the site seemed to represent a single period of occupation. Most of the Beakers represented were late, step 6 or 7, and the similarity of motifs suggested to Bamford that there was only a small group of potters at work. About 60 vessels are represented. c.32 are rusticated and 3 combine comb and fingernail decoration. The remaining are Beaker. Plastic rustication is also present.

Field 612 (TL 692877) site 62 consists of a single hearth.

Pottery. This consists of a sherd from a later Beaker plus two others with applied external 'blobs' of clay.

Field 613, site 62, consists of an 'L'-shaped area with a 'hearth' at the eastern end, and a circular hollow. Food remains were found in the area as well as burnt daub.

Pottery. This consists of necked Beaker (? step 6) as well as some sherds of handled Beaker.

Field 612, site 62 consists of a Beaker hearth and a hollow which contained later Beaker sherds as well as Mildenhall and Food Vessel pottery. The stratigraphy was not well-defined enough to distinguish Food Vessel and Mildenhall phases of occupation.

Pottery. The Beaker pottery is again represented by late Beakers of at least step 6.
HOCKWOLD cum WILTON, continued....

Site 21 (TL 66648622) consists of a small hearth group associated with late necked Beaker pottery.

Pottery

Dr. Bamford states in her thesis that sherds from different sites were often found to be conjoining so it seems that either the sites were all contemporary at least in the Beaker phase of occupation, or else the pottery was not all carefully collected or stored after its recovery. The pottery from all sub-sites at Hockwold is illustrated on fig. N.C.W. 1 - N.C.W. 11. Interesting is the presence of Urn pottery and the very large amount of rusticated ware (though it must be remembered that the fine ware from the site has not been illustrated by the writer). The bucket-shaped vessel has been reconstructed from sherds (N.C.W. 2:20) and illustrates well the problems of sherd reconstruction when not all the vessel survives. The writer does not pretend that this reconstruction is any more accurate than other attempts but it serves to show that not all Beaker-associated rusticated ware need have the basic Beaker form.

Location

Norwich.

NOR, EAST BEREHAM, Norfolk.

Ref.

Arling, H., 1931.

Site

One of a number of cooking sites. Layer of pot boilers were found and were apparently associated with pot fragments, 36 scrapers and flakes and cores.
Pottery. No details but sherds from six Beakers were found.

The decoration consisted of combed chevrons and
cross hatching. No vessels were reconstructable.
'Some large domestic ware' was also present.

Location Norwich.

HOLDENHURST, Hampshire.

Ref. Piggott, S., 1937.

Site Long barrow. An occupation layer was found in the
ditch at the north-west end.

Pottery As usual there are no reconstructable vessels but
the Beakers would appear to be late with fingernail
impressions between comb lines, and with vertical
decoration also present. The rusticated pottery
present is almost all from heavily rusticated ves-
sels and consists of both vertical and horizontal
finger impressions. There is one sherd from a
finer vessel with linear finger-nail impressions.

Location Christchurch.

ITFORD HILL, Sussex. (TQ 447053).


Site Deverel-Rimbury settlement but a Beaker storage pit
was located to the north of hut C which was the
most westerly hut of the settlement.

Pottery None of the pottery from the site is reconstructable.

One of the sherds is from a fine ware vessel deco-
rated with horizontal and (?)oblique comb lines
and the comb would seem to have had small round
teeth in contrast to the usual square or rectangu-
lar teeth of Beaker combs. The remainder of the
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pottery would appear to be fingernail rusticated ware and again forms are not reconstructable though the pots would appear to have had bulbous bodies and straight and upright necks. Both linear and random fingernail impressions appear to be present. Perhaps about six vessels are represented by the sherds.

Location Lewes.

ITFORD HILL BARROW, Sussex. (TQ 44670541).


Site Circular barrow surrounded by a penannular pit and twelve postholes. The central burial was an urned cremation. The barrow was possibly connected with the settlement above as the Deverel-Rimbury pot from both sites was very similar. Beaker pottery was found below the mound and in the mound material and was obviously residual from a settlement.

Pottery Some is illustrated on fig. HEA. 1:10-17. Again there are no reconstructable vessels but the pottery would appear to have had straight but slightly everted necks and bulbous bodies. There would appear to have been several combs used on the fine ware, a rectangular comb, and ones with round teeth (HEA 1:17). Comb and fingernail impressions are also combined. Chevrons would seem to be the most frequent motif used on the fine ware. About 17 vessels are represented by the sherds, seven of which are fine ware vessels and the rest fingernail rusticated. Some
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of the fingernail sherds have raised 'pellets'
of displayed clay at one side of each impression.
This would seem to be a deliberate effect.

Location Lewes.

KENNAY, Aberdeenshire.
Site Surface find.
Pottery One Beaker represented.
Location N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

KENNEL HALL KNOWE, Northumberland (NY 667898).
Site Romano-British native site. Two earlier pits
were found in area A and Beaker sherds were
recovered from pit A. There was no skeletal
material found in the pit.
Pottery Eleven sherds of Beaker were recovered from pit A
and probably represent a single fine ware vessel.
Much of the pottery was in a very abraded condi-
tion, and the vessel is not reconstructable. It
seems to have had alternating decorated and unde-
corated zones and the predominant motif used on
the sherd is combed chevrons. The comb used has
had fine rectangular teeth.
Location With G. Jobey.

KILELLAN FARR, Islay. (NR 266721).
Site Sand dune midden site covering an ephemeral stone
structure which the excavator suggested may have
KILELLAN FARM, continued....
been a place for shellfish preparation and cooking.

Pottery
Illustrated on figs. KIL. 1 - KIL. 5. The pottery is discussed in detail above (p. 467).

Location
With C.B. Burgess.

KILENAM, Yorkshire. (TA 056673).


Site Long barrow. Beaker came from an occupation layer at the east end of the north quarry ditch.

Pottery
With the exception of a sherd from an AOC combed Beaker and a sherd carrying incised herringbone decoration both from the south quarry ditch, all pottery comes from the occupation deposit mentioned above and is AOC Beaker. No vessels are reconstructable and there are no rusticated vessels. The pots would appear to have had an undecorated zone beneath the rim and internal rim decoration appears to be present on one sherd. There is also a sherd from near the base of a vessel exhibiting three lines of plaited cord impressions which are, typically, quite widely spaced. About 6 vessels are represented.

Location
With T.G. Manby.

KILN COMBE, Sussex.

Ref. Bell, M., pers. comm.

Site Spread of Beaker domestic material found below 1.7m. of hillwash on a dry valley floor.

Pottery
Some illustrated on fig. L.D. 1:5-10. The pottery is all very small indeed and often very abraded.
KILN COMBE, continued.

The Beaker is nearly all combed and much of the decoration that survives consists of short straight lines but it is unlikely that there is any 400mb present. Comb decoration is also combined with reed impressions, single fingernail, paired fingernail and incision. It would appear to be from a fairly late assemblage. The haphazard decoration on L.D. 1:10 is unusual and does not seem to constitute a motif from the usual Beaker repertoire. Finger pinching is the predominant rustication technique. There also appears to be an element of Peterborough pottery in the assemblage (L.D. 1:8 and 9) one undecorated sherd with a heavy inturned rim and probably from a small hemispherical bowl, and one from the shoulder of a (?)Fortlake bowl. It is uncertain whether the three circular impressions on the shouldered sherd constitute deliberate decoration. There is also a flat inturned rim from another possible Peterborough bowl.

Location

With M. Bell.

KIRKBURN, LOCKERBIE, Dumfries. (NY 130832).


Site Series of pits on a natural knoll. Some pits contained cremation burials while others contained domestic debris.

Pottery Pottery from the site included Western Neolithic, Peterborough ware, Beaker, Food Vessel and Urn. The pottery is discussed above (p. 117).

Location
KNAPP HILL, Wiltshire. (SU 121636).


Site Causewayed Camp. Beaker sherds found in the upper ditch silts.

Pottery About seven or eight Beakers are represented from the upper ditch silts but are not to be regarded as stratified. They are from late Beakers (step 5 or 6) and there appears to be no rusticated ware associated with them. Filled chevrons and lozenges would appear to be the predominant motif and comb, fingernail incision, and small oval impressions are all combined though the vessels are still certainly fine ware.

Location Devizes.

KNOWNTH, Co. Meath.


Site Passage grave in the Boyne valley cemetery. There are areas of Beaker activity around the base of the monument. Pits, hearths and post-holes are associated with the activity but no structure plans have been identified. Food remains and flint working also attest considerable domestic activity.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. KNO. 1 - KNO. 3. Described in detail above (p. 140).

Location With G. Eogan.

LAKENHEATH, Suffolk. (TL 1071).


Site Sand dune site. Beaker domestic activity was represented by hearths and a spread of sherds.
LAKEHEATH, continued....

Some pits may also have been present.

Pottery

Beaker and rusticated ware were both recovered from the site. Twenty two combed Beaker sherds are illustrated in the report, each apparently from a different vessel. Comb seems to be combined with incision, fingernail and pinched fingernail decoration. No vessels are reconstructible but they would all appear to be from necked vessels with vertical ornament present, and represent step 5/6 Beakers. There are also sherds from two large potbeakers. One has an ovoid body and everted neck. The zones are narrow and contain basic motifs such as herringbone or oblique lines, and they are also fringed. This is assigned to step 4 by Lanting and van der Waals (1972). The second large vessel is very different. It has a short upright neck and ovoid body but the neck is also decorated with two cords that run horizontally round it. The decoration would appear to be incised and combed. As well as a rectangular toothed comb a round toothed also seems to have been used on at least one sherd. A sherd from a handled Beaker is also present and perhaps fig. 7a in the report represents a hemispherical bowl, or else an extremely rounded neck. Only three sherds of rusticated ware are illustrated. Two base sherds are decorated with linear single fingernail impressions while they also give no indication of form. The third sherd is a rim sherd with paired fingernail impressions, also linear, and has an everted rim and a probably
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smooth ovoid profile.

Location Ipswich, Cambridge.

LAKEHEATH, Suffolk, (TL 718840).


Site Two hundred sherds of Beaker and rusticated ware were recovered during ploughing of the area.

Pottery About 16 vessels are estimated to have been represented by the sherds. Comb decorated and incised decoration are both present and though no fine ware vessels are reconstructable step 5/6 can be assigned to the assemblage. The predominant motifs are open running chevron, cross hatching, comb and fingernail impressions and also metoped decoration. Paired and single nail impressions decorate the coarse ware. The proportion of fine to coarse ware is not known.

Location Ipswich, Cambridge.

LAMBourn, Berkshire, (SU 323834).


Site Earthen long barrow. Beaker, Peterborough, Western Neolithic and Urn pottery were all found in the upper levels of the ditch so cannot be regarded as stratified.

Pottery The pottery is not illustrated in the report and has not been seen by the writer, but it does not seem to be extensive. Only two sherds appear to be decorated, one with combed herringbone, and the other with paired fingernail impressions below an irregular combed line.
LAMEOURN, continued...

Location

LATCH FARM, Hampshire.


Site Round barrow with primary collared Urn cremation and secondary Deverel-Rimbury cremations. Beaker came from GGS below the barrow.

Pottery There were some undecorated sherds from the GGS and also a sherd of a necked Beaker with an inturned rim. It is probably from a step 6 Beaker.

Location Christchurch.

LATCH FARM, LOWER CLOSE, Hampshire.


Site Found during gravel quarrying.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. K.N. 1: Latch Farm 1 - 3. Five Beakers are recorded from the site, one of which is funerary and the other four are domestic. There are also sherds from three rusticated pots and a food vessel though their contexts are unknown.

Location Christchurch.

LAURISTIC TARRANT, Dorset.


Site Barrow 11 had double ditches which had been left open and allowed to silt after the barrow construction. The inner ditch had cut through a Beaker pit filled with domestic debris which had spilled out into the ditch itself.
Pottery

The pottery forms an apparently early assemblage from AOC, AOcombed and comb zoned Beaker. The AOC and AOcombed sherds would seem to have had the decoration contracted into zones, and one of the AOcombed vessels has an everted and externally cordoned rim. The comb-zoned sherd has the zone filled with herringbone and bordered by four horizontal lines and it is in keeping with the early date of the assemblage. The rusticated pottery consists of two sherds with fingernail impressions (single), a sherd decorated with diagonal whipped maggots, a sherd decorated with a round-toothed comb and one with finger raised cordons but with little of the finger impressions surviving. The assemblage seems to have consisted of 10 vessels with the fine and coarse wares evenly balanced.

Location

Dorchester.

LION POINT, CLACTON, Essex.


Site

Beaker came from a 'pit dwelling' at site 4, a 'cooking hole' in area 2, and a 'cooking hole' on site 114. From the large amount of pottery seen by the writer at the British Museum it would appear that other unpublished excavations had taken place, or else that not all the pottery was published. It also proved very difficult in the time available to exactly provenance a lot of the pottery.

Pottery

A selection is illustrated here on fig. 1.P.C. 1 and 1.P.C. 2. The pottery from site 114 is a EW
LION POINT, continued.....

Beaker assemblage with two Beakers associated with sherds of fingernail rusticated and grooved vessels. It would appear to be from a sealed context and so is interesting in the way that it has two fine ware vessels, secondary and coarse ware in the same assemblage.

Location B.M.

LITTLE DOWNHAM, Cambridgeshire.


Site No details.

Pottery This is illustrated on fig. L.D. 1:1-4. The pottery consists of two Beaker sherds and two rusticated sherds. One of the Beaker sherds (L.D. 1:1) is from a necked Beaker with vertical decoration but not enough of the second vessel survives to allow pontification. The rusticated sherds (L.D. 1:3 and 4) probably come from the same vessel as they seem to both combine whipped decoration with fingernail impressions scattered randomly over the surface of the pot.

Location Cambridge.

LITTLE HOUGHTON, Northamptonshire. (SP 8059).


Site A pear-shaped pit 2.6m long by 3.4m deep which was found during road construction.

Pottery No details except that a quantity of decorated Beaker pottery was found.

Location With D.A. Jackson.
Llanbedgai, N. Wales.


Site: Henge B, class II. Pit found near the inner lip of the ditch.

Pottery: No details except that the pit contained fragments of crushed necked Beakers.

Location: Not located.

Lochanhead of Daviot, Aberdeenshire.


Site: Recumbent stone circle. See above (p. 74) for the contexts of the Beaker sherds.

Pottery: Illustrated on K.H. 1. It is discussed above (p. 74).

Location: N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

Lochhill, Dumfries. (NX 969651).


Site: Long cairn covering a facade and mortuary structure of a type often found beneath earthen long barrows.

Pottery: Beaker was found among the stones of the upper part of the mound midway along the central axis. No details except that the sherds are from N3 Beakers according to Clarke's scheme.

Location: With L. Masters.

Lodge Hill, Buckinghamshire.

Ref: Head, J.F., 1955 and pers. comm.

Site: It is possible that the pottery from the Lodge Hill barrows and the Cop Hill barrows, both excavated by Mr. Head has since been confused.
LODGE HILL, continued,...

The Lodge Hill barrows were badly disturbed by badgers and foxes so it is not certain that the sherds do not come from disturbed burials. Mr. Head, however, recalls flints 'which would not be out of place on a living site' and 'a burnt deposit - 2" deep - of charcoal etc. apparently in situ' (Head 1979 pers. comm.)

Pottery

The pottery from the site is illustrated on fig. L.H. 1. It comprises of a number of sherds of fine ware Beaker plus one or two sherds that may be from collared urns. The Beaker sherds are all combed and in the form of small sherds that cannot be reconstructed. L.H. 1:3 has a slight cordon below the rim and motifs present on the Beaker sherds consists of bordered zones of cross-hatching or oblique lines, fairly basic motifs that are long-lived in the Beaker tradition. There would not appear to be any late traits such as vertical decoration present but it is impossible to say that the sherds are early for sure. The comb(s) used are all of the oblong-tooth variety with the exception of one sherd (L.H. 1:12) which has been decorated with a round-toothed comb.

Rusticated vessels are not well-represented (L.H. 1:10) consisting of one sherd exhibiting paired fingernail impressions. Grooved ware is also represented by a couple of sherds (L.H. 1:6 and 15). One is a rim sherd with nicks occurring at the top and three horizontal lines on the outside. It may tentatively be identified as a Clacton
LODGE HILL, continued....

style vessel. The fabric is, however, rather fine. Undecorated vessels are also present (L.H. 1:18, 16-18) and the profile and fabric of L.H. 1:19 suggests that it may be from a collared urn. L.H. 1:13 may also be from a small urn in fine thin fabric.

Location Aylesbury.

LOUGH GUR, Co. Limerick.


Site Beaker was found in varying quantities at site C, D, H, and I, and the controversy of O’Riordain’s stratigraphy has already been outlined above (p.218). Beaker may, therefore, be associated with the small circular houses on site C, the oval houses on site D, the ‘U’-shaped structure on site H and the stone structures on site I. This cannot be tested, however, until the sites are re-excavated.

Pottery A very small selection is illustrated on fig. KNO. 5. The vast amount of pottery and the nature of its storage in the National Museum of Antiquities of Ireland made viewing impossible for the writer. O’Riordain’s drawings have been relied on and the pottery is discussed in detail above (p.284).

Location N.M.A.I. Dublin.

LUCE BAY, (GLENUCE), Wigtownshire.

LUGNAY, continued....

Site Sand dune middens on various parts of the bay.

Pottery The pottery in the National Museum of Antiquities of Edinburgh has been illustrated in figs. GLE 1 - GLE 10. The pottery is discussed in detail above (p. 129).

Location Kelvingrove, N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

LUNDIN FARM, Perthshire. (NN 882505).


Site Standing stones set around a burial mound.

Beaker and urn frags. found in the mound material.

Pottery The Beaker fragments are broken and abraded and suggested to the excavator that they were broken before deposition. They represent a single AOC vessel. The urn was also fragmentary and the interior was carbon encrusted which suggested a domestic function to the excavator. The collar of the urn was decorated with filled chevrons of plaited cord impressions.

Location N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

LYLES HILL, Co. Antrim.

Ref. Evans, E.N., 1953.

Site Late Neolithic enclosure. Beaker was found under the turf of a cairn inside the enclosure.

Pottery The majority of the pottery from the monument was Lyles Hill ware. Beaker is represented by a single sherd with three comb lines visible on the surface.

Location Belfast.
LYNDE, Hampshire.


Site 'Pit dwelling' 6ft.6ins. deep and 5ft. in diameter at the base. There was also an 8ins. deep charcoal layer at the bottom of the pit. The Beaker was found against the east wall of the pit and contained some 'black material'.

Pottery The Beaker is reconstructable as a step 6 vessel with three zones of chevron decoration.

Location Christchurch.

MAIDEN CASTLE, Dorset.


Site Causewayed camp and Neolithic bank barrow beneath the Iron Age hillfort.

Pottery Pottery is described above (p.63).

Location London Inst., Dorchester.

MAIDEN'S GRAVE, Yorkshire.


Site Henge monument. No other details.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. F.G. 1:27,28. Two sherds from the site may be Beaker rusticated ware and may be from the same vessel. Decoration on the rim sherd comprises two fingernail impressions.

Location Hull.

MANNHAM HILL, Yorkshire.


Site Thought to be an occupation spread.

Pottery Most of the pottery from the site is illustrated on figs. M.H. 1 - M.H.2. The majority of the
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Pottery would seem to be from the Grooved Ware tradition with Grooved and ribbed sherds being obvious in the illustrations. Beaker is quite rare among the assemblage and tends to be represented by some fine rusticated ware (M.H. 1:1, 3–5, 15 etc.) some undecorated pottery (M.H. 1:17, 19), and some incised ware (M.H. 2:27, 29–32). Combed or cord decorated pottery is altogether absent. Beaker fine and coarse ware combined possibly represent 14.9% of the total, ribbed pottery represents 23.4%, fingernail rusticated ware represents 29.8%, and nn-Beaker incised or grooved pottery represents 26.6% and undecorated pottery represents the remaining 5.3%. Incised Beaker as a percentage of the total pottery represents only 5.3%.

Location Scarborough.

MANTON WARREN, Lincolnshire.

Ref. Riley, D.N., 1957.

Site Sand dune site. One of a number around Risby Warren.

Pottery See Risby Warren below. A few sherds are illustrated on fig. MISC. 1:1–3.

Location Scunthorpe.

MARTLESHAM HEATH, BARROW 1, Suffolk. (TM 24584570).


Site (?)barrow site. The barrow had no ditches and no burials but did cover a spread of occupation debris.
**MARTLESHAM HEATH, BARROW I**, continued...

**Pottery**

The pottery is not particularly 'fine' and has all the appearance of a domestic assemblage. It would appear that only about 4% of the pottery was fine B&W decorated Beaker while 27.5% are fingernail rusticated and a further 68.6% are undecorated. Possible reconstructed profiles for the pottery seem to show an East Anglian ovoid body with slight everted rim while some also have a slightly flaring neck as if from ultimate Maritime Beaker derivation and all the pottery would fit happily into step 3 for East Anglia. An element of step 4 Beaker might be seen in some of the rusticated and undecorated 'coarse' ware flaring necks. If they are step 4, however, this need not detract from chronological homogeneity of the assemblage.

**Location**

Not located.

---

**MARTLESHAM HEATH, BARROW II**, Suffolk. (TM 25514530).

**Ref.**


**Site**

No trace of the barrow survived, and there was no ditch or burial. Instead, there were about 1,000 sherds of domestic pottery recovered.

**Pottery**

The assemblage has been well written up in the report and the statistics are quoted here:

'A high proportion of the pottery (21%, approximately half the decorated pottery) was ornamented with... barbed wire impressions; 15% of the pottery was decorated with fingernail impressions. Other forms of decoration were sparsely represented: comb stamped, 2.6%; plain stamped, 3.8%; incised 3.8%; bone impressions 0.1%, stick end impressions 0.1%. The decorative motifs displayed on the pottery are very limited, the favourite being horizontal lines, sometimes grouped into zones...
MARTLESHAM HEATH, B ARROW II, continued.

Also...herringbone, ladder motifs, fringe motifs, cordons below the rim are also present... (Martin, ibid. p.28).

The finger rusticated ware is all comparatively fine with fingernail impressions rather than fingertip or pinched. The shapes of the pottery ascertainable are either ovoid Beakers with everted necks or else Maritime derived vessels similar to the site above, and the size range varies considerably with some very large undecorated vessels being present but having a similar shape to the small fine ware types. A step 3 date may be given to the assemblage.

Location
Not located.

MARTLESHAM HEATH, B ARROW III, Suffolk. (TM 25494529).


Site Barrow with ring ditch below but no grave. Beaker was found over the site but randomly and seem to have been residual.

Pottery The pottery is very similar in character to the pottery from the barrow above and again Martin's statistics are quoted:-

'The most common forms of decoration are: Fingernail impressions or fingerpinching, 18.4%; and;... barbed wire impressions, 16.0%. Less common forms of decoration are: comb stamped, 5.8%; plain stamped, 4.9%, finger-smoothed horizontal lines, 9.7%. A large proportion of the sherds are... plain, 32%. The decorative motifs employed are again very limited...' (Martin, A. E. ibid. p.58).

The pottery is again assignable to step 3 and it is likely that it is derived from the same settlement as the pottery from barrow II. It is also possible that the pottery represents scatter on
MARTLESHAM HEATH, BARROW III, continued....

Fields as manuring processes and as a result of cleaning out huts that may await to be discovered nearby.

**Location** Not located.

MARTLESHAM PLANTATION, Suffolk. (TM 24074596).


**Site** Barrow mound that had secondary (apparently) burials inserted into the mound material (cremations) but did not seem to have a central primary burial. A hearth was found below the barrow and domestic pottery was also recovered.

**Pottery** There is not nearly as much pottery from below this barrow as from the other Martlesham Heath examples above but rusticated sherds were recovered, which were thought to have been from a destroyed burial but which are more likely to be the last vestiges from the same settlement that was responsible for the debris below the above sites.

**Location** Ipswich.

MARGHAM HEATH, Norfolk.

**Ref.** Unpublished.

**Site** No details. Surface collection?

**Pottery** Illustrated on Fig. H.Q. 1:25 - 26. Two rusticated sherds are represented and there is no fine ware. One sherd is decorated with fingertip impressions and the other with fingernail incised cords.

**Location** Kings-Lynn.
HAUGHTBURY RINGS, DORCHESTER, Dorset.


Site Henge monument below the Roman amphitheatre.

Most of the earlier features had been destroyed by the later monument but some shafts survived.

Pottery The only Beaker sherd to have survived is a rim sherd exhibiting two sloping lines of comb impressions made by a comb with round teeth.

Location Dorchester.

NELSON QUARRY, Yorkshire.


Site No details. 'But circles' are mentioned.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. M.Q. 1. The Beaker from this site is all incised and seems to have chevron and filled lozenge motifs though no vessels are represented by more than a couple of sherds. The sherds are all either incised, undecorated, or finger-impressed. One sherd possibly from a Food Vessel or fine grooved ware has two internal horizontal comb lines and diagonal cord lines on the outside. Of the twenty three sherds, only about three can confidently be identified as Beaker (N.Q. 1:10, 16, 19) but it is possible that some of the undecorated rim sherds may also be from this class, seven are incised and the rest undecorated.

(N.B. due to an error in the numbering sequence, there is no No. M.Q. 1:7).

Location Hull.
MERTHYR MAWR, Glamorgan.

Savory, H.N. 1953.

Site Sand dune site with pottery revealed by wind erosion.

Pottery The Beaker sherds are nearly all from combed Beakers with incision and shell impressions also present. One sherd has four lines of horizontal comb impressions on its surface and could be from an AOcombed Beaker but this is not certain. Filled chevrons would appear to be the favourite motif.

Location Cardiff.

METHOLD, Norfolk. (TF 699332).


Site No details but it would appear to have been a domestic scatter.

Pottery Much of the coarse ware is illustrated on fig. M1 - M5. It is unlikely that all the pottery is associated but details of stratigraphy were not available. Of the fine ware Beaker it is possible that there may be an element of AOc Beaker (M1:17,21) but in the main the pottery is late, consists of about 52 sherds and is made up of 21% open running chevron decoration, 3.8% of herringbone zones, 11.5% is combed cross hatching, 15.3% of ladder motif, 1.9% of open triangles between horizontal lines and 34% is pottery with only horizontal lines being present. The remaining 12.5% is from combed Beaker with the motifs not in evidence. Whereas some Beakers
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may be as early as step 2, it is clear that some
are as late as step 6. Also hinting at a wide
date range is the presence of urn pottery (MET 2:4,
MET 3:1) and later Neolithic pottery from the
Peterborough tradition (MET 3:2) as well as what
may be pottery from the Grimstone/Lyles Hill series
(MET 2:20). Some of the rusticated ware may have
a basic ovoid East Anglian shape (MET 2:1) but the
absence of Barbed wire decoration should be noted.
Both light and heavy finger rustication is present
and often the fingernail impressions are found in
two or more directions on the same sherd (MET 2:15).
Some cordons are also present (MET 1:20, 25, 27)
but these may be from later urn-like vessels. In-
cision, though present, is not frequent (MET 2:21,
25, 29).

Location Norwich; Kings Lynn.

MILDENHALL PEN, Suffolk.

Ref. S.I.P. IVG. D. 7436

Site No details, possible occupation spread.

Pottery This is illustrated on fig. M.F. 1 - M.F. 4. The
association of all the pottery from this site is
very dubious and it may be possible that a number
of sub-sites are represented. In addition to the
combed Beaker sherds, which are not numerous, there
is also some Beaker rusticated ware (M.F. 1:15)
but a great deal of pottery that seems very indi-
vidual in character and possibly related to Collared
Urn pottery. Bowls with biconical profiles are also
present (M.F. 3:1, 2, M.F. 4:3), and much of the cord
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decorated pottery (M.P. 2:1, 11, 16, 17 etc.) seem to be from Food Vessels while some other cord decorated sherds, including plaited cord (M.P. 2:7, 18, 19, 23, 24 etc.) may be more likely to come from Collared Urn pottery. Some Several-Bisbury influenced pottery would also seem to be present (M.P. 3:4), and at the other end of the chronological span a sherd from a Neolithic carrinated bowl (M.P. 4:10).

Location Cambridge.

MILTON BUCKINGHAM, Buckinghamshire, (SP 88163864).


Site Ring ditch. Beaker pottery came from the ditch silts.

Pottery No details except that sherds from an AOC Beaker and also from a step 6/7 Beaker were found, as well as an undecorated Beaker base. They were not strictly associated. There was also the base from an incised Beaker and a similar sherd from a combed Beaker from unstratified positions.

Location Not located.

MONCRIEFF, Perthshire, (NO 132193).


Site Stone circle and cairn site. Beaker sherds associated with phase II of the site marking the transition of the site from a henge with timber uprights so a stone circle.

Pottery Beaker sherd of unknown type came from the fill of the ditch of the henge which was deliberately
MONCRIFFE, continued.

filled when changed to a stone circle.

Location Not located.

MONKEN, Co. Cork.


Site Cairn overlying an earlier Neolithic monument.

Beaker-like pottery comes from the cairn material and from secondary contexts in the ditch of the earlier monuments.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. MON. 1. MON 1:1 and 2 are probably from a Food Vessel but the chevron decoration is Beaker influenced. Some of the incised pottery (MON 1:9,11) are also quite similar to Beaker were it not for the porous fabric.

Location U.C. Cork.

MONKNOWN, Co. Meath, (O 0176).


Site Domestic enclosure rather similar to a henge monument. There was a hut site inside the monument and patches of occupation debris which had no internal stratification recognisable by the excavator.

Pottery A selection is illustrated on fig. MNK. 1. The pottery is discussed above (p. 127).

Location With D.P. Sweetman.

MOUNT PLEASANT, Dorset. (SY 710899).


Site Wessex henge monument with an internal wooden structure similar to the type known from
Durrington Walls and other Henge monuments. The Bank and ditch were later replaced by a large palisade which enclosed the hill-top. Beaker seems to be secondary at the site and comes from the post holes of the timber structure, the secondary ditch silts and stone holes where it forms the majority of the pottery recovered, and the palisade trench, and the Conquer barrow ditch. The pottery has been admirably written up by Ian Longworth in the excavation report and attention is drawn to that. The majority comes from the secondary and tertiary silts of the ditch at site IV, and Dr. Longworth states that 'the Beaker pottery from the site is of particular interest not only for its range and chronological span but also for the multiplicity of traditions apparently in contemporary use on the site' (p.86). According to Clarke's scheme, for example, European and Southern 2 - 3 Beakers were all found in the secondary silts of site IV ditch, at least a step 2 to step 5 gap in Lanting and van der Waals' scheme, and possibly even step 2 to 6. Step 1 to step 7 Beakers come from Mount Pleasant with a full range of rusticated ware including fingernail cordoned ware. The implications of this are that the styles of Beaker represented may all be contemporary or at least show a degree of overlap that had not previously been envisaged. It may also be, however, that the vessels did not need to have been made at the same time just because
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they were deposited at roughly the same time.
The secondary silting may also have been a good
deal slower than the excavator envisaged.

**Location**
Dorchester.

**Norfolk.**

**Ref.**
Unpublished.

**Site**
No details.

**Pottery**
Illustrated on fig. *MET* 3:12-17. In addition
to the illustrated sherds, there are two other
base sherds from a large vessel decorated with
sparse paired fingernail decoration. The other
sherds are from slightly coarser finger-tip deco-
rated sherds. *MET* 3:12 has fingernail decoration
and horizontal raised ribs which is a similar
decorative scheme to a round based bowl from
Runcorn Holme (see above) and so it is possible
that this sherd may have had a similar profile.
*MET* 3:17 is decorated with paired fingertip deco-
ration and also a type of collar as if it comes
from a type of Fangate vessel. No fine ware was
associated with this pottery.

**Location**
King's Lynn.

**Suffolk.**

**Ref.**

**Site**
No details.

**Pottery**
Some illustrated on fig. *F.M.*. Beaker fine ware
is represented at this site by approximately 2
vessels. One is decorated with zones of incised
oblique lines between horizontal lines and also
on the (?):lower part with filled chevrons. A
second vessel is decorated with narrow zones of ladder pattern. It is difficult to assign this sherd evidence to a step, but it would certainly seem to represent late vessels. Rusticated ware is represented by both fingernail and fingertip impressed pottery (N.M. 1:3 and 4) and in keeping with the late fine ware is a vessel with finger raised cordons running both vertically and horizontally (N.M. 1:6 and 7). There would also seem to be an undecorated vessel perhaps representing the secondary ware of the assemblage, and this would appear to have had a sinuous 's'(?)shaped profile (N.M. 1:5). N.M. 1:1 is from a vessel with a horizontal cordon in the neck which is a form seen on some early assemblages but the upright neck of this vessel might suggest a later modification of an earlier form.

Location Ipswich.

NESS OF GRUTING, Shetland.


Site Shetland stone house.

Pottery This was discussed in the above report by Isla McInnes and 'seems to have a certain amount of Beaker influence as if Beaker imitation. It is discussed above (p. 47).

Location N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

NETTLEBRIDGE, COCKLES WOOD CAVE, Somerset, (646486).

Site

Cave site. Occupation deposits were found including charcoal and food remains, including animal bones. Fragments of human bone were also found among the debris.

Pottery

Grooved Ware, Beaker and rusticated ware were found in apparently the same layer at Nettlebridge. The Grooved Ware is from a single vessel. It had curved sides indicative of a bowl shape or a kind of shallow tub. The multiple horizontal grooves have been formed by deeply incising a broad point into the wet clay. The Beaker is a fine burnished vessel decorated with comb impressions. The decoration forms two broad zones on the vessel, the upper consisting of opposed filled chevrons, and the lower comprising of a broad zone of cross hatching with a small zone of vertical herringbone below that. The neck and decoration suggest a step 5/6 vessel. The rusticated pottery is represented by two sherds of the same vessel. It has been decorated with opposed fingernail impressions that have resulted in low rounded horizontal cords being raised.

Location

Taunton.

Newborough Warren, Anglesey.

Ref.


Site

Sand dune scatter similar to many sites from western and eastern Scotland. There are no details of any concrete settlement evidence except the mention of occasional charcoal.
NEWBROUGH WARENN, continued....

Pottery

This is comprised of small sherds with no vessels reconstructable and about 12 or so pots represented. Again in keeping with some of the Scottish sites of this type, the Beaker would seem to be fairly early in the sequence. AOC vessels are represented for instance and though there are no AOCombed Beakers sensu stricto there does seem to be a Beaker with an early European Bell Beaker shape but with AOCshell impressed decoration which produces an effect very similar to comb. The rim sherd from this vessel would appear to have had a cordon about 1.5cm below the lip. Combed vessels are decorated with both rectangular and round-toothed combs. The motifs are simple and some have cordons below the rim. Ladder pattern and (?)open chevrons are both represented as well as one sherd of cross-hatching. The rusticated sherds are all from fine fingernail decorated vessels with the impressions being light and randomly spaced rather like the comparable vessels from Ross Links (see below). Again cordoned rims are present. An incised sherd with (?) filled triangle decoration may be from a later Beaker and not part of the earlier assemblage.

Location Bangor.

NEWGROANER. Co. Meath.


Site Beaker settlement overlying the collapsed quartz wall and rubble of the large passage grave at
Newgrange. continued...

Newgrange. The settlement comprised a series of pits, postholes and trenches with hearths also being present.

Pottery
Illustrated on fig. NEW 1 - NEW 4. The pottery has been described above (p. 154).

Location
With M.J. O'Kelly.

Newton, Glamorgan.

Res.

Site
Cairn with a primary pit cremation of an adult and child. Below the cairn was an arc of eight postholes which, if projected, would constitute a circle c.7.4m. in diameter, and which Savory took to represent a hut. Associated with this was a hearth and fragments of necked Beaker.

Pottery
Combed Beaker would appear to be the minority among the pottery and the assemblage is mostly made up of incised Beaker. No Beaker is reconstructable but angles suggest that they have had bulbous lower profiles and perhaps upright or everted necks as small straight sherds are also present. The zones would appear to be expectedly broad with filled chevron/losanges being the predominant motif. One sherd has large sweeping incised herringbone. There are no rusticated sherds though none of the pottery is particularly fine.

Location
Cardiff.

Normandy Park, Lincolnshire.

Ref.
Riley, D.N., 1957.
NORTH BERWICK, TUSCULUM, East Lothian.


Site Beaker occupation site discovered below a medieval floor. Food remains in the form of animal bones were found, and though charcoal occurred throughout the deposit only one hearth was located near the top.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. TUS 1 - TUS 3. The pottery is discussed above (p. 67).

Location N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

NORTHTON, Harris. (NF 976913).


Site Site with Neolithic, Beaker and later phases of occupation. Beaker was represented in two levels and associated with two oval huts, partly subterranean, one of which was more or less intact and the other similar structure was largely destroyed. See above (p. 134 ff).

Pottery This has been illustrated on fig. NOR 1 - NOR 6, and Richard Langley's illustrations have been included as supplementary drawings. His plate numbers have been retained. I am grateful to Derek Simpson for allowing me to use these...
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illustrations. The pottery is discussed above
(p. 34).

Location With D. A. Simpson.

KUTBANE, Hampshire. (SU 330459).
Site Earthen Long Barrow. Beaker found in the upper
layers of the ditches. Food bones were also
found in this horizon.

Pottery The Beaker represented was a biconical vessel
according to Case in the above ref. and is illus-
trated on fig. R. M. 2. It is decorated with
narrow zones of cross-hatched comb impressions
between horizontal lines of the same technique.

Location Not located.

OFFAM HILL, Sussex, (TQ 399118).
Site Causewayed camp. Beaker came from high up (layer
2) in the ditch fill.

Pottery Beaker was represented by a single vessel. This
was a step 3 vessel that was decorated with zones
consisting solely of horizontal combed lines.

Location Inst. London.

OLD KILG, Aberdeenshire. (NJ 593195).
Site Recumbant stone circle. Beaker sherds were found
in a 'grey' layer possibly assignable to the con-
struction phase of the monument.
OLD KEC, continued...

Pottery
The pottery was all in small sherds and consisted of combed sherds with herringbone motif.

Location
N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

OLD HAYNE, Aberdeenshire. (NJ679280)

Ref.

Site
Recumbant stone circle. Archer's wrist guard came from the central pit.

Pottery
Beaker was perhaps a step 3 vessel and comb decorated.

Location
N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

OLD SACHN, Wiltshire.

Ref.

Site
Three 'U'-shaped pits c.1ft. deep and 2ft. diameter were found in a section of a pipe-line excavation. They were filled with grey earthy material and two pits produced Beaker and later Neolithic pottery.

Pottery
Ten small abraded sherds were recovered, one having combed decoration. Some small sherds also had fingernail impressions and cord impressions.

Location
Not located.

ORSETT, Essex.

Ref.

Site
Causewayed camp. Beaker came only from feature CF121, a pit in the interior of the camp.

Pottery
Consists of very small sherds representing an AOC Beaker.

Location
Not located.
ORTON LONGUEVILLE, Huntingdonshire.


Site Cremation pit. Sherds found above the layer holding the cremation in the fill of the pit and were not associated with the burial. They were perhaps residual.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. O.H. 1:16 - 18. Three vessels are represented, two collared vessels and a small collared rim sherd with incised decoration (O.H. 1:16) and in a Beaker-like fabric.

Location Cambridge.

OVERA HEATH, Norfolk.

Ref. Acland, R., 1921.

Site Cooking place with pits and a layer of pot boilers 6ins. deep. Scrapers, a barbed and tanged arrowhead, and pottery were all discovered in this layer.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. O.H. 1. The pottery consists of small sherds and has no reconstructable vessel, and few vessels are represented by more than one sherd. Combed Beaker is rare (O.H. 1:9) and the only sherd consists of a rim sherd with two comb lines visible. This is not sufficient to hint at the shape of, or the motifs employed on, the vessel. One sherd has small oval impressions also arranged in two horizontal lines (O.H. 1:1) and may be an attempt to imitate comb or simply an alternative form of decoration. One sherd has lines of small triangular impressions (O.H. 1:8) of a type also seen at Newgrange (NEW 2:16) but
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rare elsewhere in Britain and on Beaker pottery generally. Fingernail impressions are all single and neatly executed. There is no finger-pinching present. There are also four sherds with whipped decoration all in the same fine fabric (O.H. 1:2, 3, 12, 13). They may be related to the Barbed Wire pottery of East Anglia but in this case the whipping is very close and fine in comparison to the usually more open impressions on BW pottery. Fine whipped decoration of this type is also found at Newgrange but it is more common than the small triangular impressions mentioned above. A maximum of 12 vessels are represented here and all are quite fine.

Location Norwich.

OVERTON DOWN, Wiltshire. (SU 11936834).


Site Barrow 6a was found to date to the Roman period. Nearby was a pit filled with food remains including the bones of ox, sheep/goat, dog, and flint flakes and a scraper. Soil analysis suggested that the fill of the pit was derived from the surrounding topsoil. The pit also contained Fen­gate sherds. A Beaker sherd came from the mound material and may be contemporary with the pit though this is by no means certain.

Pottery The pottery from the pit was, without exception, in the Fenge­gate style characterised by its over­hanging rim and truncated body. The Beaker sherd from the mound material was from an AOC Beaker.
OVERTON DOWN, continued....

Location

PAIBLE, North Uist. (NF 715682).


Site Sand dune midden site. Located for a maximum of 100cm. and has a depth of 95cm. in places.

Pottery No details except that AOC pottery was found as a result of wind erosion.

Location N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

PEACOCK'S FARM, SHIFFEA HILL, Cambridgeshire.


Site Spread of occupation debris. Possible cooking site.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. P.F. 1. It is uncertain how much of the pottery illustrated here is strictly associated. The only Beaker sherd located by the writer is P.F. 1:12 which is from a comb decorated Beaker with cross-hatched zones and with herringbone fringing. P.F. 1:6 may be from an AOC vessel but it is equally possible that it came from a Food Vessel or a small bowl. The rest of the pottery seems to have come from Food Vessels or miniature urns. Twisted cord seems to be the favourite decorative technique though there is also some triangular impressions (P.F. 1:7), some incision (P.F. 1:6), and some fingernail impressions (P.F. 1:4). P.F. 1:2, 4, 9, and 14 all have internal bevels and external rim mouldings typical
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of the Food Vessel class. Again the uncertainty of the contemporaneity of this material must be emphasised.

Location Cambridge.

PEN-Y-BONT, Dyfed. (SM 611267).


Site Round mound of earth and rubble with two central pits one of which was associated with an encrusted urn. Two adjacent pits were sealed beneath the edge of the barrow. Beaker came from both pits.

Pottery No details. Fragments of two Beakers came from pit a and were associated with flints. Fragments of one Beaker and an Urn came from pit b.

Location Not located.

PINHOLE CAVE, CRESWELL CRAGS, Derbyshire. (SK 533741).


Site Cave site. Two floors were found. Hearths in the upper level produced rusticated sherds and from the lower floor was a fine ware Beaker.

Pottery Illustrated on PIN 1. The fine ware Beaker is incised and carelessly ornamented with a broad zone of filled lozenges on the upper portion, and possibly a Broad cross-hatched lower zone. It is assignable to step 7. The rusticated sherds are unusual in that the vessel seems to combine fingernail ornament with shallow grooves. The form of the vessel is unknown.

Location Manchester.

Site. Hearth site located by surface finds of pottery and occupation debris in the sandhills.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. P.F.S. 1. As with the site at Peacock’s Farm (above) it is not certain how much of the pottery illustrated here comes from the same horizon(s) and how much it is firmly associated. The pottery certainly seems to represent more than one phase. The pottery seems to be predominantly Beaker or Food Vessel. At least two phases of Beaker are present represented by the sherds with AOcomb decoration from a single vessel with a European Bell Beaker profile and with a cordon below the lip (P.F.S. 1:28) and by the sherds from metope decorated vessels (P.F.S. 1:26) and necked Beakers, (P.F.S. 1:27). The Beaker sherds are all combed with a square-toothed comb and are perhaps from step 5 or 6 vessels judging from the vertical decoration and the inturned neck of (P.F.S. 1:27). One possible Beaker sherd that differs is one sherd that has been decorated with a round-toothed comb but the motif employed is not discernable. Incision has been used on P.F.S. 1:7 and the motif used would appear to be filled chevrons. The finger decorated pottery is nearly all fingernail decorated with both single and paired impressions. Finger pinching occurs on one sherd (P.F.S. 1:21). The Food vessel pottery is both incised and cord decorated. There is no indication as to the form of the ves-
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sels except that the familiar rim bevels and mouldings are present. There is one sherd with very fine whipped decoration (P.F.S. 1:14) which seems to have a ladder motif between two horizontal lines, all in the same technique as if it were being used to imitate comb.

Location Cambridge.

PLEDDON, Essex.


Site 'Fit dwelling', In this were found domestic Beaker and a 'slab' of pottery '1½ ins. thick'.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. ROE 1:4 and 5. Two rusticated vessels are represented and both would appear to be similar rather ovoid vessels with a small upright or slightly everted neck, and paired fingernail decoration starting just below the neck. They are clearly from different vessels and were perhaps made by the same potter.

Location B.M.

POLEDWYTH, Cornwall.

Ref. Information from D. Harris via J.V.S. Megaw.

Site A small mound made up of burnt stones and charcoal.

Pottery No details except that about 100 sherds of comb stamped Beaker were found and that none of the vessels were reconstructable.

Location With D. Harris.
POORS HEATH, suffolk. (TL 794685).


Site Round barrow built in two phases and covering a primary inhumation associated with a hybrid Beaker. The second mound also covered a Beaker inhumation. Large numbers of food remains were found in the mound material suggesting that a settlement was nearby and that the mound was composed of material from that settlement. Bones of ox, pig, sheep, horse, deer, dog, badger and hare were recovered from the mound.

Pottery Two sherds of Beaker were found in the mound material and may be associated with the material above. One is a sherd with horizontal lines made by finely whipped thread and not 'a finely serrated comb' as stated in the report. The form of the vessel is not reconstructable. The second Beaker is represented by sherds from the lower part of the vessel. It is comb decorated, has a bulbous body and a very sharp shoulder. The decoration consists of herringbone and oblique lines between horizontal combed lines.

Location Not located.

POPPLENCHURCH BARROW, WAREBOROUGH, wiltshire.


Site Round barrow, sherds came from the mound material

Pottery Illustrated on fig. PIN 1:3-8. Among the sherds are three sherds of Beaker with horizontal combed line impressions possibly from a combed vessels, though one sherd shows that the comb deco-
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ration was at least contracted if not zoned (PIN 1:7). Another sherd has a single incised line and gives no indication as to motif (PIN 1:8). There is a small rim sherd with no visible decoration (PIN 1:5) and finally a fingernail rusticated rim sherd. The rim is inturned (PIN 1:4) and may be from a barrel-necked vessel or possibly also from a small bowl.

Location Ashmolean.

PORTRUSH, Co. Antrim.


Site Sandhills in the Bann estuary.

Pottery No details except that six sherds of 'thick and coarse' pottery were found. Beaker has, however, come from other sandhills in the immediate vicinity.

Location Belfast.

PORTSTEWART, Co. Derry.


Site Sandhill site. Pottery found in surface scatters.

Pottery A small sherd of incised Beaker came from site A in the sandhill.

Location Belfast.

PEAH SANDS, Cornwall.

Ref. Patchett, F.M., 1944.

Site Midden in sand dune site.
Pottery Only one Beaker is represented and this is a necked vessel with incised and combed decoration consisting of filled triangles and running chevrons. The rim of the vessel is inturned. It is probably to be attributed to step 7.

Location Truro.


Site Bronze Age (and later) hillfort. Beaker sherds came from an I.A. lynchet and from a Roman pit. Both were obviously residual.

Pottery The sherd from the lynchet is a rim sherd from a smooth profiled vessel with a slightly everted neck and which is completely undecorated - at least on the surviving fragment. The sherd from the Roman pit has horizontal incised or blured comb lines.

Location R.W. Museum


Site Barrow site below which was a settlement represented by anumber of pits and postholes. The absence of a turf line sealing the pits suggested to O'Riordain that there was no break in occupation between the settlement and the building of the barrow.

Pottery Neolithic, Beaker and Food Vessel pottery were all present on the site. The Neolithic pottery
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takes the form of Lough Gur class I and class II. Food Vessel is not common. The most common decoration found on these sherds is combed impressions and false relief. Vase and bowl forms would also appear to be present. Beaker forms the majority of the pottery. Most of the decoration is in the form of horizontal combed lines, sometimes combined with ladder motif, ermine motif, cross hatching, fringing or triangles. All the motifs employed are fairly simple. The forms of the vessels are difficult to reconstruct but the motifs would tend to suggest that they may be early and there is also the possibility that there may be some combed vessels present. Of the whole assemblage, Beaker represents 53.5% of the pottery, 26.8% is made up of Food Vessel pottery, 15.5% is Lough Gur class I, and 4.2% is Lough Gur class II. The complete absence of fingernail rusticated pottery should be noted. Lough Gur class II ware probably fulfilling this role.

Location N.M.A.I. Dublin.

RAVESCLIFFE CAVE, Derbyshire.


Site Cave site. In addition to pottery, two polished axes, two ribbed gold strips, and a bronze awl were found.

Pottery No details except that a sherd of 'Beaker type' rusticated ware, a sherd of Peterborough pottery,
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a sherd with a flattened and expanded rim, and a collared sherd were all found.

Location B.M.

REFFLEY WOOD, Norfolk.


Site Barrow with urned cremations built over a Beaker domestic site recognised by a spread of Beaker and rusticated pottery and hearth sites.

Pottery A selection is illustrated on figs. REF. 1. -

REF. 2. It was not possible to draw or examine all the pottery from this site due to shortage of time and also due to its method of storage in the British Museum. All the fine ware from the site that was seen by the writer is from late vessels, c. step 6, which are in the main comb decorated with ladder and chevron motifs (REF. 1:12), and with cross-hatched zones. The pottery compares well with similar material from sites such as Fengate and Chippenham. The finger-rusticated pottery is interesting for its variety and range in sizes and decoration. Fine fingernail decoration is present on some Beakers (REF. 1:1 and 2) and in one case it would seem to be on a vessel with a European BellBeaker profile (REF. 1:2) with an external cordon below the rim and in this case the fingernail decoration would seem to be trying to imitate twisted cord in a technique called 'pseudo-cord'. Also similar to some of the
Fenogate pottery is a sherd with single fingernail impressions and with raised lumps formed from the displaced clay beside them. Single and paired linear and random impressions are all common on the pottery including finger-raised cordons on some larger and heavier vessels (REF 1:5, 2:1-5). In addition to the finger rustication, small triangular points have also been used (REF 1:6, 13) as well as large circular objects (REF 1:19, 20), and there is also an instance of a round-toothed comb having been used (REF 1:11). Incised decoration (REF 1:7, 2:6) and fine whipped impressions (REF 2:9) are also found amongst the pottery, and are doubtless more common than the illustrated material would have us believe.

**Location**
Kings Lynn; E.M.; Norwich.

**RICKINGHALL SUPERIOR,** Suffolk. (TM 04557508).


**Site** Pits found containing charcoal and pottery.

**Pottery** No details except that some 'M.B.A.' pottery was found, and one Beaker sherd was recovered from one of the pits.

**Location** Ipswich.

**RINOC,** Orkney.


**Site** Stone built late Neolithic 'village' of Skara Brae type (see below).
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Pottery
This is predominately Grooved Ware in the Rinyo sub-style. A Beaker was located in house A and would appear to be the only Beaker from the site. It would appear to have a sinuous 'S'-shaped profile with a rather short neck. The decoration is combed and it comprised of a narrow zone of horizontal comb line bordered in effect by multiple chevron fringing on the neck, and mirrored chevrons separated by horizontal lines on the body. Both the shape and the decorations appear to be quite degenerate.

Location
N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

RISBY WARREN, Lincolnshire.

Ref.
Riley, D.N., 1957.

Site
Sand dune site. A number of pits were located and found to be filled with domestic refuse including Beaker and associated pottery. Some of the charcoal stained pottery had spilled out of the pits due to erosion. There was also some evidence for heavy wattle and daub at the site, with grass and bracken being used to bind the clay. The flint material was mostly in the form of simple flakes though scrapers were also quite common, again in keeping with the domestic nature of the site.

Pottery
A selection of the pottery, especially coarse pottery, is illustrated on fig. R.1. 1 - R.1. 15. The fine ware has been quite well illustrated in the report above. The majority of the fine ware
Beakers are late and both incised and combed examples are present. There is also quite a large element of handled Beaker which also tends to be late in the sequence. The majority of the fine Beaker would not seem to be earlier than step 6 and mostly step 7. The exception to this seems to be the presence of a few cord decorated sherds possibly representing ACC Beakers (R.W. 15:4, 6, 10-15) though a lot of the cord decorated pottery is from Food Vessel (R.W. 15:1, 5). It must be remembered, however, that not all the pottery from Rigsby Warren comes in fact from the excavation above, but from a long history of collection from the sand dunes in the area and so, as at similar sites such as Glenluce, the contemporaneity of the pottery must be held suspect. This is especially so of the coarse pottery where some Grooved Ware is present, as well as later Food Vessel related pottery. The fine ware from this site, however, and from nearby sites such as Manton Warren, all seems to be contemporary, at least stylistically, and any chronological discrepancies would not appear to be significant when viewing the assemblages as a whole. Some of the undecorated pottery would appear to be from the Grooved Ware tradition, especially the hollow rims (R.W. 1:16-18) and some of the heavy rounded rims (R.W. 1:1-5) would seem to suggest large bucket shaped vessels. Some of the ribbed pottery (R.W. 2:3-12) is also reminiscent of some pottery
of the Grooved ware tradition especially at sites such as Manham Hill (see above), and, of course, some of the Beaker-associated Lough Cur class II ware in Ireland. Nearly all combinations of fingernail and fingertip decoration are present in the assemblage as at a glance at figs. R.W. 3 to R.W. 10 will show. Scarcely are any vessel forms reconstructable, however, but as well as necked Beaker-like shapes as possibly represented by sherds such as R.W. 2:11, 8:2, 38 there would also seem to be different forms such as bowls (R.W. 2:10), ribbed vessels (R.W. 2:25), and large straight-sided vessels (R.W. 5:12) though it must be remembered that this is based on sherd evidence and the uncertainties of this are self-apparent. Ribs may also be combined with the fingernail impressions, either single or multiple ribs and again these pots may be fairly straight-sided (R.W. 10:16, 18). In keeping with the later date for the assemblage there is a good deal of incised ware from the site (R.W. 11 - R.W. 13). Some of these sherds are certainly from fine ware Beakers but others possibly represent more variations in coarse ware. Some even bear a close resemblance to grooved ware (R.W. 11:9 - 11). Again forms are mostly impossible to reconstruct but both small vessels (R.W. 12:4) and large, possibly tub-shaped, pots both seem to be represented (R.W. 12:1). Not all the sherds have been seen by the writer due to lack of time but of the 822 sherds noted and drawn (excluding the publi-
shed drawings) 40.5% would seem to be from fine ware vessels. 5% are undecorated, 4.1% are decorated with linear single fingertip impressions, 4.3% have linear paired fingertip decoration, 2.4% have random paired fingertip, 9.4% are single fingernail decorated, and 11.8% are from paired fingernail decorated vessels. Of the rest, 21.2% are incised, 24.2% are combed, and only 3.0% are corded.

Location B.M.; Scunthorpe.

ROCKBARTON, Co. Limerick.
Site Pottery and domestic debris appears to have come from all three sites at Rockbarton. Site I was destroyed at the time of the report but had had pottery collected from it, site II consisted of a charcoal and ash spread plus a mound of used pot boilers and produced sherds, scrapers and burnt bone. Site III was similar to the last one mentioned except that there was no mound or pot boilers.

Pottery This is illustrated on fig. ROC. 1. The pottery is described in detail above (p. 247).
Location U.C. Cork.

ROEBERRY, SOUTHBOURNE, Hampshire.
Site No details.
Pottery A selection as illustrated on fig. ROE 1:1-3. The sherds seen by the writer were all from
fingernail decorated vessels, one having a Beaker-like profile and with a cordon below the rim similar to vessels associated with Beakers from Clacton (see above). The fabric of ROE 1:2 is quite fine and may be from a domestic secondary vessel. ROE 1:1 and 1:3 are both rather more coarse.

Location Christchurch.

ROGINISH, Benbecula. (NF 873537).


Site Hebridean midden site with associated stone 'U'-shaped structure possibly representing the end of a structure similar to those at Northton (see above). Plough marks were discovered below the midden which was excavated in a series of random 1m. squares.

Pottery No details other than the small amount illustrated in Shepherd, 1976, and commented on above (p. 134). The writer was denied access to the pottery from the site, either to draw or take notes and so cannot use the site in the discussion except in a minor way.

Location With I.A.G. Shepherd.

ROSS LINK, Northumberland.


Site Coastal sand dune site revealed by erosion.
Pottery

A selection of the pottery is illustrated in fig. ROS 1:1-7. The majority of the pottery from Ross Links is from AOC sherds with low belly carinations and with an undecorated zone beneath the rim of the vessel (ROS 1:2), which identifies them as step 2 vessels. There are no certain step 1 Beakers in the group. Some of the combed sherds, however, have concentric chevron decoration which does not usually appear before step 3 or 4 although the profile of Tait No. 22 is still early. Some sherds have fine whipped cord maggot decoration (ROS 1:4) suggesting immediate contact with the native Neolithic pottery traditions. These are probably the sherds identified as Food Vessels by Brewis and indeed their fabric does differ from classic Beaker but is still finer than a lot of the Food Vessels from the area. The fingernail rusticated vessel (represented by sherds ROS 1:5-7) is also different in fabric to the other Beakers and is slightly more sandy or 'coarse'. The rustication appears to be single and randomly placed impressions. The Ross Links material suggests that it is early but not primary in the British sequence but as AOC Beakers have rather a long life, this stylistically early assemblage need not be chronologically early.

Location M.A.N. Newcastle.

RUDH' AN DUNAIR, Skye.

RHUD' AN DUNAIN, Skye.

**Site**
Cave site. Beaker and associated sherds were found in the lowest of the occupation deposits.

**Pottery**
The pottery is illustrated on fig. ROS 1:8-29, and is discussed above (p. 45).

**Location**
N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

RUDSTONE WOLD, Yorkshire. (TA 10406620).

**Ref.**

**Site**
An oval patch of dark charcoal-filled soil approx. 30ft. in greatest diameter, and 2.5 to 6ins. in depth. Three pits were found within this oval, one of which had cremated bone in it. Charcoal and sherds were found in the area between the pits.

**Pottery**
The Beaker sherds from the site were not numerous, but included two sherds of combed Beaker, one with a zone of oblique lines between two horizontal lines and with the start of a second zone below this. A second sherd retains evidence of a fringed zone. In addition to these sherds there is an undecorated rim sherd, slightly everted and perhaps from an early 'Bell Beaker' shaped vessel though the sherd is small and it is difficult to speculate. The possibility that it comes from a step 3 AOCC or AOcombed vessel must also be kept in mind. The fourth sherd illustrated carries incised lattice decoration with an incised border line.

**Location**
Not located.
Runcton Holme, Norfolk.


Site No details except that a Peterborough/Beaker domestic site was found during gravel quarrying, and that there were no stratigraphic details recorded.

Pottery The pottery is illustrated on fig. R.H. 1 - R.H. 2. Pottery from this site was seen at both Cambridge museum of Archaeology and Ethnology and at Norwich Castle. It is possible that the sherds may be from the same site but it is not certain. The Norwich sherds are illustrated on fig. R.H. 1. The complete vessels illustrated by Clark (above ref.) are not illustrated here. It is unlikely that the Beakers all represent one period of occupation at the site as step 3 and step 6 Beakers are both represented and although overlap must be taken into account between the different steps, it is unlikely to have been so extensive as this. The step 3 Beaker has an East Anglian shape and contracted zones of AOcomb decoration. The later Beakers all have two or three broad zones of decoration and rather slack profiles. There is also some haphazardly incised pottery (R.H. 2:2, 5) in hard Beaker like fabric. The associated pottery consists of Peterborough and rusticated ware, some of which also belongs to the Peterborough tradition (R.H. 2:3). The rusticated ware (R.H. 1:2-5) is decorated with both fingernail and stabbed decoration and the impressions are both random and linear. On one sherd the impressions
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have dislodged the clay in such a way as to res­
ult in small 'collars' around the impression. One
vessel may be flat based (N.H. 1:1) in which case
it may be from a tub-shaped vessel, whereas if it
is round based it would be a rather deep bowl.
The decoration is restricted to the area immed­
imately below the rim, and it is defined at the
bottom by a narrow groove, perhaps made by the
potter's finger, and this forms a very ill-defined
collar. A round based bowl is also present and
is decorated above the shoulder with horizontal
finger-raised cordons, and below the carination
with oval impressions. The uppermost cordon is
also perforated as if for suspension. It brings
to mind the finger-raised cordons on Potbeakers
and Beaker-associated rusticated ware and may
represent the fusion of two styles or perhaps
even a stage in development.

Location Cambridge.

ST. GERMAINS, Midlothian. (NT 427742).
Site Iron Age fortified homestead which produced
Beaker sherds from an earlier occupation of the
site.
Pottery No details except that AOC Beaker was represented.
Location With excavator.

THE SANCTUARY, OVERTON HILL, Wiltshire.
THE SANCTUARY, OVERTON HILL, continued....

**Site**

Small henge monument with internal circular settings of postholes and stones connected by the West Kennet avenue (see above) to the large henge monument at Avebury (see above).

**Pottery**

Two Beaker-like sherds may represent traces of occupation near the site. The first is decorated below the rim with incised filled chevrons beneath a single horizontal line and the rim is slightly lipped on the interior. This came from the filling of hole 3 in the 6ft. ring. The second sherd is also a rim sherd decorated with four horizontal combed lines beneath the rim on the exterior. It also seems to have had a slight external cordon below the rim and may be from an AOcombed vessel.

**Location**

Devizes.

**SANNA BAY, Argyll.**

**Ref.**

Lethbridge, T.C., 1927; Ritchie, J.N.G., 1970.

**Site**

Shell midden. The Beaker was associated with two stone axes, a barbed and tanged arrowhead, and two flint scrapers.

**Pottery**

The pottery is predominantly AO Combed Beaker, at least two with internal cord decoration on the rim, and at least one with an undecorated band below the rim. There are also sherds from an AOcombed Beaker and several sherds from shell-impressed Beaker probably imitating combed lines.

**Location**

N.M.A.S. Edinburgh; Cambridge.
SANTON WARREN, Norfolk TL 838875.


Site Surface Collection.

Pottery A selection is illustrated on fig. SKE. 1:20 -23
In addition there are four Beaker sherds with combed and combed-and-stabbed decoration. Motifs discernable seem to be filled chevrons. Eight vessels are represented by the sherds, and the rusticated ware would also seem to be fine and neatly executed.

Location Norwich.

SCALPAIG, North Uist (NF 728755).


Site Midden site.

Pottery No details except that a Beaker sherd was recoved from a rabbit burrow in the midden.

Location N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

SGOTTON, Lincolnshire.

Ref. Riley, D.N., 1957.

Site Domestic scatter in sand dunes.

Pottery No details.

Location Not located.

SEELWESTON, Sussex.


Site 'Pit dwelling' in which a Peterborough 'hearth' was found in the upper layers.

Pottery Finger rusticated Peterborough ware was associated with the hearth. The sherds are fairly straight sided and decorated with random finger-
SELKESTON, Sussex, continued....

nail impressions. Two rim sherds seem to be unmoulded but with internal rim bevels. Again they appear to be from rather straight sided vessels and finger rusticated. A single sherd of Beaker comes from the top-soil immediately over the 'hearth'. The motif is not really discernable but one horizontal line and one oblique line of comb are both visible.

Location Lewes.

SEWELL'S CAVE, Yorkshire.

Ref. Raistrick, A., 1936.

Site Rock shelter which had two occupation phases.
The upper one had R.B. sherds and the lower contained Beaker and Peterborough sherds. Quantities of animal bone as well as some human remains were also found in the cave.

Pottery Peterborough bowls are represented by two intumed rim sherds from presumably round bottomed bowls. The first is decorated with fingernail impressions (linear single) and with similar small oval impressions on the rim bevel. The second rim-sherd is similarly decorated though not quite so profusely. The possible Beaker sherds comprise a sherd with two horizontal twisted cord lines probably from an AOC Beaker and a second sherd is decorated with linear and well-executed triangular impressions. A third vessel may be Beaker rusticated ware and is decorated with two lines of oblique fingernail impressions.

Location Settle.
SHALCOURT, Wiltshire.


Site Barrow I. Three Beaker-like sherds from the mound material.

Pottery No 'classic' Beaker is represented but one sherd with random single fingernail impressions, a thickened rim and a possible external cordon below the rim is in Beaker fabric. A second sherd is also fine and appears to be rusticated with a square point though it is possible that deep fingernail is intended. A third sherd is a carrinated sherd with an apparently concave neck which has the shoulder decorated and emphasised with oblique fingernail impressions. This is very probably from a Peterborough bowl.

Location Not located.

SHEFFIELD'S HILL, Lincolnshire.

Ref. Riley, D.N., 1957.

Site Domestic scatter in sand dunes.

Pottery No details.

Location Not located.

SHEWALTON SANDS, Ayrshire.

Ref. Smith, J., 1895.

Site Sand dune site.

Pottery Much of Smith's descriptions suggest that pottery from a good many periods are included in his notes. The only possible Beaker sherd is a sherd from an AOC Beaker with eight lines of twisted cord visible. None of the pottery from the site can be said to be associated.
**SHEWALTON SANDS.** continued....

**Location** Greenoch, N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

**SHEEBURY, Essex.**


**Site**

No details, probably a domestic scatter.

**Pottery**

The pottery is illustrated on figs. SHO. 1 - SHO. 2. There seems to be more pottery from Sheebury, from later Urn forms, that is probably not associated with the Beaker (SHO. 1:10, 12: SHO. 2:2) though the certainty of this assumption can not be demonstrated. The Beaker would all seem to be early in the sequence. There are fragments from two AOC Beakers, one having an undecorated band below the rim, and this sherd is also perforated at least once in this undecorated band. Other fine ware vessels include a body sherd from what may be a Maritime or developed Maritime Beaker (SHO. 1:7) as it is in a very fine fabric and has been decorated with a narrow zone of bordered oblique lines and the teeth of the comb used have also been very fine and small. Another fine ware vessel is in keeping with the other sherds in date and seems to be from a globular East Anglian type Beaker (SHO. 2:1) with zones of oblique lines and Horizontal lines all executed with a toothed comb. Finally there is a Barbed wire Beaker decorated with broad zones of multiple border lines and oblique fingernail incision. It would be logical to see this sherd (SHO. 1:8) as from a globular East Anglian form though the rim suggests a more slack profile. Among the possible Beaker asso-
SHORDBURY, continued....
ciased coarse ware are rather thick vessels with
everted and externally cordoned rims (SHO. 1:1,4)
decorated with linear horizontal and linear verti­
cal fingernail impressions respectively. Two
similar sherds, perhaps from the same vessel
though this cannot be proven, are decorated with
horizontal lines of close paired fingernail im­
pressions giving a 'pseudo-plaited cord' effect
(SHO. 1:3, 5). SHO. 1:6 may be from an undeco­
rated Beaker. The assemblage would appear to
date to step 3.

Location Colchester.

SKARA BRAE, Orkney.

Ref. Childe, V.G., 1931, Childe V.G., and Peterson,
J.W., 1929; Clarke, D.V., and Ritchie, A., 1972;

Site Stone built village surrounded by midden depo­
sits. Grooved ware is the predominant pottery
from the site.

Pottery A few sherds have been found that seem to differ
from the Grooved ware and may possibly be Beaker
sherds. No other details.

Location N.M.A.S. Edinburgh.

SLIP GYLL WINDYFIT, Yorkshire.


Site Cave site with Beaker found on a ledge 30ft.
down in the cave.

Pottery The Beaker consists of a single handled vessel
Illustrated on fig. WIN. 2;9. It is decorated
SLIP GYLL WINDYPIT, continued...

with vertical rows of paired fingernail decoration on the body and in a finer form on the handle.

See Antofta and Ashberry Windypits above.

Location Scarborough.

SNAIL DOWN, Wiltshire. (SU 219521).

Ref. Thomas, N., and Thomas, C., 1956 : Thomas, N.

Site Barrow cemetery. Remains of a Beaker domestic site and Beaker and associated domestic pottery was found in the material of some of the barrows.

Pottery A selection of the pottery is illustrated on figs. S.D. 1 - S.D. 2. A typescript of the third ref. above is included as appendix No.

Location With N. Thomas.

SNAILWELL, Cambridge.


Site Barrow cemetery with Beaker and Peterborough pottery coming from beneath most of the barrow mounds.

Pottery A selection of the pottery is illustrated on figs. SNA. 1 - SNA. 2. There are ten fine ware Beaker sherds from the site with motifs including cross-hatched zones, filled chevrons, ladder motif and parallel horizontal comb lines. Both comb and incision are used to decorate these vessels (three incised sherds, seven combed). Beaker rusticated sherds seem rare (SNA. 1:23, SNA 2:7) and the rest of the sherds are from vessels in the Peterborough
SNAILWELL, continued....

tradition with vessels from the Ebbsfleet (SNA. 1:15), Mortlake (SNA. 1:10), and Fengate sub-styles (SNA. 1:14) all being represented. The majority of sherds, however would appear to be from the Fengate style and so broadly contemporary with the late Beaker which probably dates to step 4 and later. Of the 43 sherds, Beaker represents 23.2%, Ebbsfleet represents c.2.3%, Mortlake represents c.9.3% and Fengate will make up the remaining 65.2% of the pottery.

Location Cambridge.

SNETTISHAM, Norfolk. (TF 662349).


Site Spread of pottery and flint.

Pottery No details except that a fragment of a 'B Beaker' was found.

Location Norfolk.

SNETTISHAM, Norfolk. (TF 665348).


Site Pottery spread probably different from the above site.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. SKE. 1:15 – 19. The Beaker sherds are undecorated but seem to have early profiles. A sherd with a rilled rim may be from a collared urn in a fine fabric. A final sherd has a single circular impression.

Location Norwich.
SOUTH KELSEY, Lincolnshire.
Site No details.
Pottery No details except that Clarke mentions 84 Beakers and fingernail impressed ware.
Location Lincoln.

SOUTHWINTER CUTTING, Essex.
Site Domestic scatter.
Pottery Illustrated on fig. S.C. 1. Some of the pottery is rather strange though it would seem to be Beaker influenced at the very least. S.C. 1:5 for example, would seem to have a Beaker shape though the fingertip impressions on the rim are a rare form of decoration on Beaker pottery. The shape of the comb decorated sherd (S.C. 1:4) is also strange and it is as if the external cordon below the rim had been purposely flattened. S.C. 1:1 is also unusual in that it seems to be from a hemispherical bowl yet the fabric and the decoration suggest Beaker. Some of the undecorated pottery is similar to that from Snettisham (see above). The finger raised cordons of S.C. 1:3 suggest a potbeaker and probably also a late date for the assemblage though this cannot be proven. Clarke lists 84 and FP Beakers though does not illustrate them.
Location Colchester.
SOUTH STREET, Wiltshire. (SU 09026928).


Site Earthen Long barrow. Beaker came from the secondary fill of the ditches, from the base of a clearance horizon in the ditches and from the actual clearance horizon itself.

Pottery From the secondary silts fragments of six Ebbsfleet/Mortlake bowls were found and traces of small combed Beaker sherds. From the base of the clearance horizon comes a shouldered sherd with an inturned rim rather similar to some of the biconical vessels from Mildenhall Fen (see above). The remaining sherds come from the clearance horizon and represent three Beakers. One is an AOC vessel, the second decorated with short lengths of comb impressions (? from an AO combed vessel) and the third has a zone of oval impressions bordered by three comb horizontal lines above and five of the same below, and below this is an undecorated zone. All the pottery is apparently early in the series, and there is an absence of rusticated pottery.

Location Not located.

SPRITSAIL TOR, Glamorgan.


Site Hearth site in shell mound.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. 340, 2. The Beaker is reported as a western variant of a S3 Beaker, and is step 6.

Location Cardiff.
SPROUTON KNOLL, Suffolk.


Site A museum card in Ipswich Museum records that the sherds were found with occupation traces near the sewage workings on Sproughton Knoll.

Pottery One of the cordoned sherds is illustrated on fig. MISC. 1:7. There are ten similar sherds representing, at the most, two vessels. In addition there are seven undecorated sherds in an E.B.A. type of fabric, probably from a Food Vessel, and two sherds of comb impressed Beaker. One of these sherds exhibits a ladder pattern and the other has two horizontal combed lines below which there would appear to be multiple chevrons.

Location Ipswich.

STAINSBY, Lincolnshire.


Site Round barrow covering a Beaker domestic site. Some of the sherds are labelled 'not from pits or the barrow' and so a second site may be represented.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. STA. 1 - STA. 3., though in addition there are 14 sherds from mainly incised Beakers exhibiting late motifs with filled chevrons and lozenges being particularly common. The Beakers would not appear to be earlier than step 5, and probably are more assignable to step 6. It is unlikely that any of the vessels represented can be reconstructed. Handled Beakers are
also present (STA. 1:17, 2:2) and also a fine ware base with combed filled triangles but which has a number of perforations pushed through from the inside. A similar sherd comes from Glenluce (GLE. 6:3) but parallels are, on the whole, rare. The rusticated pottery comprises both linear and random fingernail and fingertip impressions as well as finger-raised cordons, (STA. 1:12, 13, 2:4, 7, 8, etc.) which are very similar to some of the Dutch 'Potbeker' pottery. Other fingernail decoration is very fine and neatly executed (STA. 3:6 - 10). There are also some peculiar vessels with heavy moulded rims (STA. 2:3, 3:1, 4:5) which are also finger decorated. Perhaps these are to be seen as an expansion of the variety of rusticated pottery towards the end of the Beaker period. 29.6% of the pottery is Beaker fine ware, 20.4% is finger-raised cordoned, 3.7% is undecorated, 25.9% has fine finger decoration.

Location
Lincoln.

STANYDALE, Shetland.


Site  Roughly oval stone built structure normally referred to as Stanydale Temple. Pottery was found in a post-hole and on the floor in some of the wall recesses.

Pottery  Three gritty sherds of AOC Beaker were found in the western posthole. Other coarse sherds simi-
STA NY D ALE, Shetland. (NU 28503).
Site Stone built structure normally referred to as Stanydale House to distinguish it from the last mentioned site.
Pottery No details except that it is similar to the pottery from Ness of Gruting (see above) which appears to be Beaker influenced.
Location N.M.A.S., Edinburgh.

STA NY D ALE, continued...
lar to those from Ronaldsway were found on the floor in recesses 1 and 2.
Location N.M.A.S., Edinburgh.

STA NY D ALE, Shetland. (NU 28503).
Site Stone built structure normally referred to as Stanydale House to distinguish it from the last mentioned site.
Pottery No details except that it is similar to the pottery from Ness of Gruting (see above) which appears to be Beaker influenced.
Location N.M.A.S., Edinburgh.

STA NT ON HA RCOUR T, Oxfordshire. (SP 406049).
Site Ring ditches, and Beaker cemetery. Some sherds were found in the region of Burial 1, and Burial 3.
Pottery The sherds represent three Beakers which would appear to be fairly contemporary. The breaks are old and the sherds are leached and eroded which suggested to the excavator that they were residual at the time the burial was made. The two Beakers found near burial 1 are AO decorated Beakers with the decoration consisting only of multiple horizontal lines. Comb is used to decorate one Beaker while the other is incised, though it may be possible that this is abraded and blur-
red comb which is often impossible to differentiate from incision. Both Beakers represent step 3 Beakers. The sherd from near burial 3 is comb zoned and consists of multiple lines bordering ladder motif. Again a step 3/4 vessel may be represented but it is difficult to be certain from such a small sherd.

**Location**
Ashmolean.

**Ref.**

**Site**
Casual hearth represented by an elongated patch of charcoal. Burnt food bones, waste flints, and heat cracked stones were all found.

**Pottery**
Both fine ware and coarse ware was found, the former from necked and comb decorated Beakers with horizontal and vertical decoration probably datable to step 6 or 7 if related to the Yorkshire focus area. An incised Beaker is represented by a base sherd, a rim sherd represents a Beaker combining incision and fingernail impressions, another has crossed fingernail impressions while a final sherd is unusual in that it combines vertical, horizontal and slanting lines of fine whipped decoration in a kind of box motif. This technique has been noted on Beakers before but rarely in any such motif with the exception of a Grooved Ware sherd from Marden (Appendix A, fig. 4). The coarse pottery is all fingernail rusticated, forming
horizontal rows of fine paired impressions on one sherd. About ten vessels are represented and evenly split between fine ware and coarse ware.

Location
Not located.

STEVENSTON SANDS, Ayrshire.

Ref. Smith, J., 1895; Scott, L. 1951.

Site Sand dune site and occupation spread. Neolithic and E.A. flint types have been found.

Pottery No details. Urns are mentioned and also 'coarse hand built pottery'. Some finger rusticated ware is also reported.

Location
Not located.

STOCKBRIDGE DOWN, Hants.


Site Round barrow, burnt flint, food remains and pot sherds were found in the material of the mound.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. 370. 1:12-17. The total pottery comprised 28 sherds of Beaker (2 or 3 vessels), 19 sherds from Urn pottery (370. 1:12, 17 etc.), and four sherds of Romano British pottery.

Location
B.M.

STOKE FERRY, Norfolk.


Site No details. Occupation spread is likely.

Pottery A selection is illustrated on fig. S.F. 1 - S.F.4. The fine ware Beaker from the site would again appear to be late with evidence for vertical and metoped decoration (S.F. 4:5). The decoration is
STOKE FERRY, continued....

also usually close and combines several motifs
in a single broad zone. Motifs employed consist
of cross hatching, herringbone, fringe motifs,
filled running chevrons, cross-hatched triangles,
filled lozenges and ladder motif. About 19
sherds are represented, all perhaps from differ­
et vessels, and possibly representing step 6
Beakers. S.F. 4:7 may come from a Beaker bowl, or
may represent a very convex neck. The coarse
ware is typical of that found in East Anglia for
its diversity and peculiar nature. It is likely
that not all the pottery illustrated is associat­
ed and some of the Urn forms may be later (S.F.
4:1,6,9) but some of the fingernail impressed
ware is very typical of the types found with
Beakers, especially the sherds with East Anglian
shape (S.F. 3:4) and with paired fingernail deco­
ration (S.F. 2:1-5). Cordoned rims are also pre­
sent in the assemblage (S.F. 1:1, 3:8) again
suggesting functional utilitarian vessels.

Location
Cambridge.

STONEHENGE, Wiltshire.

Ref.  Cunnington, M.E., 1934 : Crawford, O.C.S., 1954 :
Hawley, W., 1922, 1924, 1928 : Newall, R.S., 1929,

Site  Multi-period henge monument and stone circle.

Pottery  Despite the great deal of literature written on
Stonehenge this has tended to be architectural or
astronomical and little of the archaeology, with
the exception of summarised constructional phases
STONEHENGE, continued....

has been published. Beaker comes from the upper layers of the ditches, from stone holes and from flat areas in the interior. It is connected with the lithicisation of the monument and may be residual from nearby settlements. The few sherds of pottery seen by the writer in Salisbury museum are illustrated on fig. STO. 1. STO. 1:1 and 2 are from stone hole No. 30. STO.1:3 is from one of the Aubrey holes, STO.1:4 is a fragment of collared urn from the X and Y holes, STO.1:5 is from the area at the open end of the horse-shoe, and STO. 1:6 is from the area of stone 6 and 7.

Location Salisbury; with J.C.R. Atkinson.

SWARKESTON, Derbyshire. (SK 365293).


Site Two-phased round barrow overlying a Beaker settlement. A shady grey soil underneath the barrow represents a turf line and humus that formed after the abandonment of the settlement. The settlement evidence consisted of 262 stake and post holes, pits and hearths as well as fragments of pottery and flint. The post holes were divided into two groups. Group A was two converging lines suggested as an animal segregator, a bird trap, or an avenue, but a palisade is another possibility, perhaps with two phases if the two lines are not strictly contemporary. The convergence may be due to the posts coming to a hairpin entrance or else the two phases may not have been concentric.
Group B formed a rectangular structure free from internal stakeholes and pottery as though it had been cleaned out.

**Pottery**

Peterborough and Beaker were found on the site and the excavator argued that this therefore represented two occupation periods. Western Neolithic pottery also occurs in the same layer as the Beaker sherds but seems to be restricted to the west of the settlement. The combed and incised Beakers again seem to represent step 6 vessels, certainly no earlier than step 5, and ApSimon suggests that perhaps 10 combed vessels are represented while the rusticated sherds represent only 5 pots. The rusticated sherds are mostly fingernail impressed, either singly or in pairs, and no forms are reconstructable. Bird bone impressions also seem to be present.

**Location**

Derby.

---

**TALLINGTON,** Lincolnshire.


**Site**

Barrow, site 17, had a central pit grave in which subsequent inhumations had been made. Beaker sherds were found in the fill and may represent an earlier burial, or may represent residual sherds from a nearby/earlier settlement as they were all abraded.

**Pottery**

One Beaker is represented and comes from a step 7 vessel. It is rather squat with a slack profile and decorated with filled hexagons which have been in effect cut off at the top and bottom.
TALLINGTON, continued...
by horizontal combed lines so that only four
sides of the hexagons survive.

Location Cambridge.

TENTS MUIR, Fife.
Ref. Longworth, I.H. et. al., 1967; Wederburn, L.M.M.
1971.
Site Sand dune midden sites and burial sites.
Pottery Illustrated on figs. T.M.1 - T.M.4. The pottery
is surveyed above (p. 111ff ) and in the first
ref. above.
Location N.H.A.S. Edinburgh.

THICKTHORN DOWN, Dorset.
Site Long barrow. Beaker came from the upper levels
of the ditches. The barrow had no primary inter-
ments.
Pottery The rusticated sherds are illustrated on fig.
MISC. 1:4-6. The Beaker cannot be regarded as
stratified as Romano-British sherds were also
found in these levels. The sherds seem to com-
prise two combed vessels (one combined with
fingernail impressions) and some fingernail rus-
ticated sherds. The vessels would appear to be
late, perhaps step 5 or 6.
Location Dorchester.

THISTLEBARROW, BOSCOMBE, Hampshire.
THISTLEBARRROW, ROSECOMBE, continued...

Site
No details. The sherds were not found in a funerary context.

Pottery
No details. Calkin lists it as Beaker rusticated ware, and Clarke reports the sherd(s) as indeterminate.

Location
Christchurch.

TINSHILL, Yorkshire. (SE 254402).
Site
Beaker, a flint flake, and a scraper were found in the disturbed top soil of a garden. There was no trace of a burial or pit found, and the sherds were scattered.

Pottery
The sherds represent a single Beaker. The decoration is incised and combed. There is a cordon below the rim which has been slashed. The decoration is very haphazard and carelessly executed and consists of a broad zone on the neck filled with herringbone, an attempt at running chevrons and another attempt at filled lozenges. On the belly the decoration consists of eight horizontal combed line interrupted by a narrow band of ladder motif and below this is very haphazard and careless cross-hatching.

Location
Leeds.

TOPSHAM, Devon.
Site
Neolithic settlement area found beneath a Roman farmstead. The settlement was represented by a
TOPSHAM, continued...

number of pits and features, by Neolithic pottery,
and by contemporary flint artefacts and waste
flakes.

Pottery  Pengate ware and Grooved Ware, some at least in
the Durrington Walls sub-style, are both represen­
ted among the pottery. The only Beaker is in
the form of two sherds. One in undecorated but in
Beaker-like fabric, and the other from a Beaker
rusticated vessel with fingernail decoration.

Location  Not located.

TORFORD, Arran. (NR 896312).


Site  Eight hut circles and 20 clearance cairns of
which two huts were excavated. One hut had
Beaker associated with the earliest phase.

Pottery  No details except that AOC Beaker was found.

Location  N.R.A.S. Edinburgh.

TRY, Cornwall. (SW 460350).


Site  Standing stone with cairn. Beaker was found in
the material used to deliberately fill the cist
and in a small pit S.W. of the cist. The pit
also contained dark soil and charcoal.

Pottery  The Beaker sherds are small and abraded, and are
decorated with blurred comb and incision. Three
sherds have filled running chevron decoration and
may all be from the same vessel. Two other sherds
have evidence for combed herringbone. A final
sherd has small circular impressions in the fab-
TRY, continued....
ric, and these are arranged in horizontal rows, two of which are visible.

Location Truro.

TUSCULUM, NORTH BERWICK, East Lothian.
Ref. Cree, J.E., 1908.
Site See above, North Berwick, (p. 118).

WALLINGTON, BARROW I, Norfolk.
Site Round barrow, sherds thought to come from the mound material.
Pottery Illustrated on fig. W.F. 1:3-9. The sherds are all small and cord or comb decorated. The only decoration visible on any of the sherds are horizontal lines. Only one sherd is cord decorated (W.F. 1:3). If this is from an AOC Beaker then it is possible that the other sherds are from AO comb vessels but with such small sherds surviving it is difficult to be certain.

Location E.M.

WALNEY ISLAND, Lancashire.
Site Occupation spreads in the sand dunes.
Pottery The pottery is illustrated on fig. WAL 1. The pottery from the site is from a number of periods and much of the B,A. pottery is typical of the Highland zone in its lack of standard characteristics. The large bucket or tub shaped vessels...
WALNEY ISLAND, continued....

illustrated do seem to be in a 'B.A.' fabric (if such a term may be used) but again we run into difficulties as to the relationship of the different pottery to each other as a great deal was found in surface collection. Beaker is not common at the site but two sherds can be identified as such (WAL 1:6, 9) one being incised and the other part of a rim. Other possible Beaker sherds are too abraded to allow positive identification. Possible Food Vessel sherds are represented by two pieces of pottery both with whipped maggot decoration (WAL, 1:11, 12).

Location Barrow in Furness.

WALTON-ON-NAZE, STONE POINT, Essex.

Ref. Hasseldine Warren et. al., 1936.

Site Area three was described as a camp site with Beaker ware, and area four, a cooking hole associated with large domestic Beaker.

Pottery This is illustrated on fig. W.O.N. 1. The rusticated Beaker illustrated seems to be in the East Anglian tradition, with ovoid profiles. The pottery is generally fine, and the fingernail impressions carefully executed. No fine ware Beaker was located by the writer.

Location B.M.

WAR DITCHES, Cambridgeshire.


Site Henge monument? Small sections of an apparently circular ditch were excavated. Pottery was found
WAR DITCHES, continued....

in the primary ditch silts, and was associated with a good many sheep bones. This may suggest a domestic or at least a secular (stock rearing?) purpose.

Pottery

The pottery from the ditches that is illustrated in the report may in fact be Beaker and associated rusticated ware. One base sherd seems to have evidence for incised chevrons, and some of the rusticated pottery is very similar to types already seen here. One rim sherd has horizontal rows of fingernail impressions forming low cords running across the sherd. Another sherd, thought to be Food Vessel by Lethbridge also has paired fingernail impressions and is a type that has also been recognised on Beaker domestic sites. A final thick and heavy base without decoration may be from an Urn.

Location Cambridge.

WATTISFILED, COTTAGE FIELD, Suffolk.


Site Occupation spread including some deep shafts and pits.

Pottery A selection of the rusticated pottery is illustrated on figs. WAT, 1 - WAT, 3. In addition to these, there are 86 sherds of fine ware vessels representing possibly 10 to 20 vessels though this is very much a guess estimate due to few vessels being reconstructable, and there are a further 51 rusticated sherds. Some of the sherds
are so small that it is often difficult to work out the motifs employed on the fine ware vessels. Cross-hatching, for example, is very common, but this may be from horizontal zones, broad zones, filled lozenges, triangles or hexagons. Filled lozenges and triangles do seem to be a favourite motif and two reconstructable vessels are decorated in this way. The fully contracted decoration and the apparent absence of vertical and elaborated decoration would suggest that we are dealing with step 6/7 Beakers, and an element of handled Beaker is also present. The majority of the Beakers are incised. The rusticated Beaker is typical in many ways of this type of pottery from other East Anglian sites looked at above. It is decorated with a variety of techniques such as fingernail impressions, fingertip impressions and both occur either randomly or linearly. Dislodged clay 'bumps' are, on the whole, rare (WAT 2:22) though the surfaces tend to be very 'lumpy'. Finger-raised cordons are also present (WAT 2:3–5, 7, 8) and small fine vessels with external rim cordons are also present (WAT 2:1, 17, 3:8). In addition to finger rustication, there are also stabs of various kinds found on the pottery (WAT 1:20–23) which may suggest links with Food Vessel traditions, an idea in keeping with the late date of the pottery. It is difficult to estimate the forms of some of the rusticated vessels, but it would be dangerous to assume that they all have 'Beaker-like' profiles as is normally assumed, because there is a real
WATTISFIELD, COTTAGE FIELD, continued....

absence of strongly curved sherds suggesting the lower part of a Beaker, and it would be unlikely that it is only the neck sherds that have survived. Perhaps we may have some bucket-shaped vessels here too, as has been tentatively suggested for some of the rusticated ware at Hockwold-cum-Wilton (see above). Expressed as percentages the assemblage is as follows:— 38.2% is fine ware Beaker, 41.7% is from fingernail decorated sherds, 13.3% are from finger tip decorated pottery, and 3.6% of the sherds have stabbed decoration, and the rest is undecorated.

Location Ipswich.

WETING, Norfolk.


Site No details.

Pottery No details except that Clarke lists Beaker in the southern tradition and rusticated pottery with fingertip decoration.

Location Not located.

WELLS, (?) Suffolk.


Site No details.

Pottery Illustrated on fig. W.K. 1:23–26. The Beaker sherds represent a small roughly biconical vessel (W.K. 1:24) decorated with chevrons made by a round-toothed comb. An undecorated vessel is also present, as is a small sherd with an applied
WELLS (?), continued...

circular knob like some of the pottery from Mildenhall Fen (see above) and from Newgrange (see above). There are also sherds from the upper part of a collared urn that seems to have had twisted cord (?) cross-hatching on the collar.

Location Ipswich.

WEST ASHBY, Lincolnshire.

Ref. Unpublished, information from the excavator, Naomi Field.

Site Barrow site. Beaker domestic debris was associated with phase II of the site found in the ditch fill and over the primary mound as though the material for the second mound came from a domestic site.

Pottery A selection is illustrated by the writer in fig. WHI 1:9-33, and others are included in the supplementary drawing section and were kindly supplied by the excavator. Beaker, Rusticated Ware, Grooved Ware and some possible Food Vessel sherds are all represented. No vessels can be reconstructed and rim forms are few. The running chevron and multiple ladder motifs on the Beaker as well as the filled chevron motifs on a base sherd would suggest at least a step 3 date for the fine ware and this would seem to be supported by the absence of heavy fingertip impressed sherds with plastic decoration that are so common in the make up of later assemblages. The
WEST ASHBY, continued....

Comb used is generally one with rectangular teeth, but a round-toothed comb would also seem to have been used on at least one sherd (WHI. 1:21) which is perhaps from a small hemispherical bowl which comes from a charcoal surface below mound 1. This does not mean it is therefore not associated with the other material as it all seems to be residual anyway. The Grooved ware seems to be in the Clacton sub-style though the sherds are rather small to be certain. There is also a sherd with fine shipped decoration from the middle ditch which may be related to the Peterborough tradition if not to the Grooved ware. 23.1% of the pottery is fine ware, 24.6% is from Grooved ware, 14.4% are finger rusticated, 13.1% are impressed, and 14.5% are incised, 8.7% are undecorated.

Location With N. Field.

WEST HESLETON, Yorkshire.
Site Multi-period site. A hut circle 5m. in diameter was found and associated with Beaker pottery and flints.
Pottery No details except that Beaker, Peterborough and Grooved ware are all associated.
Location With D. Powelsland.

WEST KEAL, Lincolnshire.
Site Pottery and occupation spread.

Pottery A selection is illustrated on fig. W.K. 1:1-22. In addition to the pottery illustrated, there are a further 15 fine sherds. Four exhibit horizontal comb lines, one has combed cross-hatching, two have combed ladder pattern and two have AOC decoration. The other sherds are incised and have cross-hatched, ladder or herring-bone motifs. As well as Beaker from the site there would also appear to be some Food Vessel (W.K. 1:10, 20) with incised herringbone decoration, and some possible Peterborough ware with rather globular rims (W.K. 1:2, 8, 11, 22). The Beaker sherds would appear to be early with multiple lines defining the zones (W.K. 1:3) and may be from step 3 or slightly later vessels though it is difficult to be sure when no forms are reconstructable. In keeping with this is the fineness of the finger rustication with no large and coarse fingertip decoration being present.

Location Lincoln.

West Rudham, Norfolk.


Site Long barrow. Only one Beaker sherd was found in secondary contexts and possibly derived from a hearth site.

Pottery Only one Beaker sherd was recovered. This had three horizontal incised lines.

Location Norwich.
WEST STOW, Suffolk. (TL 808748).


Site Two hearths found beneath a barrow. Associated were calcined flints including about 200 flakes and 30 scrapers. There were no food remains, however.

Pottery Two sherds of Beaker and three rusticated sherds were found. The Beaker is comb decorated though no motifs are discernable. The rusticated sherds all seem to have paired fingernail impressions. One sherd is a base sherd.

Location Bury St. Edmunds.

WALEY, Derbyshire.


Site One of two rock shelters.

Pottery Grooved ware, Peterborough, and Beaker are all represented. The Beaker sherds have incised and combed decoration in the form of cross-hatched zones, running chevrons and perhaps also filled lozenges/hexagons. The Grooved ware comprises two sherds. One is a rim with filled triangles and the other a body sherd with elongated incised herringbone. The Peterborough pottery has incised and impressed decoration. As well as a small bowl with a squared rim Mortlake and Pen-gate styles are both represented. There is also a sherd with paired fingernail decoration.

Location Not located.
WHITEHAWK CAMP, BRIGHTON, Sussex.


Site Neolithic causewayed camp. Beaker pit found 2ft. from the ditch in cutting C VIII. Beaker was found in the fill.

Pottery The Beaker would appear to be early in general. There is a sherd of what seems to be AO combed Beaker with a moulding below the everted rim, and other combed sherds have zones defined by multiple horizontal lines which might suggest that they were still step 3 Beakers. There may be sherds from two other AO combed Beakers and perhaps also an All Over incised vessel. The rusticated sherds are all fingernail rusticated and linear, either paired or single. One rim sherd has a lipped rim and an external horizontal cordon below the rim. Expressed as percentages, then the numbers are as follows: 38.9% are from fine ware Beakers, 27.8% are from single fingernail impressed ware, 22.2% are from paired fingernail impressed sherds, and 11.1% are undecorated.

Location Brighton.

WHITE PARK, Antrim.


Site Sand dune site.

Pottery One sherd of pottery only. This is a probable Beaker sherd with four lines of horizontal comb decoration visible. Traces of overlap of the comb
WHITE PARK, continued...

are also present.

Location Belfast.

WICK PARK, Hampshire.


Site Domestic site in gravel pit.

Pottery No details except that fine ware and rusticated sherds were found. Clarke only lists a W/MR Beaker.

Location Christchurch.

WIGGANHOLT.


Site Beaker occupation traces found below a Romano-British site.

Pottery Three sherds were decorated with combed horizontal lines bordering incised cross hatched zones. An early step 3 Beaker seems to be represented.

Location Not located.

WILLINGTON, Derbyshire. (SK 288278).


Site Area of pits and post holes, some of the latter were paired and three trapezoid settings were recognised, possibly structures. Beaker sherds came from groups B, C, and F. Beaker and Grooved Ware also came from a pit and Beaker domestic ware from the turf stack of a nearby round mound.

Pottery No details save that some pottery is cord ornamented and some is 'domestic'. Grooved Ware and Grimstone Ware were also found.
WINDMILL HILL, Wiltshire.


Site Neolithic causewayed camp. Beaker and associated sherds were found in the upper layers of the ditches, but were found with Romano-British sherds so cannot be regarded as stratified.

Pottery A selection is illustrated on fig. W.H. 1. A total of 435 fine ware and 83 coarse ware sherds were found but could not all be located by the writer. At least 14 early Beakers could be recognised (step 1 - 3) some of which were cordoned, while about 60 - 70 necked Beakers were also present. Coarse rusticated vessels are also present, but are not common.

Location Avebury.

WINDMILL HILL LONG BARROW, Wiltshire. (SU 086705).


Site Long barrow. Late Neolithic and Beaker pottery were found in the upper layers of the ditches.

Pottery Beaker is again from secondary contexts and would appear to be early in the sequence though obviously the pottery does not all have to be deposited at the same time. Two AOC vessels are represented, one having double if not plaited cord lines. Two sherds have lines of horizontal comb impressions and may be from AOC-combed Beakers though not enough survives to be certain. On the
body sherd there would seem to be evidence that at least the A0comb decoration had contracted. Three other sherds have chevron decoration, one at least having broad zoned decoration, and one has filled chevrons while the other two are apparently multiple. A small ovoid vessel is also present and appears to resemble an East Anglian Beaker except that the sparse and careless decoration has been executed with a round-toothed comb. A sherd of rusticated ware is decorated with single fingernail impressions. Associated with the Beaker was a rim sherd of fingernail decorated Fengate ware and a rim sherd from an undecorated bowl.

Location Not located.

WINTERBOURNE KINGS, Dorset.
Site Round barrow. Beaker occupation represented by sherds in the O.C.S.
Pottery This included a sherd of incised Beaker, a sherd from a small collared urn, a sherd from a bowl with internal incision and a sherd of fingernail impressed ware.
Location Not located.

WITNESSING, Suffolk
This sherd (W.F. 1:13) was found in a "hearth pit" but has been included here in error.
WOODHENCE, Wiltshire.


Site Henge monument with timber circles inside, possibly representing a roofed structure.

Pottery The pottery is predominantly Grooved ware, and a selection is illustrated on fig. W.C.N. 1:5-10. The Beaker sherds from the site would appear to be early and comprise AOC vessels and combed vessels. Pendant chevrons filled with horizontal impressions are present, and may be from near the base of step 3 Beakers.

Location Devizes.

WOLVERSTONE PARK, Suffolk.


Site No details.

Pottery Two vessels are represented. One by a base sherd with pendant filled chevron decoration, and the other with horizontal narrow cross-hatched zones, and a cordon below the rim. Both sherds seem late and are incised.

Location Ipswich.

WORMWELL, Suffolk.

Ref. Clarke, B.L., 1970; Green, H.T., 1933.

Site No details.

Pottery Clarke classes the sherds as indeterminate but Green refers to Beaker and rusticated pottery.

Location Not located.

WYLYE DOWN, Wiltshire. (SU 005365).

YEWROE, continued....

**Site**  
Stray sherd found while digging a lynchet.  
Probably represents earlier occupation.

**Pottery**  
The sherd is very weathered and is comb ornam­mented with a line of oblique comb impressions  
between at least two horizontal lines. The  
marked angularity of the sherd and the simple  
decoration suggests that it is from a vessel  
not later than step 3.

**Location**  
Ashmolean.

YEAWERING, Northumberland.

**Ref.**  

**Site**  
Anglo-Saxon royal settlement overlying earlier  
B.A. features such as pits, a ring-ditch and a  
cremation cemetery.

**Pottery**  
Sherds of AOC Beaker are from the most frequent  
type of Beaker from Yeawering and bear comparison  
with the other Northumbrian site at Ross Links  
(see above). Some AOC sherds were found with  
cremations but were not regarded as associated  
with the burials by the excavator. Their abraded  
nature suggested that they were residual. There  
is also a small sherd in Beaker fabric which has  
incised herringbone decoration below a single  
incised line and so would suggest a late Beaker  
and somewhat degenerate. A small vessel with  
cremation 25 may be a form of rusticated ware.  
It is in Beaker fabric, is a small bucket shaped  
vessel, and has three well-spaced lines of elong­
gated fingernail impressions. It is similar to
the Beaker from Hasting Hill in Co. Durham (Tait, J. 1965) though the two are certainly not identical. A sherd of heavy fingertip rustication comes from cremation 26. It may not be Beaker at all but associated with the Peterborough and Grooved ware from the site.

**Location**
With B. Hope-Taylor.

**YSGOWNANT**, Denbighshire. (SS 188305).


**Site** A partly natural mound with a collared Urn cremation. Frags. of three Beakers were found.

**Pottery** The three sherds probably all represent separate vessels. One sherd has filled multiple chevrons and horizontal comb lines.

**Location** Not located.
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Fig. 5. Model of possible contextual derivations
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Fig. 10. Location map of Beaker domestic sites in S. Britain
Fig. 12. Bar graph of rim types from the Wyman-Abbot Beaker collection, Peterborough Museum.
Fig. 13. Frequency of motif combination in the Wyman-Ambott Beaker collection in Peterborough Museum.
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Fig. 29. Chronology chart.
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INTRODUCTION

In his view of British Prehistory, Professor Hawkes asked for the compilation of corpora of prehistoric material (Hawkes 1951). His plea has gone largely unheeded, especially on a national scale, and thus the importance of local corpora is self-evident. The tendency has been towards local corpora of Bronze Age pottery (Simpson 1965; Manby 1958; Savory 1955, 1957, 1958; Smedley and Owles 1963) and it is hoped that this corpus will, together with those already published, help towards the compilation of a national Bronze Age Pottery corpus and also act as a complement to John Tait's work on the Beaker pottery from the same area (Tait 1965).

In general terms, the counties of Northumberland and Durham are bounded by the rivers Tweed and Tees to the north and south, and by the sea and Pennines to the east and west respectively, thus forming a geographical as well as a territorial unit. Rivers such as the Aln, Coquet, Tyne and Wear dissect the area latitudinally and are important for the settlement of prehistoric peoples, whether reflected by their burial practices or actual settlement sites. The then densely wooded Tyne gap through the Pennines and the similarly wooded and, in addition, marshy Tees valley would have hindered the penetration of people from outside the area, but obviously would not have prevented it altogether.

The types of vessels to be discussed are those commonly referred to as Food Vessels, Enlarged Food Vessels (or, preferably, Food Vessel Urns), and Cinerary Urns. These terms are far from satisfactory, for example Food Vessel may plausibly be applied to any vessel from the earliest ceramic cultures to modern containers, nor are we sure that food was held in the pots, and similarly drink need not have been confined to the Beakers or Drinking Cups. "Food Vessel", however, is a term that has become embedded in the archaeological terminology from at least as early as Abercromby's classification (Abercromby 1912), and its redeeming feature now is that it is a label for a specific group of pottery.

The division of Food Vessel Urns and Cinerary Urns is also an unsatisfactory one. Cinerary Urn simply means an Urn for cremation and so strictly speaking it also includes the Food Vessel Urns. "Food Vessel Urn" however is at least descriptive in that it shows the Food Vessel shape, and the Cinerary Urn function. For ease of reference here, therefore, Food Vessel will refer to the small vessels normally classed as such, and Food Urn will refer to the Enlarged Food Vessel and Encrusted Urn groups: "Cinerary Urn" here denotes all Urn types with the exception of the Food Vessel Urns.

The vessels are not associated with any one burial rite, with the exception of the Cinerary Urn, and inhumation and cremation are both associated. However, these sepulchral differences need not necessarily constitute cultural differences. Similarly, the terms include pottery showing great variation
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in form and decoration, which is only to be expected in view of their wide
distribution. Any attempted classification, therefore, should not depend on
such fine characteristics as width of grooves or number of stops, and so the
vessels in the corpus have not been divided into neatly labelled groups, but
have been arranged only according to similarity of shape and decoration.

NOTE ON THE DISTRIBUTION MAPS

Firstly, the maps show that the high ground in the area was avoided, with
very few vessels coming from above the 1000 ft. contour. Where they do
intrude into the highland zone, they are found beside the main rivers and their
tributaries and generally keep to the river valleys. The importance of the
rivers, even in the lowland areas, can be seen to advantage on the Wear,
Tyne, Coquet, Ains, and Till. The Milfield basin in north Northumberland,
through which the river Till flows, has always been important in prehistory.
Neolithic pottery has been found at Ford, Thirlings and Yeaver, there is
a cluster of henge monuments and a possible cursus in the area, the largest
hillfort in the county is nearby at Yeaver Bell, and it is also the site of
Edwin’s palace. It can be seen that the pottery distribution is dense in the
Milfield area, and the same is true of the Beakers in the area (Tait 1965).

The high density of finds in the north of the area and their paucity in the
south is perhaps more apparent than real. Firstly, many of the finds are
due to the activities of Canon Greenwell, but then more barrows must have
been visible to him in this area. Secondly, the mouths of the Tyne, Wear,
Tees and Wansbeck have all been heavily built over and have long been in­
dustrial areas, so that many burials may have been built over or may have
been found at an early date before there was any real antiquarian interest in
the area, and so were not recorded. Thirdly, agricultural activity has been
greater to the south than to the north of Coquet, and again evidence may have
been destroyed.

It may also be pointed out that the distributions coincide basically with
other distribution maps of the area such as those of Beakers, hill-forts
and Iron Age settlements.¹

NOTES

¹. For Beakers see Tait 1965. Scooped Enclosures see Jobey 1962.
Hillforts and Romano British Settlements see Jobey 1965. It is worthy
of note that Mr. Jobey has intimated that further rectilinear settlements
may still await discovery, especially in the Northumberland coastal plain,
where they may possibly lie on slight knolls on which modern farms now
stand.
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SECTION I
FORMS OF THE VESSELS

FOOD VESSELS

The term "Food Vessel" is a very ill-defined label used to identify a great variety of different types of vessel, such as Yorkshire vases, Hiberno-Scottish bowls, Southern ridged Food Vessels, and Northern tripartite vessels to name but four (see Burgess 1974). The first real typology of Food Vessels (Abercromby 1912) showed at once the diversity of the group, as six different classes, each with sub-types, were used in the classification. Similarly, when dealing with the vessels from the Peak District, T. G. Manby found it necessary to employ four basic forms and a total of eighteen sub-types (Manby 1958).

The Food Vessels in this corpus can be divided simply into bipartite, tripartite and bowl. The bipartite class is the most numerous, and can be subdivided into simple bipartite with rim moulding (fig. 1:1), simple bipartite without rim moulding, Yorkshire vases with shoulder groove and stops, bipartite with shoulder groove only and bipartite handled vessels. The tripartite vases have one broad or two shoulder cavetto zones, and the bowls need no explanation. The few handled vessels are mostly bipartite but include one bowl, No. 66, which has been placed among the handled bipartite vessels for convenience of comparison.

Decoration cannot really be used as a significant feature for classification as different techniques and motifs may be combined on a single vessel. There are a few zoned vessels, but most are unzoned though not necessarily decorated all over. A more significant distinction seems to be that between incised and impressed decoration, only very few vessels combining both.

Rim forms also vary slightly in form, the most common being internally bevelled and externally moulded. Flat and simple rims also exist, but in smaller numbers (fig. 1:2).

FOOD VESSEL URNS

The Food Vessel Urns from the area are all of bipartite form, the nearest to a tripartite vessel being vessel No. 106 from High Buston with three shoulder grooves, and obviously bear more resemblance to Food Vessels than to Cinerary Urns. These vessels can be divided into four groups, simple bipartite vessels, vessels with shoulder groove or grooves, vessels like the last mentioned but with stops in the grooves, and finally the Food Vessel Urns with relief decoration, normally called Encrusted Urns (fig. 1:1). This classification, like that used with the Food Vessels, is a rigid one and the writer is aware of its limitations, but it is justifiable on a local corpus such
Frequency of rim types.
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as this and is useful as a descriptive measure. The decoration and rims bear
the same scrutiny as those of the Food Vessels but in addition there are two
tiered rim bevels, vessels Nos. 100 and 108.

The distinction between Food Vessel and Food Vessel Urn has been found
difficult to make by many but it will be seen from the scatter diagram (fig. 1:3)
that there is a definite break between the two groups at 20 cm in height, the
Food Vessels all falling below and the Food Vessel Urns above this figure.

CINERARY URNS

Like the relationship of Food Vessels to Food Vessel Urns, there does
appear to be a similar state of affairs in the Cinerary Urn class. There is
a class of small urns, all under about 15-18 cm high but which have all the
characteristic features of the larger urns, usually 20-30 cm high. These
"Miniature Urns", as they will be called in this monograph, are not of course
restricted to the north-east but occur throughout England, and there does
not appear to be such a distinctive height to separate them from the large
Cinerary Urns as there is at the 20 cm mark between Food Vessels and Food
Vessel Urns. Both these Miniature Urns and the larger Cinerary Urns will
be treated together here, except in the catalogue.

The terms "Overhanging Rim Urn" and "Collared Urn", to denote Collared
Urn without and with a cavetto zone respectively beneath the collar, are no
longer widely used in Bronze Age studies and instead the two types are classed
simply as Collared Urns. The two groups, however, clearly do exist and so
are referred to here as bipartite and tripartite Collared Urns respectively.
In addition, there is one Cordoned Urn from the area, No. 141, from Moralee
Farm. A few Bucket Urns possibly can be seen as representing the Northern
equivalent of the Southern Deverel-Rimbury class of urn, and so may the very
curious urn from South Charlton, No. 142, with rounded bulbous shoulder, no
neck and moulded rim. The cord horse-shoe patterns on this vessel are also
unusual.

NOTES

1. For example see Burn Ground Hampnett, Gloucs. 13 cm high (Grimes
   1960). Ferry Fryston, Yorks. 18 cm high (Pacitto 1970). Tower Hill,
   Warley, Yorks. 18 cm high (Gilks 1970). Wykenham Forest, Yorks.
   Urn 4 15 cm high, Urn 5. 12 cm high, Urn 6. 15 cm high, Urn 7. 15 cm
   cm high (Brewester 1972). Avebury, Wilts, No. 508. 10 cm high (Annable
   Beckhampton, Wilts, No. 521. 13 cm high. Avebury, No. 523. 13 cm
   high.
Fig. 1.3
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SECTION II
ORIGINS

FORM

The degree of influence of the Beakers in the development of the native pottery styles has often been over-estimated in the past, and has recently come to be questioned, but as late as 1970 it could still be said that "the shape and cordon decoration (of the Yorkshire Vase Food Vessels) may be related to the developed cordon All Over Corded Beakers... and to their influence on the middle Neolithic bowl forms" (Clarke D. L. 1970). It is not proposed here that the early Bronze Age Sepulchral pottery in question owes nothing at all to the Beakers: this is clearly not the case. For example, the use of combed decoration is not demonstrably pre-Beaker, and it is unlikely that once a decorative technique became known it would be confined to one type of pottery, especially when that style has such a wide distribution. But it is suggested that it is only with regard to a few decorative techniques and the zoning of decoration that the pottery under review can, with any degree of certainty, be said to exhibit Beaker traits.

FOOD VESSELS

Our closest Food Vessel types are to be found in Professor Piggott's secondary Neolithic pottery forms. Sandhill and Ebbsfleet wares show the concave neck and decorative rim moulding of the bipartite vessels (Piggott S. 1954, fig. 50, No. 1., fig. 49 No. 3). This development is present throughout the Peterborough and Grooved Ware traditions, and Peterborough bowls from Hedsor and Mortlake (Piggott 1954 Pl. X, figs. 4 and 5) have bipartite Food Vessel forms in all but their rounded bases. R. A. Smith (Abbott and Smith 1910) has shown that a pot from Upper Swell in Gloucestershire, 4 in high and of pink-brown fabric with toothed stick decoration, has a flat base only just large enough to allow the vessel to stand; however, this is essentially a Neolithic bowl and not a Bronze Age type. Smith takes this vessel to represent an intermediate stage in the development of the Food Vessel. Similarly Smith demonstrates that an Irish Neolithic bowl, cylindrical above and hemispherical below a grooved waist, possibly developed into a bipartite Food Vessel with shoulder cavetto zone; the similarity in decoration of the vessels used in the demonstration perhaps indicating no great difference in date.

The curving heavy rims of the Peterborough Northern sherds from Red Scar Bridge, Ford, Northumberland (fig. II.I) and the fact that the rims are decorated may also provide a link between this Neolithic type and the Food Vessels, it being easy to imagine the Neolithic rim forms developing from a curve into the decorated rim moulding and bevel of the Food Vessels and Food Vessel Urns. Indeed, this rim moulding and bevel found in the bipartite and
tripartite vessels and also the hollow neck is already present in two of the sherds from Ford (fig. II: 1c and d) and essentially "Food Vessel" rims are quite common among the Peterborough pottery from the Yorkshire Wolds, recently published by T. G. Manby (Manby 1975), especially those rims from Rudston Wold West Reservoir site 5, an occupation pit and hearth, where the external moulding and decorated internal bevel are present and fully developed on one sherd (Manby 1975, fig. 10, No. 3). A Peterborough bowl, from Rudston corner field site 2 which consisted of three occupation pits, has a flattened base and so, in form at least, it would not be out of place in a food vessel corpus (Manby 1975, fig. 7, No. 7).

This suggests that the Food Vessels and Food Vessel Urns may not be much later. Also characteristic of this type of rim, normally attributed to the the Bronze Age and especially so with regard to bevel decoration, is the style of rim found on Grooved Ware sherds such as those from the Woodhenge area (Stone J., F. S., 1949) which have both moulded rims and straight bevels. This rim feature seems to be a purely native development since comparatively few beakers have internal bevels, and even fewer have that feature decorated, though internal rim decoration itself is fairly common especially in the All Over Corded Beakers (see examples in Clarke 1970, Vol. II). (e.g. Nos. 1, 2, 6, 8-9, 12, 18, etc.).

Dr. D. L. Clarke, in his recent study of Beaker pottery (Clarke 1970) suggests that the profile of the developed cordoned All Over Corded Beakers became slack and unbalanced and the rim cordon and the belly carination became raised as ribs. This gives, he adds, the basically flower-pot shaped vessels a tripartite appearance matched in the Food Vessel from Wark No. 63. But J. F. S. Stone (Stone J. F. S. 1949) gives in the writer's view a more pleasing explanation, suggesting that the cordons of the bipartite vessels, especially the Yorkshire Vases, may be derived from Grooved Ware prototypes, such as the sherds from the Woodhenge area, and that the slashing on the cordons of some Food Vessels, such as No. 53 from Iderton, may also derive from this source. The flat base of the pottery under review may also be developed from this Neolithic ceramic tradition, though it is also possible that Beaker influence played a part in this. The pottery from the Woodhenge area to which we have been referring also has stop ridges in the grooves, perforated on one sherd, which Stone suggests may have developed into the stops of the Yorkshire Vases.

We therefore, have, in the bipartite Food Vessel, a basically Peterborough bowl shape with Grooved Ware features such as rim, cordons, and stops. Since the majority of Food Vessels are found in graves and very few are from domestic contexts, it could be that this class of pottery represents a merging of Peterborough domestic pottery with Grooved Ware ritual pottery, most commonly found in henges, to produce a hybrid vessel intended primarily to serve a sepulchral purpose.

The basic form of the bowl vessel is common from the earliest Neolithic ceramics, but Clarke, in the same work, has suggested that some bowls similar in shape to No. 79 from Calally may be linked to East Anglian Beakers, the cord decoration and the rather "S"-shaped profile being common to both. This, however, need not necessarily be so. Firstly, the "S"-shaped profile
may be more by chance than by design since there were obviously a great many potters at work and so variations in form were bound to occur, especially in such hand-built pottery. Secondly, the cord decoration referred to is a popular and long-used technique.

**FOOD VESSEL URNS**

Dr. I. Longworth (Longworth 1961) has suggested that the Food Vessel Urns are the result of the adoption of the Collared Urn burial rite by the inhuming Food Vessel community, and so there is a chronological difference and a slight difference in practice between the users of Food Vessels and Food Urns. A. M. ApSimon (ApSimon 1972) suggests however that this may not have brought about the genesis of the Food Vessel Urn since it may already have existed as part of a domestic assemblage, as at the settlement site at Kilellan Farm. ApSimon supports this by the observation that the Food Vessel Urns owe nothing in the way of form or decoration to Collared Urns, but only their associated burial rite. However, in discussing these views T. Cowie (Cowie 1975) points out that the large vessels are often of such proportions that they would have been of little use, in a practical sense, in a domestic assemblage since their stability is poor, as in the case with the vessels from Goatscrag, Nos. 103 and 110, and Broomhouses, No. 109. Cowie also decides that it is possible to combine the theories of Longworth and ApSimon and suggests that the large domestic vessels could have been adapted for cremation upon the adoption of the Cinerary Urn rite, and that the stability would then have been of little importance since the vessels were often inverted over the cremation deposit. This still implies a chronological difference between the Food Vessels and Food Vessel Urns.

It is possible, however, that we should regard the rite of cremation on its own and not label it a "Collared Urn" rite. This is a form of burial that has survived from the Neolithic and is probably older than the rite of individual inhumation found with Beakers and some Food Vessels. Just as today cremation and inhumation exist side by side in the same cultural setting, so they may have co-existed in the early Bronze Age; but while cremation or inhumation are determined by religion or personal choice today, perhaps religion or social status was the determining factor in the Early Bronze Age. With individual inhumation existing in the pre-Beaker Neolithic, the labels "Beaker rite", "Food Vessel rite" and "Urn rite" are becoming less and less acceptable. Both Food Vessels and Food Vessel Urns, therefore, could easily have developed contemporaneously, each with its own burial rite. The co-existence of two forms of burial in the same community is possibly supported by the finding of Food Vessels with cremations and Food Vessel Urns with individual inhumations, as well as the finding of cremations in cists, but especially the occurrence at Carton Slack, No. LXXV (Mortimer 1905) of an inhumation with a cremation piled over its feet.

Food Vessel Urns with shoulder grooves and stops are almost certainly related to the Yorkshire Vases, and that from Whickham, No. 100, is of classic Yorkshire Vase shape with a broad, well defined shoulder groove and a single row of stops. Cowie points out in the same work that vessels with two rows of stops usually have the stops applied rather than raised as in Nos. 103 and
105, from Goatscrag and Barrowford respectively, but they are presumably related to the same Yorkshire Vases as are the very rare Food Vessel Urns with three rows of stops as in vessel No. 106 from High Buston. The rims of the Food Vessel Urns are also similar to the Food Vessels in that they are usually bevelled and moulded. In some cases among the Food Vessel Urns the rim bevel is tiered, for example in the vessels from Whickham, and Ryton, Nos. 108 and 106 respectively, but this feature is again rare.

CINERARY URNS

With regard to the Cinerary Urns, Clarke (Clarke 1970) suggests that they can perhaps be considered as the late Neolithic pottery of the northern and central areas of Britain, later over-running the Fengate territory, especially in Wessex, but he also emphasises the part played by Beakers in this development, and he says that the "Beaker introduction of the Collared rim and the later zoned herringbone device would suggest that the initial development of the Primary Series of Collared Urns was contemporary with the arrival of the N/MR Beaker group (c. 1800 b.c.)". This theory has never had wide support, and Dr. Clarke's suggested date is too early for Collared Urns. He also claims that "direct Beaker influence can be detected in the herringbone device, possibly stimulated by the N/MR Beaker group". Dr. I. Longworth, however, (Longworth 1961) sees the origins of the Collared Urns in the Peterborough pottery tradition. He says that the Collared Urns "come directly from the later phases" of that tradition, and that the collar had already been formalised in the Fengate style. There is support for the view that Collared Urns are native developments uninfluenced by the Beakers. This can perhaps be upheld by Piggott who illustrates a Neolithic bowl from Dundrum of Sandhill type (Piggott S. 1931, fig. 50) which would be identical in shape to a Collared Urn were the body truncated instead of hemispherical. Even the twisted cord handling on the collar would not be out of place among the Cinerary Urns. As for the herringbone motif referred to by Clarke, this appears on the rim mouldings of two Neolithic vessels from Ford, Northumberland, mentioned and illustrated above, which on analogy with those from Meldon Bridge with carbon-14 dates of $2336 \pm 50$ BC and $2290 \pm 55$ BC, (Burgess 1976) may be pre-Beaker and not late in the Peterborough tradition as suggested by Longworth (Longworth 1964).

DECORATION

Most of the decorative techniques and motifs found on the vessels in question (fig. II:2) can be traced back to the Peterborough pottery tradition of the Neolithic (Piggott S. 1931; Smith I. 1956). Simple incision, technique 1, is the most commonly used and take the form of herringbone (motif a), very common on Peterborough pottery, which occurs in 23 examples among the Food Vessels alone. An elaboration of this occurs in the Yorkshire Vase from Hollystone Common, No. 45, where the herringbone is vertical, and the two bands are separated by a single incised vertical line. Incision also takes the form of chevrons and irregular lengths of parallel, horizontal or vertical strokes (motifs b, c and d).

A variation of simple incision is technique 2, the stab and drag device, which is again found on Peterborough pottery and occurs here in two forms.
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The first is formed by an angular point, and the second by a rounded point, which is then stabbed into the soft clay and dragged down and out at the same time resulting in strokes about 1 cm in length and decreasing in depth. This is most commonly found in the herringbone motif, and also random strokes or stabs, motif g.

A further variation on incision is scoring or the making of shallow grooves by dragging a blunt point at a uniform depth through the soft clay, technique 3, and it occurs commonly in motif c. An example of this from the area is a bowl from Beamley, No. 74, where the lines occur in groups of three and perhaps follow the Beaker method of separating zones of decoration. This technique, however, is also used on Peterborough pottery, and especially Grooved Ware (Manby T. G. 1974), and it is notable that similar grooves, but diagonally orientated and less regular, occur on a wall sherd from a Clacton style vessel from Ford, Northumberland (fig. II.3).

Cord decoration in its many forms is also common to the pottery under review and the Peterborough tradition. Whipped cord decoration (technique 4) is formed by wrapping a piece of twisted cord tightly round a second piece, of cord, stick, bone or something similar. The use of this device to form maggots, so-called because of their short oval and segmented nature (technique 4.i), is very common. These maggots are most often arranged in herringbone fashion, motif a, while they are also found in short lengths arranged in irregular vertical or horizontal lines, motifs c and d. Larger lengths of whipped cord are also found, technique 4.ii, arranged in motifs d and e.

A simpler type of cord decoration employs cord in its twisted form, technique 5, without being whipped, and this is especially common in the pottery from the area, as indeed in this type of pottery generally (Manby T. G. 1957; Simpson D. D. A. 1965). Twisted cord decoration is found both in the native Neolithic pottery, and the Beaker pottery of Britain and the Continent, especially in the All Over Corded Beakers. Encircling lines, motif c, are especially common and may be influenced by the AOC Beakers, certainly in the case of vessels with closely set encircling lines. In some cases this motif is used to separate zones of decoration and so again may be indicative of Beaker influence. This technique is found in all motifs in the Food Vessel Corpus.

Combed decoration, technique 6, also appears in various forms on this style of pottery, and also in the Peterborough tradition. This is often found in short lengths which are termed pseudo-maggots because of their similarity to the whipped cord maggots described above (Piggott S. 1931). Like whipped cord, however, combed decoration also appears in continuous lines which form motifs c, e, and h, while the short lengths are invariably found in motif a.

Stabs made without dragging by a sharp or blunt instrument in the soft clay also form part of the large range of decoration found on the Food Vessels, and are found in regular or irregular patterns. These occur in motifs b, c, and g, and form less ambitious patterns than the other techniques, though this is perhaps only due to their more disparate nature. These stabs are
again found on the Neolithic native pottery, local examples being the Clacton sherd from Ford, and one from Thirlings, Northumberland, which have deep conical stab marks made by a sharp pencil-like point (fig. II:3).

Finger nail impressions, technique 8, also have Grooved Ware predecessors in such vessels as that from Pickering (Manby T. G. 1974) and they also occur on a few examples in the present corpus. These, however, seem to be mostly accidental and appear in places such as the ends of lengths of twisted cord where they have been pressed into the clay. However, they are intentional on vessel No. 78, from Blaydon, where they most resemble the vessel from Pickering mentioned above, and on vessel No. 54 from High Buston.

Of the Food Vessels in the corpus, three have what may be termed Beaker decorative traits. One from How Tallon, No. 23, has stamped or rouletted decoration forming bands of dentate triangle shapes which encircle the vessel, each band being separated from the next by three encircling lines in the toothed stick technique. So little of this vessel remains, however, that it could well be a beaker though the fabric and internal rim bevel argue against this. The second is a bowl from Moor Lodge, Alnwick, No. 72, which is decorated with filled triangles placed base to base to form lozenges (Clarke 1970, vol. II). The third is also a bowl from Jesmond, No. 70, which is of Hiberno-Scottish type. This is covered with rouletted decoration, including lozenges and chevrons, which is divided into zones by groups of encircling lines of notched stick decoration. A few other Food Vessels have zoned decoration such as vessel No. 74 from Beanley West Farm and a bowl from Ford, No. 73, but otherwise their decoration is not typically Beaker.

Three Food Vessels deserve individual attention because of their highly ornate nature (fig. II:4). No. 43, from Harbottle Peels, is of Yorkshire vase form and is decorated neatly and entirely with stabs and scoring. The scoring takes the form of encircling lines (motif c) and filled triangles (motif f) and the stabs also encircle the Food Vessel and help to emphasise the stops in the shoulder groove. All of this is executed by a fine but blunt point. On the base itself is a cross formed by two scored lines made by the same point that intercept at right angles at the centre, and these are flanked by stabs similar to those on the body of the vessel. As Greenwell pointed out (Greenwell 1877) this basal decoration is quite rare among the Food Vessels, but it is not entirely unknown. The other two vessels from Bolton and Lowick House, Nos. 7 and 8 respectively, are virtually identical in their elaborate decoration and their bipartite form. Their similarity in having such unusually elaborate decoration suggests that they may be the work of the same craftsman. They have relief decoration on the body and neck which seems to be formed by cutting away the clay between the ribs rather than by adding the ribs by way of plastic decoration, and the faces of the ribs are covered with incised herringbone and cross hatching. In the grooves between the ribs are vertical lines of circular impressions which seem to be formed by the impression of a cut feather or reed into the soft clay. The decoration of all three vessels is of a very high aesthetic standard.

The relief decoration of the "Encrusted" Food Vessel Urns is usually restricted to the area of the concave neck between the rim moulding and the
shoulder, and usually takes the form of chevrons with the resulting triangular spaces filled with the decorative techniques mentioned above, such as twisted cord or incision. On the Food Vessel Urn from Coatscrap, No. 110, the arcing is neither triangular nor applied, but is raised in the form of sub-rectangular bays which are very unusual among such vessels. Twisted cord is used to accentuate the arcing and some spaces are filled with concentric cord semicircles which can perhaps be related to the concentric cord decoration on the rims of some Peterborough sherds, such as two of the Neolithic sherds from Ford referred to and illustrated above. Generally speaking there is rarely any decoration on the crests of the chevrons themselves though there are notable exceptions to this rule in this area. For example, vessel No. 112, from Ford, has twisted cord lines on the ridges of the relief decoration and vessels Nos. 108 and 109, from Broomhouses and Ryton respectively, both have slashing across the relief. Stone (Stone J. F. S. 1949) points out that some Grooved Ware sherds from the Woodhenge area have similar slashing on the cordons, so it is possible that the slashing on the reliefs of the Coatscrap and Ryton vessels may be derived from this Grooved Ware device.

The origins of this type of relief decoration are obscure but ApSimon (ApSimon A. M., 1974) points out that the Bronze Age potters had experience of plastic decoration from the Grooved Ware tradition, and also in the stops of the Yorkshire vases and the Food Vessel Urns with stops in the shoulder grooves. Since these stops are not far removed from the applied chevrons, outside influences need not be sought. The applied ridges on some grooved ware fragments such as the plastic strips on the Durrington Walls style of pottery are also probably related to the applied chevrons of some Food Vessel Urns.

All other decorative techniques and motifs used on the Food Vessel Urns, and indeed on the Cinerary Urns, are also to be found on the Food Vessels, and so have been dealt with above. This strengthens the possibility of a relationship between the Food Vessels and the Food Vessel Urns already referred to with regard to form. Linked directly to Grooved Ware, however, are the carefully executed grooves on the Food Vessel Urn from Ryton, No. 108, and the studs on the Clacton sherd from Ford referred to above can be directly paralleled by the studs on the Food Vessel Urn from Kirkwhelpington, No. 86, the more so since the fabric of the Grooved Ware sherd is essentially of Early Bronze Age type.

Plaited cord decoration is rare; it is absent from the Food Vessels but it is found on one Food Vessel Urn and two Cinerary Urns in the corpus. The two Cinerary Urns, Nos. 124 and 140, are from Holystone Common and Stonebridge respectively and the Food Vessel Urn is No. 106 from High Buston. The High Buston vessel is more unusual as it is also the only Food Vessel Urn to have three shoulder grooves each with its row of stops.

One Food Vessel Urn, that from Roseborough, No. 90, deserves special mention because of its elaborate nature. This vessel almost has a Collared Urn form, but it has two Collars, and its bipartite form and the applied decoration qualify it for inclusion among the Food Vessel Urns. The applied decoration takes the form of small pellets of clay added to the rim moulding and to the shoulder, to give those features a scalloped effect. The belly
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of the vessel is decorated from the shoulder to the base with incised filled triangles, and such total decoration is rare among the Food Vessel Urns. This Food Vessel Urn is very closely related to the two elaborate vessels from Beanly and Lowick illustrated in fig. II.4, especially in the elaborate use of incision and grooving with reed impressions in the grooves, both on the rim moulding and on the internal bevel. It is suggested, therefore, that we are dealing, in the above vessels, with the work of the same potter.

Unfortunately, this urn was not located by the writer in the British Museum and it seems to be preserved only in Greenwell's engraving. It is to be hoped that the Urn will come to light when work in progress on the Greenwell material reaches Durham and Northumberland.

NOTES

1. I am grateful to Mr. Roger Miket for this information.
SECTION III
BURIAL CONTEXT

All aspects of the burials that accompanied the vessels will be dealt with under the heading of Burial context with the exceptions of the associations, which shall be dealt with under chronology, except in so far as they shed further light on the burials, such as indicating the possible sex of the body. The Food Vessel Urns will be dealt with separately, as well as Cinerary Urns since their general associated rite is different from the mode of burial normally associated with the Food Vessels. Obviously there is much of the burial that will not survive in the archaeological record such as any ritual song, prayer or dance that might have played some part in the ceremony, so even with the fuller recording of more recent excavation we can only study an incomplete picture.

FOOD VESSELS

A. Mound

Before discussing the sepulchral monument itself, it is worth pointing out that in this monograph the term "cairn" is used to indicate a mound composed mainly, though not necessarily totally, of stones, and "barrow" to refer to a similar monument of earth.

We are fortunate to have some details of at least part of the burial context of the majority of the total number of possible sepulchral vessels in the Food Vessel corpus, but unfortunately fully detailed reports are very few. As many as 46 may have come from a cairn or barrow, but of these six had no trace of any associated burial and in five instances there is no distinction made; between a barrow and a cairn. Of the remainder, none can definitely be said to have had no mound covering the burial at all. The burial in a cairn or barrow probably represents no more than a topographical difference, and though the materials may be different, the end result is the same, namely a mound, invariably circular, covering at least one burial. Later additions to the mound itself as well as to the burials are possible, which now exists to a greater or lesser extent. These circular mounds were generally thought to be the result of Beaker influence, the practice of individual contracted inhumation in a round barrow or cairn coming from the continent with the Beaker intrusions. Piggott (Piggott S. 1954), however, points out that these round mounds are also found in Neolithic Britain. He says "there is some evidence for burial under round barrows with the same or similar rite to that in the unchambered long barrows of Wessex", and he gives as an example the Dilton round barrow in Wiltshire which was formed from the up-cast material from a quarry ditch which surrounds the mound like those of the long barrows, and which covered seven or eight disarticulated skeletons. Piggott later points
out in the same work that "peculiar to Yorkshire are a large number of burials of various types under round barrows but associated with pottery and grave goods of Neolithic types". He quotes evidence of multiple inhumations under round barrows in such cases as Greenwell Nos. VII, VIII, and LVII (Greenwell 1877), and evidence for single or double inhumations of Neolithic date in Greenwell III. Greenwell III had a single contracted burial associated with Neolithic pottery, and this practice of single inhumation is also found under long barrows in Wiltshire.

In Northumberland and Durham, there was a cremation trench below the round barrow at Copt Hill, near Houghton-le-Spring, and a Food Vessel and Food Vessel Urn came from secondary contexts in the mound. The Neolithic mounds of County Durham may provide a link between those of Yorkshire and Northumberland, such as at Ford (Greenwell CLXXXVIII). Neolithic pottery also came from the material of the barrow at Hasting Hill near Sunderland (fig. III.1). Since this came from the mound material it may represent little more than Neolithic activity in the area, but Trenchman also found various bones in the material, apart from the secondary burials, and it could be that a Neolithic deposit was disturbed when the "primary" Beaker inhumation was inserted. At Warden Law, however, also in County Durham, a round barrow 33 ft in diameter was excavated (Trenchman 1914) and produced evidence of two interments, possibly in a cist, with a fragment of "undecorated pottery of the usual type", but also containing a cache of flints including two Neolithic leaf-shaped arrowheads and part of the cutting edge of a greenstone axe, also characteristically Neolithic. It seems therefore that the round barrows of the Copper and Bronze Ages may owe as much, if not more, to local development than to Beaker intrusion.

There are five examples of cairns being described as set in a circle of stones. These are Greenwell's CLXXXVII, CC, CCXI and CCI. Barrow CCI on Bewick Moor is especially interesting since the rim fragment of Food Vessel Urn No. 116, which was found among cremated remains, may be Neolithic judging by its dark brown colour and general form. These stone circles are probably to be seen more as kerbs to the cairns or barrows rather than actual standing stone circles as are found in henges, except in a few cases. At Chatton Sandyford, from which came vessel No. 96, the cairn has been scientifically excavated to modern standards and a kerb of stones set on edge round the periphery of the cairn was revealed. Here the excavator (Jobey, G. 1968) saw that the kerb was secondary and served the purpose of enlarging the cairn after the third Beaker interment, and possibly contemporary with or slightly preceded the deposition of vessel No. 96 and its associated cremation. Such kerbs are by no means rare (Fox C. 1939) but that at Chatton Sandyford is notable for the high standard of the carefully dressed stones. At Catcherside (CCXI) a similar ring was composed of only six standing stones of which three had been robbed away and three were still standing. Whether this represented a broken kerb which would still help to retain the material of the mound, or a standing stone circle of the type found in henge monuments, can only be guessed at, and while the former may be the more likely, the connection between henges and barrows should be noted (Ashbee P. 1960).

The generally poor standard of the reports of the finding of the vessels extends to the recording of their positions in the mounds, and only in eight
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cases do we have sufficient details to determine the secondary or primary position of the burials. At Broomhill (Greenwell CLXXXVII) vessel No. 80 was in a primary position with six secondary Urn interments. At Doddington (Greenwell CLXXXIX) vessel No. 61 was the only interment, as were vessels Nos. 48 and 84 at South Charlton, and so they must be assumed to be primary unless burials were overlooked. At Eglingham and Holystone Common (Greenwell CC and CCIV) a Food Vessel and vessel No. 45 again occupied the primary positions, the secondary interments being a burial with a bipartite Food Vessel and an unaccompanied burial at Eglingham and two unaccompanied burials at Holystone Common. At South Charlton and Hasting Hill the primary interments were Beakers, but that at Hasting Hill (Tait J. 1965, No. 88) is very degenerate and has a form not unlike a bipartite Food Vessel. At Hasting Hill there were three bipartite Food Vessels, one Collared Urn and one Food Vessel Urn comprising the secondary burials as well as an unaccompanied inhumation, while at Copt Hill the barrow yielded Neolithic primary material and a Food Vessel, Food Vessel Urn and a Saxon interment in secondary positions. It should be noted that no Food Vessel has been found stratigraphically earlier than a Beaker in a Barrow or cairn, and the relationship between Urns and Food Vessels in similar.

B. Interm ent

The method of deposition of the burial, either inhumation or cremation, associated with the Food Vessels is most commonly in a rectangular cist formed by at least four large flat stones set on edge to form a box and covered by a cap-stone often of considerable size and weight. Seventy-eight of the Food Vessels in the corpus can certainly be said to have come from such a cist while only eleven can be said not to have come from a cist but still accompany a burial deposit. This practice of cist burial is possibly to be seen as a Beaker contribution to local burial customs and the practice of a dug pit-grave in lowland areas and a built stone grave in the highland zone was brought with the Beakers from the Continent. Of the Beakers from Tait's corpus (Tait 1965), numbering 106 in total, and excluding Nos. 1-25 from Ross Links, a coastal sand dune site, and Nos. 26-30 from Old Yeavering about which there are no details, 48 came from cists, and one, from Cartington (Tait 1965, No. 96) from a dug grave. To these may be added the dug graves at Chatton Sandyford (Jobey 1968). Of the remaining 28 only five can with any degree of certainty be said not to have come from a cist. The cists in which the Food Vessels of the present corpus were found were all of standard form, except for that from Harbottle Peels in which there was a Food Vessel (now lost) which is interesting in that it had a stone base. In this respect it resembles that found at Little Driffield (Mortimer 1905). From the same cairn at Harbottle Peels there came a cist containing vessel No. 37, which had a pattern "like a foot" 5\(\frac{1}{2}\) in long by a maximum of 3 in wide incised on one of the slabs that formed the south side. The cist found with vessel No. 83 from Hasting Hill was also unusual in that it was roughly circular, but the stones were too substantial for it to have been simply a casing of stones like those which protected some of the Food Vessel Urns and Cinerary Urns from the area. The cist itself is the only aspect of the so-called Early Bronze Age burial rite of single contracted inhumations that cannot be seen to have clear beginnings in the late Neolithic. But many cists have been found without
dateable associations and these may prove, when more radiocarbon dates have been determined, to date from the Neolithic. The practice of assigning a cist to the Early Bronze Age simply by analogy may eventually prove to be very dangerous.

The orientation of the cists can only be determined in twenty cases and the majority of these fall into the north/south to east/west orientation, and the north/south orientation is the most common (fig. III. 2b). This unfortunately tells us very little except that such an orientation allows the body to be laid on its right side with its face looking from east to south, the significance of which will be dealt with below.

With regard to the actual type of burial associated with the Food Vessels, we have records of a possible 21 cremations and 25 inhumations. The majority, therefore, are inhumations and although the numbers appear to be quite close, and the difference therefore insignificant, it is likely that a large number of inhumations may have disappeared due to the acid soil conditions that are prevalent in Northumberland. Inhumation is present in the Neolithic in Britain, but here the remains are often disarticulated, especially beneath long barrows, as though the corpses had been allowed to decay and the bones gathered at a later date. Crouched inhumations, however, are found in Neolithic contexts and so was clearly being practised in Britain at a time before there was any question of Beaker influence.

The actual orientation of the skeleton is not often given in the reports, mainly because of the poor state of preservation of the remains, and we can only determine the orientation in five cases (fig. III. 2a). In these skeletons faced south-east or east, which has prompted suggestions of an ancestor cult, since the Beaker folk who were thought to have introduced this mode of burial were also thought to have come from the Continent, and this position was then adopted by the native population. But it may also have been to allow the deceased to face the new sun which gave new life to the earth after the dark and possibly signified life after death. That an after-life was believed in is possibly attested by the presence of grave goods. Any such beliefs, however, unfortunately form part of the burial context that has not survived in the archaeological record. All the skeletons lay on their right sides except that from Blaydon with vessel No. 20, which was on its left, but still faced south-east.

Of the twenty-one known cremations, sixteen were found in cists of the same type as those associated with inhumation, and two were protected by a casing of stones of the type characteristic or urned cremations. The remaining two seem to have been unprotected deposits. If the rite of cremation is to be seen as evidence of contact with the individual cremating urn groups, then we have a conflict in burial rites. The idea of the cist forming the grave is present, as is the need for an accompanying vessel, but the mode of interment has radically changed. A similar conflict remains today, however, when cremated remains may be placed in small coffins for interment in family vaults. But the rite of cremation may have survived from the final Neolithic among other groups than just urn users. Neolithic cremation trenches underlie round barrows as has already been mentioned, and it is possible to see the Neolithic cremations developing parallel with the inhumations from multiple to individual. This may also represent a change in social structure.
Three vessels were probably protected by a casing of stones, and of these one, No. 68 from Simonside is certainly associated with cremation. This vessel fits satisfactorily into neither Urn nor Food Vessel categories. It has at least one handle near the top and has a bipartite profile with a concave neck. It has no collar and it cannot be said to be bucket shaped. The height is similar to that of the bipartite Food Vessels but the height/rim diameter ratio is more akin to that of Cinerary Urns. This vessel was found standing upright in a circular cairn protected by a casing of flat stones set on edge, and covered by another flat stone. A Food Vessel, now lost, from Ilderton was said to have been found in a railway cutting "between two large stones" but no further details or record of a burial are given.

Since little usually survives of the skeletal remains in this area, the sex of the body can rarely be determined. The determination was possible in only six cases in the Food Vessel corpus. Five of these were male and one female, and a further two were described as 'child' but no sex was recorded. The male interment at Blaydon, with vessel No. 20, was accompanied by a stone bead; that at Dodington with vessel No. 61 was found with fragments of leather, a flint flake and a flint knife. The female burial was found at Great Tosson with vessel No. 2, and was accompanied by a 'V'-perforated jet button. At Kyloe the body was not sexed, but it was associated with a jet necklace with spacer beads, a type that normally accompanies female skeletons (Callender G. 1915). The details of this aspect of the burials are too scanty to allow any conclusions to be drawn, but evidence from other parts of the country suggests that little if any distinction was made between male and female burials, though possibly perishable material which has not survived or some ritual not present in the archaeological record would have given us a different picture.

There are two certain instances in the area where two burials shared the same cist. At Sunderland two Food Vessels, now lost, shared the same cist. One was accompanied by a male contracted inhumation while the other held a child cremation. Also at Dour Hill (Jobey G. 1977) a bowl had been placed in the cist with an inhumation. This had been disturbed since fragments of the bowl were found outside the cist, and this disturbance probably took place at the time of the deposition of a second interment accompanied by a Northern Tripartite Vase.

FOOD VESSEL URNS

Mound

Details are known of 25 of the 34 Food Vessel Urns. Sixteen came from cairns or barrows, barrows outnumbering cairns by eleven to five. Of the remainder none can certainly be said to have had no mound except for the three vessels from the Rock Shelter cemeteries. No more can be said of the mounds than has already been said in relation to the Food Vessels except that the cairn at Chatton Sandyford was possibly enlarged to take the Food Vessel Urn deposit. With regard to their positions in the mounds, there is only one example of a Food Vessel Urn forming the primary interment, and that is at Catcherside where vessel No. 86 came from Greenwell CXXII and had a Collared Urn in a secondary position. At Chatton Sandyford the primary
interment was accompanied by a Beaker, while there were another two secondary Beakers also stratigraphically earlier than the Food Vessel Urn. At Roseborough (Greenwell CXCIX) the primary interment was also a Beaker while the secondary Food Vessel Urn held a double cremation.

INTERMENT

With regard to the actual method of interment, that is in a cist, a casing of stones or unprotected, five came from cists and five (including one uncertain example) had a casing of stones. Of the cist burials two were associated with inhumations, vessel No. 89, from Alnwick and vessel No. 98 from Great Tosson. The remaining three accompanied cremations. Those protected by a casing of flat upright stones with a cover slab were all, as might have been expected, associated with cremations. A further twelve were associated with cremations but were either unprotected or the reports are lacking in detail on the subject, but only the two mentioned above were associated with inhumations either unprotected or otherwise. Two uncertain burials come from High Buston, the report on which is confusing, having been published by an independent body a considerable time after the actual discovery. A small "cist" is recorded, nine inches square, on top of which was placed one vessel, while another three were "placed around" the cist which contained bones but no vessel. One of the vessels, perhaps of Yorkshire Vase form, is now lost, but one Food Vessel, No. 54, and two Food Vessel Urs, Nos. 97 and 106, have survived. Their relation to this central cist is not known, nor is it known whether they were associated with it, as seems unlikely. At High Buston, vessel No. 90 was inverted on a cist cover, but again the two were probably not associated. Vessel No. 110 from Goatscrag and a lost Food Vessel Urn from South Charlton were both placed in pits, the Food Vessel Urn from Goatscrag being inverted while the position of the South Charlton Urn was not recorded. Food Vessel Urn No. 100 from Whickham is the only one that has been reported as having been found upright, since it had a cover stone "over" the mouth. However, the possibility remains that "over" may be used in the sense of "across". All the other urns in the corpus, where we have such information, have been found inverted, six examples having a stone covering the mouth of the vessel. The Food Vessel Urn No. 110 from Goatscrag was found to have been broken at the time of deposition. A lost Food Vessel Urn from Lowstead Farm was said to "have had when discovered a cover much ornamented" (A.C., p. 11, No. 13) which may possibly mean a cap-marked stone like that found with Food Vessel Urn No. 96, from Chatton Sandyford. Food Vessel Urn No. 93 from Hasting Hill rested on a prepared bed of gravel.

The inversion of the Food Vessel Urns or their covering with a cap stone may be a Collared Urn rite adopted by the Food Vessel users (see above under origins) or, if it is accepted that the Food Vessel Urns and the Collared Urns are contemporary and should not be seen as having influenced one another as is suggested, then it can be seen as a simple and logical means of protecting the cremation deposits so that they were not unintentionally mixed with the earth that covers them. Whichever view is accepted, this burial practice is common to both Food Vessel Urns and Collared Urns and in the Cinerary Urn corpus from Northumberland and Durham (for the Urn corpus in tabulated
form see Gibson 1976) twelve are known to have been inverted while five were found upright. Six were protected by a casing of stone slabs and seven were placed in a pit or hollow in the natural surface. However, details of the discovery of the majority of the Cinerary Urns are lacking.

ROCK SHELTER CEMETERIES

Both the rock shelter cemeteries at Goatscrag and at Edlingham produced Mesolithic and Neolithic worked flints, but in neither case was there any association with the Food Vessel Urns. The excavator of Goatscrag points out that "Prehistoric cave and rock shelter burials occur widely in the British Isles, but where dating is possible they usually belong to the Neolithic, especially the late Neolithic. Cemeteries as well as isolated burials are met with, but the burial rite is almost invariably inhumation" (Burgess 1972).

CINERARY URNS

Mound

We have only scanty information on the majority of the Cinerary Urns in the corpus. For example, only fourteen are said to have come from cairns while twenty came from barrows, as defined above. Some Urns certainly had no mound, such as No. 143 from Barnard Castle which came from the river bank at Egglestone. That still leaves over half the corpus with no record of either the presence or absence of a mound. It seems unlikely that such a large proportion are from flat graves, and no doubt some are from ploughed-out or eroded mounds. One Urn, No. 125 from Howick Heugh, comes from what was thought to be an enclosed cremation cemetery which the excavator pointed out had "a superficial resemblance to some Wessex Culture disc barrows... where the bank lies within the peripheral ditch" (Jobey G. and Newman T. G. 1975). This monument consisted of a slight, just off-centre, mound surrounded by a slight bank and ditch. Excavation showed, however, that the outer bank and ditch were not associated with the inner barrow since beneath the bank lay plough soil and a sherd either of Iron Age date or of native pottery of the Roman period.

Details of the relative positions of the Cinerary Urns in the mounds are often neglected and few instances are recorded. Of those noted, the majority (twenty examples) seem to be secondary while six are recorded as primary. These numbers are probably too small to be significant, although it could be argued that the difference is large enough to suggest that secondary interments probably outweigh primary, as seems to be the case in the rest of the country, and that the northern Urn users were clearly not against re-using existing mounds.

Interment

As is to be expected with the Cinerary Urns, cremation is by far the most common mode of interment and is recorded in 49 cases. Again, those without mention of a burial are probably poorly recorded, except in a few cases, and it may be that the older antiquaries expected an Urn to imply a cremation. Some, however, are definitely recorded as being without any accompanying burial, such as a lost cinerary Urn from Roseborough, but it seems to be a
casual find in the material of the mound. Two Urns are recorded with inhumations which may provide yet another example of the mixing of burial traditions apparent already from the Food Vessels and Food Vessel Urns. One of these Urns, that from Fulwell, is especially interesting in that the skeleton and the Urn were both covered by a flat stone and by a layer of limpet shells. This is unparalleled in the area and possibly had some ritual significance, now unfortunately lost.

The normal method of deposition was for the Urn to hold the ashes of the cremation and then to be placed either upright or inverted in the material of the mound. In the corpus, twelve are recorded as inverted and five as upright. The mouths are often closed by a flat stone, recorded in fourteen cases, whether upright or inverted, and in one case, an Urn from Broomhill, the mouth was sealed with a clay plug. Other examples may have had a perishable covering such as leather or cloth which has not survived. Some Urns were clearly inverted before the cremations were inserted, such as an Urn from Yeavering which had the base broken for the insertion of the ashes.

The Urns themselves were often protected. Six examples are recorded with a stone case around them to protect them against earth pressure. In seven other recorded cases the vessel was placed in a pit that was dug into the sub-soil and performed the same purpose as the stone case. In a mound on Etall Moor opened by Canon Greenwell, four Urns shared the same pit, one being empty and the rest containing cremations. Five examples are recorded as having come from cists, among them three from Tunstall Hill that shared the same cist. This again seems to show a mixing of burial customs, unless a casing of stones set around the Urn was considered a cist by the excavators. In three recorded cases a larger Urn protected a smaller one: at Broomridge, Holystone Common and Stonebridge cremations were contained in a Cinerary Urn which has then been placed inside a second Urn. The Broomridge Urns were further protected by being placed in a clay-lined hollow.

The sex of the interments is very rarely reported, as is perhaps to be expected. In several cases "adult cremation" is recorded, and "young person" and "child" each occur twice. At Kirkhill there were three adults and a child in one Urn. At Ford Common, however, a female cremation was contained in the Urn and at Howick Heugh the Urn accompanied, but did not contain, a cremation deposit of a woman over 21 years of age and an infant of 1 or 2 years, presumably her child. All the identifiable examples, therefore, are female burials but we know too little of the corpus as a whole to suggest that Urned Cremation was reserved for women and children, and indeed this seems very unlikely.

It can be seen, therefore, that the burial rites associated with the sepulchral vessels in the corpus have a long Neolithic ancestry, and, like the form and decoration of the vessels, need not owe anything to Beaker influence. The mode of burial found with the Food Vessel Urns confirms their close connection with the Cinerary Urns and indeed it is only the form of the two Urn types that differs. It therefore seems possible that native rites had a greater influence than the Beaker folk on the burial rites associated with the pottery under consideration, but in the absence of a national corpus this cannot be
said to be any more than a local trait. It does, however, seem to extend to
the Food Vessels in south-west Scotland and the Peak District, and to the
Food Vessel Urns of northern and southern England (Simpson D. D. A. 1965;
Manby T. G. 1969; Cowie T. G. 1975; Smedley and Owles 1963; Savory
M. N. 1955).
SECTION IV
ASSOCIATIONS AND CHRONOLOGY

The question of the date of Food Vessels has already been dealt with by Simpson on a national basis (Simpson 1968), with reference being made there to the relevant vessels from the area with which the present monograph is concerned. To avoid a simple reiteration of Simpson's work, therefore, the corpus will be dealt with in isolation to see whether the pottery can be dated on its own characteristics. Useful evidence is scanty in Northumberland and Durham due to the small number of scientifically conducted excavation, and C-14 dates are rare.

Simpson points out (Simpson 1968) that the traditional sequence of Beaker — Food Vessel — Urn has long been rejected and that the three types existed at least partly contemporaneously, but it should be noted that no Food Vessel has yet been recorded as stratigraphically earlier than a Beaker in a mound, and a similar situation exists between Urns and Food Vessels. A typical stratigraphic sequence may be seen at Hasting Hill where the primary inhumation was accompanied by a degenerate Beaker with secondary Food Vessel burials, while urns occupied perhaps still later positions. Although primary and secondary positions do indicate order of deposition, the period of time between each need not be at all great, so that the Beaker — Food Vessel — Urn sequence may have a greater sociological than chronological significance.

Amongst the associated objects, the scarcity of firmly datable artifacts is at once apparent. Perishable objects were probably deposited with the dead, as is shown by the traces of leather found in a cist at Doddington, and it has long been realised that wooden vessels, possibly similar to those from the Wilford Shaft (Aslibee 1963) may also have accompanied burials. Such associations are hypothetical, however, in the north-east of England, and contribute little to the determination of chronology. The same is true of the fourth molar of a sheep and the ox molar associated with vessels Nos. 83 and 21 from Hasting Hill. These were no doubt charms associated with the burial rite, but their significance is now lost.

The most common associated object in Northumberland and Durham is a second vessel. Again, however, because of the early date of many of the excavations and the fact that many are chance finds, there are few examples which can be said to be from sealed contexts. For example, vessel No. 42 from Hazon had obviously been disturbed because it was associated with a modern spur according to the report. It was also associated with a second vessel which may have been a lid. Such lids are known to have been found with Food Vessels in rare cases such as at Potter Brampton Wold (Greenwell 1877, p. 90, fig. 77), but the extreme rarity of these objects makes the suggestion that the object from Hazon was in fact part of a second vessel the more plausible explanation in the opinion of the present author. Vessel No. 84 from
South Charlton is also said to have been found with a second vessel, but the report is greatly lacking in detail, although it does seem that both vessels were protected by a casing of stones and shared the same pit. Again the question is raised as to whether or not they formed part of the same deposit. The vessel from Greenville, No. 38, was also found with a second vessel but again we do not know whether to regard this as an association in the strict sense of the word. The second vessel is described as "like the first but larger" so we may assume that it too was of Yorkshire Vase form, but it would be rash to suggest that "larger" meant that it was a Food Vessel Urn. At Glanton nothing is known of the find save that there were three cists each of which contained two vessels. At Dour Hill, however, excavation by modern standards showed that a bowl and a Northern tripartite Food Vessel shared the same cist, but here there was clear evidence of intrusion as parts of the bowl were found outside the cist, displaced at the time of the secondary deposit, and there were traces of two skeletons in the cist, one lying above the other (Jobey 1977).

A Food Vessel of unknown form from Hasting Hill was associated with a sherd from an incense cup of a very fine fabric (fig. 4-1A), and the Yorkshire Vase from Murton Farm, No. 34, was also associated with a simple bipartite vase-shaped pigmy vessel (fig. 4-1B). If this association is strict, then it shows that there is no chronological difference between Yorkshire Vases and simple vases of bipartite form, or at the very least there is a chronological overlap.

Food Vessels Nos. 22 and 55, from Catheugh Farm near Barraford, are both recorded as having come from the same cist in 1822, but little more information is available and again they need not be in strict association. If we assume for the sake of argument that the association is valid, then we have evidence for the contemporaneity in the north-east of simple bipartite vases and bipartite vases with shoulder grooves, and this can be linked to the Yorkshire Vase series via the Murton Farm example mentioned above. At Longridge Towers near Berwick a bipartite vessel and a bowl were both found in the same cist. If this association is also valid then the contemporaneity of the bipartite vases can be extended to bowls. The bowl, however, has a very asymmetric form and could possibly be seen as a degenerate bipartite vase or even a degenerate Beaker, as has already been observed by Mr. G. Jobey. If this is the case, then the find paralleled by that at Lesbury, where vessel No. 4 was associated with a short-necked Beaker (Tait 1965, No. 63). Mr. J. Tait held the opinion that these short-necked Beakers are contemporary in the north with his "Bell Beaker derivatives", and in absolute terms he placed them as post c. 1850 B.C.

Two associations, with Food Vessel Urns Nos. 90 and 99, can also be dispensed with as they contribute nothing towards the determination of date. Both were associated with squarish flint flakes showing traces of working on one or both sides. The example from Ovingham is certainly a scraper as it shows evidence of working one side only, but the flint from Roseborough has unfortunately been lost. Such flakes have a long existence in pre-history and are of no value for chronological purposes until more work is done on Bronze Age flints.
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Second vessels are recorded with eight of the Cinerary Urns in the corpus. One from Berwick upon Tweed, or Murton, Co. Durham (the report does not state which), is an incense cup of biconical form, as is one from Moralee Farm which is decorated completely with impressions made with a quill or hollow reed. The incense cup from Lilburn Hill is vase-shaped and decorated with vertical lines of finger nail impressions. The Etal Moor incense cup is illustrated in Greenwell, Fig. 155, but is a nondescript globular vessel formed from a small ball of clay. A "second vessel" and a "small vessel" are recorded in association with the Urns from Fulwell and Rye Hill respectively but no further description is given.

At Broomridge a Food Vessel and a cremation were found beneath a Collared Urn, but the Food Vessel is of an unusual type, and can be seen as a cross between a bipartite vase and a tripartite collared urn. The size and decoration suggest Food Vessel affinities while the basic form is a Collared Urn, so this vessel is an excellent example to show that no real distinctive lines can be shown between the pottery types, but instead they merge into one another forming indeterminate forms between classic types. This vessel combines not only physical characteristics of Urns and Food Vessels, but also functional ones, in that it is both a cremation container and an accessory vessel. This clearly shows that the two types of burial were in use simultaneously.

A bipartite Food Vessel from Great Tosson was associated with a "V"-perforated conical jet button (fig. IV.2). Ashton (Ashton 1972) points out that these buttons are often found singly or in pairs in the north of England, and in some cases are components of necklaces consisting of differently shaped beads. They are similar to those of amber found in Wessex I graves and so are probably contemporary with that culture, jet being a substitute for amber in the north. These buttons also occur frequently with Beakers and also with Cinerary Urns, but in the two cases from the north the Urns and the buttons cannot be said to be strictly associated. In the north, the association with Beakers is mainly with North British Beakers according to Clarke’s classification (Clarke 1970) which begin around 1800 B.C. (Clarke 1970, Vol. 1, fig. XIV), and Beakers at Chatton Sandyford (Jobey, 1968) associated with such a button yielded a date of 1650 ± 50 b.c. For the metal associations with such buttons, Ashton lists (Ashton 1972) one awl, seven daggers and one flat axe. At Carton Slack (Ashton op. cit.) a "V"-perforated jet button was associated with four bronze beads and a similar button was associated with a stone axe hammer from the same area (Mortimer 1905, p. 210, fig. 513). These buttons, therefore, seem to belong to the Early Bronze Age but probably begin in the Neolithic as one at Calais Wold was associated with a leaf-shaped arrowhead (Mortimer 1905, p. 64).

A jet necklace was found with vessel No. 76, from Kyloe, which suggests that this was a female burial as Callander (Callander 1915) points out that such jewellery normally accompanies that sex. These necklaces, consisting of cylindrical beads with spacer beads (fig. IV.2), are thought to have their origins in the amber Neolithic necklaces with spacer beads from Denmark which consisted of five strings of beads (Crow 1928). A similar amber necklace was found in Wiltshire and in this case the amber, if not the finished article, came from the Baltic. As was the case with the "V"-perforated
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conical buttons, jet was probably used instead of amber in the north where it is more common, but the beads are probably still contemporary with those of amber from Wessex contexts. They seem to have a long life, however, as at Solum Fen in Cambridgeshire (Fox 1923) one was found with "a socketted chisel-like axe of late type", though Fox doubted that the association was valid. In an earlier context, jet spacer beads were found at Melfort in Argyll with two bronze armlets. These armlets are decorated with three bands each consisting of three parallel lines, one group at each opening and one in the centre, and the intervening spaces are filled with embossed lozenges. They are therefore similar to, and probably contemporary with, one found at Migdale with an early flat axe and "V"-perforated buttons. In Northumberland a jet necklace was found in a Neolithic context round the neck of a pottery vessel from Crookham Dene, Ford, which Longworth (Longworth 1969) has suggested was one of the five Neolithic sherds from Ford illustrated above. This is unfortunately now lost. These jet spacer beads are normally considered to be a Scottish Bronze Age phenomenon since most come from that area and so it is interesting to note that a second example associated with a Food Vessel comes from Northumberland north of the Tweed, at High Cocklaw, No. 28 (fig. IV.2), that vessel No. 76 from Kyllo is in fact an Hiberno-Scottish Bowl, and that a third spacer bead comes from Simonburn, Northumberland (fig. IV.2), but this last had no associated objects. Four jet beads, three cylindrical and \( \frac{1}{2} \) in, 5/8 in and \( \frac{3}{8} \) in long, and one conical bead resembling a jet button were reported as having been found with a Cinerary Urn from Ford Common, and it is possible that this represents another jet necklace though not necessarily such an elaborate or complete one.

The flint associations have suffered greatly with the years, since of the seventeen recorded associations, fourteen now appear to be lost. The flint knife reported with vessel No. 3 from Plessey Mill may not have been associated with this particular vessel as two others were found at the same time. The knife may possibly have been a squarish flake or of the plano-convex type which is often found with Urns (Clarke J. G. D. 1932) but not with Beakers or Neolithic pottery, which suggests that they are probably a native development of Early Bronze Age date. Such a knife was found with the Food Vessel from High Cocklaw, No. 28.

Similarly an unfinished arrowhead is reported as having been found with the Food Vessel bowl from Benley West Farm, No. 74, but this again is lost and its type is unknown. The same fate has befallen the flint knife and flake from Doddington, and the flint knife or scraper from Birtley. The "arrowheads and other objects" associated with the vessel from How Tallon, No. 33, are slightly more informative from our point of view as the arrowhead (the only one seen by the writer) is of barbed and tanged variety, normally thought to be a Beaker introduction, and so this may reinforce the possibility that the How Tallon sherds do in fact represent a Beaker. A flint knife 3 in long and 1.5 in wide is said to have been found with the Cinerary Urn from Simonside, but this too is lost and no further description or drawing survives.

Food Vessel No. 65 from Hasting Hill was associated with a flint saw and flake which now appear to be lost but are illustrated in the report of the find. The flake appears to be a scraper while the saw is a small elongated flint.
with a ridge running down the back and a serrated edge. This however does not help us to date the vessel.

Flints are also associated with the Cinerary Urns but again their nature is such as to defy close dating, at least until more work is carried out on the late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age flint industries and forms. Flint flakes are reported, but are now lost, from Broomhill and Ford Common, seven scrapers are reported from Rye Hill but could not be traced by the writer, and two non-descript calcined flints were found in the Urn from Kirkhill and are illustrated in the report.

Vessel No. 56, from Haugh Head, however, was associated with six flints (fig. IV.3A) of which four are not recognisable as having formed parts of any implement while one is a single barbed arrowhead and another a spearhead. The spearhead is similar to that from Little Driffield, Yorkshire (Mortimer 1905, fig. J13) (fig. IV.3C), which was also associated with a Food Vessel, and to one from Ford (fig. IV.3B) found with a cremation (Greenwell 1877, fig. 157) possibly of Neolithic date, though this example is of a rather more regular form. The arrowhead is rather more interesting. It is a type "F" petit tranchet derivative according to Clarke's classification (Clarke J. G. D. 1934). Clarke sees this type of arrowhead as developing from the Mesolithic petit tranchet arrowhead. The Haugh Head specimen is very similar to that from post-hole E17 at Woodhenge (Clarke J. D. G. 1934, fig. 10, No. 37), which is a Grooved Ware site. Clarke shows that three such arrowheads have come from Grooved Ware sites while one has come from a Peterborough — Beaker site (the hyphen being used to show that both types of pottery were found there). This therefore suggests that the Haugh Head arrowhead can be dated typologically to the final Neolithic but the type possibly continues into the Middle Bronze Age.

Food Vessel No. 66, from Colwell, was found to contain a small round piece of sandstone. This may have been a pot-boiler although it does not appear to be heat crazed, and though it cannot provide chronological information it is worth noting that at Ardeer in Ayrshire (McLellan Mann L. B. I. 1905) pebbles were found in Cinerary Urns. Most of the sixteen urns found, all of which were bucket-shaped, contained at least one pebble while Urn No. 4 contained no less than fifteen. They were also associated with gold leaf and faience beads of star and segmented types. Since, however, the pebble from Colwell is of sandstone and those from Ardeer are quartz, this parallel may not be valid.

Bone pins are recorded with three Cinerary Urns, from Broomhill, Etal Moor and Roseborough, and in the last two cases the pins are reported to have been calcined, indicating cremation with the body, perhaps as dress fasteners. They, like most of the associations, are long lived artifacts.

From Amble Quarry, with the Yorkshire Vase No. 68, there came an important find as regards chronology: a three rivetted bronze knife (fig. IV.4). This has been much worn away by sharpening and use, but it is of plain form and can be paralleled with the only other Food Vessel—bronze dagger association, that at Kilmaho in Argyll (Simpson 1968), which, however, has only two rivets. Simpson points out that these small knives have a long life and appear in female graves of Wessex I and II as well as on the Continent.
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Bronze finds are also recorded with two Cinerary Urns, from Etal Moor and from Kirkhill, the latter being only a green stain on some of the cremated bones. The artifact at Etal Moor was much decayed and now appears to be lost, but it seems to have been a small awl of the type common in the very Early Bronze Age. A green stain on some of the bones from the Collared Urn cremation at Kirkhill, vessel No. 138, shows that here too a small copper alloy artifact, possibly an awl, had been interred with the cremated remains. A radiocarbon determination from this cremation has given a date of $1292 \pm 90$ B.C. (SRR-133), which seems unusually late.

The associations with the Food Vessel Urns are no more numerous in proportion to the size of the corpus than they are with the Food Vessels and Cinerary Urns. Vessel No. 98 from Great Tosson may have been associated with a "V"-perforated jet button, although this may be the same one as is mentioned above. An antler is also reported as having been found with this vessel, possibly an antler "pick", but such artifacts are long lived. The possible Food Vessel Urn from Bewick Moor, represented only by a rim sherd, was found with a flint knife said to have been long by $1 \frac{3}{8}$ in wide and with rounded corners. This knife was most probably of the plano-convex type which is characterised by its oblong oval shape and by pressure or scale flaking on the upper or convex surface, while the underneath retains the flake surface, often with the bulb of percussion and the striking platform still intact. Mortimer found such a knife with a bronze rivetted dagger and a stone perforated hammer at Towthorpe (Mortimer 1905, fig. 10), so an Early to Middle Bronze Age date should be applicable to them. Clarke also notes that they have been found with the Food Vessel style of pottery in 23 cases and with cinerary Urns in four cases, and this can be seen as evidence for the native development of the plano-convex knife and as possibly reflecting a similar development of the pottery, as has been suggested. It is not certain, however, that this rim sherd is the actual fragment mentioned by Greenwell in his report of the find, and it could possibly be of Neolithic type.

With the Food Vessel Urn No. 96, from Chatton Sandyford, a cup-marked stone was found (fig. IV.4). These are normally considered to date from the Early Bronze Age but this is because of their frequent association with Early Bronze Age burials, so the use of this evidence would result in a circular argument. The Food Vessel Urn from Spindlesstone, No. 95, is, like the Bewick Moor sherd, possibly of Neolithic date, though here the identification is more certain, and it was in true Urn tradition associated with a pigmy vessel or incense cup (fig. IV.5, No. 2).

Cowie (Cowie 1975), dealing with a larger corpus of Food Vessel Urns, encountered the same general scarcity of closely datable associations but he did have evidence for the contemporaneity of Food Vessels and Food Vessel Urns as the two types were associated in two instances in the corpus. A third vessel was associated with a perforated battle axe, while a fourth was possibly associated with a convex flanged axe.

The associated artifacts, where datable, mostly seem to have late Neolithic roots but all extending to the Middle Bronze Age and defy any attempt to impose more rigorous limits. The early dates for some of the Meldon Bridge pottery, c. 2500 B.C., could easily indicate very early Food Vessel.
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phases, but the main occurrence of this ceramic type must have been around 1600 B.C. on radiocarbon evidence (fig. IV.6), with a similar date range for Collared Urns. The latter are, however, later and outlive the Food Vessels.

The Food Vessels are contemporary with the Mortlake and Fengate styles in the Peterborough tradition, but outlive both, and with Grooved Ware and all Lanting and Van Der Waal's Beaker stages. Technologically they span industrial stages II to V (fig. IV.7).

The Collared Urns are clearly derived from the Fengate style, the collar, truncated body and proportionally minute base being common to both, and so must have been contemporary with at least the later stages of that style and also extend up to c. 1200 B.C. when a variety of cremation forms take over. This places them as contemporary with industrial stages III to V and Lanting and Van Der Waal's Beaker steps 4 to 7.

Like the form and decorations of the sepulchral pottery, the associations seem to show more derivation from local Neolithic traditions than from Beakers. Some associations such as the Type "F" single barbed arrowhead and the "V"-perforated Jet buttons seem to begin in the final Neolithic, but none can be said to have been obsolete before the Middle Bronze Age. If we consider the Beaker evidence, we have a date of c. 1850 B.C. for the earliest short necked Beakers in the area according to Tail's classification, and they seem to be contemporary with the Northern British or Southern British Beakers according to Clarke's classification, which yielded a date of c. 1850 B.C. at Chatton Sandyford. Time and again parallels for the associations can be found in the Wessex graves of around 1650-1400 B.C., but the lack of consistently occurring grave goods of a datable type makes precise dating impossible. The closeness of the pottery in many respects to native Neolithic forms and especially the early radiocarbon dates of c. 2300 B.C. for pottery from Meldon Bridge (Burgess 1976), which seems to be of essentially Food Vessel form, suggests that the Food Vessel style may already have appeared by c. 2000 B.C. and have entered the burial record somewhat later, in c. 1800 B.C., before being replaced in c. 1460 B.C. by a variety of Middle Bronze Age cremation practices. Similarly the Collared Urns seem to have evolved in the first few decades of the second millennium B.C. from Fengate and Mortlake styles; the Cinerary Urns undoubtedly entered the burial record before the end of the "Food Vessel phase", as the confusion in burial traditions that seems to exist in the north possibly bears out, and so a date of c. 1600 B.C. seems appropriate, extending down to c. 1200 B.C., with the radiocarbon date from Howick Heugh (of 1440 ± 90 B.C.) falling between these two dates.
YEARS b.c. | INDUSTRIAL STAGES | BEAKERS | LATE NEOLITHIC WARES | FOOD VESSELS | URNS
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1200 |  |  |  |  |  
1300 |  |  |  |  |  
1400 | V |  |  |  |  
1500 |  |  |  |  |  
1600 | IV |  |  |  |  
1700 |  |  |  |  |  
1800 | III |  |  |  |  
1900 |  |  |  |  |  
2000 | II |  |  |  |  
2100 |  |  |  |  |  
2200 |  |  |  |  |  
2300 | I |  |  |  |  
2400 |  |  |  |  |  

Numbers refer to Lanting & V. Der Waaier steps.

FIG IV:7
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NOTES

1. Now in the Museum of Antiquities of the University and Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne, Accession No. 1821-3.
2. Simpson 1968 adds a further nineteen examples.
SUMMARY

The pottery in the corpus forms an interesting group, from a geographically defined area, comprising classic and unusual types of vessel. All, however, have the common characteristic of being developed from the Peterborough Neolithic pottery tradition and, more specifically, from the Mortlake and Fengate substyles. Grooved Ware comes in a secondary position in degree of influence, and this influence is more apparent in the Food Vessel and Food Vessel Urn classes than the Cinerary Urns. The degree of influence of Beaker pottery types is minimal. Very few vessels are zoned in Beaker fashion, any Beaker techniques are used in Peterborough motifs, for example combed herringbone, and Beaker forms can only really be seen in the hybrid vessel from Amble, No. 85. The hand of one individual pottery can probably be seen in the vessels from Beanley and Lowick Nos. 7 and 8, and since the find spots of these vessels are separated by about twenty miles this seems to suggest either that potters travelled round or that transhumance among family groups was practiced.

Similarly, in the burial tradition we have the practice of individual inhumation below round mounds, already practiced in the pre-Beaker Neolithic, continued by Food Vessel users while the old Neolithic rite of cremation was re-asserted by the Urn users. The Beaker burials can be seen to fit easily into an existing Neolithic tradition, and then to die out with the Food Vessels. This suggests, therefore, that these Food Vessel, Beaker, Food Vessel Urn and Cinerary Urn users may have only been distinguishable sociologically rather than culturally. Positions of the pottery in the mounds could also represent a sociological distinction rather than a chronological one. This may prove to be supported by the occurrence of a few late radiocarbon dates for Beakers, such as that from Chatton Sandyford mentioned above, which may later prove that the Beaker chronology should be extended.

The lack of closely datable grave goods, however, means that the chronology rests heavily on radiocarbon dates, of which there are very few determinations in the North East. Considering Britain as a whole, however, there is seen to be a considerable overlap amongst the pottery types, all of which were in simultaneous use for a great part of their existence.
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VESSEL NUMBERS

The catalogues of the vessels have been arranged alphabetically for ease of reference. The corpus drawings, however, have been arranged for ease of comparison, and numbered consecutively. This section is designed to enable easier vessel identification.

FOOD VESSELS

1. Eglingham, Blawearie 44. South Charlton
2. Great Tosson 45. Holystone Common
3. Pleasay Mill 46. Roddam
4. Hawkhill Lesbury 47. Hexham
5. Birtley 48. South Charlton
6. Harbottle Peels 49. Unknown
7. Bolkon House, Beanley 50. Broomhill
8. Lowick, Bowdren 51. West Hallington
9. Beves Hill 52. Benthall
10. Doddington 53. High Buston
11. Lesbury 54. Catheugh Farm
12. Rothbury 55. Houghton
13. Lowick 56. Hough Head
15. Amble Quarry 58. Lesbury
16. Chatton 59. Hasting Hill
17. Amble Quarry 60. Unknown
19. Rothbury South Forest 62. Prudhoe
20. Blaydon 63. Wark
21. Hasting Hill 64. Hiderton
22. Catheugh Farm 65. Hasting Hill
23. How Tallon 66. Colwell
24. West Lilburn 67. Doddington
25. Ashington 68. Simonside
26. Seahouses 69. Amble
27. Amble 70. Jesmond
28. High Cocklaw 71. Hiderton
29. Bowburn 72. Moor Lodge
30. Cornhill 73. Ford
31. Hirst, Ashington 74. Beanley West Farm
32. Newham 75. Corbridge
33. Denton Hall 76. Kylooe
34. Murton Farm, Bewick 77. Newcastle
35. Hulne Park 78. Blaydon
36. Harbottle Peels 79. Calally
37. Harbottle Peels 80. South Charlton
38. Greenville 81. Black Heddon
39. Roddam 82. Hasting Hill
40. Warkworth 83. Hasting Hill
41. Farchill Crags 84. South Charlton
42. Hazon 85. Amble
43. Harbottle Peels
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOD VESSEL URNS</th>
<th>MINIATURE URNS</th>
<th>CINERARY URNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86. Catcherside</td>
<td>102. Edlingham</td>
<td>129. Liburn Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Farnham</td>
<td>103. Goatscrag</td>
<td>130. Kyloe Craggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Trimdon Grange</td>
<td>104. Error. No no. 104</td>
<td>131. Ingram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Alnwick</td>
<td>105. Barraford</td>
<td>132. West Bitchfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Roseborough</td>
<td>106. High Buston</td>
<td>133. Broomridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Humbledon Hill</td>
<td>107. Humbledon Hill</td>
<td>134. Etal Moor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Green Leighton</td>
<td>110. Goatscrag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Spindleston</td>
<td>111. Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Chatton Sandyford</td>
<td>112. Ford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. High Buston</td>
<td>113. Broomhill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Great Tossor</td>
<td>114. Scremerston Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Whickham</td>
<td>116. Bewick Moor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117. South Charlton</td>
<td>123. Roseborough</td>
<td>137. Rothbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119. Rothbury</td>
<td>125. Howick Heugh</td>
<td>139. Etal Moor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. Etal Moor</td>
<td>126. Rye Hill</td>
<td>140. Stonebridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. Scremerston Hill</td>
<td>127. Broom House Farm</td>
<td>141. Moralee Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. Rothbury</td>
<td>128. Moralee Farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<pre><code>                                                                               |                                                                                |                                                                             |
</code></pre>
<p>|                                                                                  |                                                                                |                                                                             |</p>
CATALOGUE OF FOOD VESSELS

ALNWICK (N)
Remarks: Found at Windys Edge.
Description: Bowl. Five encircling lines of twisted cord at the top, beneath this panel of twisted cord hurlding, then four encircling twisted cord lines, followed by a panel of short vertical lengths of twisted cord impressions, with one encircling cord line near the base.
Location: B.M. (not seen by writer).

AMBLE (N) Vessel No. 17
Remarks: Found with a beaker at Amble Quarry in a cist.
Description: Bipartite vase. 9.9 cm H.; 10.2 cm D.R.; 6.7 cm D.B. Pink-buff fabric with a grey core. Twelve encircling lines of twisted cord impression at the top, beneath this a zone of vertical short lengths of twisted cord, then three encircling lines of twisted cord, then two panels of vertical short lengths of twisted cord separated by an undecorated strip. Internal bevel decorated with four cord lines.
Location: M.A.N. 1923.2.4.

AMBLE (N) Vessel No. 15
Ref: Archaeologia, LII (1890), p. 68.
Remarks: Found at Amble Quarry, in a cist.
Description: Bipartite vase. 9.7 cm H.; 12.5 cm D.R.; 7.5 cm D.B. One encircling line of oval stabs inclining to the right at the top, at shoulder level. Below this one line of vertical whipped cord maggots and two lines of the same motif inclining to the right at the top. Below this large sweeping incised crosses.
Location: M.A.N. 1923.2.4.

AMBLE (N) Vessel No. 27
Remarks: Found beneath a cairn with a cremation in a cist.
Description: Bipartite. 12.5 cm H.; 11 cm D.R.; 7.5 cm D.B. One row of stab and drag decoration covers the bevel, and on the exterior are two and a half lines of herringbone in the same technique. Sudden change in direction of the body may be the remnants of a collar. Lower 6 cm of the body are undecorated. Buff fabric with pink patches.
Location: B.M. 84.12-23.1.
AMBLE (N) Vessel No. 85
Ref: Archaeologia, LII (1890), p. 69.
Remarks: Found beneath a cairn. Contained a cremation and a flint core.
Description: Beaker shape but with Feud Vessel decoration. Brown fabric with incised and twisted cord decoration.
Location: B.M., 84.12-22.2.

AMBLE (N) Vessel No. 14
Remarks: Found at Amble Quarry with an inhumation in a cist.
Description: Bipartite vase. 15.3 cm H.; 16.6 cm D.R.; 8 cm D.B. Decorated to the shoulder only with whipped cord maggots. Five lines of sloping impressions form two and a half lines of herringbone with an encircling line of whipped cord after the second and third lines. On the internal bevel is one line of whipped cord maggot herringbone with a central whipped cord encircling line.
Location: M.A.N. 1929.29.

AMBLE (N) Vessel No. 69.
Remarks: Found at Amble Quarry in a cist orientated SW-NE, associated with a small bronze article.
Description: Bipartite vase with a groove above the shoulder containing three perforated stops. 9.6 cm H.; 11.8 cm D.R.; 7.4 cm D.B. Decorated entirely with whipped cord maggots arranged in herringbone fashion, including the internal bevel. Grey-buff fabric.
Location: M.A.N. 1923.2.2.

ASHINGTON (N) Vessel No. 25
Remarks: Found at Woodhorn Road.
Description: Bipartite vase with a flat rim. 11 cm H.; 14 cm D.R.; 7.3 cm D.B. Flat rim decorated with incised zig-zag. Incised herringbone in the neck, and below the shoulder is decorated with panels of vertical and horizontal lines, on one half executed by notched stamp, and on the other by incision. Buff fabric with dark grey core.
Location: M.A.N. 1960.1.

BEANLEY W. FARM (N) Vessel No. 74
Ref: A.C. p. 10, No. 9; Pl. xiv, fig. 2.
Remarks: Found in the "out field" in a cist surrounded by stones. Contained one piece of flint "like an unfinished arrowhead" and one human tooth.
Description: Bowl. 12.7 cm H.; 12.7 cm D.R.; 8 cm D.B. Decorated with four scored grooves beneath the rim moulding. Below this are two sets of two lines of circular stabs and three encircling scored grooves. One line of oval stabs on the bevel. Buff fabric.
Location: Alnwick.
BEDLINGTON (N) Vessel No. 57
Remarks: Found in Mill Field. One of five cists to be found. One cist held a beaker. Found in a small rough cist and contained a cremation.
Description: Bipartite vase with slight shoulder groove. Internal bevel has a row of whipped cord maggots inclining to the left at the top. One row of short vertical cord maggot impressions runs round the top moulding of the shoulder groove and a second encircles the vessel below the groove. In the shoulder groove and overlying the top row of maggots is a crudely incised series of chevrons. 13.1 cm H.; 16 cm D.R.; 8 cm D.B.
Location: M.A.N. 1963.15.4.

BELFORD (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C. 1879-81, p. 250.
Remarks: Found on Chesters farm in a cist.
Description: No details known.
Location: Lost.

BENTHALL (N) Vessel No. 51
Remarks: Found with a contracted burial in a cist. The cist was orientated N-S and the skull faced S.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove. 15.3 cm H.; 15.3 cm D.R.; 7.1 cm D.B. Upper half of the exterior and the internal bevel are decorated with incised herringbone.
Location: M.A.N. 1937.3.

BEWES HILL (D) Vessel No. 9
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bulbous body with a carination and concave neck, but no collar. 21. cm H.; 18 cm D.R.; 9 cm D.B. Decorated in the neck and on the body with scored cross hatching. On the flat rim are whipped cord maggot impressions. Pink-buff fabric.
Location: Sunderland L.61(2).

BIRTLEY (N)
Remarks: Found in the easternmost of three cists in a barrow. Associated with a flint knife or scraper, and stone chippings.
Description: Scored. No further details.
Location: Lost.

BIRTLEY (N) Vessel No. 5
BIRTLEY (N) Vessel No. 5 continued ....
Description: Bipartite vase. 14 cm H.; 15.3 cm D.R.; 6.4 cm D.B.
Bevel and rim moulding have incised herringbone. The rest of the body seems
to have random incised strokes and with an encircling line of stabs around the
shoulder.
Location: Lost.

BLACK HEDDON (N) Vessel No. 81
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bowl with a slight shoulder. 11.3 cm H.; 11 cm D.R.; 8 cm
D.B. flattened "hammer" rim. The exterior is decorated to about 2/3 down
Location: B.M. 52.10-1.4.

BLAYDON (D) Vessel No. 20
Remarks: Found in Axwell and pit.
Description: Bipartite bow. 11.7 cm H.; 14 cm D.R.; 8.1 cm D.B.
Decorated with a 6-toothed comb or notched stick, in encircling lines and
chevrons. Finger nail impressions on the bevel. Light brown fabric with
black core.
Location: Blaydon E. Secondary School.

BOLTON HOUSE (N) Vessel No. 7
Remarks: No details.
BOLTON HOUSE (N) Vessel No. 7 continued ...

Description: Bipartite vase. 14.5 cm H.; 14 cm D.R.; 7.5 cm D.B. One horizontal groove on the rim moulding and six on the neck filled with circular impressions. The resulting ribs are covered with intersecting incision. The bevel is similarly decorated, as is the belly but in this case the grooves are vertical. Light brown fabric.
Location: Alnwick. 1880.10.

BRANDON WHITE HOUSE (N)

Ref: H.B.N.C. 1885-6, p. 283.
Remarks: Found in a cist with a contracted inhumation and an "iron spear".
Description: No details known.
Location: Lost.

BROOMHILL (N) Vessel No. 50

Remarks: Found in a barrow 16 ft in diameter and 3 ft high enclosed by a circle of stones. Primary cist orientated N-S, near the skull of a child contracted inhumation. Vessel was upright and empty.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove, 9.9 cm H.; 11.5 cm D.R.; 4.8 cm D.B. Decorated all over, including bevel, with incised herringbone. Light brown fabric.

BROOMRIDGE (N) Vessel No. 18

Remarks: Found under Urn (see Broomridge in 'Cinerary Urns').
Description: Bipartite vessel. 12 cm H.; 11.5 cm D.R.; 5.5 cm D.B. Decoration to the shoulder is of encircling lines of twisted cord. Below the shoulder is a single row of sloping incisions. Rest of the vessel, including bevel, undecorated. Pink fabric.

CALLALY (N) Vessel No. 79

Remarks: Found in a cist at Castle Hill quarry.
Description: Bowl. 13.7 cm H.; 15.3 cm D.R.; 10.2 cm D.B. Decorated on the bevel with two wavy encircling lines of twisted cord, and on the body by encircling cord lines, both horizontal and wavy.

CATHEUGH FARM (N) Vessel No. 22

Ref: A.C. p. 10, No. 10, Pl. VIII.
Remarks: Found in a cist with vessel No. 55 (see below).
Description: Bipartite vase, 9 cm H.; 12.2 cm D.R.; 6 cm D.B. Decorated entirely by notched stamp sloping lines and by notched stamp herring-
CATHEUGH FARM (N) Vessel No. 22 continued...
Description: bone on the bevel, notched stamp decoration on the base.
Buff fabric.
Location: Alnwick. 1880-10.

CATHEUGH FARM (N) Vessel No. 55
Ref: A.C. p. 10, No. 11.
Remarks: Found in a cist with vessel No. 22 (see above).
Description: Incomplete bipartite vase with shoulder groove. No evidence for stops. Surviving pot is 12 cm H.; 8.5 cm D.B. Stabbed herringbone decoration above the shoulder. Oval stabs accentuate the inside edges of the cavetto. Below this incised double chevrons. Lower third undecorated.
Buff fabric.
Location: Alnwick.

CHATTON (N) Vessel No. 16
Remarks: Found in a cist on Linkley Law.
Description: Bipartite vase. c. 14 cm H.; c. 17 cm D.R.; Fragments only. Rim bevel decorated with four encircling lines of cord, very short lengths of twisted cord have been impressed vertically into the rim moulding and on the shoulder. In the neck are multiple encircling lines of twisted cord, and on the belly are multiple lines of circular stabs forming elongated chevrons. Buff fabric with black core.
Location: Alnwick.

CHIPCHASE CASTLE (N)
No further details. The vessel is now lost.

COLWELL (N) Vessel No. 66
Ref: B.A.P., I, No. 125.
Remarks: Contained a small round stone when found.
Description: Bowl with cavetto zone at the shoulder and one perforated handle. 10.2 cm H.; 14 cm D.R.; 6.4 cm D.B. Decorated with three zones of incised and stamped chevrons, separated by scored encircling lines. Light brown fabric with black patches.
Location: M.A.N. 1856-27.

CORBRIDGE (N) Vessel No. 75
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bowl with four perforated feet. 8.7 cm H.; 14.7 cm D.R.; 5.8 cm D.B. Combed decoration in encircling lines at the top, accentuated by incision. Below this short vertical lengths of combed impressions. On the centre of the body filled concentric semicircles of stamped decoration.
CORBRIDGE (N) Vessel No. 75 continued . . .

Description continued: . . . Below this, vertical lines of rouletting run to the base. The internal bevel has encircling lines of rouletted decoration and the base has lengths of rouletting running out from the centre.
Location: M.A.N. 1813.14.

CORNHILL (N) Vessel No. 30
Remarks: Found in gravel pit, no trace of a burial.
Description: Bipartite vase. 14.7 cm H.; 15.6 cm D.R.; 8.3 cm D.B. Decorated all over, including rim bevel, with encircling lines of stabbed, roughly oval, pits. Grey-pink fabric with a dark grey-black core.
Location: M.A.N. 1929.66.

DENTON HALL (N) Vessel No. 33
Remarks: Found in a cist that had been divided into three compartments, each about 2 ft x 1.5 ft. Vessel found in the central compartment and contained "a substance like shag tobacco". The western division was empty and the eastern division held a cremation.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder cavetto zone and five perforated stops. 11.5 cm H.; 15.3 cm D.R.; 7.7 cm D.B. Exterior decorated all over with combed pseudo-maggots arranged in herringbone fashion. Internal bevel has encircling lines of twisted cord decoration. Buff fabric with pink patches.
Location: M.A.N. 1815.2.

DODDINGTON (N) Vessel No. 61
Remarks: Found in a cist with a male (24-30 yrs old) contracted inhumation. Primary inhumation. Cist orientated E-W, and the skeleton faced E. The vessel was found near the skull. Traces of leather clothing remained on the corpse. Associated with a flint flake and a flint knife 2 7/8 in long.
Description: Bipartite vase with four handles, perforated, in the neck of the vessel. 17.2 cm H.; 17.9 cm D.R.; 8.9 cm D.B. Decorated at the top of the belly with two complete lines of herringbone incision with three crudely incised encircling lines above and below. Light brown fabric.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9.

DODDINGTON (N) Vessel No. 10
Description: Bipartite vase. 13.9 cm H.; 13.2 cm D.R.; 6.3 cm D.B. Decoration confined to the concave neck, and consists of 2 encircling lines of twisted cord decoration on the rim moulding and 4 similar lines on the bevel. In the neck are four encircling lines of stabbed impressions.
Location: M.A.N. 1966.5.
DOUR HILL (N)
Remarks: Found in and outside a cist with a contracted burial and had therefore been disturbed by the insertion of a second burial (see below).
Description: Bowl.
Location: Private possession (Mr. Jobey).

DOUR HILL (N)
Description: Northern tripartite vase. Undecorated except for three encircling cord lines on the bevel, and short faint twisted cord impressions on the lip.
Location: Private possession (Mr. Jobey).

EGLINGHAM (N) Vessel No. 1
Remarks: Found in a cairn enclosed by a circle of stones, in a cist orientated NW-SE, 9½ ft SW of the centre of the cairn. The cist was secondary and contained charcoal but no bone.
Description: Bipartite Vase. 15.9 cm H.; 15.3 cm D. R.; 7.6 cm D. B. Exterior of the body decorated on the top three-quarters by incisions arranged in herringbone fashion, as is the bevel. The lower quarter is undecorated. Brown fabric.

EGLINGHAM (N)
Ref: B. B., CC, p. 418.
Remarks: Primary burial in a cist in the same cairn as the above.
Description: No details.
Location: Lost.

FARHILL CRAQS (N) Vessel No. 41
Remarks: Found while quarrying.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder cavetto zone and five unperforated stops. 12 cm H.; 14.5 cm D. R.; 6.4 cm D. B. Neck decorated with encircling lines of twisted cord as is the cavetto zone. The belly is decorated with whipped cord maggots arranged in three full lines of herringbone motif. There is a pronounced groove on the base. Cinnamon coloured fabric.
Location: Lost.
FORD (N) Vessel No. 13
Ref: B.B., p. 91-2, fig. 80.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bowl, 16 cm H.; 15 cm D.R.; 9 cm D.B. Bevel and rim moulding have finely incised sloping lines. The body has zoned decoration, the zones delineated by roughly scored grooves. 1st zone has circular stabs in a single encircling line. 2nd zone has one full line of incised herringbone. 3rd zone consists of slanting incised lines, and the 4th has one complete line of herringbone and an encircling line of circular stabs. Light brown fabric. Location: B.M. 79.12-9.1419.

GLANTON (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C. 1885-6, p. 314.
Remarks: Two food vessels found in each of three cists, accompanying charcoal and heat affected bones. No further details. All now lost.

GREAT TOSSON (N) Vessel No. 2
Remarks: Found in one of four cists but with no covering mound, two of which were orientated N-S and the other two NE-SW. Accompanied a contracted (?) female inhumation, associated with a V-perforated conical jet button. Decorated all over, including the rim bevel, with finely incised herringbone. Grey fabric. Location: B.M. 79.12-9.1457.

GREENVILLE (N) Vessel No. 38
Remarks: Found with another similar but larger in a cairn. Accompanied a cremation. No cist. Description: Bipartite vase, 12.8 cm H.; 13.0 cm D.R.; 4.8 cm D.B. Decorated all over, including bevel, with finely incised herringbone. 8.9 cm H.; 9.6 cm D.R.; 3.8 cm D.B. Location: Lost.

HARBOTTLE PEELS (N)
Ref: B.B., CCII, p. 422-3.
Remarks: Found with an inhumation, in the W. corner of a cist with a stone base below a demolished cairn. Description: 15.3 cm H.; 16.6 cm D.R.; 8.3 cm D.B. "whole surface decorated with encircling lines of oval impressions". Location: Lost.
HARBOTTLE PEEL S (N) Vessel No. 37

Ref: B.B., CCH, p. 423.
Remarks: In SW corner of a cist below a destroyed cairn. Cist orientated N-S, and held an inhumation. Slab on the S side had an incised pattern like a foot, \( \frac{5}{2} \) in x 3 in.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder cavetto zone and four perforated stops. 12.2 cm H.; 16.6 cm D.R.; 7 cm D.B. Bevel and upper \( \frac{3}{4} \) of the body decorated with incised herringbone. Lower \( \frac{1}{4} \) is undecorated. Buff fabric.

HARBOTTLE PEELS (N) Vessel No. 43

Remarks: Found on the natural surface beneath a cairn. No burial remains.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove and four unpierced stops. 12.4 cm H.; 14.3 cm D.R.; 6.3 cm D.B. Rim moulding and neck decorated with encircling lines of neat circular stabs and finely incised lines. Belly has two zones of incised filled triangles accentuated by similar stabs. Bevel is tiered and decorated with similar incised lines and circular-oval stabs. On the base is an incised cross flanked by circular stabs.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9.1440.

HARBOTTLE PEELS (N) Vessel No. 36

Ref: B.B., CCH, p. 424.
Remarks: Found in a cist orientated WNW-ESE, in the N corner beneath a cairn. With an inhumation.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove and four unpierced stops. 12.7 cm H.; 12.7 cm D.R.; 5.7 cm D.B. Decorated all over, including the bevel, with incised herringbone. Brown fabric.

HARBOTTLE PEELS (N) Vessel No. 6

Remarks: Found on the natural surface beneath a cairn. No associated burial.
Description: Bipartite vase. 15.9 cm H.; 15.9 cm D.R.; 7 cm B.D. Decorated only in the neck and on the shoulder with stab and drag herringbone. Pink-brown fabric.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9.1442.

HASTING HILL (D)

Description: "One raised line visible as decoration".
Location: Lost.
HASTING HILL (D) Vessel No. 59

Remarks: Found in the material of the barrow.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove. 10.2 cm H.; 12.7 cm D.R.; 7.5 cm D.B. Neck and shoulder groove decorated with short lengths of twisted cord arranged in herringbone motif. Bevel has two encircling lines at the top of twisted cord, and one at the bottom, with short sloping lengths of the same technique between the second and third line. Light brown fabric. Finger nail impressions on the belly, probably accidental.
Location: Sunderland.

HASTING HILL (D) Vessel No. 83

Remarks: Secondary interment 12 ft SW of the centre of the barrow.
Roughly circular cist c. 1 ft 2 in in diameter with adult cremation and fourth milar of a sheep.
Description: Fragment only. Decoration consists of one probably encircling line of twisted cord decoration with one line below and at least four above of vertical short lengths of twisted cord. Pink-brown fabric.
Location: Sunderland.

HASTING HILL (D) Vessel No. 65

Remarks: Found on the E edge of the barrow in a cist with a contracted inhumation. Cist orientated NW-SE, and the skeleton lay on its right side facing E. Associated with flint flake and saw.
Description: Tripartite vase with a cavetto zone above and below the shoulder, 15.3 cm H.; 12.7 cm D.R. A line of circular impressions decorate the rim moulding, below this are three encircling lines of twisted cord technique, two encircling lines of short vertical lengths of twisted cord, one encircling twisted cord line on the shoulder, and at least four lines of short lengths of twisted cord, arranged vertically below this. On the bevel are three encircling twisted cord lines. Dark red-brown fabric.
Location: Sunderland.

HASTING HILL (D) Vessel No. 21

Remarks: Found in a cist in the extreme NE of the mound. Cist orientated NNE-SSW and held the contracted inhumation of a child on its right side facing E. Vessel was behind the child's head. Associated with the molar of an ox.
Description: Bipartite vase. 10 cm H.; 10.8 cm D.R.; 6.4 cm D.B. Has two encircling twisted cord lines on the rim moulding and on the bevel, and one similar on the shoulder. In the neck are twisted cord chevrons. The belly is decorated with incised herringbone, with incised chevrons at the base. Light brown fabric with pink patches.
Location: Sunderland.
HASTING HILL (D) Vessel No. 82
Remarks: Found near, but not associated with, an uncoiled contracted inhumation.
Description: Rim fragment only. Finely decorated with incised herringbone interrupted by single encircling twisted cord lines. Red-brown fabric.
Location: Sunderland.

HAUGH HEAD (N) Vessel No. 56
Remarks: Found in a cist orientated E-W with charcoal and six flints including one dart head 2¼ in X 1¾ in and one arrowhead.
Description: Bipartite vase, with shoulder groove. 12.1 cm H.; 15.3 cm D.R.; 6 cm D.B. Decorated on the rim moulding and carinations with short vertical whipped cord maggots. Similar maggots, but longer, are arranged in horizontal rows in the neck and cavetto zone. The belly has alternating panels of horizontal and vertical incised lines. The bevel has filled triangles of whipped cord. Has a grain impression on the body. Buff fabric.
Location: M.A.N. 1946.25.

HAZON (N) Vessel No. 42
Ref: A.C. p. 9, No. 8, pl. VIII.
Remarks: Said to have had a lid when found, "associated" with a modern spur.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove and five unpierced stops. 14 cm H.; 15.3 cm D.R.; 6.4 cm D.B. Decorated on the bevel, rim moulding, neck and cavetto zone with encircling lines of twisted cord. On the belly are whipped cord maggots arranged in herringbone fashion. Buff fabric.
Location: Alnwick.

HEPPLE (N)
Remarks: Eight vessels of simple bipartite form are said to have been found in small barrows in the Kirkhill area, two being found in one cist, and the other six in individual cists.
Description: One drawn in outline is simple bipartite vase form. 12.5 cm H.; 12.5 cm D.R.
Location: Lost.

HEXHAM (N) Vessel No. 47
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Heavily restored bipartite vase with shoulder cavetto zone. Brown fabric. No decoration. 16 cm H.; 21 cm D.R.; 8 cm D.B. (as restored).
Location: B.M. 84.12-24.1.
HIGH BUSTON (N) Vessel No. 54
Remarks: One of four vessels found on and around a small cist.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder cavetto zone. 13.4 cm H.; 17.2 cm D.R.; 9.2 cm D.B. Bevel and cavetto zone decorated with herringbone stab and drag technique. Finger nail impressions occur on the rim moulding, and triangular stabs occur in the neck and on the belly below the shoulder groove. From there to the base are incised chevrons.
Location: Lost.

HIGH BUSTON (N)
Remarks: One of four vessels found on and around a small cist.
Description: No details.
Location: Lost.

HIGH COCKLAW (N) Vessel No. 28
Ref: P.S.A.S. LXIII, (1928-9),
Remarks: Found in a cist, associated with a jet necklace with spacer beads, and a plano-convex knife.
Description: Bipartite vase. 12.60 cm H.; 15.7 cm D.R.; 7.6 cm D.B. The vessel has a flat rim decorated with semicircular impressions. The rim moulding is extended to resemble a shallow collar. This and the upper three quarters of the body is decorated with lines of vertical scorings executed by possibly a broken stick. The lower quarter is plain. A slight bulg in the wall marks the shoulder. Light brown fabric.
Location: Edinburgh. EQ 378-381.

HIRST, ASHINGTON (N) Vessel No. 31
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bipartite vase. 13. cm H.; 13.7 cm D.R.; 8 cm D.B. Very roughly decorated with stabbed pits. There seems to be an attempt at zoning as there are alternating bands of small and large stabs. Vertical lines of small stabs occupy the bevel. Pink-buff fabric.
Location: M.A.N. 1894.8.

HOLYSTONE COMMON (N) Vessel No. 45
Remarks: Found in a cist orientated SE-NW, with the primary cremation below a cairn. In E corner of the cist.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove and four unpierced stops. 10.2 cm H.; 12.1 cm D.R.; 6.4 cm D.B. Rim moulding, bevel, and body to 2 cm below shoulder decorated with finely incised herringbone. A line of circular stabs decorate the rim lip and the top and bottom of the shoulder groove. The rest of the body is covered with vertical lines of herringbone interrupted by vertical lines, all executed by incision. Buff fabric.
HOUGHTON LE SPRING (D)
Remarks: Found with a secondary inhumation in Copthill barrow. 16 ft ENE of the centre and 3 ft 4 in above the old ground level. No further details, now lost.

HOWBURN (N) Vessel No. 29
Ref: H.B.N.C. 1869-81, p. 252.
Remarks: Found in a cist.
Description: Bipartite vase. 10.7 cm H.; 14 cm D.R.; 9 cm D.B. Body decorated all over with vertical lines of whipped cord maggots. Bevel is undecorated. Brown-buff fabric.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9.1764.

HOW TALLON (N. YORKS) (Now in Durham since re-organisation). Vessel No. 23
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: Found with an inhumation in a cist associated with "flint arrowheads and other objects".
Description: Fragmentary, perhaps a bipartite vase or possibly even a bell derivative beaker. 16 cm D.R.; 7.5 cm D.B. All fragments except those near the base decorated with rouletted dentoid impressions and notched stick encircling lines. Bevel is similarly decorated. Buff to pink fabric.
Location: Bowes Museum.

HULNE PARK (N) Vessel No. 35
Ref: A.C. p. 11, No. 16.
Remarks: Found with an inhumation in a cist.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove and five unpierced stops. 10.2 cm H.; 12.7 cm D.R.; 5.6 cm D.B. Decorated all over with a notched stamp or comb. On the bevel this takes the form of herringbone interrupted by an encircling line. The exterior is decorated all over with herringbone except for two encircling lines below the rim moulding, and three similar lines in the shoulder groove.
Location: Alnwick.

HUMBLETON (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C. 1876-78, p. 395.

ILDERTON (N) Vessel No. 53
Ref: B.A.P., I. No. 171.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove. c. 11.4 cm H.; c. 12.2 cm D.R.; c. 6 cm D.B. The neck and shoulder seems to be decorated with one and a half lines of herringbone incision interrupted by three encircling lines of incision after the first half. The belly is decorated with short horizontal slashes.
Location: B.M. not seen by writer.
ILDERTON (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C. 1885-6, p. 275;  p. 419.
Remarks: Found in a cist.
Description: Seems to be a bipartite vase. 10.5 cm H.; 15 cm D.R.; 6.4 cm D.B. Bevel decorated with two rows of circular impressions with short diagonal twisted cord on the lip. The rim moulding has similar impressions forming a complete line of herringbone, and below this are one line of oblong impressions. Below this are three series of cord impressions, one row of diagonal cord impressions; on the shoulder are two rows of upright short lines with two rows of oblong impressions between them. From here to the base the belly is decorated with horizontal lines of twisted cord. Location: lost.

ILDERTON (N) Vessel No. 71
Ref: H.B.N.C., 1885-6, p. 278.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bowl. 7.7 cm H.; 9.5 cm D.R.; 4 cm D.B. Rim bevel to waist decorated with concentric incised chevrons with an incised encircling base line. Below this to the base is the same but inverted.
Location: lost.

ILDERTON (N) Vessel No. 64
Ref: H.B.N.C., 1885-6, p. 279.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Tripartite vase with a groove above and below the shoulder. c. 14 cm H.; 15.3 cm D.R. Decoration appears to be of twisted cord impressions. From the rim moulding to the bottom of the second cavetto zone is decorated with short sloping lengths of cord alternating with two encircling lines of cord. This is repeated three times below this, on the belly are filled twisted cord triangles, underlined by c. 7 encircling lines of twisted cord.
Location: Lost.

ILDERTON (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C., 1885-6, p. 279.
Remarks: Found between two large stones.
Description: Bowl. 14 cm H.; 14.6 cm D.R.; 8.9 cm D.B. From the published description the body appears to be gently ribbed with "chipped out" pits. Beneath last of three ribs are horse-shoe impressions made by a three notched stick.
Location: Lost.

JESMOND (N) Vessel No. 70
Remarks: Found in a cist with a contracted male inhumation.
Description: Bowl. 10.4 cm H.; 14 cm D.R.; 7.3 cm D.B. Decoration is all executed by a stamp, or incision. On the rim moulding is one complete line of herringbone executed by a notched stick, then four encircling scored
lines, two bands of vertical, pseudo-maggots and three rouletted encircling lines, one band of stamped chevron and lozenge impressions, four incised lines, stamped lozenges, three encircling scored lines and below this to the base are filled incised triangles. Bevel decorated with encircling rouletted lines. Brown fabric.

Location: M.A.N. 1828.5.

JESMOND (N) Vessel No. 61


Remarks: Two cists found, each containing two vessels, only one recovered whole.

Description: Tripartite vase with two cavetto zones. 17.8 cm H.; 19.1 cm D.R.; 8 cm D.B. Undecorated.

Location: M.A.N. 27.3.1884, now missing.

JESMOND (N)

Ref: B.A.P., I, No. 159.

Remarks: No details.

Description: Bipartite bowl with a broad central groove and five unpierced stops. Size unknown. Decoration is entire and executed by twisted cord, in sloping and encircling lines, seemingly alternating.

Location: B.M., not seen by writer.

KYLOE (N)


Remarks: No details.

Description: Fragment only, thumb nail decoration.

Location: Lost.

KYLOE (N)


Remarks: No details.

Description: Fragments only. Has short ribbed markings, some straight and some in the form of a horse-shoe (whipped cord maggots)?

Location: Lost.

KYLOE (N) Vessel No. 76


Remarks: Found in a cist orientated N-S with charcoal and a jet necklace.

Description: Tripartite bowl. 12.7 cm H.; 19.1 cm D.R.; 8.3 cm D.B. Decorated on the bevel with vertical notches sticked impressions. On the body are roughly zoned oblique stabs formed by a rounded point.

Location: M.A.N. 1927.138.

LESBURY (N) Vessel No. 4

Ref: Unpublished.

Remarks: Found in a cist with a beaker.
Description: Bipartite vase. 12.7 cm H.; 14.7 cm D.R.; 6.4 cm D.B.
Decorated all over, including the bevel, with incised herringbone. Pink fabric with buff patches.
Location: M.A.N. 1850-16.

LESBURY (N) Vessel No. 11
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bipartite vase. 7.6 cm H.; 10.4 cm D.R.; 5.1 cm D.B.
Rim bevel decorated with three encircling lines of twisted cord. Exterior decorated with two encircling twisted cord lines below the lip and the shoulder. Between these are three rows of sloping whipped cord maggots separated by single encircling lines of twisted cord. Below the shoulder are two complete lines of herringbone motif formed by whipped cord maggots. Brown-grey fabric.
Location: Alnwick 1880-22a.

LESBURY (N) Vessel No. 58
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove. 10.3 cm H.; 14 cm D.R.; 9 cm D.B. Rim bevel decorated with vertical to sloping whipped cord maggots. Exterior has vertical lines of horizontal whipped cord maggots applied very roughly. Very coarsely levigated pink fabric.
Location: Alnwick 1880-22.

LILBURN HILL (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C., 1885-6, p. 272.
Remarks: Three cists found, each with bones and an "urn".
Description: Largest: vase shaped with cord decoration 19.5 cm D.R.
Middle: Upper parts decorated with lozenge pattern. 16.5 cm D.R.
Smallest: Cup shaped with finger nail indentations. 6.7 cm D.R.
Location: Lost.

LONGRIDGE TOWERS (N)
Remarks: Found in a cist sunk into the natural surface, with a second vessel (see below).
Description: Bipartite vase. 10.5 cm H.; 10.6 cm D.R.; 6.3 cm D.B. Decoration is entirely of notched stick technique. On the bevel this takes the form of a short sloping lines and similarly on the rim moulding. Below this is a line of short vertical impressions. Below this is a complete line of herringbone, and from here to near the base three pairs of encircling lines alternate with two lines of sloping impressions.
Location: Longridge Towers, Berwick.
LONGRIDGE TOWERS (N)

Remarks: Found in a cist with the above.
Description: Biplatite vase. 18 cm H.; 15.6 cm D.R.; 8.1 cm D.B.
Notched stick impressions on the bevel and oval stabs in roughly vertical lines on the exterior.
Location: Longridge Towers, Berwick.

LOWICK (N) Vessel No. 13

Remarks: Found in a cist with a second vessel (see below).
Description: Biplatite vase. 11.5 cm H.; 14 cm D.R.; 6.3 cm D.B.
Upper three quarters of the exterior decorated with short lengths of twisted cord arranged in herringbone motif. Three encircling lines of twisted cord decorate the bevel. Light brown fabric with a dark core.
Location: M.A.N. 1964.7.1.

LOWICK (N) Vessel No. 8

Remarks: Found in a cist with the one above.
Description: Biplatite vase. 17 cm H.; 16 cm D.R.; 7.5 cm D.B.
Elaborately decorated. The bevel is tiered and has two full rows of incised herringbone. The rim moulding has a deep groove in the centre which contains a row of circular impressions perhaps made by a hollow reed. The raised portions are decorated with cross-hatched incision. The neck has five similar grooves filled with the same decoration as that on the rim moulding. The ribs have incised herringbone or simple sloping lines. The belly is similarly decorated except that the grooves are vertical. Dark brown fabric.
Location: M.A.N. 1964.7.2.

MOOR LODGE (N) Vessel No. 72

Ref: A.C. p. 10, No. 12; pl. X.
Remarks: Found in a cist.
Description: Bowl. 15.5 cm H.; 17.2 cm D.R.; base missing. Rim bevel has four roughly scored encircling lines. Below the undecorated rim moulding are three notched stamp encircling lines. The rest of the body is covered with filled lozenges. Buff fabric.
Location: Alnwick Parish.

MURTON FARM (N) Vessel No. 34.

Remarks: Found in the western part of a mound 80 ft in diameter. Associated with a pigmy vessel.
Description: Biplatite vase with shoulder groove and four unperforated stops. 14.1 cm H.; 15 cm D.R.; 6.6 cm D.B. The rim bevel has one and a half lines of herringbone with one encircling twisted cord line below the first complete row. The exterior is decorated all over with incised herringbone.
Location: M.A.N. 1966.4.
NETHERTON (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C. 1885-6, p. 302.
Remarks: In cist with cremation. May possibly be an urn. No further details. Vessel now lost.

NEWCASTLE (N) Vessel No. 79
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: Found in Elswick Lane.
Description: Bowl. 11 cm H.; 12.2 cm D.R.; 7 cm D.B. Decorated all over with notched stick impressions. There are short vertical impressions on the bevel, sloping and horizontal impressions on the rim moulding, and panels of variously positioned and sized impressions on the body. Buff fabric.
Location: M.A.N. 1913.3a.

NEWHAM (N) Vessel No. 32
Ref: A.C. p. 11, No. 15.
Remarks: Near to skull fragments in a grave beneath a tumulus.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove and four unperforated stops. 12.7 cm H.; 7.6 cm D.R.; 5 cm D.B. Rim bevel decorated with three encircling lines of twisted cord impressions. Decorated from below the rim moulding to near the base with whirled cord maggots arranged in herringbone fashion. Reddish fabric.
Location: Alnwick Castle.

NEWHAM (N)
Ref: A.C., p. 11, No. 15.
Remarks: As above. No further details. Now lost.

NEWHAM (N)
Details as above.

PLESSAY MILL (N) Vessel No. 3
Remarks: Found "with several other urns". No apparent mound. Contained a cremation and possibly a flint knife.
Description: Bipartite vase. 11.2 cm H.; 9.9 cm D.R.; 5.6 cm D.B. Seems to be decorated all over with incised herringbone or sloping lines.
Location: B.M. Not seen by writer.

PRUDHOE (N) Vessel No. 62
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: Found at High Mickley.
Description: Bipartite vase with two cavetto zones. 18.2 cm H.; 19.7 cm D.R.; 8.2 cm D.B. Three twisted cord encircling lines decorate the rim bevel. The exterior decoration is all over and consists, from top to bottom, of two encircling twisted cord lines, one complete line of incised herringbone, three cord lines, half a line of incised herringbone, three cord lines, the
second half row of herringbone, three twisted cord lines, one complete row
of herringbone, two twisted cord lines, one and a half rows of herringbone
incision, two cord lines and finally one row of herringbone incision. Buff
fabric with pink patches and grey-black core.
Location: Seen on loan to M.A.N., 16.1.78.

REYHEUGH (N)
Ref: B.B., p. 415.
Remarks: Beneath a small barrow.
Description: Ornamented with six encircling bands of short impressions
inclining to the right.
Location: Lost.

RODDAM (N) Vessel No. 46
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: Found in a mound with another 'urn', now lost.
Description: Bipartite bowl with a high cavetto zone with four stops. 12.5
cm H.; 15.3 cm D.R.; 8 cm D.B. Combed herringbone on the rim bevel,
short horizontal lengths of combing decorate the rim moulding. In the cavetto
zone are triangular impressions. On the belly are filled triangles of combing.
Below this to the base are eight encircling lines of combed impressions,
Buff fabric.
Location: M.A.N. 1907.6.

RODDAM (N) Vessel No. 39
Ref: H.B.N.C. 1929, p. 188.
Remarks: Found with an inhumation in a cist.
Description: No details.
Location: Lost.

ROTHBURY (N) Vessel No. 12
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bipartite vase. 16 cm H.; 16 cm D.R. Decorated with
whipped cord herringbone on the bevel and the exterior to the shoulder. Below
this are encircling lines of vertical cord maggots. Brown-buff fabric.
Location: Alnwick.
ROTHBURY S. FOREST (N) Vessel No. 19
Ref: A.C., p. 11, No. 17.
Remarks: In a cist, and contained a cremation.
Description: Bipartite bowl. 10.2 cm H.; 11.5 cm D.R.; 7.2 cm D.B.
Decorated on the bevel with two encircling twisted cord lines. In the neck
is twisted cord hurdlng, and below this for a depth of 3-4 cms, are roughly
executed twisted cord chevrons.
Location: Alnwick.

SATLEY (D)
Remarks: In a cist beneath a barrow.
Description: No details. Now lost.

SEAHOUSES (N) Vessel No. 26.
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details. Now lost.
Description: Bipartite, vase. 13.7 cm H.; 11.5 cm D.R.; 6.2 cm D.B.
Decorated on the bevel, neck and two-thirds of the body with roughly executed
Location: M.A.N. 1912.10.

SIMONSE (N)
Ref: A.A. (2nd ser.), XV (1892), p. 27.
Remarks: Found in a small cairn, fragments of two small vessels.
Description: No details. Now lost.

SIMONSE (N)
Remarks: Spital Hill, standing upright in a cairn, a second vessel found
3 ft SE of the central cist, upright with a cremation. Found in a circle of
small stones and covered by a slab.
Description: Bipartite vase. 14 cm H.; 12.1 cm D.R.; 8 cm D.B.
Decorated in the neck with one and a half lines of whipped cord maggot herring-
bone with an encircling whipped cord base line. Has at least one perforated
handle in the neck. Dark brown fabric.
Location: M.A.N. 1889.23.1.

SOUTH CHARLTON (N) Vessel No. 84
Remarks: Found in a pit beneath a circular barrow, with a second vessel.
Both protected by two stones on edge.
Description: Fragment only. 7.7 cm D.B. Second fragment 5.2 cm D.B.
Location: Lost.

SOUTH CHARLTON (N) Vessel No. 48.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove. 10.5 cm H.; 12.4 cm D.R.; 5.5 cm D.B. Decorated on the bevel and exterior with fine incised herringbone. Near the base this changes to vertically incised lines. The cavetto zone is undecorated. Buff-pink fabric.
Location: Alnwick.

SOUTH CHARLTON (N) Vessel No. 80
Remarks: Secondary interment in a barrow, in a pit protected by two flat stones set on edge.
Description: Small vessel with a rolled rim rather than a collar. 12.5 cm H.; 12 cm D.R.; 7 cm D.B. Decorated on the body with encircling lines of twisted cord.
Location: Alnwick.

SOUTH CHARLTON (N) Vessel No. 44
Ref: A.C., p. 8, pi. 8.
Remarks: Found in a cairn, in the primary and central cist. Found in the centre of the cist and contained dust and ashes.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove and five or six lugs. 12.7 cm H.; 14 cm D.R.; 6 cm D.B. Decorated on the rim bevel with one and a half rows of herringbone incision. Rim moulding to cavetto zone is similarly decorated. Below this for a depth of c. 4 cm are concentric twisted cord chevrons. Grey-buff fabric.
Location: Alnwick.

SUNDERLAND (D)
Remarks: Found in a cist below a slight mound. At head of a contracted male inhumation. Cist orientated E-W. A second vessel in the cist held a child cremation, and a female inhumation lay 3 ft to the W.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove and five unpierced lugs. 12.1 cm H.; 13.4 cm D.R.; 6.5 cm D.B. Bevel and exterior decorated with incised herringbone.
Location: Lost.

SUNDERLAND (D)
Remarks: Found with the above. Held a child cremation.
Description: Bipartite vase (?). 13.4 cm H.; 13.4 cm D.R.; 6.6 cm D.B. Three encircling cord lines on the bevel, one on the lip, and eight encircling lines on the exterior to the shoulder. Vertical cord lines cover the rest of the body, radiating from the base.
Location: Lost.
TITLINGTON MOUNT (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C., 1885-6, p. 313.
Remarks: Found in a cist.
No further details. Now lost.

WARK (N) Vessel No. 63
Remarks: No details.
Description: Tripartite vase. 12.7 cm H.; 12.5 cm D.R.; ø 6.7 cm D.B.
Rim bevel and neck decorated with short lengths of twisted cord arranged in herringbone fashion. From here to about half way down the belly are eleven encircling lines of twisted cord impressions. Below this to the base are vertical lines of the same technique.
Location: B.M. Not seen by writer.

WARKWORTH (N) Vessel No. 40
Ref: A.C., p. 9, pl. 9; H.B.N.C., 1887-9, p. 525.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove and four pierced stops. 14 cm H.; 17.9 cm D.R.; 10 cm D.B. The bevel has two rows of incised herringbone interrupted by two encircling twisted cord lines. Exterior down to the bottom of the cavetto zone decorated with incised herringbone. Below this is one line of sloping incisions, three roughly executed encircling lines of twisted cord, sloping impressions (one line), two encircling twisted cord lines, one line of sloping incisions, four encircling cord lines, one line of sloping incision, two encircling cord lines and a final row of sloping incisions. Some incisions seem to be cut by finger nail impressions.
Location: Alnwick Castle.

WEST HALLINGTON (N) Vessel No. 51
Remarks: Found at Colwell, in a cist.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder groove. 12.7 cm H.; 14.3 cm D.R., D.R.; 7.7 cm D.B. Decorated on the bevel and two-thirds of the exterior with incised herringbone. Below this are two rows of vertical incisions. Pink fabric with buff patches.
Location: M.A.N. 1886.21.

WEST LILBURN (N) Vessel No. 24
Remarks: Found in a cist with scattered flints in the area.
Description: Bipartite vase. 13.7 cm H.; 16.8 cm D.R.; 9 cm D.B.
Three encircling twisted cord lines on the bevel. On the exterior are seven encircling twisted cord lines at the top, then two rows of oblique stabs executed with a rounded point, then five encircling cord lines, two rows of similar impressions, then the cord lines and impressions repeated. Below this to the base are vertical twisted cord impressions. Grey fabric with red core.
Location: Private possession.
WEST LILBURN (N)

Remarks: Found in a cist.
Description: Bowl. 14 cm D.R. Rim sherd only. Decoration executed by deep scorings in horizontal and sloping lines.
Location: Unknown.

UNKNOWN probably Northumberland

Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bipartite vase with shoulder cavetto zone. 14.5 cm D.R. base missing. Decorated all over with incised herringbone.
Location: M.A.N. 1956, 188a.

UNKNOWN (N?)

Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Possibly bipartite vase with shoulder groove. 12.8 cm D.R. Rim sherd only. Decorated all over with stabs and encircling lines of twisted cord.
Location: M.A.N. 1956, 1881.
CATALOGUE OF FOOD VESSEL URNS

ALNWICK (N) Vessel No. 89
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bipartite, possibly with a shoulder cavetto zone. 28 cm D.R.
Location: B.M. 79. 12.9.1788.

AMBLE (N)
Remarks: In a cist with an inhumation containing dark earth.
Description: Type unknown. 20.4 cm H.; 14 cm D.R. Zig-zag scorings alternate with dotted lines, and upright and sometimes sloping scorings, which appear to have been made by some rude instrument. Scorings continue over the edge of the rim.
Location: Lost.

AMBLE (N)
Remarks: Found in a cairn with a cremation.
Description: Bipartite with shoulder cavetto zone. 26.1 cm D.R. Rim sherd only. Decorated on the bevel and the exterior with whipped cord maggots arranged in herringbone fashion.
Location: Lost.

BARRASFORD (N) Vessel No. 105
Ref: A.C. p. 67, pl. XXII, No. 5.
Remarks: Found beneath a barrow with a cremation.
Description: Rim fragment only but with at least two cavetto zones with 6 applied stops in each. Decorated all over including the bevel, with short whipped cord maggots. Coarse pink fabric.
Location: Alnwick.

BEWICK MOOR (N) Vessel No. 116
Ref: B.B. CCI, p. 421.
Remarks: In a cairn enclosed by a circle of stones. In a cist orientated NE-SW, with a flint knife and charcoal. Flint knife is oblong with rounded corners, and measures 2 2/3 in x 1 3/8 in.
Description: Small rim fragment. Incised herringbone decoration on the bevel and incised lines on the exterior. Dark brown fabric.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9 1951.
BOLDON (WEST) (D) Vessel No. 115
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Fragment only. Bears oval impressions arranged herringbone fashion. Pink fabric.
Location: Sunderland.

BROOMHILL (N) Vessel No. 113
Ref: B.B. CLXXVII, p. 409
Remarks: One of six urns found around the primary cist beneath a barrow/cairn. All contained cremations. Mouth was sealed with a clay plug.
Description: 28 cm D.R. rim fragment only. Rim moulding has one and a half rows of incised herringbone. Grey-brown fabric.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9.1409.

BROOMHouses (N) Vessel No. 99
Ref: B.B. CCXIV, p. 437.
Remarks: Found in a barrow, inverted over a cremation, associated with a flint knife of square form. Above the vessel was a whinstone boulder packed around by small stones.
Description: Bipartite with a shoulder cavetto zone. 34.2 cm H.; 20.3 cm D.R.; 11.6 cm D.B. Rim bevel decorated with twisted cord hurdling which also occurs in the neck. On the rim moulding are short sloping lengths of twisted cord. In the shoulder groove and for c, 3-4 cm on the belly are rows of twisted cord herringbone. Varying lengths of twisted cord on the belly form rough filled triangles. Reddish brown fabric.

BROOMHouses (N) Vessel No. 109
Ref: B.B. CCXIV, p. 438.
Description: Encrusted Urn. 38.3 cm H.; 33.1 cm D.R.; 10 cm D.B. Bevel and rim moulding decorated with whipped cord maggots arranged in herringbone fashion, one and a half rows on the bevel and half a row on the rim moulding. In the neck and on the relief decoration are short incisions with some attempt to arrange them herringbone fashion. Beneath the shoulder is one row of incised herringbone and beneath this are incised chevrons and intersecting lines. Pink-buff fabric.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9.1467.

CATCHERSIDE (N) Vessel No. 86
Ref: B.B., CCXI, p. 343.
Remarks: Found in a cairn, enclosed by a circle of stones. 9 ft E of centre, in a hollow 14 in below the surface. Inverted and covered by a large stone. With a cremation. Possibly primary.
CATCHERSIDE (N) Vessel No. 86 continued...

Description: Bipartite. 36.6 cm H.; 32.5 cm D. R.; 9. cm D. B. Bevel decorated with two encircling lines of twisted cord impressions and the rim moulding has one line of the same technique. In the neck and below the shoulder are two encircling lines of circular stabs. Red-brown fabric.

Location: B.M. 79 12-9.1463.

CHATTON SANDYFORD (N) Vessel No. 96


Remarks: In a cairn surrounded by a stone ring. Inverted over a cremation. Associated with a cup-marked stone. Secondary.

Description: Bipartite with shoulder cavetto zone. 20.4 cm D. R., fragments reconstructable only to shoulder. Decorated to shoulder with incised herring-bone neatly executed including bevel. Dark brown fabric.

Location: Newcastle University Department of Archaeology post graduate teaching collection.

EDLINGHAM (N) Vessel No. 102


Remarks: Found at Corby Crags rock shelter cemetery, with a cap-stone and with a cremation.

Description: Possibly bipartite with c. 10 stops in the concave neck. Rim bevel decorated with three encircling lines of twisted cord impression. Irregular twisted cord impressions decorate the neck to just below the shoulder.

Location: M.A.N. 1975.9.

FARNHAM (N) Vessel No. 87

Ref: Unpublished.

Remarks: Contained a cremation and was covered by a flat stone c. 20 cm diameter.

Description: Bipartite with extremely sharp shoulder. 24 cm H.; 20 cm D. R., 9 cm D. B. Short horizontal lengths of twisted cord impressions. Short sloping twisted cord maggots decorate the rim moulding, and similar lengths in regular vertical and horizontal rows decorate the exterior to c. from the base. The rest is plain. Light brown fabric.

Location: B.M. 79.12-9. 1762.

FORD (N) Vessel No. 112

Ref: B.B. p. 438 (note).

Remarks: No details.

Description: Encrusted urn with shoulder groove. 27 cm H.; (as restored) 27 cm D. R. Rim bevel has five roughly executed encircling cord lines. Three similar lines of twisted cord decorate the rim moulding. Short lengths of the same fill the chevrons that result from the relief decoration, and in places extend into the shoulder groove. Brown-black fabric.

GOATSCRAG (N) Vessel No. 110
Remarks: Found in a rock shelter cemetery. Inverted in a pit 38 cm diameter and 18 cm deep. With a male cremation. Urn broken at the time of deposition.
Description: Bipartite, with arcing in the lower part of the neck. 37 cm H.; 33.5 cm D.R.; 12 cm D.B. Eight twisted cord encircling lines decorate the bevel and sloping twisted cord maggots occupy the rim moulding. In the upper part of the neck concentric semi-circles of twisted cord hang from the rim moulding. In the lower half is raised arcing accentuated by twisted cord impressions and filled with a variety of twisted cord impressions either herringbone, concentric semi-circles or horizontal lines. Sloping incisions occupy the upper part of the belly. Light brown fabric.

GOATSCRAG (N) Vessel No. 103
Remarks: Found inverted in a rock shelter cemetery, covered by a stone slab with a propstone. No sign of a pit. Contained the cremated remains of a woman and child.
Description: Bipartite with two cavetto zones in the concave neck. Six unpierced lugs in each cavetto zone offset. 37 cm H.; 33 cm D.R.; 12 cm D.B. Bevel decorated with whipped cord maggot herringbone motif, and sloping whipped cord maggots occupy the rim moulding and immediately below it. Two rows of vertical maggots occupy each cavetto zone and sloping maggots decorate the stops. On the upper part of the belly, maggots form one row of herringbone, and one row of vertical impressions. Light brown-buff fabric.
Location: M.A.N. 1969.20.

GREAT TOSSON (N) Vessel No. 98
Remarks: Found in one of four cists with a jet button and an antler. With a crouched inhumation, and beneath a barrow.
Description: Bipartite with shoulder cavetto zone. 21.4 cm H.; 19.8 cm D.R.; 9 cm D.B. Four encircling twisted cord lines decorate the bevel. Sloping short lengths of the same occupy the rim moulding, and below this three lines of herringbone extend down over the cavetto zone to just below the shoulder. Light brown fabric.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9, 1458.

GREEN LEIGHTON (N) Vessel No. 94
Ref: B.B., CCXII, p. 434.
Remarks: 9½ ft SW of the centre of the barrow, on the limestone rock. No associated burial.
Description: Bipartite with shoulder groove. 25.6 cm H.; 22.3 cm D.H.; 8.5 cm D.B. Decorated on the bevel with two rows of triangular stabs. Similar appear on the rim moulding, the neck and the centre of the shoulder groove. Above and below each moulding of the cavetto zone are rather nearer lines of stab and drag technique. Light brown fabric.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9.1465.
HASTING HILL (D) Vessel No. 93
Description: Bipartite with shoulder cavetto zone. 30.6 cm H.; 26.5 cm D.R.; 11.2 cm D.B. Decorated on the bevel with neatly executed stab and drag marks arranged in herringbone fashion. One row of similar marks occupy the rim moulding, and there is one row above and below both ridges of the cavetto zone. Buff fabric.
Location: Sunderland.

HIGH BUSTON (N) Vessel No. 97
Remarks: One of four vessels found on and around a small cist (see Food Vessels).
Description: Bipartite with shoulder groove. 25.5 cm D.R.; base missing. Decorated to c. 5 cm below the cavetto zone with roughly executed herringbone formed from whipped cord maggots. Below this are crude sloping incisions. Two rows of herringbone occupy the rim bevel. Light brown fabric.
Location: Newcastle University, Department of Archaeology.

HIGH BUSTON (N) Vessel No. 106
Remarks: One of four vessels on and around a small cist.
Description: Bipartite with three cavetto zones between rim moulding and shoulder, each with applied stops. 27.5 cm D.R. base missing. Three encircling twisted cord lines decorate the bevel and two encircling lines of plaited cord occupy the uppermost cavetto zone. Elsewhere the decoration is roughly executed herringbone formed from whipped cord maggots, often with finger nail impressions across the top. Dark brown fabric.
Location: Newcastle University, Department of Archaeology.

HOUGHTON LE SPRING (D) Vessel No. 92
Description: Bipartite with shoulder groove. 33.8 cm H.; 26.5 cm D.R.; 11 cm D.B. Decoration is all by fine incision and does not extend below the shoulder groove. On the bevel are one and a half lines of herringbone, sloping lines occupy the rim moulding, and the shoulder groove. In the neck are one and a half lines of herringbone. Buff fabric.
Location: B.M. 90.11-11.1,
HUMBLEDON HILL (D) Vessel No. 91
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bipartite with shoulder groove. 37 cm H.; 30.5 cm D.R.; 15 cm D.B. Rim bevel decorated with one and half rows of incised herringbone. From rim moulding to 5 cm below the shoulder the decoration is herringbone in the stab and drag technique. Light brown fabric with pink patches.
Location: Sunderland.

HUMBLEDON HILL (D) Vessel No. 107
Remarks: Found 4 ft below the surface, and contained cremation.
Description: Encrusted urn. 35.7 cm H.; 33.1 cm D.R.; 13 cm D.B. Horse-shoe shaped impressions decorate the bevel, with an encircling line of twisted cord on the lip, and on the rim moulding. The base of the rim moulding has a scalloped effect by the application of clay pellets. Below this is a cavetto zone occupied by whipped cord maggots. A second cavetto zone below this holds the applied chevrons, the resulting triangular spaces being filled with incision. Below this a third cavetto zone forms a shoulder groove filled with horse-shoe impressions as on the bevel. Light brown-pink fabric with black interior.
Location: Sunderland.

LOWSTEAD FARM (N)
Ref: A.C., p. 11, No. 13, pl. VIII.
Remarks: "Said to have had when discovered a cover much ornamented".
Description: Base and lower wall only. Decorated with rows of hoop impressions.
Location: Alnwick. Not seen by writer.

ROSEBOROUGH (N) Vessel No. 90
Ref: B.B., CXCVII, p. 415; B.A.P. II, 120.
Remarks: Secondary burial in the centre of a barrow. Inverted on the primary cist cover over the cremated remains of a man and a woman. With a flint artifact 1\(\frac{3}{4}\) in long by 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) in wide.
Description: Encrusted Urn. 38.2 cm H.; 31.9 cm D.R.; 10.2 cm D.B. Rim bevel decorated by what appears to be one and a half rows of incised herringbone with a groove below the complete line. The groove seems to have circular impressions in it, and two similar features appear on the rim moulding with sloping incision between them. In the neck are roughly incised filled triangles or chevrons and the belly is covered with incised filled triangles. The bottom of the rim moulding and the shoulder are decorated with applied pellets of clay with vertical incised lines on them.
Location: B.M. Not seen by writer.
RYTON ON TYNE (D) Vessels No. 108
Remarks: Found in the sand pit.
Description: Encrusted Urn. 33.2 cm H.; 29.3 cm D.R.; 10.6 cm D.B. One and a half rows of incised herringbone decorate the bevel, with a row of almost circular stabs between each half row. The rim moulding has fine almost vertical whipped cord maggots. Below this is a shallow groove containing sloping incisions which form a line of herringbone with the incisions in the neck below. Rows of vertical incision fill the triangles between the applied chevrons the crests of which are accentuated with transverse incisions. Below the shoulder are six well formed horizontal grooves and below this three rows of vertical incisions alternate with two rows of almost circular stabs. Finally one row of small incised chevrons, and one row of larger chevrons completes the decoration. Light brown fabric.
Location: M.A.N. 1929.17.

SCREMERSTON HILL (N) Vessel No. 114.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Rim sherd only. Decorated on the bevel with a row of hemispherical depressions between encircling lines of twisted cord. On the exterior one encircling line of twisted cord defines the rim moulding, and below this whipped cord maggots are arranged in herringbone. Medium Brown fabric.

SOUTH CHARLTON (N)
Remarks: Secondary interment in a barrow, inverted over a cremation.
Description: 31.9 cm H.; 25.5 cm D.R. Twisted cord decoration on the external surface.
Location: Lost.

SPINDLESTON (N) Vessel No. 95
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: Found possibly with an incense cup.
Description: Probably a bipartite urn with a shoulder groove. 30 cm D.R.; Decoration is all incised herringbone. One and a half rows occupy the bevel, and on the exterior the decoration extends only to the shoulder groove. Brown fabric.

TRIMDON GRANGE (D) Vessel No. 88
Remarks: In a barrow.
Description: Appears to be a bipartite urn with a pronounced shoulder 27.5 cm D.R. Decorated on the bevel and exterior with whipped cord maggots in herringbone arrangement. Brown to black fabric.
WHICKHAM (D) Vessel No. 100
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: Washing Well farm. Contained cremation and had a stone over the mouth.
Description: Bipartite with shoulder groove and applied stops. 30 cm D.R., most is missing. Five encircling cord lines decorate the bevel. Exterior to 9. 6 cm below the shoulder is decorated with twisted cord maggots arranged in herringbone fashion. An encircling twisted cord line runs round in the cavetto zone. Pink fabric.
Location: Sunderland.

UNKNOWN (?N) Vessel No. 101
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Bipartite with shoulder groove(s) and applied stops. 37 cm D.R. Four rows of circular stabs decorate the bevel and two rows of the same occupy the rim moulding. Similar stabs accentuate the ridges of the cavetto zone. In the neck are sloping incisions. Grey-buff fabric.

UNKNOWN (?N)
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9.
CATALOGUE OF MINIATURE URNS

BROOM HOUSE FARM (N) Vessel No. 127
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Collared urn with cavetto zone beneath the collar. 14 cm H.; 9.5 cm D.R.; 5.5 cm D.B. Decorated on the bevel, the collar and the cavetto zone with irregular stabs from a triangular point. Pink-brown fabric.
Location: Alnwick 1880-21a.

ETAL MOOR (N) Vessel No. 120
Remarks: In a pit beneath a barrow, between the one above and a flat stone. Secondary deposit. Upright and empty.
Description: Collared urn. 18 cm H.; 12 cm D.R.; 7 cm D.B. Decorated on the flat rim with a single encircling cord line. On the collar are twisted cord filled triangles. Beneath the rim are short vertical lengths of twisted cord. Brown fabric with pink patches.

HOLLYSTONE COMMON (N) Vessel No. 124
Ref: B.B., CCV, p. 428.
Remarks: Secondary interment in a cairn. Contained charcoal and a smaller vessel (see below).
Description: Collared urn with a bulbous body. 14.5 cm H.; 11 cm D.R., 8 cm D.B. Decorated on the collar with two encircling lines of plaited cord between which are sloping lines of the same technique. The upper half of the body has similar encircling lines with twisted cord between them forming a netting pattern. Brown-black fabric.

HOLLYSTONE COMMON (N)
Ref: B.B., CCV, p. 428.
Remarks: Found inside the one above.
Description: Collared urn. 8.7 cm H.; 7.3 cm D.R.; 5.2 cm D.B. Collar and body for c. 2 cm below the collar, are decorated with vertical lines of ? twisted cord, the lower series of which are edged at the bottom with an encircling cord line.
Location: B.M. Not seen by writer.
HOLLYSTONE COMMON (N)

Ref: B.B., CCV, p. 428.
Description: 10.5 cm H.; 11 cm D.R.; 7 cm D.B. Plain. Slight indication of a rim made by the contracting of the urn at the place where the bottom of a rim would ordinarily have been.
Location: Lost.

HOWICK HEUGH (N) Vessel No. 125

Remarks: Found beneath a cairn with the cremated remains of a woman and an infant. The cremations were placed in contiguous crevices in the bedrock and were accompanied by the urn. Dated to 1440 ± 90 b.c.
Description: Collared urn. 13.5 cm H.; 14 cm D.R.; 10 cm D.B. Decorated with two encircling twisted cord lines on the bevel, and four similar on the collar. Irregular short cord impressions on the body. Buff colour, dark core.
Location: In the possession of the excavator, Mr. G. Jobey.

KIRKNEWTON (N) Vessel No. 118

Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Collared urn. Bevel decorated with two encircling lines of whipped cord impressions. On the collar a similar pair of lines run round the top and the bottom with twisted cord filled triangles between them. Below the collar are vertical lines or maggots of whipped cord. Pink Fabric.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9.177.

MORALEE FARM (N) Vessel No. 128

Remarks: Found inside Cinerary Urn — see Moralee Farm.
Location: M.A.N. 1921.3.

PLESSAY MILL (N)

Remarks: Found with "several" other urns. Contained a cremation.
Description: 5½ in (c. 14.5 cm) H. Collared Urn. Appears to have had vertical short twisted cord lines on the collar. On the upper part of the body appears twisted cord hurdling, with irregular horizontal lengths of twisted cord beneath this.
Location: B.M. Not seen by writer.
PLESSAY MILL (N)
Ref: B.A.P., II, 493b.
Remarks: Found with a cremation and "several" other urns.
Description: Appears to be a collared urn, c. 15.5 cm H. Seems to be decorated all over with herringbone, interrupted by encircling lines on the top part of the body. Technique employed is not known.
Location: B.M. Not seen by writer.

ROSEBOROUGH (N) Vessel No. 123
Ref: B.B., CXCVIII, p. 417.
Remarks: Primary burial on the natural surface in the centre of a cairn.
Upright, covered by a slab, and containing the cremation of a person 18-20 yrs. old, and two thirds of a calcined bone pins.
Description: Collared urn. 16 cm H., 14 cm D.R., 11 cm D.B. Two encircling twisted cord lines decorate the bevel. On the collar is twisted cord hurling set between two pairs of twisted cord encircling lines. Two similar lines are on the body beneath the collar. Are occasional accidental finger mall impressions. Dark brown fabric with pink patches.
Location: B.M. 78.12-9.1425.

ROTHBURY (N) Vessel No. 122
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Fragments of two urns.
1. On the collar is twisted cord decoration in the form of two encircling lines at the top and bottom between which are vertical lines of twisted cord. Pink fabric.
Vessel No. 119
2. Decorated on the collar with twisted cord arranged in intersecting sloping lines to give a reticulated pattern. Red fabric.
Location: Alnwick.

RYE HILL (N) Vessel No. 126
Ref: B.A.P., II, 129
Remarks: Found with an inhumation and seven flint scrapers beneath a small barrow.
Description: Collared Urn. 14.3 cm H.; 12 cm D.R.; 8.5 cm D.B. Decorated with incised intersecting lines on the collar. Pink coarse fabric.
Location: M.A.N. 1889.2.4.

SCREENWOOD (N) Vessel No. 121
Remarks: In a cist.
Description: Collared urn with a cavetto zone beneath the collar. 13 cm H.; 11.5 cm D.R. Decorated on the collar with an encircling line of twisted cord
SCREENWOOD (N) Vessel No. 121 continued...

Description continued: ... at the top and bottom, between which are vertical lengths of twisted cord. In the cavetto zone are filled triangles in twisted cord with an encircling base line.
Location: Lost.

SOUTH CHARLTON (N) Vessel No. 117

Description: Collared Urn. 14.3 cm H.; 13 cm D. R.; 8 cm D. B. Decorated on the collar with two encircling twisted cord lines between which are lozenges formed by sloping twisted cord lines intersecting at right angles.
Location: Alnwick.
CATALOGUE OF CINERARY URNS

BARNARD CASTLE (D)
No further details. Now lost.

BARNARD CASTLE (D) (EGGLESTON) Vessel No. 143
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: Upright with a cremation. No mound or pit or stone case.
Description: Bucket shaped urn, three shallow grooves at the top seem almost to be the marks of the potter's fingers. 32.5 cm H.; 26 cm D.R.; 15.5 cm D.B. Undecorated apart from the grooves mentioned above. Light brown fabric.
Location: Bowes Museum.

BARRASFORD (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C., 1885-6, p. 304.
Remarks: Found on a gravel bank in the joining of the Swinburn and the N Tyne.
Description: Rudely ornamented with irregular strokes and indentations.
Location: Lost.

BERWICK ON TWEED (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C., 1831-41, p. 53
Remarks: In a barrow with a cremation.
Description: Two urns are described, one from Berwick and one from Murton(D) but which urn belongs where is not clarified. Also one is associated with an incense cup. Smaller of the two is c. 15 cm H.; and 14 cm D.R., the decoration is all incised herringbone on the bevel, and covering half of the exterior. The vessel has no collar but there is a concave neck and carination. The larger has no measurements. It has a collar decorated with ? incised filled triangles. Below this the concave neck has ? incised cross hatching. The body below the shoulder is undecorated.
Location: Lost.

BILLINGHAM (D)
Ref: Unpublished.
No details known. Not seen in Sunderland Museum.
BIRTLEY (N)

Remarks: In protective casing of stone slabs.
Description: Of squat form, 33 cm H. Scored round the rim with incisions and cord lines.
Location: Not preserved.

BIRTLEY (N)

Ref: A.A. (2nd ser.), XII (1887), p. 244.
Remarks: Found in the centre of a mound, covered by a stone slab. In a hollow in the sub-soil. Contained a cremation.
Description: Bucket shaped urn. 24.5 cm H.; 25.5 cm D.R.; 17 cm D.B. Notched stick impressions on the upper part of the exterior.
Location: Lost.

BIRTLEY (N)

Remarks: Contained cremation.
Description: Asymmetrical bucket shaped urn. 25.5 cm H.; 19 cm D.R.; 14 cm D.B.
Location: Lost.

BIRTLEY (N)

Description: Ornamented with lozenges of twisted cord.
Location: Lost.

BIRTLEY (N)

Remarks: Near the centre of a barrow. Standing upright in a hollow and containing a cremation.
Description: 29.5 cm H.; 25.5 cm D.R.; 17.5 cm D.B. Broad projecting rim with two rows of intersecting cord lines on it. Slightly convex base.
Location: Lost.

BOLDON (N)

Remarks: Found when excavating the reservoir.
No details. Now lost.

BOWSDEN HOLLINS (N)

Remarks: No Details. Now lost.
stones. Secondary burial.
Description: Rim c, 6.5 cm deep ornamented by irregular dots applied by an oval pointed instrument.
Location: Lost.

COLLERTON (N)
Ref: B.B., CCXIII, p. 436.
Remarks: Found 9 ft SSE of the centre of a barrow. Secondary interment. Inverted over the cremation of a young person.
Description: Appears to be collared urn with twisted cord hurdling decorating the collar.
Location: Lost.

DODDINGTON (N)
Remarks: Found with a cremation.
Description: "Flower pot shaped". Seems to be decorated with scored hurdling and chevrons.
Location: Lost.

ETAL MOOR (N) Vessel No. 134.
Ref: B.B., CLXXXIV, p. 404; B.A.P., II, No. 116d.
Remarks: Secondary burial in a barrow 16 ft diameter, and 2½ ft high. Upright with cremated bones in and around it.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9, 1380.

ETAL MOOR (N) Vessel No. 139
Remarks: 6 in E of the two above. In the same pit. Secondary interment. Upright, and contained burnt bones and an incense cup.
Description: Collared Urn. 23 cm H.; 18.5 cm D.R.; 11 cm D.B. Decorated only on the collar with twisted cord hurdling. Pink-buff fabric.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9, 1383.
BOWSDEN MOOR (N)
Remarks: Two urns found in a barrow. Both inverted on slabs and contained cremations.
No further details. Now lost.

BROOMHILL (N)
Ref: B.B., CLXXXVII, p. 409.
Remarks: Secondary burial outside the stone ring of a cairn. Contained a cremation.
No further details. Now lost.

BROOMHILL (N)
Remarks: Secondary burial. One of six urns, one of which was a Food Vessel Urn, around the central cist. Inverted with the mouth sealed with clay. Contained the cremation of a person c. 17 yrs. old. Contained a calcined bone pin and flint flake with secondary working on both edges.
Description: Collared urn with a cavetto zone beneath the collar. 26 cm H.; 22 cm D.R.; 9 cm D.B. Decorated with vertical incisions on the rim bevel, and incised herringbone for a depth of 10.5 cm on the exterior.
Location: B.M. not seen by writer.

BROOMRIIDGE (N) Vessel No. 133.
Remarks: In a circular hollow lined with clay. Inverted over a second urn and contained a cremation.
Description: Collared urn with a cavetto zone beneath the collar. 22.5 cm H.; 17 cm D.R.; 9 cm D.B. Decorated on the bevel with an encircling line of twisted cord at the top and bottom, between which are intersecting chevrons of the same technique resulting in lozenge patterns. On the exterior to g. 2 cm below the shoulder is herringbone formed by short lengths of twisted cord. Pink fabric.

BUSTON (N)
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Location: M.A.N. 1987.140.

CASTLESIDE (D)
Ref: Unpublished.
No details. Not seen at Sunderland.

CATCHERSIDE (N)
Ref: B.B., CCXI, p. 434.
Remarks: Found in a cairn. Inverted on a flat stone. Protected by 3 flat
ETAL MOOR (N)
Ref: B.B., CLXXXIV, p. 405.
Remarks: Found in a barrow "some inches" N of the one above. In the same pit. Secondary interment.
Description: Appears to be a collared urn. Collar covered with a reticulated pattern of twisted cord impressions. The body below the rim is marked irregularly with scattered oval impressions.
Location: Lost.

FORD COMMON (N) Vessel No. 136.
Remarks: Found in the centre of a barrow 14 ft diameter and 1½ ft high. Primary burial. Was upright and contained a female inhumation, three cylindrical jet beads, a conical jet button and a piece of calcined flint outside.
Description: Collared Urn. 21 cm H.; 19 cm D.R.; 10 cm D.B. Bevel decorated with two encircling lines of twisted cord. On the deep collar is twisted cord hurdling. Rest of the urn is plain. Pink-buff fabric.
Location: B.M. 70.12-8. 1392.

FULWELL (D)
Remarks: Found in a sand bed, with a skeleton, covered by limpet shells and a large slab. With fragments of another vessel.
Description: Appears to have been a collared urn. Decorated with an encircling line of twisted cord at the top and bottom of the collar, the two linked by sloping twisted cord lines.
Location: Lost.

GLANTON (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C., 1885-6, p. 314.
Remarks: Two "urns" found. One large and one "very small". No further details, now lost.

GREAT TOSSON (N)
Remarks: Two urns, both inverted on flat stones beneath a barrow. No further details. Now lost.

HARDBOTTLE PEELS (N)
Ref: B.B., CCIII, p. 423.
Remarks: In a cairn. Inverted over an adult cremation. Rim c. 1½ ft below the natural surface.
Description: 41 cm H. Rim decorated with chevrons of twisted cord.
Location: Lost.

HASTING HILL (D)
Remarks: Secondary interment, 12 ft SE of centre of barrow.
Description: Fragmentary when found. Bevel decorated with four concentric twisted cord lines. Neck decorated with intersecting vertical and horizontal twisted cord lines. Rim decorated with sloping twisted cord lines.
Location: Lost.

HUMBLEDON HILL (D)
Remarks: Found 3 ft below the natural surface. No further details. Not seen at Sunderland.

INGRAM (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C. 1885-6, p. 288.
Remarks: Found at Ingram Hill, beneath a cairn.
Description: Said to have had scored decoration.
Location: Lost.

INGRAM (N)
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: Found on Heugh Hill.
Description: Possibly bucket or barrel shaped. 20 cm D.R. rim sherd only. Decorated with rows of three stabs on the bevel. On the exterior are rows of circular stabs then larger oval-triangular stabs crudely arranged in herringbone fashion. Then two scored lines, one row of oval stabs, and a single scored line. Grey-red fabric.
Location: Alnwick.

KIDLAND (N)
Remarks: Beneath cairn with cremation.
Description: Chevron decoration.
Location: Lost.

KIRK HILL (N) Vessel No. 138
Remarks: Inverted in a pit, over a sandstone flag that showed traces of burning. Contained the cremated remains of three adults and a child. Some bones were stained green and there were two calcined flints. 1392 ± 90 bc (SRR.133).
Description: Collared Urn with cavetto zone beneath the collar. 32 cm H.; 27 cm D.R.; 10.9 cm D.B. Twisted cord herringbone decorates the bevel. On the collar are filled twisted cord triangles, and in the cavetto zone are two and a half lines of stab and drag herringbone. The rest is plain. Light brown fabric.
KIRK WHELPINGTON (N)
Ref: B.B., CCX, p. 433.
Remarks: Secondary interment in a barrow. Inverted over a flat stone on the natural surface. Stone was cup-marked. Contained the cremation of a young person.
Description: No collar. The urn perhaps broken before deposition.
Location: Lost.

KIRK WHELPINGTON (N)
Ref: B.B., CCX, p. 433.
Remarks: Primary burial in the centre of the barrow. Above the natural surface. Contained cremation.
Description: Collared urn.
Location: Lost.

KYLOE CRAGS (N) Vessel No. 130
Remarks: No details.
Description: Eight wall sherds. Light brown to pink fabric. Very coarse.
Location: M.A.N. 1919.29.

LILBURN HILL (N) Vessel No. 129
Remarks: Found in a triangular compartment in a cist. Contained a cremation and an incense cup.
Description: Collared Urn. 16 cm D.R, fragmentary. Decorated inside the plain rim with a single encircling cord line. On the collar are filled twisted cord triangles. Light brown-red fabric.
Location: M.A.N. 1889.22.3.

MILLFIELD (N)
Ref: Unpublished.

MORALEE FARM (N) Vessel No. 141
Ref: P.S.A.N. (3rd ser.), (1921-2), p. 27.
Remarks: Found with a cremation. Contained a small bronze knife, an incense cup of biconical form decorated with stabs from a quill or hollow reed etc., and a smaller urn.
Description: Cordoned urn. c. 44 cm H.; 36 cm D.R.; 12.5 cm D.B. Decorated with twisted cord zig-zag on the bevel. On the upper part of the body are two encircling twisted cord lines between which are twisted cord lozenges, roughly subdivided with twisted cord lengths. Dark brown and very coarse fabric.
Location: M.A.N. 1956.225a.
MURTON (D)
Remarks: Found in a barrow with a cremation.
Description: See urn from Berwick on Tweed.

NEITHERTON (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C. 1885-6, p. 302.
Remarks: Found within four stones and a cover. With a cremation.
No further details. Now lost.

PAWSTON HILL (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C. 1887-89.
Remarks: A small urn found beneath a cairn, with a cremation, on Mindum Farm.
No further details. Now lost.

PLAINFIELD MOOR (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C. 1885-6, p. 297.
Remarks: Three urns found: One from a cairn that contained a cist. The urn is 7 in H. and "jar" shaped. One from a cairn set around by stones.
Held a cist and a large urn decorated with chevrons. One from a cairn.
Broken.
No further details. Now lost.

REYHEUGH (N)
Ref: B.B., p. 415.
Remarks: In a small barrow. Contained a cremation and covered by a pentagonal stone.
No further details. Now lost.

RODDAM RIGG HOUSE (N)
Ref: H.B.N.C. 1885-6, p. 280.
Remarks: Mention of six urns containing cremations.
Description: "Jar shaped".
Location: Lost.

ROSEBOROUGH (N)
Ref: B.B., CXCVIII, p. 417.
Remarks: 2 ft SSW of the centre of the cairn on the natural surface. No associated burial.
Description: Decayed. Possibly not complete when deposited.
Location: Lost.

ROTHBURY (N) Vessel No. 137
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Collared Urn. Collar decorated with sloping twisted cord lines and a grid formed by horizontal and vertical twisted cord lines. On the body are sloping intersecting twisted cord lines. Grey-pink fabric.
Location: M.A.N, 1935, 33, 34.

SIMONSEIDE (N)
Remarks: Surrounded by a circle of upright flat stones, with one over the top.
Beneath a cairn 20 ft in diameter. Contained a cremation.
No further details. Now lost.

SIMONSEIDE (N)
Remarks: Inverted on a stone slab beneath a cairn. Contained a cremation and a flint knife 3 in long by 1½ in wide. Also contained pot sherds.
Description: Collared Urn with a cavetto zone beneath the collar. 28 cm H.; 20.5 cm D.R. Decorated on the collar with twisted cord hurdling. The cavetto zone is occupied by twisted cord herringbone.
Location: Lost.

SOUTH CHARLTON (N)
Remarks: Secondary interment beneath a cairn that covered one primary and at least nine secondary interments.
No further details. Now lost.

SOUTH CHARLTON (N) Vessel No. 142
Remarks: Secondary interment in a barrow. In a pit, and contained burnt bones and charcoal.
Description: Bipartite, with a globular body. 20.3 cm H.; 17.2 cm D.R.; 8.6 cm D.B. Three encircling cord lines decorate the bevel, and two of the same on the rim moulding. On the body to just below the shoulder are nine widely spaced encircling twisted cord lines. Below this are horse-shoe impressions formed from twisted cord. Pink fabric.
Location: Alnwick.

STONEBRIDGE (D)
Remarks: Found inside a larger urn, see below, inverted over a cremation. No mound.
Description: Collared Urn, 23 cm H. Collar decorated with encircling lines of twisted cord. The truncated body is undecorated. Red-brown fabric.
Location: B.M. Not seen by writer.

STONEBRIDGE (D) Vessel No. 140
Remarks: Found to contain a cremation and a smaller urn.
Description: Collared Urn. 37 cm H.; 28 cm D.R.; 8.5 cm D.B. Rim bevel decorated with two encircling lines of plaited cord technique. The collar is occupied by filled triangles in the same technique. On the upper part of the body below the collar are sloping incisions, intersecting in places. Brown fabric.
Location: B.M. 79.12-9. 2411.

TUNSTALL HILL (D)
Remarks: In a cist with two others. All contained cremations.
Description: One seems to be a collared urn with chevron patterns on the collar.
Location: Lost.

WEST BITCHFIELD (N) Vessel No. 132
Ref: Unpublished.
Remarks: No details.
Description: Collared Urn. 24 cm D.R.; 12 cm D.B. Decorated with incised filled triangles on the collar and with at least one and a half rows of roughly incised herringbone on the body below the collar. Brown fabric.
Location: M.A.N. 1956.366a.

YEAVERING (N)
Ref: Unpublished.
Description: Hole in base for the cremation to be inserted.
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BRONZE AGE POTTERY FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE CITY MUSEUM AND ART GALLERY, PETERBOROUGH

When working on the Beaker material from Fengate in the Peterborough museum, Martin Howe kindly invited me to draw (p91) and publish the Bronze Age pottery in the museum’s collection. I am most grateful to Mr Howe for this opportunity. The numbers referred to in the text are the catalogue numbers of the pottery in the above museum. Unfortunately, little is known of the burial contexts.

1.2. BADWELL ASH GRAVEL PIT, BURY ST. EDMUNDS. This ‘barbed wire’ decorated Beaker, or rather decorated with impressions made by a hoously whipped length of cord or gut, is in a medium to light brown fabric with some grey patches on the exterior. The decoration is all in the ‘barbed wire’ technique except for a single row of rounded stabs at the top of the highest zone. Some grits protrude through the outer surface. The profile is stack and ‘S’ shaped and is similar to a vessel from Ernwell in Suffolk (Clarke 1970, no 876) but in this case, the decoration consists only of parallel horizontal lines. A Wessex/Mid Rhine beaker from Little Rollright in Oxfordshire (Clarke 1970, no 755) has similar broad zoned decoration and a bag-shaped profile.

1.6. OLD FLETTON. This is a bipartite vase Food Vessel with an externally moulded rim, but lacking an internal rim bevel resulting in a form which resembles very much a tripartite collared urn, and so this vessel is very obviously one from the ‘grey area’ between two definite pottery types, the food vessel, and the urn. The decoration is typical of a collared urn in that it does not extend below the shoulder, but this is quite common on food vessels too, and the technique employed, circular and triangular stabs, is common to both urn and food vessel types. The fabric of this vessel is brown to pink on both surfaces, with a very few grey patches and the core is black.

1.7. NEWARK PITS, PETERBOROUGH. Exposed during gravel quarrying, this tripartite collared urn is decorated with finger-nail impressions. The shallowness and angle of the collar is akin to Fengate ware. The fabric is light brown to light grey in colour with moderate quantities of shell grit. A similar urn comes from Creeting St Mary in Suffolk (Smedley and Owles 1964, no 248) but in this example the cavetto zone beneath the collar is wider. Similarly an urn from Barton Stacey in Hampshire has a shallow collar and incised decoration (Abbercornish 1912, no 13), but this is slightly smaller than the Peterborough urn.

2.01. CASTOR. This tripartite collared urn was found with a cremation in the bank of the river Nene at Castor. The fabric is red with a black core, and is coarse and crumbly with a slightly cracked exterior. The decoration is all in the twisted cord technique. A similar urn with twisted cord borde decoration comes from Screnwood in Northumberland but this has filled chevrons in the cavetto zone instead of the twisted cord herring bone as is on the Peterborough urn (Gibson 1978, no 127).

2.3. PEAK RIDE. The body only survives of what is probably a tripartite collared urn, which, like L971, is decorated with twisted cord herring bone in the cavetto zone. The fabric is pink to light brown in colour with some grey patches on the exterior and with a light brown interior. The core has some medium sized grits but is still very hard and well-fired, and approaches Beaker fabric in quality. Found with the cremation of an adult.

2.8. OLD FLETTON. Like 1.6 from the same area, this can be seen as a vessel combining both collared urns and food vessel characteristics. The pot is tripartite with a cordon representing the line of the collar base, and there is no true collar on the vessel, but instead, a rather concave neck. The upper portion is decorated with intersecting twisted cord from while short lengths of the same decorate the cordon and the rim. Curved lengths of cord fill the cavetto zone. The two scored lines appear to be accidental. The colour of the fabric is medium brown with red and grey patches on the exterior. The core is black, and the grits are medium sized with some shell protruding through the surface.

Notes
NOTES

Fig 1  Bronze Age pottery, Peterborough Museum (1/3)

90
A small miniature urn with blurred twisted cord laddering on the collar like L971. There are also small oval impressions on the body. It has no true collar, but instead, a cordon running round, about mid-way down the body. The fabric is buff to pink on the exterior, and light brown on the interior, with shell and grog added to the clay which protrudes in large quantities through the surface. The urn resembles very much one of similar size, and with a biconical profile, from a ring ditch at Grendon in Northants, excavated by Tony McCormick, which has a similar ladder pattern of blurred cord on the collar area, although the impressions are not present in this case.

ALEX M GIBSON
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AERIAL ARCHAEOLOGY IN NORTHAMPTONSHIRE

Archaeological aerial survey over Northamptonshire was first carried out in the 1920s by O G S Crawford, who made a number of flights across the county and recorded several cropmark and earthwork sites. Consistent survey work began after the Second World War, and until very recently this continued to be carried out as part of the national survey programmes of Professor St Joseph (Cambridge University), the Air Photographic Unit of the NMR, and James Pickering. The most notable exception was the important work of R Hollowell, a local amateur, during the 1960s and early 1970s (Hollowell 1971). A considerable number of flights were also carried out by Warhurst (Northampton Museum) in the late 1950s and more recently by Kirk, Rollings, Moore (Northampton Museum) and Williams (Northampton Development Corporation).

As far as the County Council was concerned, the principal use made of aerial photography was of the vertical surveys carried out by professional companies to provide information for the Highways, Planning, and Architect's Departments, with no account being taken of archaeological requirements. However, in common with many other vertical survey collections, these photographs can be of considerable use in recovering evidence of medieval field systems. It was not until 1967, when a photographic record was made of the excavations in progress on the Hardingham School site, that the archaeological potential of aerial photography was realised by the County Council. During the summer of 1972 photographs were taken of the excavations at Deanshanger, again on a site being developed by the County Council. With the appointment of Paul Everson as County Archaeologist in 1973, and the increasing involvement of the Department of the Environment, a regular aerial survey programme was initiated, with the accompanying development of an archive of photographs. The great increase nationally in DoE funding in the mid 1970s led to the establishment of many such local surveys, and of particular relevance to Northamptonshire is the continuing work of Stephen Upex in the Peterborough area, as well as the photographic archive and 1:2500 scale sketch plots of sites recorded by Upex which is being maintained by the Nene Valley Research Committee (Upex 1977). Other archives of air photographs relating to Northamptonshire are at Northampton Museum, Northampton Development Corporation (Archeology Unit), Cambridge University, National Monuments Record, Ordnance Survey (Archaeological Division), as well as the private collections of Rollings, Kirk, Hollowell, and Pickering.

Each summer since 1974 the NCC has carried out a number of flights to record cropmark sites, but the main effort has been concentrated on the recording of medieval and post medieval earthworks. In particular, in 1976-77 a survey of village earthworks was carried out and over 100 sites were photographed, providing a considerable amount of new information, which has yet to be fully assimilated into the Sites and Monuments Record.
SOME BEAKER POTTERY FROM THE G. WYMAN-ABBOTT COLLECTION IN PETERBOROUGH MUSEUM.

Excavations at Fensate, Peterborough, England;
   The third Report

by F.F.M. Pryor, 1980
Other long bone lengths and articular diameters can be obtained with a considerable measure of uncertainty.

These limb bones are of moderately light build but muscle markings are fairly well developed, though not strong. They are more marked on the lower limbs than the arms.

Apart from the metopism there are no anatomical variants of any note. And apart from her dental disease there is no evidence of any pathology.

APPENDIX 9

A NOTE ON THE HUMAN SKELETON FROM A DITCH OF THE SECOND MILLENNIUM BC SYSTEM (CAT’S WATER SUBSITE)

FVH Powell

The inhumation described below was located in a shallow grave (F1594) at the north-east corner of the intersection of ditch 862 and ditch 2 in Area XI of the Cat’s Water subsite at Grid 523W/515N (ru 97).

The condition and arrangement of the bones are described in detail in Chapter 4.

This was a disturbed crouched burial of an adolescent female of about 15 to 16 years. The sex was based on the slightness of the long bones and the wide angle of the ischiatic notch, the presence of a pre-auricular sulcus, and the sub-pubic angle of the pelvis. The age was based on the presence of unfused epiphyses of the phalanges of the right hand; the presence of unfused epiphyses of the innominate; and the unfused proximal epiphysis of the left femur but with an unfused distal epiphysis.

MEASUREMENTS: (in mm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left Humerus</td>
<td>Minimum diameter of shaft — 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum diameter of shaft — 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Scapula</td>
<td>Maximum Glenoid Fossa Breadth — 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Ulna</td>
<td>Height of Radial Facet — 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Femur</td>
<td>Anterior/posterior diameter — 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transverse diameter — 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Platymeric Index — 75.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Patella</td>
<td>Maximum diameter of head — 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum length — 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 10

SOME BEAKER POTTERY FROM THE G WYMAN ABBOTT COLLECTION IN PETERBOROUGH MUSEUM

Alex M Gibson

The G Wyman Abbott collection of Beaker pottery at Peterborough comprises over 350 sherds, of varying sizes, of fine and rusticated wares, all of which have been drawn by the writer, except in the few cases where more than one sherd are demonstrably from the same vessel; in these cases only the most informative sherd, or sherds, have been drawn. All rims and bases have been illustrated, together with a representative collection of wall sherds.

The collection is the product of emergency salvage operations by Mr Wyman Abbott during gravel quarrying at Fengate, and as a result, stratigraphic details are usually missing (Abbott 1910). Numerous sites were explored during these operations, and the collection probably derives from several different settlements on the Fen-edge; but it has, unfortunately, been impossible to provenance the sherds more precisely than ‘from Fengate’, since the collection was already in a confused state when obtained by the museum. It is, however, known that some Beaker sherds were recovered from Williamson’s Pits, but the actual sherds are unknown. The subject of this report, therefore, is a large, essentially unstratified collection of pottery from the Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age transitional period, from roughly the same region on the Fen-edge.
As stated earlier, all the sherds have been drawn, but only a representative selection has been illustrated here due to lack of space. As can be seen from figs 121-127, the size of the sherds varies considerably from about 70mm square to little more than thumb-nail size, the average being about 30mm square. The fabric varies slightly in colour from buff through pink to light brown, only occasionally grey. The size of the sherds is unburnished, and sometimes has some slight grit protruding, as in the case of figs 128, 17, 129, 1, or else has a slightly pitted surface (figs 125, 3). On the whole, however, the surfaces are smooth. The fabric itself is filled with medium-sized to finely-crushed shell which appears to be the only added tempering. Small amounts of natural flint, quartz, haematite and fossiliferous limestone are also visible in thin section but appear to have been already in the clay. The fabric is quite fine, hard, and well-fired, and even the generally coarser rusticated pottery does not have large-sized grits and closely resembles the fine wares microscopically.

The fabric and appearance of all the sherds was very similar indeed, and the group is markedly homogeneous; this made the task of sorting the pottery into individual vessels virtually impossible. Some sorting was nevertheless attempted, but with success only in a very few instances, particularly among the rusticated sherds, where the fabric differences were slight, but significant. In the latter instance, 35 or 36 vessels are thought to be represented. On the basis of the quantity of sherds, and in view of the way in which fine ware sherds greatly outnumber coarse ware rusticated sherds, an estimate of about 20 or 60 fine beakers would be conservatively indicated.

The bar graph (fig 118) of formal traits present among the sherds shows that by far the most common are convex belly sherds, with convex neck and rim sherds following a close second and third respectively. There are 29 base sherds and a modest nine cordoned sherds and three sherds with both neck and belly traces. The sherds appear to be from a straight neck just below the rim, but the dotted lines imply that there may be more of these among the formally featureless sherds of which there are about 100.

The bar graph (fig 119) shows that simple rounded rims are the most numerous, with inturned rounded rims and cordoned rims occurring the least frequently. Few sherds are large enough to display more than two motifs so the diagram of frequency of motif combinations is significant. This diagram is read across: for example, cross hatching occurs on its own 77 times; fingernail impressions, twice with metoped decoration, and three times on its own. The motifs are not very varied, and on the whole fairly simple, the most elaborate being the metoped decoration (fig 123), and the fine all-over decoration of figs 124, 4. Excluding, temporarily, the rusticated sherds, most of the decoration is by impressed comb, fingernails are sometimes used, in the case of fig 126, 7, and also fingerprints (figs 125, 10, 127, 7). Corded decoration is absent. The rusticated sherds are mainly fingernail decorated, with the decoration consisting of pinched, paired impressions (figs 125, 15, 16; figs 126, 4, 6). Single rows of fingernail impressions are also present (figs 126, 3), and other decoration techniques include stabbing (figs 126, 5, 9), cordon, and incision (figs 126, 6). It is possible that fig 126, 6 may be a sheath decorated with a 'Finger Venetian', but it would be unsafe to make a definite identification in view of the minimum size of the sherd.

The motifs used all fall into Clarke's Basic European, Southern British and Metoped or Panelled groups (1, 4, and 5 respectively), the metoped decoration appearing to be Clarke's motif No 38 (Clarke 1970). In the Basic European group, motifs 1-5, and 7, are all included in the Fengate material, and in the Southern British group motifs 29, 32 and 34 are all employed. Despite the Basic European motifs present, there are few, if any, early Beakers in the group, the exception probably being figs 124, 14 and 123, 2, which are the only sherds that have zones of medium width, as well as early motifs. The rest of the sherds are late and can be placed in Lanting and Van der Waals' (1972) steps Four or Five, on the slight evidence for accentuated necks and metoped decoration. The cylindrical neck and globular body of figs 121, 1, and the two broad zones of decoration are even later features, and assign this vessel to Step Six.

The sherds are unusual in that they do not show the amount of variation that is commonly found in Beaker pottery assemblages from domestic sites in the Fen area, where rusticated sherds are usually present in greater proportions, and where there is often some unclassifiable material among the pottery. With the exception of the rusticated ware (and even this is comparatively fine) and of a few large vessels, such as fig 121, 7, and fig 123, 5, all the Beaker pottery might pass for funerary material. No mention, however, is made of skeletal material being found with the Beakers, and although they were salvaged and not excavated scientifically, Abbott does mention animal bones. Under these circumstances it is likely that human bones would be noticed too. The broken nature of the pottery is also evidence in favour of the pits being receptacles for refuse of a domestic nature. It is, of course, possible that the pits had a 'ritual' function and that breaking the vessels was a part of the ritual (especially in view of the high percentage of fine wares).

Weathering, often a characteristic of domestic rubbish, has only affected a few sherds, and it seems probable that the material must have been covered up soon after breakage. Generally domestic sites produce a large proportion of sherds pottery. The Grooved Ware sherds from the recent excavation on the Storeys Bar Road subite (FNG 2) are certainly abraded, but they had probably been on the surface for some time in antiquity. The pottery found by Abbott had been tidily dumped.
Fig. 119  Appendix 10: histogram showing frequency (in nos) of rim types.
Fig. 120  Appendix 10: chart showing frequency of motif combinations.
Appendix 10: Beaker pottery.
Fig. 122  Appendix 10: Beaker pottery.
Fig. 123 Appendix 10: Beaker pottery.
Fig. 124  Appendix 10: Beaker pottery.
Fig. 125 Appendix 10: Beaker pottery.
Fig. 126  Appendix 10: Beaker pottery.
This material compares favourably with that recently discovered at Fengate (Chapters 1 and 2, above) which is, if anything, in a slightly poorer condition than that in the museum; but this is probably due to more extensive weathering or different soil conditions. The rusticated pottery (no 60, 36) is rather more coarse than the Wyman Abbott material, and more typical of the coarse varieties of finger rusticated pottery which is common among Peterborough assemblages and often confused with the rusticated ware in Beaker fabrics, as seen, for example in nos 50, 30.
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ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE BOWES MUSEUM

by D. Coggins and S. Clews

with contributions from J. Ferris, A. Gibson, J. Rackham, R. Young and J. Weyman

A. Summary of activities
B. The Eggleston Urn
C. The How Talton material

A. Summary of activities

In the last issue of the Transactions R. F. J. Jones began his account of archaeology in the Bowes Museum by saying that "... the Bowes Museum is now active again in archaeological matters ..." That this activity has continued during 1978-9 can be seen from the following summary.

(1) Museum Collection

The Museum collection of flint and stone implements has been studied and largely recatalogued by Stephen Clews and Susan Vaughan. While many of the specimens are local the rest range widely in both time and space. In most cases it has been possible to establish provenances though this has often needed a great deal of research. One example may suffice: a collection of flints donated in 1945 by Mr. Hodgkin, a trustee of the Museum, had been acquired from a gentleman in Darlington who had bought them at Harrods in 1939. They had formed part of the dispersed Welkonna Trust Collection which had in turn been bought at Christie's in 1924. Christie's had acquired the flints as part of the Rosehill Collection from the Southampton Museum to which they had been transferred from the Winchester Museum in 1914. They had been originally collected by Baron Rosehill, 9th Earl of Northesk and deposited in Winchester in about 1880.

Mr. Clews, Ms. Vaughan and Ms. A. Morris have also described and drawn the Museum collection of stone axes. It is hoped to publish the results as a Bowers Museum Archaeological Report.

Other items in the collection which have been reappraised include a Bronze Age urn from Eggleston and the How Talton hoard.

Ms. L. Gidney has continued to work on the Roman potteries from Binchester and together with Ms. J. Raine has made much progress with the task of classifying the vast quantity of animal bone from the site. We are grateful to Mr. J. Rackham of Durham University Archaeology Department for his invaluable help with this project. Ms. Raine has also carried out preliminary work on the human skeletal material from previous excavations at Binchester. Mrs. A. Biggs has continued to catalogue the small finds from Binchester and Mr. B. Laiden has worked on the environmental samples.

(2) Accessions

Accessions to the Museum Collection include archives and finds from a series of excavations carried out by K. J. Fairness and D. Coggins in Upper Teesdale between 1972 and 1979. Among other donations are a small axe probably of Langdale stone found near Tow Law and presented by Mr. Later of Wolsingham, and a collection of Roman coins found in the site of the 19th century heard at Cockers Beck, Darlington by Mr. Atkinson of Gainford.

By far the most important acquisition for many years is the group of sculptures from Sockburn, which have been generously given on permanent loan to the Museum by the Bishop of Durham. They include the famous Viking-age sculptured stones and also one of the finest knightly effigies in the country. At the time of writing negotiations for the removal of these items to the Museum are in hand.

(3) Fieldwork

Members of the Antiquities Department staff have carried out routine monitoring of planning applications, lists of which have been regularly supplied by District and County Planning Departments. This work has involved the inspection of listed buildings and visits to places where proposed re-development would affect archaeological sites. Reports and recommendations have been submitted to the appropriate body. The areas proposed by the N.C.B. for open-cast coal-mining have been the subject of particular attention. Air photographs have been studied, documentary resources consulted and extensive field-walking carried out.

This work has resulted in a greatly increased knowledge of archaeological sites in the County and it has been possible to extend and improve the sites and monuments recorded accordingly, though much remains to be done before the latter can be regarded as being satisfactory.

(4) Excavations

Excavations, directed by Mr. I. Ferris and Mr. R. F. J. Jones, have continued throughout the year at Binchester. An interim report will appear in the forthcoming B.A.R. volume of papers given at the 12th International Lines Conference (1979). Discoveries since this paper was given deserve further comment and are summarised below by Ian Ferris.

Work concentrated on the area to the south-west of the fourth century commandant's bath-house has revealed an interesting stratigraphical sequence. The remains of a firing room, only 1.5 metres square internally, were excavated. An associated flue suggests that this room was possibly part of the original (phase 6A) bath-house subsequently demolished together with part of the residential accommodation, to make way for the much grander (phase 6B) bath complex.

Excavation has also taken place inside the room containing one of the stoke-holes for the phase 6B bath.
It seems that when the bath-suite fell out of use the area was used as a rubbish dump. In places this deposit is up to 1 metre deep and contains a great quantity of animal bone and potsherds. Cattle bones are by far the most numerous and of these a high proportion consist of skulls or skull fragments. The pottery group is dominated by classic E. Yorkshire wares. This deposit is given a good terminus ante quem by the gravegoods of an inhumation burial dating to the mid-sixth century. The shallow scoop in which the body lay was cut into the upper surface of the rubbish deposit. This relationship is important in that it shows some form of occupation at Winkburn after the phase 68 borth-house had gone out of use in the late fourth or early fifth century, and before the burial in the mid-sixth century. The depth of the deposit suggests that this occupation was more than casual use. The antiquities department has also played an important part in several other excavations. In May 1978 the stripping of topsoil in preparation for building an extension at Park View Comprehensive School, Chester-le-Street revealed wall foundations and sherds of medieval and Roman pottery. An emergency excavation was organised and directed for the Museum by Mr. J. Evans. Evidence of occupation extended over an area of some 80 x 60 metres and a range of medieval buildings at least 30 metres long was observed within a boundary wall running along the northern limits of the site. Lack of time and finance however, limited excavation to two small areas. Beneath the medieval buildings and partly destroyed by them was part of a late Roman road which in turn overlay an extensive area of light cobbles. When excavation had to cease so that building could go ahead a watching brief on the site was maintained. It soon became obvious that the numerous clay and cobbles foundations appearing in the northern half of the site and similar but more massive foundations beneath the east end of the medieval buildings were Roman.

These were destroyed by the contractors. There can be little doubt that a most important site showing evidence of both Roman and Medieval occupation has been destroyed without proper examination or recording because of lack of funds. Assistance was also given by the department with two excavations in Upper Teesdale: the early medieval settlement site of Simy Folds and the prehistoric and later site of Middle H曲折.

(5) Other activities

Other activities of the Antiquities department have included the preparation of specialist reports and the provision of advice and help with other projects of an archaeological nature within the county.

An archaeological survey of the coal measures and magnesian limestone areas of County Durham by R. J. Jones, P. Turnbull, P. Clark et al was completed early in 1979 and published as the first of a projected series of Museum Archaeological Reports. Reports on the archaeology of the Derwent Valley and of Lundale parish have been prepared for the County Planning Department and the Countryside Commission respectively. Ms. S. Mills has been actively engaged with a project initiated by the vicar of Escomb intended to improve the tourist facilities at the Saxon Church by producing a new guide and establishing a small site museum.

Advice on the reorganisation of the display of Roman archaeology at Witton Park Field Centre is being provided by Ms. L. Grays and Mrs. A. Biggs.

(6) Future Plans

The activities detailed above have only been possible with the aid given by the M.S.C. schemes. One of these, for school leavers has been concerned exclusively with the excavation of Binchester Roman Fort. The other, a S.T.E.P. scheme, has enabled the other aims of the department to be pursued. This scheme ended in November 1979 and because of cuts in public expenditure, will not be renewed. It is thus impossible for the multifarious duties of the Antiquities Department both within the Museum and with respect to the county as a whole to be continued on the scale of 1978-79.

B. Bucket Urn from Eglinton, Co. Durham

The urn (pl. 1, fig. 2) was discovered in 1967 by Mr. Raine, the former Eggleston postmaster, whilst fishing in the River Tees. The discovery followed a flooding episode which had eroded the river bank. The urn was exposed in the north-eastern bank of the river at O.S. grid ref: NY 977 243 (fig. 1). Mr. Raine informed Mr. M. Wheeler of the Durham County Museum Education Service of the urn, and he immediately excavated it. According to Mr. Wheeler (pers. comm.) the urn lay upright or 2 feet below the ground surface and ca 3 feet above the normal water level. It lay in a clean river silt and a search revealed no sign of a pit, or of any structure over the urn. The urn was removed by shoring the bank which was unstable and digging into it. The urn contained a cremation, with the bones lying in a clean grey loam in the bottom 10cm of the pot.

The pot and contents were donated by Mrs. Garrett, the landowner, to the Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle, where it was reconstructed and is now on display, Accession No:- 1975.17.

The Bucket Urn by A. Gibson

This large bucket urn is perhaps to be placed in the Late Bronze Age pottery tradition of the North of England/Bouth of Scotland which is represented by very few vessels. The urn is very coarse with a brown exterior and light brown-grey interior. The rim is rounded and simple but slightly flattened in places suggesting parallels with the Late Bronze Age flat-rimmed ware found in Southern Scotland. Large grey grits, identical to those in pottery from the recently excavated Bracken Rigg settlement, protrude through the surfaces of the vessel resulting in a very coarse knobbly texture as well as a heavily cracked exterior. Three or four slight grooves decorate the upper portion of the body just below the rim. These are faint and would appear not to be intentional but, more probably, the result of the potter using his/her fingers round the top of the vessel in an act of finishing off.
Fig. 1. Eggleston urn: location map.
Linking these finds at Eggleston and Bracken Rigg with the well known finds in Southern Scotland, Peebleshire, Ayrshire etc., are perhaps the bucket urns found at Birtley in North Tynedale, Northumberland, found in a barrow and associated with cremations. About four urns appear to have been found here, mostly what would seem to be bucket urns, judging by the photographs. Some of these are, however, decorated.

The Bone by Dr. J. Weyman, D.D.Sc., M.D.S., F.D.S.R.C.S.

The material was cremated and particularly fragmented, indeed most of it could be described as crumbs. As a result few bones could be identified except in part. Among those present were small fragments of skull vault, sphenoid bone, vertebrae, petrous bone, long bones, phalanges, alveolar part of a jaw bone with tooth sockets, and 11 small fragments of teeth. These gave enough evidence to be sure that a human individual was represented, and probably no more than one. The tooth roots were probably all from the deciduous dentition but there was a developing crown of a first premolar. This suggests an age of 5–6 years and this would be supported by the skull vault fragments which were all fairly thin and young but not of an infant. There was no evidence of sex or pathology.

There was no charcoal accompanying the bony material. The dry weight of the washed material was 1.150 kg.

C. The How Tallon Finds

The How Tallon tumulus is situated on the crest of the How Tallon Ridge, Barningham Moor, at an altitude of 1467 feet (O.S. Grid Ref: 0575 0745). It is a scheduled ancient monument, no. 362 in the Yorks North Riding list.

It lies on the watershed between Teesdale and Arkengarthdale on the modern Durham/North Yorkshire county boundary (fig. 3).

The area is rich in archaeological remains, including prehistoric settlements and field systems, cup and ring marked stones and a stone circle, all recently summarised by Laurie.
The stone built cairn was excavated by the Rev. Reginald Alfred Gatty and Sir Frederick Milbank in 1897, resulting in two published items - a newspaper report in the *Yorkshire Post* (September 25th, 1897) and an article in *The Reliquary*. These two articles form the basis for the discussion of the finds in this paper.

The excavation took place in two stages, being interrupted by equinoctial gales. Gatty, a well known local archaeologist, was present during the first stage of the operation and appears to have reported on this stage to the *Yorkshire Post*. The second part of the excavation was carried out by Milbank, the local landowner, and his report is quoted by Gatty in the *Reliquary* article.

There are some discrepancies between the two reports in the description of the flint finds and associations discussed in detail below by Robert Young. They may well arise, however, from a lengthier and more serious consideration of the finds in preparation for the *Reliquary* Report.

A total of five burials and an empty central cist are referred to in Gatty's report. Dr. Joan Weyman has found the remains of four individuals and a possible fifth in the surviving skeletal remains, supporting Gatty's credibility. She also reports, however, that a large part of one of the skeletons Gatty refers to is missing.

From correspondence in the Bowes Museum file on How Tallon it appears that most, if not all, of the finds found their way to the Bowes via the Dorman Museum, Middlesbrough from where they were transferred in 1936. Mr. Harrison, the curator at the time, wrote that he had all the finds shown on two old photographs which accompanied them. These two old photographs survive, showing that two flints and an almost complete human mandible have since disappeared.

This aside, the finds at present in the Bowes Museum concur well with those mentioned in the two reports, and shown on the photographs. The only additional material includes a few animal bones which were probably not considered worthy of mention or illustration, and an old sketch showing a rather fanciful reconstruction of the food vessel and a burial (pl. 2).

There is no reason to suspect accidental addition to the finds, or any losses other than those already mentioned.
Pl. 2. Contemporary sketch of the How Tallon finds.
Fig. 3. How Tallon: location map.
The Pottery by A. Gibson

Only two of the five burials found at How Tallon on Barningham Moor were associated with pottery, these being the contracted cist inhumation (burial No. 2) in which fragments of a food vessel were found, and an inhumation overlying an empty cist (burial No. 3) associated with fragments of a possible Beaker.

The Food Vessel (Burial No. 2 fig. 4, left; pi. 3)

1958.1837, 1837 A-C. The fabric at once puts this vessel in the food vessel class. It is hard and well-fired, with medium sized grits, some of which appear to be grog. The inner surface is light brown, slightly cracked, and has some grits breaking the surface. The core is black and quite close, and the outer surface is light brown with a pinkish tinge, due mainly to the application of a fairly thick slip which results in a better finish to the outer surface than to the inner. The base has a diameter of around 7-8 cm, and the rim an external diameter of 14-15 cm. The vessel has an internally bevelled rim, in keeping with this type of pottery, over 2 cm deep, which is decorated with three parallel encircling combed lines bordered by a line of triangular impressions. These triangular impressions however result in a false relief zig-zag pattern, and it this zig-zag that ought to be the focus of attention rather than the triangular impression. On the outside the decoration is similar: one line of false relief, then three lines of comb impression. False relief decorates the outer rim moulding, then three combed lines in the neck, a line of false relief and so on. In the report of the excavation, Gatty suggests that the triangular impressions of the false relief may have been executed by the point of the arrowhead found associated with the food vessel. This is an attractive idea, and S.E.M. analysis might be able to confirm this. The inevitable shrinkage during firing, however, might weigh against this theory.
Fig. 5. Flint from How Tallon.
sought as it is in this category that the false relief is most common. In Northumberland it is found on a bowl food vessel from Jesmond and further north, on a sherd from an Early Bronze Age domestic site at Kilellan Farm on the Isle of Islay. Parallels for the false reliefs are abundant in Abercromby but not for the false relief and comb combined. The groups of 3 horizontal comb lines may owe its origins to the Beaker tradition of zoning the decoration. The moulded rim is more in keeping with a Yorkshire vase.

Beaker (Burial No. 3)
1958.1837E-J. This vessel (fig. 4 right) appears very similar to the above at first glance, but on closer examination is clearly from a different type. Firstly the decoration is completely different consisting of herring-bone decoration in round, sharp toothed comb impressions, broken by single horizontal lines in the same technique. The fabric too is different, being much thinner and slightly more open and porous in section. The outer surface is light brown with a pinkish tinge, the core black, and the interior light brown. The grits are fine. There are no rim sherds but two base angle sherds suggest a base diameter of about 8 cm. The base angle is simple and the base itself undecorated. The comb used to execute the decoration had about 6 or 7 rounded and sharp teeth in contrast to the rectangular and blunt impressions of the food vessel above. These rounded and sharp impressions are common on some urn pottery and are paralleled among the Beaker pottery in Clarke's corpus. The Beaker, if such this is, would appear to be late in view of the degeneration of the decoration.

Discussion
Of all the burials at How Talion, the empty cist at the centre of the mound would appear to be the primary interment. The food vessel burial (No. 2) was also said to be near the centre of the mound, but it was quite high in the mound material as it was said to be breaking the surface of the 'six feet' high barrow. The Beaker burial (No. 3) was found above the empty cist and so must be later than it. The most likely explanation for the empty cist is that the skeleton had completely dissolved in the acid soil. At first glance this would appear to be at odds with the evidence as five burials do survive. These burials, however, are of adults and it is possible that the empty cist contained the inhumation of a child whose bones were more vulnerable to the acid soil conditions.

The Beaker burial above this may be the next in the sequence. It is possible that this burial may have been propitiatory to the first, but this is unlikely as it was associated with grave goods of its own and so would presumably have been a burial in its own right. The cover-slab of the cist may have been simply utilised as a flat surface for the inhumation. This contrasts with the burials found at Dour Hill near Otterburn where an earlier cist burial had been desecrated to make way for a second. The How Talion sequence, however, may be comparable to that at High Buston in Northumberland where an urned cremation appears to have been inverted on a cist cover. But at High Buston this burial may be propitiatory as there were a further three burials placed around the cist suggesting that the cist was a focus.

Although Beakers, Food Vessels, and Urns were probably in contemporary use for much of their existence it is still true to say that there is a Beaker - Food vessel - Urn sequence in Northern barrows. The Beaker - Food Vessel part of the sequence therefore, seems upheld at How Talion, or, at least, there is no unequivocal evidence to the contrary. As has been stated before, however, this has probably more sociological than chronological significance.

The Flint by R. Young
Thirteen implements and flakes (figs.5-6), in varying degrees of preservation and with varying patination

![Fig. 6. Flint from How Talion.](image-url)
survive from this site. All would seem to come from the excavations of 1897 reported in the Yorkshire Post for September 25th of that year and also in The Reliquary, and all are present on two photographs of the material from the barrow which may have been taken around the turn of the century. Both photographs (a general shot of all the material found, and a 'detail' of all the flints) are of poor quality. Nevertheless they are of interest in that they show the range of flint tools and flakes from the site to have been fifteen. The two missing pieces would seem to be a white patinated 'leaf-shaped' plano-convex flint knife with serrated edges, and what may have been a 'grey flint scraper'.

**Material and Condition**

Of the thirteen surviving pieces, nine are in various shades of grey flint (Nos. 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13) with No. 3 of ochreous brown flint. Three pieces (Nos. 1, 2 and 6) seem to have a complete milky white patination. The missing piece, No. 15, also seems to have been wholly white patinated. The two barbed and tanged arrowheads (Nos. 1 and 2) also show signs of thermal damage, being pitted, cracked and very brittle. Only two pieces show any traces of pebble or nodule cortex. The small leaf-shaped arrowhead (No. 4) retains a small patch of smoothed, creamy coloured pebble cortex on its dorsal face, while the irregular ovate flake (No. 6) retains much hard pitted creamy cortex on its dorsal face. In general the edges of all the implements are fresh and unworked, although the barbed and tanged arrowheads are broken and shattered.

**DESCRIPTION**

**Arrowheads**

Four arrowheads survive from the site.

(No. 1) **Max. Surviving Length 47mm. Max. Surviving Width 24mm. Max. Surviving Thickness 6mm.**

A bifacially-worked, convex-sectioned, barbed and tanged arrowhead, made on a flake. Pressure flaking seems to have been employed on both faces and both cutting edges of the piece are finely serrated by alternate flaking. The tang and one barb are missing and the whole of the base of the piece is very cracked and shattered. From the photographs it would seem that this was the condition in which the piece had been found. The arrowhead is wholly white patinated and the patination covers the broken sections of both barbs and tang. In general the surface is pitted and exhibits several of the 'pot lid' fractures usually associated with 'freeze-thaw' action on flint. The cracks and other flaws on the implement would also indicate that it had suffered thermal damage. **Accessions no. 1958.1854.1**

(No. 2) A wholly white patinated barbed and tanged arrowhead.

The overall dimensions of the implement are impossible to ascertain as it has broken into two pieces. The upper portion (accessions no. 1958.1854.4) measures 28 mm x 22 mm x 6 mm, and the lower portion (accessions no. 1958.1854.5) measures 17 mm x 22.5 mm x 5 mm. Again as with No. 1 this would seem to have been its condition when discovered. However, both photographs of the artefact assemblage show this piece as being without its tang but retaining both barbs. The barbs would thus seem to have disappeared since the photograph was taken. The piece has suffered a great deal of thermal damage, being very pitted, cracked and flawed. It is also very brittle. In places, where the 'cutting' edge survives intact it shows evidence of similar fine serration to that of No. 1.

(No. 3) **Max. Surviving Length 48 mm. Max. Surviving Width 20 mm. Max. Surviving Thickness 4 mm.**

A plano-convex leaf shaped arrowhead in brown ochreous flint, with flint, incipient bluish-white patination on both faces. This piece may show evidence for two phases of working. It exhibits very fine, shallow, pressure-flaked, 'scale flaking' on the whole of the convex face and on the right edge and lower half of the flat side. Very fine, secondary, inverse retouch is also visible on the underside of the right edge. The implement itself may never have been matched. After the scale flaking had taken place patination seems to have begun. At a later date the piece seems to have been re-worked. The irregular patches of flaking, which look like tooth marks, visible on both edges on the convex face seem to have been struck after patination had begun. The arrowhead has been broken transversely to its long axis across the base. **Accessions no. 1958.1854.2**

(No. 4) **Max. Length 24 mm. Max. Width 15 mm. Max. Thickness 3 mm.**

A small, plano-convex bifacially worked leaf shaped arrowhead, in light grey, semi-translucent flint. As with No. 3 the piece exhibits very fine, shallow, pressure flaking on both faces and retains a small patch of creamy coloured, smooth, pebble cortex. The implement is broken at the tip but otherwise is in good condition. **Accessions no. 1958.1854.3**

**End-Scraper-Cum-Knife**

(No. 5) **Max. Length 49 mm. Max. Width 18 mm. Max. Thickness 6 mm.**

A plano-convex double end-scraper-cum-knife on a light grey, semi-translucent flint. As with No. 3 the piece exhibits very fine, shallow, pressure flaking on both faces and retains a small patch of creamy coloured, smooth, pebble cortex. The implement is broken at the tip but otherwise is in good condition. **Accessions no. 1958.1854.14**

**Utilised Retouched Flakes**

Five of these were identified from the assemblage.

(No. 6) **Max. Length 60 mm. Max. Width 44 mm. Max. Thickness 8 mm.**

A sub-ovate, white patinated flake, retaining a pronounced bulb of percussion and bulbar scar and also exhibiting a hinge fracture at its distal end. Much hard, creamy cortex remains on its dorsal face. Well executed, shallow, retouch is visible on the left edge, dorsal face. This would have produced a very efficient cutting edge, the retouch forming small denticulations. Again, irregular chips have been removed on the bulbular surface of this edge. This may indicate contact with a resilient material. **Accessions no. 1958.1854.12**

(No. 7) **Max. Length 44 mm. Max. Width 28 mm. Max. Thickness 5 mm.**

A sub-ovate, white patinated flake, retaining a pronounced bulb of percussion and bulbar scar and also exhibiting a hinge fracture at its distal end. Much hard, creamy cortex remains on its dorsal face. Well executed, shallow, retouch is visible on the left edge, dorsal face. This would have produced a very efficient cutting edge, the retouch forming small denticulations. Again, irregular chips have been removed on the bulbular surface of this edge. This may indicate contact with a resilient material. **Accessions no. 1958.1854.13**

(No. 8) **Max. Length 40 mm. Max. Width 20 mm. Max. Thickness 5 mm.**

A grey, mottled, single-ridged flake with pronounced conchoidal edges on its bulbular face and a hinge fracture at its distal end. Very fine retouch/evidence of utilisation is visible
on its right edge dorsal and bulbar faces, and irregular flakes have been removed on the left edge (both faces) towards the outer end. ACCESSION no. 1958.1854.10.

A thick, ridged, grey flake ? from core trimming, struck at 90° to the core striking platform. The flake retains a pronounced bulb of percussion and exhibits the scar of a large hinge fracture on its dorsal face. Several other flake scars, seemingly struck from alternate directions are also visible on the dorsal face. Flats, irregular chips have been removed on the right and left edges, dorsal face, and much inverse battering is visible on the bulbar face towards the distal end. The distal end of the flake is of interest in that it has but at least one small flake struck across it from the left edge. It may be that the distal end of the flake has been broken off transversely to the flake's long axis. The irregular flaking visible on the bulbar face seems to be converging towards the distal end, and may have shaped it into a point. ACCESSION no. 1958.1854.8

A single ridged, grey flake segment, broken transversely to its long axis at the distal end. The piece exhibits which patination over both faces. All the working on the flint seems to have taken place after patination was well advanced. Very fine inverse battering is visible on its left edge and some crude battering can be seen on the right. Retouch similar to that on the left edge is visible running across the broken distal end of the piece. The flake has a prominent bulb of percussion and has traces of 'iron staining' on its dorsal ridge. ACCESSION no. 1958.1854.7

(No. 10) Max. Length 31 mm. Max. Width 24 mm. Max. Thickness 7 mm.

Waste Piece

(No. 11) Max. Length 24 mm. Max. Width 29 mm. Max. Thickness 3 mm.

An irregular, crudely battered grey flake with incidental bluish white patination. Battening is visible across the base of the piece and on the bulbar and left edge. It may be a fragment from a flint hammerstone. ACCESSION no. 1958.1854.3.

(No. 12) Max. Length 28 mm. Max. Width 20 mm. Max. Thickness 6 mm.

A steep-sided grey flake with slight battering/utilization on its right edge dorsal face. Incipient bluish-white patination on both faces and right edge. ACCESSION no. 1958.1854.6.

(No. 13) Max. Length 44 mm. Max. Width 11 mm. Max. Thickness 7 mm.

A light grey, pointed fragment of very cherty flint. Its underside is stained a light ochrous golden colour. ACCESSION no. 1958.1854.11

The Two Missing Pieces

These have been designated Nos. 14 and 15.

(No. 14) A very finely denudated leaf-shaped implement. The newspaper report has no hesitation in calling it a leaf-shaped arrowhead, but in the Reliquary article it is referred to as a "knife with finely serrated edge". From the photographic evidence and the illustrations available the latter identification would seem to be the correct one. It appears to have been about 60 mm long and 28 mm wide, with a milky white patination. Its thickness cannot now be ascertained.

(No. 15) A rounded ? grey flint piece. Again from the photographic evidence it seems to have measured about 20 mm long and 20 mm wide. This piece may have been the flint scraper mentioned in the newspaper account.

A Context for the Flint Material

A definite context for all the flints within the barrow cannot now be established and the documentary evidence is confused and confusing, with Gatty's two accounts differing in their accuracy and descriptive detail.

For example, in the Yorkshire Post he refers to "four flint arrowheads and a flint scraper" which seems to have been directly associated with the burial which contained the food vessel fragments - burial number two of the Reliquary article, that of an old man. However, in the Reliquary description the four arrowheads have become "an arrowhead" and "two broken fragments of arrowhead" and the plano-convex knife which was dismissed as an arrowhead in the newspaper article is identified for what it really is.

Reference to the scraper found with this burial occurs in both accounts. This piece may have been No. 15, the 2 grey scraper now lost, or it may have been No. 5, the end-scraper-cum-knife, though we cannot now be certain about this.

The arrowheads associated with this burial would appear to have been No. 1 "an arrowhead . . . serrated on the edge but with a barb and possibly the tang missing" and the two pieces which make up No. 2, "two broken fragments of arrowheads". The newspaper account only indicates with certainty that Nos. 1 and 14 were in direct association with the burial.

It is even more difficult to assign the remaining flint material to a definite context within the mound. The newspaper account is of no use at all and the Reliquary article provides little help. Burial No. 3 of the Reliquary article seems to have been disturbed, "... They had just come upon the stone of another cist. This proved quite empty when we opened it but above it was a body, the skull of which was in perfect condition". Yet "beside this body we found fragments of pottery and a flint cutting implement". Which of the remaining pieces is this? Was it one of the two as yet unprovenanced leaf shaped arrowheads (Nos. 3 and 4) in the assemblage? If the pot fragments also associated with this burial were those of a Beaker then this would be an almost unheard-of association. This cutting implement may have been any one of the utilised/retoched flakes in the assemblage (Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10); it may also have been No. 5 though again certainty is not possible.

Burial No. 5 was associated with "three flint scrapers and a sharp pointed flint". Again the problem is similar to that already outlined. There would seem to be only one definite scraper in the surviving assemblage, No. 5. This may have been one of the three recorded though again these may merely be utilised/retoched flakes. The sharp pointed flint is almost certainly No. 13.

On available evidence several pieces would seem to have no direct association with the burial, i.e. the leaf-shaped arrowheads Nos. 3 and 4 and the waste flakes Nos. 11 and 12. As a result it must be assumed that these pieces were found in the make-up of the mound in the course of the excavation and not properly recorded. It is possible that most, if not all, of the burials had been disturbed when the boundary walls, mentioned in both
The Human Skeletal Material by Dr. Joan Weyman

The Reliquary report of the 1897 excavation describes the findings of...

(No. 1) "Man in the prime of life"

(No. 2) "Jaws and teeth of an old man, for the teeth were worn down to the level of the gum..." accompanied by a Food Vessel and flint implements.

(No. 3) Body over an empty cist, "... cheek bones and jaws, which were in perfect order".

(No. 4) Body of ? woman, "... the bones and jaws were smaller... the teeth were all perfect".

(No. 5) Another body "... the teeth in the jaws were many of them missing".

It is at once evident from this report and its accompanying photographs that some of the material is not in the present collection. Examination of the material showed the following:

(f) A fragment of maxilla had present the teeth 26, 41, and sockets for 33, 11, 23, 25. The supercisors were severely worn and this suggests an age of 30+ years. A mandibular molar was probably from this body also. There was considerable alveolar loss in relation to the molar resulting from gum disease, and the necks of the teeth showed cervical (amitotic) caries. The photograph shows the dental arch complete except for 3/8 with a natural space between 1/1, bone out by the bone material. This was evidently the skull from the cist, stated to be that of an old man, no. 2 above.

(d) The major part of a mandible contained 45f757 and part of a maxilla with 34567 were probably from the same individual as they appeared to articulate well and they had similar slight wear of the tooth surfaces. The probable age was 15-20 years. A line of enamel hypoplasia on 15/34 17/345 7 would suggest a systematic upset of female type at the age of about 5 years. Loose teeth, 4/345, belonged to this individual as they also had the hypoplastic line. This person was probably female as the angle of the mandible was smooth and without the thickening due to muscle attachment evident in man's mandibles, although one cannot be dogmatic as this is a young specimen. The photograph showed the jaw intact except for the right ramus, broken off through the 37 follicle socket. This appeared to be No. 4 of the earlier report.

(c) A fragment of mature mandible containing 34567 and part of a maxilla with 34567 were probably from the same individual as they appeared to articulate well and they had similar slight wear of the tooth surfaces. The probable age was 15-18 years. Loose teeth 3/3 were likely to be from this person. They are now as shown in the old photograph except for the right ramus, broken off through the 37 follicle socket. This appeared to be No. 3 or 4 of the earlier list.

(b) The photograph shows another almost complete mandible with all teeth in situ which is not present in the current material. This would appear to represent the body of No. 1, a "man in the prime of life". There are however some teeth identified as 1212 and 7/7 which show comparable wear to those in the photograph and may be from the same individual. The age would be about 20-25 years.

(c) Among other skull fragments was a small piece of cranial vault which appeared to be thin and immature, but this was the only suggestion of the presence of a young child. Fragments of other bone include 7 pieces of long bones including ulna, humerus, femur and 3 parts of pelvis. The few small fragments include 2 phalanges. Also present were 2 pieces of thick skull vault, one with a well-developed suture margin. This could belong to any of the younger adults.

To sum up, there is evidence for the presence of at least 4 individuals, aged 50+, 16-20, 15-18 and 20-25 years, with the slight possibility of No. 5 listed above unless that was juvenile material. The remains of the "man in the prime of life", No. 1 in the list, are missing but as these were evidently in fine condition, they could well have been separated from the rest as a "show-piece".

The Animal Remains by D. James Rackham

The animal bones surviving from the excavations at How Tallon deserve little comment. Three teeth of ox are illustrated on one of the early photographs of the finds and presumably one of these is the find referred to by Gatty (1898) and ascribed to Bos longifrons and found in association with burial 2. It is no longer the...
practice to refer to domestic ox finds by such a specific name and since the finds cannot with certainty be identified as domestic they are more accurately described as Bos sp.

Additional finds to that noted in the Reliquary article and those illustrated by the early photographs include a fragment of an ox humerus, three bones of water vole (Arvicola terrestris) including a mandible, a humerus of red grouse (Lagopus lagopus) and a tibia-fibula of an amphibian.

Without an association or stratigraphic position for these finds it cannot be guaranteed that any is contemporary with the burial or barrow as a whole.

The finds of the shells of the snail Cepaea nemoralis (L.) are noted in the original article as occurring in heaps and despite searching of the barrow and surroundings no further shells of this type were found. It is possible that they were eaten, although smaller than the common snail Helix aspersa (Meller). Cain suggested that the abundance of shells of C. nemoralis and Arion atertus (L.) in a pit at Rainborough may have been due to collection for eating.

The animal remains were identified as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bos</td>
<td>Right humerus, posterior aspect of distal end of shaft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos</td>
<td>Left maxillary molar, extremely worn molar, probably M1. Larger than Chillingham specimen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos</td>
<td>Left maxillary 4th premolar, medium - well worn, large specimen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvicola</td>
<td>Right humerus, distal end and most of shaft, approximate end broken off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvicola</td>
<td>Left mandible, incisor M1 and M2 present. M3 and surrounding fragments lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvicola</td>
<td>Right maxillary incisor complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagopus lagopus</td>
<td>(Red grous) Left humerus, distal third of bone only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibia</td>
<td>Tibia-fibula, distal half with epiphysis intact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos (large )</td>
<td>Rib bone, a shaft fragment approximately 30 cm long.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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drawn by the writer, but mostly it is in the form of small sherds which are totally undiagnostic with regard to shape. When there is an indication of shape, then the sherds tend to be somewhat coarse and thin, and generally more akin to Peterborough or Urn fabric than to Beaker. An exception to this rule, however, is a shard from Stainsby in Lincolshire where a domestic scatter including Beaker and rusticated sherds was found beneath a round barrow (Petch, 1958). The shard in question is a body shard (fig. 1) showing fingertip and plastic decoration, both being complementary in the form of finger-pinched cordons. Visible on the shard from the (fig) bottom up, the scheme is as follows:

9 vertical cordons,
2 horizontal encircling cordons
15 short vertical cordons
2 further encircling cordons but somewhat more widely spaced than the first two.

The decoration is very compact and lively, the impressions are deep and the cordons boldly pinched up from the surface leaving the wall of the vessel dangerously thin in places. In all, the decoration would appear to be too bold for the thickness of the fabric. The clay too, is fine without any large tempering, and it is hard and well fired.

The vitality and zoning of the pinched decoration immediately brings to mind the Dutch 'potteker' as defined by Lehmann (1965) and in particular a 'tronpettoarteiker' from Hanendorp in Gelderland. This has a sinuous 'S'-shaped profile with repeated zones of vertical cordons bordered by encircling bands of the same technique. Like the Stainsby sherd, the fabric of the Hanendorp potteker is only 7 mm thick yet the vessel stands 38 cm high. If we follow Lehmann's definition of a 'potteker', namely:

... large vessels that, except for the manner of their decoration and their size, resemble Bell Beakers, both those with an 'S'-profile and those with a cylindrical or conical neck and an avoid body ... generally tall, almost up to 50 cm, but relatively thin-walled (surely thicker than 8 mm) ... (1965, p. 3)

then 'pottekers' are rare in Britain in their true form. In addition to the Stainsby sherd, there is a sherd from Bottisham Lock on the River Cam (Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, No 214865) and a reconstructed vessel from Lion Point, Clacton, Essex (Warren, 1936), though both vessels are rather more difficult to parallel in the Netherlands. The Bottisham Lock sherd represents the constriction where the neck joins the body. It would appear to be from a vessel with a perhaps rather sinuous profile. The decoration is vertical rows of paired fingerprint impressions, resulting in very low vertical ribs, with an undecorated band round the neck constriction itself (fig. 2). The Lion Point vessel is c. 27 cm high and has a round shouldered sinuous body with an upright cylindrical neck, and there is no clear distinction on the pot of where the neck starts and the body finishes, either marked by decoration, or formally. There are two well spaced encircling cordons on the pot which divide the neck into virtually equal thirds. With the exception of the cordons the decoration is all comprised of vertical rows of deep paired fingerprint impressions (fig. 3).

Clearly these three examples are not the only examples in Britain, more doubtless await to be recognized among the hundreds of rusticated sherds from domestic sites such as Fifty Farm and Hockwold cum Wilton but the difficulties of sherd evidence are self-apparent, and this note is only intended as a preliminary to a more detailed survey.

Clearly, however, there does seem to be an element of 'potteker' pottery in Britain although the numbers would appear to be comparatively small. It must be remembered that those large biornical vessels illustrated in Clarke's corpus are not included here as 'pottekers' sensu stricto as they are, quite unexpectedly, quite far removed from the Dutch examples. It is obvious that on both sides of
information on the nature of the deposition was gained; the vessel was observed in situ and the organic binding preserved. At a time when metal-detectors are common, it is gratifying to realise what valuable evidence is brought to light when such an instrument is used in a responsible manner.

Acknowledgements: Thanks are due to Miss J. Rown for assistance in examining the site; to Mr C. Coombe and Miss K. Wiedley, both of the Norwich Castle Museum, for respectively restoring the vessel and cleaning the bones; Dr P. T. Craddock for metallurgical analyses; Norwells Slate for identification of the vegetable fibres.

Pot beakers in Britain?

This discussion on Pot Beakers in Britain has been written (perhaps started) by Mr Alex Gibson, Department of Archaeology, University of Leicester. There are many large 'indigenous pot Beakers' in Britain, as a glance through Clarke's corpus (Clarke, 1979) will show. Vessels such as Nos. 239, 371, and 389 from Balsford, Somerset and Rutley respectively, show superbly the size that some of these Beakers can attain. It must be remembered, however, that these are reconstructions from sherd evidence and though the writer would generally agree with Clarke's reconstructions, a degree of caution must be used when comparisons are made among these vessels.

By far the largest amount of evidence for these large vessels comes from domestic sites rather than graves, as might be expected, and Clarke would see them as representing his third category of domestic vessel, the large storage jar, which, with its fine ware, and secondary ware, allowing for a degree of overlap, would constitute a complete assemblage of pottery on a domestic site. The fingernail and fingertip rustication and the plastic cordon decoration is by far the most common form of decoration on these vessels and is especially common in the late and final Southern phases of Clarke's scheme, so much so that the plain Beaker secondary ware began to decline. This had started to happen by the early phases of Clarke's Southern tradition and so he attributes the introduction of the plastic decoration and the rustication to the intrusive Ni/D group. Unfortunately, Clarke is unable to present us with any Ni/D domestic sites in Britain as evidence for this and instead quotes the Dutch material where most of the parallels lie. He also provides us with some sherd drawings of some of the Dutch material. It is also unfortunate that Lasting and Van der Waals (1972) state that Clarke's Continental groups—'are either unconvinving in not being sufficiently ''parental'' or being entirely hypothetical and lacking both in chronological and geographical homogeneity' (p. 193).

With the increasing tendency to split away from Clarke's groupings and the increasing realisation that there is much more overlap than he considered there to be, for example at Mount Pleasant where both early and final Southern Beakers are found in association (see Longworth, in Wainwright, 1979), Clarke's ideas of origins and development for this type of pottery in Britain must be regarded with caution.

The writer was prompted to look at this question by a study of the pottery from Beaker domestic sites in the British Isles. A great deal of rusticated pottery comes from these sites, and has been

Fig. 1. The Stainsby sherd: see text. Width of sherd 125 mm
in Cyprus. CAARI currently occupies one complete floor of a large building in central Nicosia, five minutes walk from the Cyprus Museum and the Department of Antiquities. The institute consists of a large common room and associated facilities, four bed rooms (2 beds each), small library, sherd/geological collection room and two offices. It is hoped that with a considerable increase in funding, the facilities of the institute will soon be improved to the point at which CAARI can provide all of the services which may be expected of it. The upgrading of the library is a top priority. The building up of a comprehensive research library will clearly require a major infusion of funds, not available at present. All donations of journals and books will be gratefully received, and authors of relevant publications reading these lines are earnestly entreated to send copies of their works (including offprints of articles) to the CAARI library in Nicosia.

Although the word 'American' appears in CAARI's title, the Institute welcomes archaeologists of all nationalities. A major feature of the institute is the provision of a meeting place where archaeologists can gather to discuss matters of mutual interest in convivial surroundings. Such a place has not existed in Nicosia before, and the need for it has been amply demonstrated by the rapidity with which CAARI's facilities have been adopted by scholars of many nationalities.

Enquiries concerning archaeological research in Cyprus and accommodation at the hostel are welcome, and should be directed to the Director, CAARI, 41 King Paul Street, Nicosia, Cyprus. The institute telephone number is Code 021, number 51832.

IAN A. TODD

Further light on Charles Dawson

Veryan Heal graduated in Archaeology at Reading University in 1976. She is now a Research Student in Cambridge working on prehistoric wood technology in N.W. Europe. This note draws attention to some curious aspects of the work of that eccentric lawyer-archaeologist, Charles Dawson. While working for a Cambridge PhD she has recently been appointed a Research Assistant at the Archaeological Research Centre of the National Maritime Museum to work on prehistoric water transport.

Charles Dawson is known primarily for his involvement in the Piltdown Affair, but his archaeological activities were extensive, particularly in Sussex where he lived. A solicitor by profession, Dawson developed a considerable interest in local history and archaeology; for some years he was actively involved in the Sussex Archaeological Society, becoming a prominent member (S.A. 84:38), local secretary for Uckfield, and an accepted local expert consulted about sites and finds in the county. He features in the Sussex Archaeological Collections between 1892 and 1914, in its consultative capacity (Notes and Queries, 1893:2; 1894; 1895; 1905; Allcroft, 1916), as possessor of unique objects (Dawson, 1903; Salignon, 1908), writing articles himself (1894:1; 1895; 1901; 1902; 1903) and with Lewis (1896), and being criticized for his work (Blackmore, 1925; Andrews, 1974).

Millar examined Dawson as man and archaeologist in The Piltdown man (1974), and this note does not intend to repeat those findings, but to examine two papers in particular which bear upon the present author's research.

The first is entitled 'Neolithic flint weapon in a wooden haft' (Dawson, 1894), and refers to a drawing of 'a haft bearing an implement in situ' (p.85), described as having been found at East Dean, Sussex, by a shepherd called Blackmore, from whom Dawson had negotiated the purchase of flints. The axe had apparently been found 'some years ago', when 'the haft was perfectly carbonized and crumbled at the touch, and all attempts to save it proved futile'. However, Blackmore, being 'a fair draughtsman... was able to make a drawing of this interesting discovery' (fig. 1).

The implement was received in a horizontal groove and on one side of the haft near the head. Above it, in the head of the shaft, appeared two small stumps, apparently where small shoots had been trimmed off the wood. Below the implement were a number of grooved rings running round the haft... The blade of the implement itself was inclined slightly downwards, and the haft curved back slightly in the centre (Dawson, 1894, p.9).

Dawson interprets the 'stumps' and 'grooves' as 'no doubt to receive the cross lashings which secured the implement in its groove in the haft', and compares the position of the head and curve of the haft with the construction of axes 'of many modern savage races' (p. 98). Given the reported
the North sea it is necked Beakers with which the 'potbokers' are associated, the end of the Southern tradition in Britain and with Vechte Beakers with which the 'potbokers' are associated, the end of the Southern tradition in Britain and with Vechte Beakers in Holland, and in both cases there appears to be frequent hybridization between the large vessels and the fine wares. According to Lanting (1973) 'trompetpotkokers' are late in the Dutch sequence whereas Lehmann tended to see this style as at the beginning of the sequence. Lanting's typology is more acceptable, however, and is also more in agreement with the finding of the Stainsby sherd associated with S4 and SH Beakers. It should be stated again, however, that S4 Beakers were associated with early types at Mount Pleasant in Dorset (Longworth, in Wainwright, 1979) and this may mean that the Beaker groups in Britain need to be looked at again if anyone is brave enough to tackle this prehistoric nightmare.

As Lehmann correctly points out, the 'potbokers' must be regarded as an Anglo-Dutch phenomenon as they do not appear elsewhere except in areas of Germany close to the Dutch border, and it must have been the case that there was constant contact between Britain and the Continent in the Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age, not folk movements or invasions as were envisaged in the past, but more casual 'going and froining', perhaps for trading purposes and the like. Perhaps the Stainsby sherd is one piece of evidence that survives for this presumably complex relationship.


The Cyprus American Archaeological Research Institute

The Cyprus American Archaeological Research Institute (CAARI), sponsored by the American Schools of Oriental Research, was officially inaugurated at its premises at 41 King Paul Street, Nicosia, on July 1978. It is modelled along the lines of the longer-established institutes in Amman and Jerusalem, and it was directed in its initial stages by Dr Anita Walker. The present writer took up the position as Director on the 1 October 1979. Although American archaeological interest in Cyprus dates back half a century or so, no resident archaeological institute had ever been established on the island. With the recent increase in the number of foreign archaeologists working in Cyprus, the need for such a centre was readily apparent, and the American Schools of Oriental Research, with their long association with the region as a whole, were well suited to establish such a facility.

The overriding goal of CAARI is the furthering of the study of the archaeology and related aspects of the island, and ultimately of the region as a whole. This aim may best be achieved by the provision of physical facilities in Nicosia, and by facilitating communication between the Department of Antiquities and foreign scholars interested...
SOME PERFORATED STONE ARTEFACTS FROM NORTHUMBERLAND AND DURHAM

Northern Archaeology, vol.1, No.2, 1980
Some Perforated Stone Artefacts from Northumberland and Durham

Alex Gibson

The subjects of this note are six perforated and one cup marked stone implements from Northumberland and Durham in the Sturge Collection at the British Museum and as far as is known to the writer they are the only ones in the British Museum from our area outside the Greenwell Collection. This latter collection is presently being worked on for publication by the British Museum authorities. Perforated axe-hammers and battle axes have also been excluded as a corpus of such implements is being compiled by C.B. Burgess (Pers. Comm.). The artefacts illustrated here comprise two maceheads, three pebble hammers, a possible perforated adze, and a stone with corresponding medial cup marks. There are no available details of exact provenance, or of the circumstances of the finds, but a generalisation has been made by Fiona Roe (1968,1979) that maceheads from funerary contexts are usually whole and complete while those from domestic contexts are broken. This may apply to Nos. 1 and 2 but such inferences must only be applied with extreme caution. The dateable examples of these artefacts show that they started in the late Neolithic and extended into the Earlier Bronze Age with objects like No. 7 probably extending later. This type of artefact has been fully discussed by Mrs. Roe (op. cit) and it is her typology that is used here.

No. 1. PAGNLEES, WOLSINGHAM, CO. DURHAM

STURGE COLL. No. 341.

A macehead of cushion type though only about half now survives. This example would appear to have been typical of the class in that it is carefully made and well-finished with a polished feel. It has also been squared off as is apparent from the section drawing. The shaft-hole is vertical sided unlike the hour-glass perforation of pebble-hammers. The surviving end has been chipped.

surviving length .... 5.5 cm.
surviving width ..... 5.0 cm.
surviving thickness . 1.6 cm.

No. 2. TWIZELL, NORHAM, NORTHUMBERLAND

STURGE COLL. No. 303.

A pestle macehead of Thames type which differs from the Orkney type in that on the latter the sides are more concave than the straight sides of the former. As the name suggests, the distribution of this type is more southern than the Orkney type but the distribution of both is markedly eastern. The perforation is typically towards the narrower end and is straight in section. The stone is hard and gritty and the artefact is slightly damaged with traces of abrasion on the broader end.

Max. length .... 8.0 cm.
Max. width ..... 6.0 cm.
Min. width ..... 4.4 cm.
No. 3. COVES HOUSES, WOLSINGHAM, CO. DURHAM
STURGE COLL. No. 468.

A pebble-hammer in hard igneous rock. The sides have probably been artificially flattened slightly, but it cannot be said to have been squared off in the same way as cushion maceheads. The shaft-hole has an hour-glass profile and is central. This hour-glass perforation is the main distinguishing feature of these pebble-hammers. Both ends are slightly flattened due to use, but it is unknown whether they derive from primary or secondary use as a label with the artefact states that the finder used it as a door knocker.

Max. length ..... 9.0 cm.
Max. width ..... 5.5 cm.
Max. thickness .. 2.4 cm.

No. 4. MILNE HOUSES, PROSTERLEY, CO. DURHAM
STURGE COLL. No. 309.

An example of an oval pebble-hammer very similar to the above, but in a slightly softer stone. The hour-glass perforation is slightly off centre. Both ends of the object have been slightly flattened and roughened by use.

Max. length ..... 8.6 cm.
Max. width ..... 5.4 cm.
Max. thickness .. 2.2 cm.

No. 5. BELFORD, NORTHUMBERLAND
STURGE COLL. No. 308.

A circular pebble-hammer in a light coloured gritty stone with a pitted surface. The central hourglass perforation is considerably more rounded in section than the examples above. One part of the edge is considerably flattened and roughened by use.

Max. diameter .... 5.9 cm.
Max. thickness ... 2.1 cm.

No. 6. WEARDALE, CO. DURHAM
BRITISH MUSEUM UNREGISTERED.

A slightly squared perforated stone disc of a type described as a stone adze by Fiona Roe (op. cit) and characterised by the hour-glass profiled shaft-hole and the sharpened edges. This example is in a light coloured soft sedimentary rock, and the edges seem to have been deliberately chipped or flaked to provide a sharper edge.

Max. length ..... 10.5 cm.
Max. width ...... 10.5 cm.
Max. thickness .. 2.4 cm.
No. 7. RIDING MILL, NORTHUMBERLAND

B.M. No. 1911.10-21.56

This is stated to have been bought from a Mr. Henry Slater from Bridgewater and the entry in the British Museum accessions register and on a label enclosed with the object reads:

'Found about half a mile south east of the Roman bridge at Riding Mill on Tyne, and not far off the line of the Watling Street. 1874.'

It is a rectangular piece of hard, dense, igneous rock with apparently squared off and smoothed edges. There are corresponding cup-marks on both of the broad faces, both of which appear smooth and polished. This may have been intended as a perforated hammer, but the shaft hole was never completed, but it is more likely that it was used as a hand-held hammer-stone with the cups giving extra grip to the thumb and fore-finger.

Max. length ..... 14.0 cm.
Max. width ...... 8.6 cm.
Max. thickness .. 3.9 cm.
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TYPESCRIPT

A RE-INTERPRETATION OF CHIPPENHAM BARROW Y, AND A DISCUSSION OF THE COARSE POTTERY

Forthcoming in Proc. Cambridge Arch. Soc.
A REINTERPRETATION OF CHIPPENHAM BARROW 5, WITH A DISCUSSION OF THE BEAKER-ASSOCIATED POTTERY.

ALEX. M. GIBSON.

I. THE BARROW

Barrow 5 is one of a number of barrows to be excavated in the 1930's by C. S. Leaf, and reported in P.C.ASS. (Leaf 1936, 1940), all of which produced evidence for pre-barrow occupation by way of sherds and flints from the old ground surface. Barrow 5, however, yielded rather more concrete evidence, and it is this barrow that forms the subject of this report.

The barrow is recorded by Leaf as being 147ft. (45 m.) in diameter with an outer bank but no visible mound although there was a thin capping of sand covering a small natural knoll. The barrow seems to have been a sand mound, therefore, and not reinforced by turves etc. The surrounding bank was of gravel.

During the excavation of the central area a double ring of stake-holes was found just inside their gravel bank for stakes about 4 ins. (10 cm.) in diameter and 3 ins. (7.5 cm.) deep. Eight feet within the bank was another ring of larger posts 9 ins. (23 cm.) in diameter and 6 ins. (15.2 cm.) deep. As noted by the excavator, these posts, filled with charcoal, may have been deeper as subsequent ploughing has destroyed much of the top of the layer. Mr. Leaf's interpretation was that 'the outer double ring would form a low palisade while the inner would form a circle of large posts, some of which were apparently arranged in pairs.' He then observes that similar stake-circles beneath barrows have been found in the Netherlands.

This is, of course, true and stake and post-holes are common beneath round barrows not only in Holland but in Britain too (Ashbee 1960). In most cases, however, the circles are rather more regular than at Chippenham. For example in Barrow 5 only some of the inner circle of posts are double, and the outer stake hole circle disappears beneath the surrounding bank on the east and north-east side (fig. 1). Especially unusual are the two large postholes to the north east, numbered hearths I and VII in Mr. Leaf's plan. The fact that they were at first thought to be hearths suggests that they were filled with charcoal, but they proved to be large postholes forming an entrance. Dimensions
for these postholes are not given in the report but from the plan it is possible that they were about 3 ft. (c. 1 m.) across, very out of character with the 4 in. (10 cm.) diameter stakes of the outer ring. Seven large hearths were found within the central area, two of which, hearths III and IX cross the line of the outer stake circle, but it is not clear from either the plan or the description whether the hearths are stratigraphically earlier or later than the stakeholes. It may be assumed that these hearths are earlier for the following reasons:

1) there is no sterile layer mentioned between the hearth and the old ground surface as might be expected if the hearth were later, and it was clearly found beneath the mound which Mr. Leaf saw as contemporary with the stake circles.

2) If this was a thin hearth above the posts then it would have been destroyed by the modern ploughing which was reported to have done so much damage to the post and stake holes.

3) there is no mention of a large spread of charcoal over the site around the area of the hearth as would be expected if the hearth was a later deep one of which only the lowest part had escaped plough damage.

4) The sherds from these hearths are said to have been few and abraded while those from the hearths nearer the house centre and within the stake circle are comparatively fresh.

5) these hearths as well as the stake holes are certainly pre-bank as they both underlie that feature, but they were certainly not contemporary.

A mesolithic working floor was found beneath hearths VIII and IX on the northern part of the site.

The sequence of activity on the site, then, is seen thus by the writer to be as follows. Firstly, Mesolithic occupation as attested by the floor just mentioned; secondly, Neolithic occupation of a rather scraggy nature represented by a carinated western Neolithic bowl and a late Neolithic incised hammer rim found in a depression near the outer ditch on the east side, and from beneath the inner bank on the east-north-east respectively. At least hearths III and IX may be associated with the second sherd mentioned, but cannot, at
any rate, be far removed in date. We then would have the construction of the stake and posthole circles, associated with possibly hearth IV or VIII, then the primary unaccompanied inhumation and the erection of the first phase of the two-period barrow.

REINTERPRETATION

The writer sees the structure beneath barrow 5 at Chippenham not as representing wooden circles of a ritual nature, but a round hut about 40 ft. in diameter (c. 12 m.), (fig. 2). The outer wall is of paired stakes which supported a wattle and daub wall, fragments of daub having been found on the site, and the post hole circle represents larger freestanding posts which formed roof supports. The fact that some are double suggests re-cutting and the replacement of decayed timber. The two large post holes on the outer circle represent an entrance and their large size is not unparalleled. The hearths, pottery, flint and domestic animal bones all reinforce the theory that there was domestic activity on the site before the erection of the barrow.

There are problems, however, and that is that not all the hearths could be contemporary, but all except hearths V and IX have produced Beaker pottery and so cannot be too far separated chronologically. Even hearths V and IX had some Beaker sherds associated with them, but these fitted sherds from other hearths. Only hearths IV, V, and VII could be contemporary with the hut, assuming that the ring of postholes is, in fact, a true circle. It may also be possible that these areas do not represent levels at all but that they are simply areas of more intensive burning which resulted from the destruction of the hut.

Daub was found at Chippenham, though in exactly what quantity is difficult to say but the outer stake holes could have supported a wattle and daub wall of considerable strength as the stakes themselves were quite broad as already mentioned, and they do not appear to have been replaced as do some of the posts of the inner ring which may be due to protection afforded by the daub. If this is the case, then the outer wall despite its flimsiness on the ground, may have been in actual fact quite strong, as the posts are about 1 ft. (c. 35 cm.) apart according to Mr. Leaf's plan. Consequently, the large size does not render the interpretation of the monument as a hut unacceptable.

West Brandon houses A and B (Jobey 1962) Little Woodbury houses I and II (Nisson
1970), High Knowes A site (Jobey and Tait 1966) are all similar to in size, if not larger than, the Chippenham site where the wattle and daub wall would give the same kind of support as offered by the ring groove of some of the other examples quoted. The internal postholes would be sufficient to hold a roof of some light material such as skins and any way, Musson has shown (op cit.) that internal posts need not be present in a house as a light roof could be entirely supported by ring or tie beams, and the two may have been combined at Chippenham with the internal supports giving added strength, and need not have even been a complete circle. The large door posts are also paralleled at some of the sites mentioned above, and in the Bronze Age houses at Itford Hill (Burstow and Hollyman 1958). Admittedly, these examples are from later contexts than the Chippenham barrow, but our knowledge of huts of this period is very slight and so the lack of contemporary parallels only represents the state of present knowledge. Also, despite the difference in date, round huts are round huts the world over, as shown by numerous ethnographic parallels, and carpentry in the Early Bronze Age would be similar to that of later prehistory, tools may have changed but there is no evidence to suggest that nails were used in the later huts, so the basic techniques may have been the same.

The hearths present the only problems of interpretation; III and IX are probably earlier than the hut, and II and VII can not be contemporary with the hut if the circle of roof supports is a complete one. All the pottery is similar and closely datable so what we must envisage is that some hearths were in existence, and fell into disuse and were used by the same people who built the hut. Certainly, the amount of pottery from barrow 5 and the other barrows in the group suggests that occupation in this area was extensive.

II. THE POTTERY.

The pottery discussed here is, in the main, non-Beaker rusticated ware which Mr. Leaf intended to publish later when his excavation was complete but which never did see print (Leaf 1940 p.60). True Beaker has been omitted from this discussion as adequate drawings, though not of all the material, were
published in the 1940 report. Nos. 30 and 86 are probably true Beaker, but have been included here as No. 39 is semi-rusticated, and the decoration of No 86 is unusual.

The majority of the pottery is coarse rusticated sherds, very different to the Beaker material in character. Finger pinched cordons are most commonly found as in sherds Nos. 44-49 inc., usually only horizontal, but vertical and horizontal ribs may sometimes be combined, Nos. 8, 17, 35. In the case of sherds No 2 and No 4, a large horizontal cordon has been applied and covered with finger tip impressions, in such a way that a collar has been formed. The body of No. 2 is probably truncated like urn or Fengate ware, while that of No. 4 is probably hemispherical. These cordons are really quite common on Grooved Ware (Wainwright and Longworth, 1971), and this is also true of the applied knobs on Nos. 39 and 42, which are common to the A-line style of Grooved Ware. The finger impressed tip decoration is also commonly formed by the whole tip being impressed into the clay as in No. 27 and 72 and so a tear shaped ridge of dislodged clay is often formed on one side of the depression.

Finger nail decoration is also quite common but not quite so frequent as finger tip (Nos. 30-34, 80, 82-3). The fabric of these vessels is also finer and handled harder than the other sherds, and so they are probably more related to Beaker ware than the vessels described above. Incision is found on only three sherds, the Beaker ware mentioned above, and the later Neolithic rim sherd No. 77, found beneath the gravel bank of Barrow 5. Cord decoration is present in only one case, No 85, possibly from a collared urn as the fabric is thick and coarse.

III. CATALOGUE OF THE POTTERY

1) Barrow 5 Hearth II

2) Barrow 5 Hearth IV

3) Barrow 5 Hearth IV
Barrow 5 Hearth IV ctd.


Barrow 5 Hearth VI

Barrow 5 Hearth VI ctd.


BARROW 5 HEARTH VIII


37) As above


46) " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " 

47) As Above


52) " " " Dark brown fabric. Fine-med. Grit. Hard

BARRON 5 HEARTH VIII

54) As Above.
55) As above. Int. missing.
59) As Above. Int. missing.
66) " " " very abraded. Light brown ext. Dark grey-black int. Fine grit. med-hard.
BARROW 5 BELOW GRAVEL BANK


BARROW 1


79) As above but from smaller vessel. Grey fabric.


BARROW 2


BARROW 4


TOPSOIL

REPORT ON THE POTTERY FROM GRENDON, NORTHANTS.

With the excavator for inclusion in the final report

It is regretted that no illustrations are available for this report.
REPORT ON THE POTTERY FROM CRENHOLM, NORTHUMBERLAND.

ALEX. M. GIBSON.

In this report, the pottery has been treated as a whole as opposed to site by site, as the pottery was grouped together during sorting, and the different fabrics grouped. This was made more difficult by the fact that there was a great variety of fabrics varying from Neolithic through Beaker to Bronze Age and Iron Age, with a few secondary Roman sherds in addition. Some apparent differences in fabric may possibly be due to certain soil conditions, but it is reasonable to say that at least 40 vessels are represented.

VESSEL 1, CREM. 5, AREA B.

This is a small bipartite collared urn, in very soft, coarse, crumbly fabric and poorly baked fabric. The grits are sparse and comparatively fine for collared urns. The colour of the fabric is a fairly uniform mid to dark brown, showing orange to brown in section. The rim is slightly everted at the top with a small internal bevel decorated with a single encircling line of faint (?) twisted cord decoration. The collar, which is only slightly shallower than the depth of the actual body, is also decorated with faint, blurred, twisted cord. There is one encircling line at the top and two at the bottom. Vertical lines in the same technique link these horizontal borders. The decoration is very blurred, but a diagonal line appears at each end of the panel of vertical impressions and seems to lead on to a panel of small circular slabs made by a small blunt instrument impressed into the clay at a slight angle. The extent of this however is not certain as the vessel is incomplete at this point and the surface, where it remains, is badly preserved.

URN 3, CREM. 2, AREA B.

This is similarly a miniature collared urn but this time a tripartite example with a cavetto zone beneath the collar. The fabric is very similar to vessel one, mid dark brown surfaces with an orange to brown core. The fabric two is soft, crumbly and poorly baked. Grit is small and sparse like
vessel 1, but some small to medium sized grits protrude through the surfaces, especially the inside. The rim is simple and undecorated; a faint encircling line on one section is probably fortuitous. A twisted cord line encircles the top, center and bottom of the collar, and are crossed by vertical impressions of the same, the vertical impressions being less well defined. Small circular to oval shallow impressions, made by a blunt instrument, decorate the carination at the bottom of the otherwise plain cavetto zone. There is one instance of a similarly formed stab at the base of the collar. The collar and cavetto zone make up about one half of the total height of the vessel, and the rest of the bulbous body is undecorated, with a well-defined base.

The development of these vessels from the final Neolithic Peterborough tradition, and more especially the Fengate style, has often been outlined, and needs no further re-iteration here. What is usually underestimated, or even ignored, however, is the size range of these vessels. Vessels 1 and 3 above are very small, Food Vessel sized, pots, and could hardly have held else but a token cremation deposit, or acted as accessory vessels. Vessels 2 and 4 (below), however, are more typical in size of the urn class. For example London Rd., Ipswich, whichxix and Sutton (Smedley and Owles 1964).

The same size difference is apparent in the food vessel class of pottery, but here it is regarded rigidly by some writers and divided into Food Vessels for the small vessels, and Food Vessel Urns, or Enlarged Food Vessels and Encrusted Urns, for the large vessels. The rite of Cremation is usually associated with the larger vessels, while with the food vessels both inhumations and cremation are associated. Trevor Cowie has recently published a scatter diagram showing the height/rim diameter ratios for Food Vessels and Food Vessel Urns in Northern Britain (Cowie, T.G. 1978) and has argued that 20cm. appears to be the dividing height between Food Vessels and Food Vessel Urns. The diagram, however, does not really show a clear cut division at this point, and it is debatable how accurate
this would be if applied to the British Isles as a whole. It is equally likely that there is a steady and smooth size range from small accessory food vessels right through to the Food Vessel Urns with little or no significant size division. Such is the state of affairs among Collared Urns, both bipartite and tripartite, where small and large, ostensibly formally & identical, vessels exist. An unpublished scatter diagram, xxmxxm, for the Urns from Northumberland and Durham prepared by the writer shows this steady size range with no distinguishable hiatus. There may, however, be a difference in function, and the smaller urns may be designed for child or perhaps cremation, or may even take on an accessory role, as seems to be the case here where two small urns accompany two larger ones. Alternatively, but not necessarily unconnected with the above hypothesis, the answer may lie in some sociological difference, large vessels for people of higher status, for example, but this is purely conjecture, and any evidence that does survive in the archaeological record for questions of this nature must be slight, if not nonexistent.

Vessels 2 and 4 were drawn in situ as the fabric was too friable and too far decayed to survive extraction. The surfaces of the vessels had already disappeared prior to excavation so there is no indication of any decoration that may have been present. The fabric that remains of both vessels mxxm is small core, with only small patches of surface remaining. The fabrics, however, seem to be identical. The external surface is reddish-brown in colour, while the inside is dark brown. The core is dark and laminated slightly, with fairly small grits, some of which are shell. The fabric does seem to be rather thin for this class of pottery. From the drawing, Number 2 appears to be a normal tripartite collared urn, though it may be argued that the belly is rather narrow, and No. 4 has the superficial shape of a classic bipartite collared urn, but the arcading of the collar. A piece of this arcading survives, and it does appear to be too severe to be interpreted simply as an uneven collar.
From site C, feature 45, come 5 sherds, four of which are contiguous, of a Neolithic vessel in coarse, crumbly fabric, with light brown exteriors and light brown to light grey interiors. The fabric is thick filled with large shell and stone grits which protrude through both surfaces, especially the inner. The rim is inx everted, rolled and flaring with faint linear cord impressions on the top, perpendicular to the edge. On the belly are four deep incisions running diagonally over the bulbous body, executed by a sharp instrument. Parallels for this vessel are hard to find, but it does bear a resemblance to Ebbsfleet Ware with incised and some impressed decoration. The slack profile, too, is not out of keeping in the Ebbsfleet style, but the rim does seem to be slightly unusual and more akin to Western Neolithic pottery. We can only conclude that this bowl must be a local variant of Ebbsfleet ware. As more secondary Neolithic pottery is coming to light it is becoming more apparent that the Ebbsfleet-Hartlake-Fenlake division of the Peterborough Tradition is no longer a valid one and there are in fact more regional variations, as one would expect, in this geographically widespread pottery style.

From the same area are 14 sherds of another local Ebbsfleet style vessel. The fabric is pink to brown on the outside and grey on the inside, with a light brown core and crushed shell grit. The grit protrudes through both surfaces. The fabric is medium to hard, and fairly well fired. The beginnings of a cavetto zone, a fairly shallow one, is visible at the top of some sherds. Sherds in the same fabric were produced on other parts of the same site:

C 37..... 5 sherds
C36..... 2 sherds
C 35..... 3 sherds, but these may be E.B.A., as one sherd is from a flat base with a well-pronounced foot.
C16..... 4 sherds
C 10..... 1 sherd.
Two sherds of different vessels, but in an almost identical fabric, both from the outer ring ditch, feature 5, of site C. The first is a plain body sherd abraded with smooth edges, one worn down almost enough to resemble a rim. The fabric is gritty to the touch, with a slightly crazed interior, with medium sized stone grits protruding through both surfaces. The fabric is grey to brown throughout. The second sherd is very like the first but with light brown patches on the exterior, and in a thicker fabric. The sherd is a rim sherd with a slight slack carination, at the base of a slight cavetto zone, about two to three cms. below the rim. The carination is decorated with vertical finger-nail impressions. Horizontal finger-nail decoration impressions appear inside the rim but these appear to be accidentally applied during manufacture. The rim is flat and undecorated, with some grass wipe marks on the exterior in the cavetto zone. A perforation drilled from the outside is detectable on the right hand side as one looks at the exterior, situated in the neck, and this could well be a suspension hole. The angle of the vessel is slightly suggestive of a local variant of the Mortlake style and it is a similar form to P266 S from Windmill Hill (Smith, I.F. 1965), though the fabric is finer than that associated with Mortlake Ware. The decoration is very simple, and more indicative of the Ebbsfleet style, however, as Peterborough pottery is in drastic need of revision, it appears that new sites when excavated produce pottery of a local nature. The writer resists the temptation, however, to label this the 'Grendon Style'.

This comprises 16 sherds of shell gritted Neolithic pottery from features 6, 16, 26, 35-37, 50, on site C. The fabric is medium hard with quite an open feel and abundant shell inclusions, giving the fabric a laminated texture. The external surface is grey-light brown, with a dark grey interior, and shells protrude through both surfaces. There are two rim sherds, but otherwise the sherds are all featureless. The first rim is from a vessel about 0.00 cms. in diameter, from C 37, and is a flat thickened rim, with a straight internal face and with a slightly everted exterior and a rounded external edge. Thickening has, therefore, taken place on the outside only. The second sherd is also undecorated. The top of the rim is rounded rather than flat, but still meets the internal surface.
From Feature C 26, in brown, fairly probably the lower silt, is a sid of Beaker. The surfaces are fine, smooth and light brown in colour, a dark core, and fairly finely crushed grits. The fabric is typically m and well fired. The decoration is in the form of two incised horizontal or, about 1.1cm. apart, suggesting zoned decoration in fairly narrow zon e so it could belong to a late vessel, but it would be rash to decide one or the other in view of the small size of the sherd. The breaks are only slightly abraded, so the sherd was probably fairly fresh when buried.

Sight small sherds of urn fabric similar to vessel 3 above, come the outer ring ditch of site B, section W, layer III, midway in the ditch. The exteriors of the sherd are an ever mid-brown colour, while the in-eriors are black. The grits are medium sized and the black fabric has a lightly laminated appearance though it is fairly hard and well fired. One or of the sherds show slight traces of wiping on the exterior. Only one sherd - - featured in any way, and that is one that shows a cavetto zone, or at least - - beginnings of one, which probably means that the sherds are from a mini-are tripartite Collared Urn.

A very similar sherd, also showing slight traces of wiping, comes from site G, feature 61, one of a line of post-holes that cuts the ring Ditch. view of the M.A. dates for this site, these posts must not have been erected long after the completion of the monument, or else the sherd which is not at all I.A. in nature, is the result of surface survival.

An unmarked rim sherd in a similar fabric, but with certain dif-ferences could be I. A. in date. This has brown to dark brown surfaces and a black fabric. It is slightly porous with small to medium sized grits but it is still hard and well-baked. The rim is simple, slightly everted, and thin-

One sherd from G, feature 4, is mid-brown in colour, and with a slightly pitted exterior, with some fine to medium grit protruding, and a comp-ltely worn interior surface. The fabric itself is dark grey, and slightly porous. The sherd is hard and well-fired, possibly of B.A. date.
From site D, feature 5, come 9 sherds of a large vessel, the exterior of which is dark grey, and speckled with protruding grit which has been used to temper the clay; there are also some small stone grits. The fabric is poor and crumbly with a laminated appearance. None of the sherds are decorated.

From features 70 and 71 on site G come four wall sherds of a large B.A. pot, possibly form a bucket or collared urn, but it is difficult to say as all the sherds are unfeatured wall sherds. The outer surface is sandy in appearance, and grey-brown in colour, as is the inner, although this tends to be more greyish. The core is dark grey, fairly hard, and has a laminated appearance.

Associated with Cremation one in area D was a vessel in coarse fabric, with medium sized, but plentiful stone and shell grit. The outer and inner surfaces are orange-brown and mid-brown respectively, and both are burst by protruding grit. The fabric is laminated and flakes come readily off the surfaces. This appears to be the base of an early to middle B.A. light urn, probably representing the local equivalent of the southern Rimbury type. A circular hole near the base of one of the sherds appears to be intentional rather than as a result of soil conditions but is probably too large to be a repair hole, and as it is near the base, it is likely to be a suspension hole. The writer is not aware of any parallels, as the purpose is unknown.

There are a further nineteen small undistinguished B.A. sherds from site G, but these do not merit further discussion.

This is represented by one sherd from feature 66 on site G, and is a large sherd of hard, well-fired fabric, with a sandy core. The outside and inside are black and dark grey respectively, both having a sandy appearance. The exterior is decorated with two well-defined horizontal grooves, which have been impressed by dragging a blunt rounded point at a uniform depth through the clay.
This sherd from site G, F4, is probably also I.A. in date and is in a very similar, but not identical, fabric to the above. The fabric is black with some small brown patches on the inside; and is porous in texture. The grit has been more coarse than that used above. The rim is sharply everted and moulded, angular in profile, with a ridge running round the bottom half of the internal rim bevel. The angle of the rim suggests a bulbous body.

A single I.A. sherd from F.15, a pit inside the ring ditch in area G. The surfaces are both pink-light brown but the exterior has a grey patch towards the top. The surface colour does not extend deep into the fabric, however, and the core is dark grey, slightly porous, with small to medium, sparsely distributed, grits. The fabric is hard and well baked. Four horizontal grooves decorate the exterior, the uppermost being the most well defined, and deteriorating in clarity towards the bottom. These have been formed by a blunt point being dragged through the clay at a uniform depth.

A base sherd and a wall sherd from G, F4, have dark grey-brown surfaces, mottled in appearance, with a similar dark grey-brown core. They are both hard and well fired, the surfaces are pitted but undecorated, and the fabric is slightly laminated with small, finely crushed, grits. There are signs of wiping on both surfaces. The base sherd is slightly darker in colour, and lacks the mottling of the wall sherd. The base is well-formed and angular, showing evidence of coil construction in the break where it joins the wall. The two sherds may not necessarily be from the same vessel.

Three contiguous I.A. sherds from G.15, with light to mid-brown exterior, with small grey patches, and small oval pits formed by the bursting out of (?) air bubbles and organic matter during firing. The interior is chocolate-brown with numerous protruding medium sized grits, and grass wiping marks are clear and distinct on this surface. The fabric is grey-brown in section, hard and close in texture, with small to medium sized grits. The sherds are undecorated and from an obviously bulbous Jar.

G.66, which cuts the ring-ditch, is a hard, well-baked, I.A.
sherds, this time decorated. The outer surface is sandy in texture and has horizontal striations suggesting that the pot may have been wheel thrown, and so is late in the British I.A. series. The colour of this surface is dark grey to mid-brown and is decorated by five parallel diagonal sets of comb impressions. The comb appears to have been a six-toothed instrument, the teeth being fine and round as if formed from thorns, or the needles of conifers. The internal surface is grey to mid-brown and sandy in appearance. The fabric has a light grey core, with finely crushed grits.

Also from site C, feature 4, is a shell gritted I.A. sherd from a bulbous bodied jar. The rim is angular and beaded with a diameter of 000 cms. The internal bevel is decorated with two horizontal scored lines, and one similarly executed line decorates the exterior. The inner surface is pink with some shell grit protruding through the surface, as is the outer surface, but in this case the shell is more numerous, and there are some grey patches. The core is grey with some white shell and some small stone grits.

A virtually identical sherd comes from area C, feature 35, the only point of difference being that the interior on this sherd is slightly more pitted. The sherd comes from near the base of the vessel, having broken along the coil at the bottom break. If this is not from the same vessel as the above sherd, then it is from a very similar one, and we can possibly envisage a straight walled jar with a bulbous shoulder occurring just below the rim.

A number of sherd s from an I.A. bag-shaped vessel were found in the clearance of site D. The fabric is orange to grey on the outer surface, and black on the inner. Both are pitted as a result of inclusions burning out during firing, and the core of the fabric is dark grey with finely crushed grits, the clay is hard and well-baked. The rim is flat and slightly everted, and it has been thinned resulting in a very slight cavetto zone between rim and shoulder, but otherwise the sherd is undecorated.

Area E, feature 58, produced a I.A. body sherd of a large I.A. vessel. It too is hard and well-baked, with some shell and crushed stone grit, some of which protrudes through the outer orange, grass wiped surface.
The interior is dark grey.

A hard, well fired I.A. sherd from a vessel probably resembling No. 24, comes from area C, feature 35. The outer surface of the sherd is grey, with white specks where the shell grit has protruded through the surface, and the inner surface is grey, through brown to light orange, with similarly protruding grit. The core is light brown, fairly porous and laminated. The join of the rim and body has been accentuated by a scored line. The line of the rim is almost perpendicular to the body, giving a splayed effect to the sherd.

From the same feature on the same site come two hard, but slightly abraded I.A. sherds in plain but well fired fabric with pink internal and external surfaces, and a black core. The paste includes sparse and fine to medium sized shell and stone grits. Six small sub-oval pits on the exterior resemble grain impressions, but are the result of firing.

A similar sherd from the same area has slightly more profuse inclusions, and the breaks are unweathered. The fabric is gritty to the touch and slightly laminated in appearance, and protruding shell gives both surfaces a speckled effect, but they are still fairly well smoothed. There is no decoration, but there does appear to be a slight indication of a poorly defined waist though whether this extended all round the body or simply represents an uneven profile is hard to say. The writer suspects that the latter possibility is the more plausible.

Still from C.35, is another thick, heavy I.A. sherd, similar to the last two, but harder, with a slightly less gritty feel to the fabric, perhaps due simply to the fact that the edges are more worn. Like No. 28, the shell grit is profuse, and protrudes through both well-smoothed surfaces. The fabric is dark grey throughout with a laminated appearance.

A base and a rim sherd from the same feature as the above are in a virtually identical fabric, but are unlikely to have belonged to the same vessel. The rim is very similar in form to that described under No. 4 above, but the fabric differs greatly. The exterior is a deep pink, with a grey tinge to it, and the interior is the same shade of pink and
the section reads from the outside to the inside, pink/light brown – dark grey – light brown – pink. Abundant moderately large shell grits give the fabric a laminated appearance and many calcareous grits have burnt or dissolved out of the surfaces so that the fabric is pitted to a fairly large extent.

The appearance of the base sherd differs slightly, but this may be due to the fact that this sherd has suffered more from abrasion. The outer surface is slightly pitted, and grey-brown in colour, the interior is pink-reddish brown. Much of the shell grit has been burnt or dissolved out of the sections leaving a black to brown porous fabric, laminated but fairly hard in texture.

Two sherds from C.16 and E.49 respectively, are both plain body sherds, and in a similar fabric to each other. The first is fresh, with a light brown slightly pitted and speckled exterior, and a similar but grey interior. The fabric is grey brown, and slightly laminated and porous due to the shell tempering. It appears to be from a straight sided I.A. vessel although the fabric is similar to some of the Neolithic pottery above. The second sherd is similar, plain, but with slight indications of a waisted profile, and with a very slightly crazed exterior. The edges are more abraded than the first sherd, and the interior surface is light brown.

Still from site C, F.61, with pink to light brown surfaces, and a black core, is another single I.A. sherd. The grits are sparse and finely crushed, and though the sherd is badly abraded, the surfaces are still probably fairly smooth and the fabric is very hard. The curvature, and the thickening of the sherd towards the bottom suggests that the sherd is from a bowl.

Two plain I.A. body sherds from area C, feature 4, are slightly abraded but recognisably of the same fabric. They have light brown exteriors and pink interiors. The light brown core has finely crushed shell grit.

Area C, feature 35, is one of the most prolific finds areas. This fabric is represented by the everted rim of an I.A. (?) Jar. It has a black exterior and a very dark brown interior with a dark red core. The fabric
as finely crushed grits, and is somewhat corky with pitted surfaces. The rim is almost flat.

Another rim sherd of a small I.A. jar from site C feature 16. The rim is plain on the outside, with an internal bevel or chamfer, and there is a very slight cavetto zone beneath the rim on the outside. It has finely crushed, quite sparse, shell grit, and a slightly pitted surface. The colour is black throughout and has a hard but slightly porous texture.

This sherd from C.16 is possibly also from an I.A. jar. The fabric is pitted and porous where calcareous inclusions have dissappeared, and the fabric is light brown to light grey throughout.

Five sherds in a similar fabric to the above, but only 4-6mm thick, made up from 1 sherd from R.50, 1 from C.6, and 3 from C.35. The fabric is hard but porous and pitted with shell grit. The colours vary from light brown to grey on the outside, but all the sherds are grey internally.

Another sherd in yet a different fabric from C.35. The fabric is black throughout with a small amount of shell protruding through both surfaces, but especially the outer. The shell grit is medium sized and the fabric smooth, hard, and well-fired. The rim is flat and square sectioned, probably from a small dish. It appears to have been straight walled although the sherd is too small to be certain.

There are a further 4 sherds of I.A. date from site G, but these are all featureless and do not merit further discussion. Sui suffice it to say that they are all black throughout.

**ROMAN**

A Roman or possibly I.A. sherd was found in Feature 70 at site G. The fabric has pink surfaces and a central light grey core which is slightly porous with sparse fine gritting. The fabric is extremely hard and well-fired with some small grits protruding through the internal surface and there are some faint traces of wiping. The sherd is undecorated.

A large, coarse handmade curved sherd of Roman roofing tile (IMBREX) in orange to light brown clay with a light grey core. The grit is
quite finely crushed, but the fabric and surfaces are both porous, and the interior of the clay is slightly laminated.

MISCELLANEOUS

One small sherd from site G, Feature 4, is pink to light brown throughout, and the fabric is soft with hardly any or no visible inclusions and may in fact be a piece of burnt clay or daub.

CONCLUSIONS

The pottery from the excavated areas at Grondon is far from being an homogeneous group except in the common feature of shell gritting. Most of the Neolithic pottery comes from area G, which agrees well with the early Carbon 14 dates from the site and with the facade structures often found beneath Neolithic barrows such as Callis Geld (Coombs, D. 1976) and King's Lynn, (Morgan, F. de H. 1959) and in ring ditches such as Chamberlains Farm, Eriswell (Bromley, D. P. 1973) which was associated with Neolithic and Beaker occupation. Later I.A. features cut the sites and any I.A. sherds in the B.A. features are probably to be explained as intrusive from these later disturbances. Most of the Neolithic pottery is early in the Peterborough series, with one exception, again agreeing with the early dates. The presence of Beaker on the site is yet another example of the close affinities of Beaker users with existing Neolithic monuments.
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THE POTTERY FROM CALLIS WOLD 275

With the excavator for inclusion in the final report

It is regretted that no illustrations are available for this report
The pottery from Callis Wold 275

The majority of Beaker domestic sites related to round barrows consist of a spread of domestic debris in varying quantities and of a varying nature below the barrow or in the mound material. The evidence may consist of a great deal of sherds, food bones and a flint industry as at Arran Down in the Isle of Wight (Alexander and Oznane 1960). They may be associated with hearth or pits as at Avebury G55 (Smith, 1965) or even structures like those beneath barrow 4 at Swarkeston in Derbyshire (Greenfield, 1960). On the other hand, there may be only one or two sherds in the mound material or in the ditch silts to suggest that some at least of the mound make up was derived from the fields of a nearby settlement. In most cases, however, it would appear to have been the domestic activity that acted as the focus for the barrow, perhaps because it was hallowed ancestral ground or, perhaps more plausibly, because it represented a 'dead' settlement whose ground was worked out and no longer fertile. Also, settlements may have moved away from the worked out ground, but need not necessarily have moved far so that the barrows represent the edge of the 'new' territory. At Callis Wold, however, the opposite would appear to have been the case as it seems that it was the existing mound that attracted the Beaker users, and more precisely it may have been the straight facade still projecting through the mound material that was the focal point. The matrix in which the sherds were found is typically domestic with one exception, the absence of food bones. This anomaly apart, the charcoal, flint and pottery is classic. So too is the state of the pottery which consists of small sherds from a large number of vessels.
and with no whole vessels being present. The sherds have certainly been brought...in this state to the site, and not smashed in situ. What is also worthy of note is the comparative freshness of the sherds. Some are obviously in a better state of preservation than others but on the whole the breaks are quite fresh and sharp, including the Neolithic sherds in the assemblage, if one may be excused for using a chronological term to describe a stylistic difference.

The Beakers from Callis Wold, with the exception of No. 3501 (Fabric 39) which must be regarded as unstratified, form an early assemblage of Fingernail rusticated, All Over Corded (AOC) and All Over Toothed Comb (AOTC) with sherds of one zoned Beker of an early type. In the absence of profiles it is really this zoned vessel that is important for dating purposes (No. 367, fabric 22). The decoration of this sherd comprises narrow zones of blurred comb decoration consisting of oblique straight lines bordered by two parallel horizontal lines. This has been termed the Basic European Motif (I) No. 2 by Clarke (1970) and in Britain is found on European (E) Beakers such as those from Wilsford (Clarke op.cit. No. 60), Avebury Avenue (No. 62) and Brampton (No. 61b.), and on Wessex-Mid Rhine Beakers (WMR) such as that from Devil's Dyke in Sussex (Clarke No. 167) With the exception of Clarke's No. 60, however, the Callis Wold spacing of the zones is quite rare in Britain where normally the motif No. 1,2 appears in mirrored pairs forming a broad zone of Interrupted herring bone. For the narrow zoned broken herring bone that would appear to have been used at Callis Wold, parallels are much more easy to find on the Continent (Clarke No. 59, Altlußheim, Germany; 166, Logabirum, Germany) and especially in Holland (Van Der Waals & Glasbergen, 1955) from Emmer, where Van der Waals and Glasbergen's description could equally well apply to the Callis W-old sherd.
'It shows the gentle, well-balanced, S-profile characteristic of the type, and the alternation of decorated and undecorated zones of approximately equal width. Also characteristic is the filling of the zones with diagonal dented spatula hatching alternating in direction from one zone to the next. These zones are bordered by double horizontal dented spatula lines.' (1955, p.19)

Whether one concentrates on the British or continental parallels, it makes no difference and it is certain that the Callis Wold Beaker must rate as stylistically one of the earliest comb decorated Beakers in Britain.

With the absence of profiles, there can be little definite said about the AOC sherds. Case (1977) sees AOC Beakers marking his Early Phase of Beaker activity in Britain and dating from c.2460±150 bc. and 2370±150 bc... the dates for the constructional phase at Giant's Hill I long barrow, Skendleby, with which two sherds of AOC Beaker were associated (Phillips, 1936). But Case also adds (op. cit.) that AOC Beakers extend into his middle and late phases judging from the associations and C14 determinations and so there is nothing chronologically decisive about the AOC decoration itself. This had already been suggested by Clarke who said that 'in Britain, as in Europe, it is much more difficult to ascertain the date of the final phases of the AOC Beaker group' (1970, p.67). This may suggest that Van der Leeuw is indeed correct in seeing the cord impressions of the AOC Beakers to be the remains of a cord-frame which the potters used to produce fine walled vessels; a difficult task for the inexperienced. The frame was removed when the vessels had become sufficiently hard but the impressions were retained for decoration (Van der Leeuw, 1977). In their Yorkshire focus area Lanting and Van der Waals (1972) see AOC Beakers representing
step 1/2 of their 7 step series. In Wessex, which has a complete 1-7 step sequence, they see AOC Beakers persisting into step 3, and perhaps even to step 4 in Scotland and the North of England. From the few rims that are present, the sherds would not appear to be later than step 2 as there is no suggestion of an undecorated zone beneath the rim which Lanting and Van der Waals specify as one of the later features of AOC Beakers.

The AOTC sherds must be seen as being contemporary in Wessex, and in Yorkshire, with the latter half of the step 2 AOC Beakers, and the AOTC Beakers themselves contract into zones of encircling comb lines in step 3. There is no evidence to suggest that the Callis Wold sherds are from zoned combed Beakers. Again there are no undecorated zones beneath the rim to suggest later examples of this class. Waisted sherds (A 299.54, 299.11) also suggest a crisp profile in keeping with the early European Bell Beaker shape. Two rim sherds (A 299.21, 214) combine comb and cord decoration. Instances of encircling twisted cord lines on the interior of a rim and AOTC on the exterior are, to the writer's knowledge rare, and find their best parallels in Ireland. One sherd from the settlement site at Monknewtown, near Slane, is, unfortunately, not illustrated in the excavation report (Sweetman, 1976), but is a rim sherd similar to A 299.21 with three lines of comb visible on the exterior and two of cord on the interior (Nat. Museum of Ireland No. E90.502). This sherd is also the closest parallel for the Callis Wold sherd. Other Irish sherds of this type come from Lough Gur, Co. Limerick (site c) and Dalkey Island, Co. Dublin. The Lough Gur sherd has an everted and internally bevelled rim. The exterior is decorated with
two parallel horizontal combed lines, then a band of Clarke's basic European motif (I) No. 5. The interior has three lines of twisted cord on the very slight bevel, and two encircling lines of plaited cord below this. The fabric is typically Beaker. The Dalkey Island sherd (Nat. Museum of Ireland No. E46.1408) is even further removed from the Callis Wold examples. It has an everted rim below which are three encircling comb lines then a cordon accentuated by oblique (?)fingernail impressions and then another three encircling comb lines, (Liversage, 1968, p.205, fig 7, P48). Inside the rim are four encircling twisted cord lines. This pot is illustrated in the report but the writer feels that the external cordon is too accentuated in the published drawing, nor has the rim such a pronounced lip. The nearest parallel geographically for this combination of decorative techniques is, to the writer's knowledge, x from He'derwick in East Lothian, a sand dune site with large quantities of AOC and AOTC Beaker. This sherd (Nat. Museum of Antiquities, Scotland, No.BM68) has a simple rim with slight external cordon c.2cms. below the lip. Immediately below this cordon are short lengths of comb impressions and internally the rim is decorated with two encircling twisted cord lines.

This combination of decorative techniques, then, appears to be very rare in Britain and can perhaps be taken to mean that the AOTC Beakers are early examples of that type as they have remnants of the twisted cord decoration from which they evolved. This, however, is very tentative.

A glance at the drawings of the combed sherds will show that where the comb impressions are sufficiently well-defined, they seem to be of a very uniform character, with well-spaced oblong teeth, being longer than they are broad.
This suggests that they have been made with a toothed comb
of the type found at Dean Bottom (Gringell, 1970) on the
Hartborough Downs and at Northton, Isle of Harris,
(Simpson, 1976 fig.12.6) both made from a thin sliver of bone.

Fingernail rusticated pottery is a type that is almost
always found on domestic sites and is perhaps the type of pottery that comes
nearest to warranting the title 'Beaker coarse wares'. Unfortunately on
Beaker domestic sites, and the writer includes Callis Wold among these
as the debris is essentially domestic in nature, if not the situation, if the
sherds are small and rarely are whole vessels reconstructable.

Three types of fingernail impressions are apparent among the Callis Wold sherds,
paired, linear and random. Only one pot exhibits linear impressions (No. \(\Delta 618-20\), fabric 17) and this will be discussed separately below. There are four instances of paired fingernail impressions of which No. \(\Delta 299,22\) is the only sherd that has a hard fabric. It is suggested below in the catalogue that this
sherd may be from a miniature collared urn in Beaker-like fabric but the
evidence for this is by no means conclusive. The other paired fingernail deco-
rated sherds (No. \(\Delta 110, 362, 367\)) are all in soft to medium fabric with
medium to coarse grits, and are quite different from the combed and cored sherds.

Clarke has already described the type of plain and rusticated Beaker found on
AOC domestic sites (1970, p. 58) and states that 'the particular form of surface
roughening used...is usually horizontal or vertical bands of paired fingernail
impressions, or more rarely repeated single impressions....' The vertical or horizon-
tal bands would not appear to be present at Callis Wold unless a somewhat
irregular version is detectable on No. \(\Delta 367\), but too little of this vessel re-
 mains to allow a certain identification. The fabric of the Callis Wold sherds
would also fit the range of \(\Delta 356\) coarse fabrics from AOC sites as defined
by Clarke (op. cit.). The sherds with single random fingernail impressions
may come from Bell Beakers like that from Ross Links, Northumberland,
an AOC sand dune site (Tait 1965, No. 23) but there are no indications of
any cordoned rims of this type from \(\Delta 356\) Callis Wold. On the other hand,
some of the Callis Wold sherds have very faint fingernail impressions...
which may, in fact, be accidental meaning that the Beakers were actually undecorated, like that from Antofts Windpit, Yorkshire (Clarke, No.33). Such is the subjective nature of small sherds!!! There are no sherds among those from Callis Wold to suggest a cordon below the rim like those from some Scottish sand dune sites and from the Netherlands, especially in the latter instance on Protruding Foot Beakers (Lanting & Van der Waals 1955, type If), nor were there sherds with the fingernail and plastic decoration typical of large domestic storage jars or Pot Beakers as defined by Lehmann (1965).

**Neolithic**

Sherds from Western Neolithic Carinated Bowls — termed locally Tosthorpe ware — which, like the Beakers, are in hard, well-fired fabric, but tending to be rather more coarsely gritted, were associated with the construction phase of the monument and was found in the bedding trench of the straight facade to which the Beakers seem to have been attracted. This local variant of Western Neolithic or Grimsbane/LylesHill ware has been adequately described elsewhere (Manby, 1975*; Green 1976) and needs no further comment here.

Of interest in the Beaker horizon are seven sherds, possibly made from the same vessel, described under fabric No.6 below. The whipped decoration on these sherds is typical of the Peterborough tradition but not the fabric which seems quite peculiar, and more in keeping with types of Western Neolithic fabric than with Peterborough or Beaker. It is becoming obvious that not all whipped 'maggots' are made from whipped cord, but that a whole range of materials have been whipped from very fine substances, like some sort of thread, to coarse string-like cord. The sherds from Callis Wold show that the whipped impressions were made by a fine material which had not been deeply impressed into the clay. There are few, if any, internal impressions in each 'notch' that are visible as certainly would have been the case if they had been made with a string like that used to decorate the AOJ sherds. Experiments have shown that such impressions must have been made by something soft wrapped round a similar substance, Hand twisted wool from a Soay sheep whipped round a piece of parcel string produced very similar impressions when pressed
lightly into the clay, nor were there any internal impressions in each 'notch' visible to the naked eye. The same wool wrapped around something hard like a needle from a set of compasses provided an altogether different and harder impression. It would appear then that the Callis Wold sherds were decorated with something like whipped wool rather than cord. Very similar impressions, if somewhat deeper, come from Hedderwick, East Lothian, (Inst. Archaeology, London, teaching Collection, No.2,54) on a sherd of Peterborough ware and from West Ashby in Lincolnshire (Unpublished, information from the excavator Naomi Field), and from Risby Warren in the same county (Scunthorpe Museum KA, code RW, AA.) which, like Hedderwick, is a sand dune site. All these sites have produced evidence for Beaker associated domestic activity. In Ireland, these fine impressions, and even finer ones resembling whipped sewing yarn, seem to continue into the Bronze Age on Food Vessel and Food Vessel Urn pottery.

Bronze Age

A vessel with fingernail decoration associated with Phase D of the barrow (Coombs, 1976) and later than the Beaker activity is of interest. These sherds (Δ 618-20, Fabric 17) come from what was probably a Bn Beaker/Food Vessel, very similar in shape and decoration to one from Ashington, Northumberland, which came from a cist burial (Tait op.cit. No.85). The Late Neolithic - Early Bronze Age was a period rich in different pottery types, when Food Vessels and Urns were evolving from the Peterborough tradition, but while that tradition still lived on in domestic contexts. Added to this there was the intrusive Beaker, so between the clear cut divisions belonging to classic pottery types such as Mortlake - Fengate - (Beaker) - Food Vessel - Urn there are 'grey areas' where a whole range of pottery types probably exist. Writers of late have tended to shun names like Beaker/Food Vessel or to have put the term in inverted commas almost by way of apology for using them but the writer feels that the name is at least descriptive and the Callis Wold sherds and the Ashington vessel do in fact look like a cross between a Beaker and a Food Vessel. The
other alternative, until the pottery from this period is looked at more closely on a national scale, is to christen the pottery in question the 'Ashington type' or some similar meaningless term which would only serve to confuse the issue further.

Note References to Nos. in Clarke, 1970 eg. Clarke No. 60, refer to the illustration Nos. in Vol II
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1) (Δ299.84 : 7.1) Three sherds in the same fabric, and black or dark grey through most. The grits have tended to dissolve leaving a corky surface and a rather open core. As a result the fabric is rather soft.

2) (Δ299.10, 299.25, 219, 299.28, 299.35, 267, 299.74, 292, 209, 265, 299.59 : 7.8) Thirteen sherds with dark brown leathery outer surfaces, a grey core, and dark brown to grey interiors. From the three rims present, at least two vessels are represented. The fabric is hard, well fired and well smoothed, with medium sized grits. It is undecorated and probably western Neolithic pottery. Two rims (Δ299.25, 219) are possibly from the same vessel, (?) a carinated bowl, or at least two similar vessels, and have everted rims 6.7 cms. in diameter. The rims have been rounded from the inside resulting in a gentle internal curve, and a rather angular external one giving a somewhat sharp look, but complementing the everted profile. The third rim (Δ299.35), from a pot in almost identical fabric, is 6.8 cms. in diameter, and is simply a rounded in profile. This may be from a simple hemispherical bowl. All the sherds are quite fresh and unabraded.

3) (Δ265)7.9 One rim sherd of (?)Neolithic pottery. This differs from the Beaker pottery in that it is much more coarsely gritted, but it is still hard and well fired. The surfaces are both light brown, and the core is a rich grey. The rim is too small to estimate the diameter. It is flat with a slight (?)internal lip.

4) (Δ305): 7.10 One body sherd in very dark brown fabric with the core being slightly more grey. The grits are
1. (399.10 : 7.1) Three sherds in the same fabric, and black or dark grey throughout. The grits have tended to dissolve leaving a cory surface and a rather open core. As a result the fabric is rather soft.

2. (399.25, 219, 299.28, 299.35, 267, 299.54, 292, 209, 265, 299.59 : 7.8) Thirteen sherds with dark brown leathery outer surfaces, a grey core, and dark brown to grey interiors. From the three rims present, at least two vessels are represented. The fabric is hard, well fired and well smoothed, with medium sized grits. It is undecorated and probably western Neolithic pottery. Two rims (399.25, 219) are possibly from the same vessel, (?) a carinated bowl, or at least two similar vessels, and have eveted rims 6.7 cms. in diameter. The rims have been rounded from the inside resulting in a gentle internal curve, and a rather angular external one giving a somewhat sharp look but complementing the eveted profile. The third rim (399.35), from a pot in almost identical fabric, is 6.8 cms. in diameter, and is simply a rounded in profile. This may be from a simple hemispherical bowl. All the sherds are quite fresh and unabraded.

3. (365:7.9) One rim sherd of (?) Neolithic pottery. This differs from the Beaker pottery in that it is much more coarsely gritted, but it is still hard and well fired. The surfaces are both light brown, and the core is a rich grey. The rim is too small to estimate the diameter. It is flat with a slight (?) internal lip.

4. (305:7.10) One body sherd in very dark brown fabric with the core being slightly more grey. The grits are
small, and although the fabric is slightly open in texture, it is hard and well fired. The outer surface is deeply and irregularly striated, possibly due to wiping or weathering, or even a combination of both. The sherd is probably western Neolithic rather than Beaker.

5) \( (\Delta 370, 374) \) Two sherds similar to fabric No. 2, but slightly softer, and with more pitted surfaces. One sherd is the remains of a pointed and everted rim of unknown diameter, and so this probably also represents a carinated bowl.

6) \( (\Delta 399.46, 47, 299.50, 52, 53, 378, 5.1) \) Seven sherds, two of which are plain, probably all from the same vessel. The fabric is thin and hard with few grits, the exterior surface is a rich brown, but the remainder is grey throughout. The decoration is of fine whipped maggots. See above.

**Fingernail decorated**

7) \( (\Delta 362, 1.1) \) One sherd of quite soft fabric with medium sized to coarse grits. The surfaces are brown in colour, and the core grey. There are three fingernail impressions on the exterior.

8) \( (\Delta 216, 1.2) \) One sherd with a possible, but very faint fingernail impression. The exterior is brown, the core grey, and the internal surface a dark grey. The fabric is finely gritted, and the core is medium hard.

9) \( (\Delta 231, 1.3) \) One sherd with possible fingernail impressions and a brown, slightly burnished, exterior, dark grey core, and a grey interior surface. The fabric is thin and hard, finely gritted, and the sherd has broken along the colt.

10) \( (\Delta 235, 1.4) \) A rim sherd with a brown burnished surface, a grey-black core, and a light brown interior. The fabric is fine, hard, and well fired but with slightly crazed surfaces. The rim is flat and undecorated on top, with a
diameter of c.14 cms.

The faintness of the fingernail impression suggests accident rather than intentional decoration.

11) (Δ 215 : 1.5) The fabric and appearance of this sherd is very similar to the above, and they may conceivably both be from the same vessel. One fingernail impression again suggests accidental occurrence, or else all over decoration of widely spaced impressions. The rim is flat, c.14 cms. in diameter, and has been thinned on the inside.

12) (Δ 299 : 1.6) This fabric has a brown exterior surface and a grey core, but the interior surface is missing. The fabric includes medium sized grits and is medium hard. The sherd is angled off the outside suggesting a very severe cordon, or, perhaps more plausibly, the base of a collar. The fabric, too, is not out of character with a miniature collared urn. One well defined fingernail impression, made by a short nail so that part of the finger tip is also visible, decorates the sherd (?) above the cordon.

13) (Δ 233 : 1.7) Fabric very similar to 10) and 11). The decoration consists of four lightly, and apparently randomly, applied fingernail impressions. The rim is flat, c.9 cms. in diameter and slightly everted. Like No.11, it is thinned on the inside.

14) (Δ 110 : 1.8) The fabric is two-toned in colour, with the full brown of the exterior meeting the black of the interior in the middle of the section. The grits vary in size with one large piece of grog, c.5mm. long, breaking the surface near the (?) bottom of the sherd. The texture of the fabric is quite soft and slightly laminated. The fingernail decoration is in the form of paired impressions possibly made by thumb and index fingers.

15) (Δ 367 : 1.10) Three sherds probably representing one vessel.
The surfaces are brown, heavily crazed, and with a grey core.
The grits are fine to medium in size, but the fabric is soft and poorly fired. The rim is rounded and everted with a diameter of c.16 cms. The decoration is of paired fingernail impressions resulting in a pinched up ridge between the impressions. Unfortunately, surface application of PVA has obscured the true texture of the sherds. There are also two plain sherds and one band of unknown origin.

16) (Δ254: 1.11) One base sherd of (?)Beaker fabric, which is light brown on the exterior and a dark grey core. The internal surface appears to be missing. The fabric is fine to medium gritted but nevertheless quite soft. There is a faint fingernail impression near the bottom of the wall and possibly signs of fingernail pinching on a very uneven outer surface. The diameter appears to be c.10 cms.

17) (Δ618-20: 1.9) These sherds have a light brown burnished exterior, a light grey interior, and a grey core. There are traces of horizontal wiping on the exterior. The fabric is quite hard with medium sized grits. There are two rounded rim sherds, c.16 cms. in diameter, with a row of fingernail impressions on the exterior below the rim. A large body sherd has a carination emphasized by a similar row of fingernail impressions above and below. There are a further seventy or so plain or fingernail decorated sherds from the same vessel. Two sherds show the angle of a flat base. See above.

Incision Decorated

The following sherds appear, to the writer, to be incised, but it is often difficult to judge whether it is really incision or whether the decoration is by blurred comb or cord. The identification should, therefore, be treated tentatively.

18) (Δ299.61 : 2.1) The fabric is very similar to No.11 and has a brown exterior, a grey core, and a grey-brown interior surface. The fabric has small to medium sized grits, and is quite soft and open. The decoration consists of three types-
ularly spaced incised (?) horizontal lines.

19) \((\Delta 217 : 2.2)\) One small incised line is the only decoration on this sherd. The fabric has a brown exterior surface, and a grey core and inner surface. The grits are very fine, and the fabric hard and well fired.

20) \((\Delta 312 : 2.3)\) The rim, base, and a wall sherd of a single vessel, but the sherds are too small to allow reconstruction. The surfaces are light brown and the core grey, and the fabric has small to medium sized grits and is medium soft in texture. The rim is simple and rounded with a diameter of c. \(2\) cms., and it is slightly everted. The horizontal lines of decoration are somewhat soft and are probably of blurred twisted cord rather than incision.

21) \((\Delta 306 : 2.4)\) The fabric has a pink-brown exterior, and a grey core and interior surface. The grits are small to medium in size and the fabric is hard and well fired. The width of the incisions is somewhat uneven suggesting that infact blurred comb may be the technique employed, or else the decoration was executed when the clay had already begun to dry out and reach their leathery stage. The decoration consists of two horizontal lines.

Combed decoration

22) \((3674; 3.1)\) Twelve sherds representing one or possibly two vessels, but again PVA application to the exterior has absorbed the true texture of the pottery. As it stands, the pottery has brown surfaces and a grey core, the grits are small, and the fabric is generally fairly hard and compact. The execution is executed by blurred comb, and comprises Clarke's motif No. 2 \((\)Clarke, D.L. 1970)\(\) that is oblique lines between horizontal borders. See above.

23) \((\Delta 299.21, 236, 358, 299.11, 299.34, 299.12, 365, 11 (29), 211, 23, 3.2)\) Ten sherds of a similar fabric and decoration, representing one or possibly two similar, \(\)manaka All Over Combed Beakers. One rim sherd a
of the rim is unknown. The fabric has a brown exterior, a grey core, and a grey-brown interior; it is hard with fine grits. On the largest of the body sherds it is apparent that the comb used has been slightly curved and had ten or eleven teeth. It is probable that this was a comb similar to, but finer than, that found at Ellegh Concrete Hall in Wilts. (Gringell, C. 1979)

24) (4211 : 3.3) One sherd of fine Beaker fabric, with a red-brown exterior, black core, and light brown interior. The fabric is very hard, and very fine. The rim is everted and quite flat, with a diameter of c. 11 cms. The exterior is decorated with what appears to be the first four lines of All Over Combed decoration, three lines showing the junction of lengths of comb. Inside the rim are three horizontal lines of twisted cord decoration. See Above.

25) (299.17, 299.18, 361 : 3.4) Four sherds in a very similar fabric. Both surfaces are brown, but the exterior is slightly more dark, and the core is fine and grey. The fabric, however, is quite soft and poorly fired. All the fragments are small and abraded, and the decoration consists of blurred horizontal comb impressions.

26) (329.1 : 3.5) One small abraded sherd of (?) All Over Combed Beaker. The surfaces are both orange, though the interior is little more than a slip, and so the outer colour does not penetrate deep into the section of the sherd. The core is grey, and the fabric itself is fine, but quite soft.

27) (329.60 : 3.6) A small sherd of Beaker exhibiting three lines of horizontal comb impressions. The exterior surface is orange, and the little that remains of the interior surface is light brown. The core is light grey. The fabric is fine but soft, and the sherd is badly weathered.

28) (329.24 : 3.7) Two sherds from what was probably a Beaker. The outer surface is a dark chocolate brown, the interior is light brown, and the core dark grey. The fabric is fine, hard, and well fired. The sherd may be from a comb decorated, and the section of the vessel, or else an All Over Combed Beaker with wide spacings between the combed lines.
29) Sherd of Beaker fabric with light brown surfaces and a grey core. The interior is slipped and so the colour does not penetrate the section. The fabric is fine and well fired but the sherd is slightly weathered. Two parallel comb lines decorate the exterior.

30) One sherd of all over combed Beaker with light brown surfaces and a grey core. It is fine, hard and well fired. The sherd is quite fresh, and six parallel horizontal lines are visible on the exterior.

TWISTED CORD DECORATION

31) Sherd with a brown exterior and light brown slotted and slipped interior surface. The core is grey with fine grits visible, and the fabric is hard and well fired. One line of blared twisted cord decorates the exterior.

32) Five sherds of All Over Filled Corded Beaker. The all have a similar fabric but it is more probable that about three vessels are represented than that they are all from the same pot. The outer surfaces are brown, and the inner light grey-brown. The core is always grey. The fabric is fine and hard, with the outer surface somewhat burnished. The number of cord lines visible on each sherd varies from one to three.

33) Seven sherds of All Over Corded Beaker in a very similar fabric and probably representing four or five vessels. The surfaces are light brown in colour, but the interior is slightly more grey. The core is grey, and the fabric very hard and well-fired with fine grits. 4271 is a rim sherd, slightly everted, with a simple rounded profile, but the diameter is unknown.

34) A total of twelve sherds of All Over Corded Beaker, similar to the above but in a softer fabric, and consequently more weathered. The fabric is also finely gritted, but is more open and more friable. Two or three vessels may be represented.

35) Five sherds of All Over Corded Beaker which probably represent two vessels. The surfaces are light brown and
and the core grey. The fabric is fine, but quite soft and friable. The outer surfaces are very smooth. Sherd No. 359 is a base sherd 6 cm. in diameter.

36) (b 280, 281, 299.72 : 4.4) Five sherds all from the same All Over Corded vessel, or else from very similar pots. The sherds all have reddish brown exteriors, and grey interiors, but the colours merge halfway through the sections so that there is no distinct core colour. The grits are soft, but the fabric is quite open and soft.

37) (N 56 : 4.7) One sherd decorated with a single horizontal twisted cord line which is not at all distinct and may possibly even be blurred comb. The exterior is light brown, the core grey, and the interior is missing. The fabric is medium soft and open.

38) (S 309, 310 : 4.8) Twelve sherds possibly from the same vessel. These sherds are all light brown with a grey core which varies from in thickness. The fabric is very soft and crumbly though the inclusions are small. Two base sherds with a diameter of 12 cm. are decorated with three twisted cord lines on the wall.

STABBED DECORATION

39) (N 501 : 6.1) One sherd of very hard and well-fired Beaker fabric. The outer surface is light brown, the interior light grey-brown, and the core is grey with fine to medium sized grits. The decoration consists of closely spaced triangular stabs executed with a sharp stick or bone hafted bordered or by a single incised line. This sherd of stabbed zoned Beaker is completely different from the rest of the material and as it was found out of context and away from the other Beaker the most likely explanation for this is that it came from the body of the mound, or even from a disturbed burial, during the Mortimer excavations.

UNDECORATED SHERDS

40) (N 299.8, 299.62, 299.72 : 7.4) Three sherds representing two or three different Beakers. The fabric is extremely thin with an orange-brown outer surface, and a grey-brown inner surface. The core is grey, finely gritted, and the fabric hard and well-fired. One
fragment of rim is too small to determine the diameter or the angle but the profile is pointed with the clay having been thinned and rounded from the inside. This might suggest an everted rim.

41) \((\Delta 218, 283, 293: 7.5)\) Three sherds like the above but darker and with smoother surfaces. Perhaps two vessels are represented.

42) \((\Delta 111, 225, 316, 299.49, 299.31, 307, 11, 269, 270, 615, 255, 299.6, 299.44, 299.63, 299.49, 286: 7.6)\) Nineteen sherds in all in Beaker fabric and characterized mainly by their softness. They represent an unknown number of vessels, their small size precluding accurate estimates, but 12 vessels would probably be conservative. The sherds are in varying states of abrasion, but are all soft and friable. The colour varies from orange to brown on the outer surfaces, and from orange to light grey on the inner surfaces. The cores are usually grey.

Sherd \(\Delta 299.44\) is a base angle, slightly lipped, and with a diameter of \(\approx 4\) cm. There are no other featured sherds.

43) \((\Delta 299.33, 299.16, 299.65, 299.70, 282, 279, 286, 229, 264, 299.40, 299.56, 299.14, 299.26, 287, 299.32, 278, 299.68, 272, 256, 299.151, 299.150, 226: 7.7)\) Twenty five sherds similar to the above, but characterized by hard, well fired, fabric. On the whole they are not so abraded as fabric 42 above. The surfaces vary from orange to brown on the outside and grey-brown to light brown on the inside. The cores are grey with very fine grit. Two rim sherds are simple and rounded \((\Delta 279, 264)\) but are too small to determine the diameter. They would both appear to have been everted, and they may both be from the same or a very similar vessel. The remains of a lipped base \((\Delta 290)\) has a diameter of \(\approx 6\) cm, but little of the surfaces remain so it is impossible to say whether this is from a truly undecorated vessel, or not. There is a second base sherd from what would appear to have been a bulbous belled Beaker. The wall remains to a height of \(2\) cm, and this is plain and undecorated, and a nick on the base angle is probably fortuitous rather than decorative. The diameter of this base is \(\approx 6\) cm.
44) (Δ 299.55, 249, 299.20 ; 7.12) Very similar fabric to No.23, but these sherds are all plain, undecorated. The outer surface is light brown, and the inner grey-brown. The core is grey with fine-medium sized grits, and the fabric is hard and well fired. The edges of the sherds are quite fresh.

45) (Δ 299.27, 284, 269 ; 7.13) Three sherds of Beaker smaller than thumbnail size with light brown exteriors, and slightly darker interiors. The core is grey with fine grits, and the fabric is hard and well fired.

46) (Δ 260, 291, 230, 288, 258, 299, 30, 372, : 7.14) Eight sherds of dark brown leathery fabric, including one rim and one base sherd. The core is dark grey with fine grits, and the fabric is hard and well fired. The outer surface is well smoothed. The rim is rounded from the inside slightly but the angle and the diameter are indeterminable. The base sherd has a diameter of 6.7 cm. Perhaps two or three vessels are represented here but they may not all be Beaker, as the fabric is not unlike the Western Neolithic sherds above. The flat base, however, suggests at least one Beaker.

47) (Δ 221 ; 7.15) One undecorated sherd of Beaker with an orange-brown outer surface, and a dark brown inner surface. The core is dark grey, and the grits are quite fine. The fabric is quite hard despite a crumbly appearance in section.

**BRONZE AGE POTTERY**

48) (Δ 262 ; 7.7) A shouldered or carinated wall sherd in a similar fabric to No.43. The carination is very sharp, and probably too angular for it to be from a bell Beaker, even of Maritime type. It possibly represents a deep section of the cavetto zone of a tripartite collared urn as these vessels are often found thus in Beaker fabric, especially the smaller among the collared urn class.

The following are crumbs of pottery too small to be informative.


Δ 299.148 was a bag, empty when found.
Five pieces of fired clay which either represent waste, burnt daub, or else very thick vessels. Only have what may reasonably be described as a surface, but either waste or daub remains the most likely suggestion. There are no recognisable twig impressions to allow a more positive identification as daub.
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REPORT ON THE BEAKER MATERIAL FROM SNAIL DOWN

D. L. CLARKE & A. M. GIBSON

INTRODUCTION

Shortly before his tragic death, David Clarke had prepared a note on the Beaker sherds from the pre-barrow occupation at Snail Down. The writer (AMG) has studied these sherds as part of his research into Beaker domestic pottery from the British Isles and was invited to contribute to the report by the excavator. This contribution has been added to David Clarke's report, and the latter updated. In general, the report is divided into two, the fine ware (DLC) and the coarse ware (AMG), the discussion is a joint effort. Thanks are warmly extended to Nicholas Thomas for allowing the writer to examine the pottery in advance of publication, and for the invitation to comment.

REPORT ON THE BEAKER MATERIAL

The Beaker material falls into two categories. The first category encompasses a small number of sherds from All-Over Corded Beakers (AOC), possibly some from European Bell Beakers (E) and probably a few sherds of their domestic wares; this scanty material should date to c. 2000 - 1800 B.C. The second category of Beaker sherds from Snail Down, in contrast, includes more than 400 sherds of Developed Southern British (SB) Beakers, and much domestic ware, clearly derived from a characteristic domestic site partly represented by the posthole complex under barrows X-XIV. This homogeneous assemblage may perhaps date c. 1650-1550 B.C. The chronological separation provided by these two occupations allows us to attempt to view the interesting and interleaved activities of Beaker and Neolithic groups in this small area of the Wiltshire downs.

PHASE 1 C. 2000-1800 B.C.

Four sherds of AOC Beaker have been recovered from Barrows III, XIV, XVIII, and XIX, strung right across the excavated area (this report sherd Nos. 4, 23, 36, 39). To these may perhaps be added three or four undiagnostic sherds possibly from contemporary E Beakers from barrows XV and XIX (report Nos. 30, 40). These few fragments scraped up in later barrows represent the fringes of a domestic scatter. Broadly contemporary, but not necessarily concurrent, with this Beaker occupation must have been the activity of people using late Neolithic impressed ware, akin to Mortlake ware, and represented by the scraped up sherds in barrow XIX. (report No. 4). This early phase of activity on
the down is most strongly represented on the south eastern part of the site, especially around barrow X, XVIII, XIX.

PHASE II, C. 1650-1550

This phase contains the clear traces of a small domestic site including S2 Beaker, partly recovered in the posthole complex beneath barrows X-XIV. The debris from this settlement, preserved in varying states of erosion, was scraped into the material of the later barrows, zoning outwards over a radius of c. 250 yds, from its main focus, approximately 224 sherd in barrow III, c. 86 in barrow XIV, c. 28 in barrow X, c. 7-17 in barrows I, II, XIII, XVII, XVIII. The majority of the flint artefacts removed from the mound material of sites X-XIV probably came from this domestic site, including the fragment of a battle axe of group XIV, Runcam Comynite.

The pottery debris from this site includes a few small sherd from a large number of vessels, typical in make up, of the range of pottery found in domestic contexts. A minimal calculation suggests suggests that more than thirty decorated fine ware Beakers, including at least one handled Beaker (report No.5) accompanied more than twenty rusticated vessels of which at least two were large heavy duty vessels, or giant pot-Beakers (report Nos.24(170), 21 (259).

There is also an element of non-Beaker amongst the material, that is the pottery that does not fall into the "pure" or sepulchral Beaker category. This is mainly finger nail/ tip rusticated pottery and various stabbed sherds, as well as sherds of at least 3 grooved ware vessels and at least one collared urn that appear to be associated with the domestic debris. The finger impressions can be divided into several types:

i) regular finger nail impressions a) alone b) with cords
   (No. 106, 111)

ii) random finger nail impressions (No. 102, 104)

iii) paired finger nail impressions (crossefoot) (No 85, 99)

iv) finger tip impressions (No. 107)

Stabbed decoration includes oval, triangular, near circular and the impressions of a sharp round toothed comb (No 51).
which is a kind of decoration more commonly found on collared urns but which is not unknown in Beaker domestic assemblages. There is thus a very wide range of rusticated ware among the Beaker, and some of this rusticated ware cannot, by reason of fabric and decoration, be called Beaker. This, overall on the whole, is typical of 'Beaker domestic sites' where there are certain areas of 'black and white classic - pottery types, a lot of which merge into each other in the form of 'grey' patches or hazy areas. The clearest example of this is in the collared urn tradition where some of the smaller urns are made of what is ostensibly Beaker fabric. The writer (AMG) is currently working on the pottery from Beaker domestic sites in the British Isles and hopes that these grey areas will become more informative when looked at more closely.

There also seems to be a real yet indefinable link between Beakers and collared urns. On most domestic sites of this type there is usually an element of collared urn present, in varying proportions, and quite often the primary interment in a barrow which covers a Beaker domestic site is an urned cremation, for example Brenchley and Snargate. It is not surprising that collared urn is found at Snail Down too, from the turf mound at site III. Nos. 122, and 125 are probably also collared urns.

Rim and base sherds may represent one undecorated Beaker (report Nos. 6, 7.) whether this be intentional or simply due to the fact that the Beaker was unfinished at the time of firing. The decorated fine ware Beakers are predominantly comb impressed with a clear preference for bar chevron decorated necks and bellies with ladder filled zones. This is a preference which, together with markedly funnel shaped neck profiles, is distinctive of the S2 Beakers of Wessex, South Wales, and Southern Ireland, as opposed to the preferential cylinder neck and hexagon motifs in the eastern counties. However, herringbone, lattice and ermine zones occur and a single case of floating lozenge decoration (report No. 20) which becomes more frequent in later phases of the Southern Beaker tradition (S3, S4.) As usual a few Beakers are grooved or incised (Report Nos. 7, 8, 12-14) thus coming significantly close to the finer vessel in the true Grooved Ware assemblage, (eg. report No. 29(31)).
The Snail Down domestic complex is one of a number of domestic sites beneath round barrows which fall into three main categories. Firstly there is the simple scatter of sherds in and/or underneath the mound material as found at Amesbury G70 and Callis Wold No. 275 to name but two. Secondly there are spreads of sherds associated with pits or hearths, or even only one or two sherds found in those features as occurred at Poor’s Heath, Risby, or at Avebury G55. Thirdly, and obviously more rarely, there is evidence for structures or house plans beneath the barrows such as the hypothetical hut at Newton, Glamorgan or a possible round hut beneath the barrow at Chippenham, Camb., No.5. The cemetery at Snail Down is useful in helping our understanding of these other sites as these various categories are present beneath the one barrow group. The nucleus of the settlement, if we may use such a term, would presumably be the post and stake hole groups similar to, but lacking the structural plans of, Swarkestone round barrow in Derbyshire, with sherds dying out in density and becoming more abraded towards the periphery, probably the result of field manuring, and probably also surface survival. (A corpus and discussion of Beaker Domestic sites beneath round barrows is in preparation by the writer (AMG)).

This, taken with the average number of vessels represented at such sites and their stylistic homogeneity, can possibly be seen as the residue of a small lineage unit of several families focussed in adjacent huts; possibly even the forerunner of the Deverel Rhiwbury and related settlements. We do not know enough to say how these domestic areas differ to or resemble the Neolithic ‘villages’ but it is likely that it is in such residential, social, economic and ecological contrasts that we must seek the clue to the peculiar pattern of Beaker/Neolithic interaction and interdigititation made apparent both in the distribution and in ceramic development.

**Phase III c. 1600-1500 B.C.**

After abandonment of the domestic site the next event may have been the re-use of the former (?) Mortlake area to the South East for a scraped up barrow (Barrow XV) with an unaccompanied primary cremation but with true grooved ware in the mound plus some early Beaker sherds. (Report No. 30-51).
PHASE IV.  c.1500 B.C.

The collared urns, faience beads, and the main barrow building phase of the barrow cemetery.
I Disc

Beaker zoned belly/bar chevron neck - 11/55/213 nos 167,171,103,176, 316,150,167

with filled triangles - 78,76,78

Ining 15 sherds probably come from one of above, including base a 12,64,93; although all sherds a little abraded they suggest little sure (i.e. buried then scraped-up for barrow ?)

II Saucer

Miscellaneous sherds of several vessels, 1 rim no.56,4 base nos.11, 15,40; 1 broad herringbone belly zone no.19; heavily eroded, no.77 might come from beaker 1 site 1.

III Bell

1 well preserved sherd of an All-Over-Cord bkr SD.III 193 (much earlier than remainder in III, by c.400 yrs)

1 sherd probably from handle spring of a handled Southern British beaker SD.III 263. A normal part of the S2 assemblage (e.g. Chippingham Cam., Barrock...

Rims, of 9 vessels, including 1 possibly undecorated, 1 rusticated; 7 rims different S2? vessels nos.266,226,51,67,243,143,271; 1 rim (2 joining sherds) Undecorated beaker/br bowl nos.217; 1 rim, squared-top, of PP (fingerpinch) rusticated vessel no.29.

Rims of at least 14 different beakers nos.203,172,63,29,232,99,172, 174,51,50,271,234,29,59,259;

base 55 comes from an incised beaker, possibly with lattice incised body sherds 261,263; base 259 may come from undecorated beaker noted under rims.

Body sherds, numbering 186 (fragments)

breakdown:-

22 simple ladder motif zones
9 pendant triangles & bar chevrons
2 lattice zones
3 grooved shers, bordering on grooved ware
but probably S2 (nos.45,51,86)
34 rusticated sherds from at least 4 vessels
- 1 plus, fingerpinch rusticatedadd 1 cuneiform bone jab
2 crescent bone jab

116 miscellaneous body and base sherds
Site III continued:

1. Packet: cutting Na Find 200:-- 10 eroded beaker sherds, probably S2?.
2. Packet: Na/Nb 256:-- 3 " " " ""

One piece of true (?) Grooved Ware, heavily blackened no. SD.III.153
(but still possibly within S2 assemblage range)

Site VIII Bell

Grooved Ware sherd, but comment about (no.12) also stands.

Site X Bowl

Grooved Ware sherd (no.16) comment as above

1. Rusticated sherds, four sherds probably four different vessels:--
159.2.XI(?) bone jab; X.157 FF; 157(31) FF plastic; 157(47) cuneiform
jab (possibly from Site III vessel similar).

Body sherds S2?, one lattice zone (nos.57.22;X,1)

2. " " " 18 largely undecorated body sherds

3. Site X,IS,12; 4 indeterminate sherds

Site XI Bowl

1. S2, five comb impressed beaker sherds, including lattice, pendant
triangle and floating lozenge motif (nos.247;235,242,232,235).
2. Rusticated beakers, 6 sherds of c.4 vessels; cuneiform jab nos.244-5;
light fingernail nos.279; fingernotch nos.279; bone jab heavy-duty
vessel nos.259 (11 mm thick).

Site XIV Bowl

1. XXX II: 1 well preserved sherd of All-Over-Cord beaker XIV.131
(compare my no.4, Site III, possibly from same vessel).
2. S2? 7 rim sherds from 6 different S2? beakers 169-173;126;304;136;
147;183.
3. 6 base sherds " c.5 " " " 125,147,209,181,135,181;
26 body sherds " c.6 " " including abundant ladder zones,
and bar chevrons.
4. 8 " " miscellaneous undecorated.
19 rusticated sherds from at least 6 different vessels, including
5 plastic fingernotch; 3 stick jab; 4 cuneiform jab; 1 bone jab
5 sherds of large heavy duty bone jab vessel (no.170;12mm thick).
1 Sherd no.155 possibly scalloped neck Fargo type food vessel but
more probably scalloped neck beaker storage vessel related thereto
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175  6N:  2  "  "  "  "  "
198:  58:  5  "  "  "  "  "
171  58:  "  "  "  "  "

10 sherds of true Grooved Ware XV;78;78;31
(note beaker affinities of no.31)
1 sherd beaker, possibly earlier type than S2; i.e. could be an early European Bell beaker (E) (no.92)
2 sherds, rusticated and point tooth comb beaker(?)
10 miscellaneous undecorated sherds, some beaker, some Grooved Ware.

171

5 sherds of true Grooved Ware XV;78;78;31
(note beaker affinities of no.31)
1 sherd beaker, possibly earlier type than S2; i.e. could be an early European Bell beaker (E) (no.92)
2 sherds, rusticated and point tooth comb beaker(?)
10 miscellaneous undecorated sherds, some beaker, some Grooved Ware.

171

S2? - 8 sherds, including two different rims (nos.58;104)
body sherds show ladder motif, lattice, and bar chevrons.
S2? 5 miscellaneous undecorated sherds
2 sherds rusticated sherd of at least 2 vessels; curve bone jab & cuneiform

171

AOC - 1 sherd slightly eroded All-Over-Cord beaker (see my nos.4,23)
4 no.172 SD57.
3 sherds rusticated beaker 97,218,184; crescentic bone jab.
8 sherds indeterminate beaker

AOC - 1 sherd All-Over-Cord no.330 (see my nos.4,23,36)
1. Beaker - 1 fine rim sherd (311) possibly early Bell (E) type
1 rusticated jabbed sherd, possibly beaker.
Mortlake (?) Ware - 7 sherds, 1 dec.rim sherd, 2 large maggott (?) dec.
1 sherd in packet, 373, cutting.

END.