

on a CD or in an Archaeological Data Service online archive would have allowed readers to select and sort information according to their own criteria. Some histograms present data as percentages without indicating actual sample sizes, making it difficult to evaluate those that show potentially interesting variations — for example site-types and the occurrence of ORS querns (50, figs 5.1–5.2). S. is aware of the problem of small sample sizes (51–2), but selective use of significance testing as recommended by Cool and Baxter (*Journal of Roman Archaeology* 18 (2005), 397–404) would nevertheless have made it easier to assess the meaning of typological variations (48). GIS techniques might have allowed the production of quantified distribution maps like those used for pottery by Hodder (*Britannia* 5 (1974), 340–59).

Historians of technology researching powered mills will find the lack of an index frustrating, but should read pages 30–1 and 47–8. ORS millstones were predominantly late, with the largest examples falling in the fourth century: ‘larger rotary querns and millstones were not introduced until the late 2nd or probably 3rd centuries AD. ... the introduction of millstones, which have been found mainly at villa sites from the 3rd century, reflects a change in emphasis from urban to rural sites’ (79). I hope that S. will use her proven geological and archaeological skills to enlarge upon this and other topics, incorporating comparative work on additional sources of stone.

Newcastle University

KEVIN GREENE

*Priory Road Garden. Excavations by Gloucester and District Archaeological Research Group (GADARG) at Priory Road Garden, St Mary's Street, Gloucester, 1972–1975.* By N. Spry, J. Punshon and P. Moss. Gloucester and District Archaeological Research Group, Gloucester, 2006. Pp. x + 95, illus. Price: £6.00. ISBN 978 0 9537918 3 5.

This volume records the results of the excavation of a site threatened by road works in the years 1972–75. In the Roman period it lay close to the east bank of the River Severn, to the north-west of the Roman fortress and *colonia*. In the Middle Ages it lay just outside one of the city gates. Occupation began late in the first century A.D. with the construction of timber buildings, apparently following the alignment of the fortress; the beginning of a rather desultory occupation which continued until a road was laid over part of the site late in the third or fourth century. The discovery of iron slag suggests that the area may have had an industrial function. The site was abandoned in the Saxon period, but in the eleventh century ditches were cut across it, although it was not until the thirteenth century that simple timber buildings were constructed within the excavated area. From then on the site was effectively divided into two parts, the western area being occupied by the rear of buildings which fronted onto the road, with their yards filling the rest. This basic pattern continued until the final demolition of the houses in the 1930s, marked only by a few significant changes such as the introduction of stone foundations for the major walls in the fourteenth century and the appearance of brick in the eighteenth century. The continuity of their simple plan for some half a millennium is striking, and it was not until the nineteenth century that small rooms were added at the back of the houses, probably to provide separate kitchens or sculleries.

The report covers all of the archaeological features period by period in great detail with rather schematic site plans showing the various phases. The major sections are all duplicated with one drawing showing only the layers, while a second shows the section drawing printed in light grey with the feature codes in black. There are no drawn sections of features which were not on the lines of the main sections, though in some cases these would have helped to clarify the text. The finds reports are authoritative, but the site was not very productive, and the authors note that no significant groups of pottery were recovered from the pits. Such documentary evidence as there is, including memories of the area before the houses were demolished, forms part of the discussion.

It is a thorough report on a minor site, which would probably have achieved wider circulation had it been placed in a local journal rather than been published as a monograph.

Penarth

WILLIAM MANNING