

- Evershed, R.P., Dudd, S.N., Copley, M.S., Berstan, R., Stott, A.W., Mottram, H., Buckley, S.A., and Crossman, Z. 2002: 'Chemistry of archaeological animal fats', *Accounts of Chemical Research* 35, 660–8
- Fulford, M., Clarke, A., and Eckardt, H. 2006: *Life and Labour in Late Roman Silchester. Excavations in Insula IX since 1997*, Britannia Monograph 22, London
- Hally, D.J. 1983: 'Use alteration of pottery vessel surfaces: an important source of evidence in the identification of vessel function', *North American Archaeologist* 4, 3–26
- Heron, C., and Pollard, A.M. 1987: 'The analysis of natural resinous materials from Roman amphorae', in E.A. Slater and J.O. Tate (eds), *Science and Archaeology, Glasgow 1987: Proceedings of a Conference on the Application of Scientific Techniques to Archaeology, Glasgow, September, 1987*, BAR British series 196, Oxford, 429–47
- Holbrook, N., and Bidwell, P.T. 1991: *Roman Finds from Exeter*, Exeter Archaeological Reports 4
- Ingrem, C. 2006: 'The animal bone', in Fulford *et al.* (2006), 167–88; 339–62
- Mills, J.S., and White, R. 1994: *The Organic Chemistry of Museum Objects*, London
- Orton, C., Tyers, P., and Vince, A. 1993: *Pottery in Archaeology, Cambridge Manuals in Archaeology*, Cambridge
- Pollard, A.M., and Heron, C. 1996: *Archaeological Chemistry*, Cambridge
- Regert, M., Garnier, N., Decavallas, O., Cren-Olive, C., and Rolando, C. 2003: 'Structural characterization of lipid constituents from natural substances preserved in archaeological environments', *Measurement Science and Technology* 14, 1620–30.
- Robinson, N., Evershed, R.P., Higgs, W.J., Jerman, K., and Eglinton, G. 1987: 'Proof of a pine-wood origin for pitch from Tudor (Mary Rose) and Etruscan shipwrecks – Application of analytical organic-chemistry in Archaeology', *Analyst* 112, 637–43
- Robinson, M., with Fulford, N. and Tootell, K. 2006: 'The macroscopic plant remains', in Fulford *et al.* (2006), 206–18; 374–9
- Sealy, P.R., and Tyers, P.A. 1989: 'Olives from Roman Spain: a unique amphora find in British waters', *Antiquaries Journal* 69, 53–72
- Serpico, M., and White, R. 2000: 'Adhesives and binders', in P. Nicholson and I. Shaw (eds), *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Technology*, Cambridge, 475–94
- Timby, J. 2006: 'The pottery from the late Roman deposits', in Fulford *et al.* (2006), 86–115; 291–313
- Tyers, P.A. 1996: *Roman Pottery in Britain*, London

A Publication Policy for Chedworth. Peter Salway writes: The death of Sir Ian Richmond in 1965 brought to an end the series of keyhole excavations he started in 1957 for the National Trust that was intended to elucidate the phases in the development of the Chedworth villa, to investigate the correctness of certain long-standing interpretations, and to inform the conservation of the visible remains. Prior to Richmond there had been hardly any archaeological activity on the site since the acquisition of the property in 1924 by the Trust after a notable public campaign — other than some early work by W. St Clair Baddeley, its principal mover⁴⁹ — or, for that matter, since the original discovery of the villa and the construction of the site museum in the 1860s. After Richmond there was another gap⁵⁰ till Dr Roger Goodburn commenced investigations linked to conservation in 1977 that lasted till the early 1990s, followed in 1994 by the appointment of Philip Bethell as property manager. The untimely death of Sir Ian left the Trust with the daunting problem that it had no detailed records of the work on which he based his interpretations and which it can be assumed he had every intention of writing up. Fortunately Goodburn's scholarly 1979 National Trust guidebook⁵¹ preserves the essential structure of Richmond's overall interpretation and his conclusions on a number of important details. However, the general problem remained, further complicated by a number of subsequent difficulties. It was not till the award of a project-planning grant

⁴⁹ 1925: stoke-hole, Room 25; 1935: infant burial outside Room 4, followed by Eve Rutter's excavation of Room 4 (latrine) itself in 1954 (Rutter 1957).

⁵⁰ Except for R. Shoemith's 1977 evaluation in advance of the construction of the visitor reception building (Shoemith 1978).

⁵¹ Goodburn 1979.

in 2005 by the Heritage Lottery Fund in respect of a proposal for the renovation of the site and of its presentation to the public that the need for a publication policy was addressed afresh. Realizing that the existence of the Archaeological Data Service offers much greater flexibility than conventional methods and allows the depositing of records that can be updated at will, it has been decided to establish an ADS website for Chedworth and to enter on it the material that is currently available, improving old records whenever that becomes possible, and adding new data as it is created by ongoing and future work.⁵² This is a policy that does not rule out subsequent publication in traditional print form. At the time of writing arrangements are being made to complete the post-excavation work and full writing-up of the excavations and other investigations on site between 1994 and 2006, and to assess the most appropriate form or forms of publication. It is also planned that physical access to documentation and to finds not on display, that were held up to 2007 on site in cramped and unsuitable conditions, will be transformed by their relocation to a newly-converted store at the National Trust offices on the nearby Sherborne Estate which is now amalgamated for managerial purposes with the Chedworth property.

It had already been decided that there was a need for an assessment of how work at Chedworth since Goodburn's guidebook has affected interpretation of the site. In 2006 the Trust therefore commissioned Atkins Heritage to undertake this survey. It was carried out by Philip Bethell, the Trust's former property manager at Chedworth. His report was completed in 2007.⁵³ The text will appear on the website — accompanied by tables cataloguing all known archaeological and conservation interventions since the discovery of the villa in 1864 — but it may be helpful if the principal results are very briefly described here.

The plan of the villa has received important additions and modifications. The more recent reconstruction drawings have been proved broadly correct.⁵⁴ The south wing has been proved by excavation to extend eastwards as far as the long-exposed north wing, and, like it, to consist of a single row of rooms, fronted by a corridor. Geophysics⁵⁵ in the field between the eastern boundary of the National Trust's land and the River Coln has confirmed that the lower courtyard is indeed a closed court, defined by a cross-wall identified 10–15 m beyond the present fence and possessing a substantial gateway, matching a similar gate in the portico dividing the upper and lower courts. This lower gate was approached by a driveway bounded by ditches, while excavation within the lower court revealed a cobbled path leading towards the upper gate. The geophysics did not detect any subsidiary buildings between the villa and the river, contrary to the long-held idea that service and agricultural structures — absent from discoveries so far — were likely to be present in this space. It is not, of course, possible to confirm this negative without large-scale excavation, but it now seems quite likely that the slope was kept free of buildings, enhancing the monumental effect of the approach uphill towards the villa. A small excavation behind the north wing disproved the possibility that structural remains known from that area represented the missing subsidiary buildings. Instead this proved to be a metal track, probably giving access for materials during the construction of that wing, succeeded by drainage to divert surface water from the new building. In one striking aspect the reconstruction drawings were proved wrong. There was no formal garden in the upper or garden court. Instead excavation suggested that in the late Roman period the court was initially grassed, subsequently being provided with a fairly rough hard surface, possibly to tackle the problem that the grass could rapidly turn into a very slippery and muddy slope in wet weather, due to the flow of groundwater from the hill behind that still presents a serious problem.

Fundamental to Richmond's interpretation was that the villa developed in stages over a long period. It now seems that a modest, self-contained, second-century establishment — chiefly represented by the early phases of the west wing — sat on a relatively narrow terrace cut back into the hillside. In front of this was a steep slope, provided with drainage, where the garden courtyard was subsequently located. This villa continued to be occupied in the third century. In the late Roman period the house was

⁵² Website address : http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/resources.html?chedworth_nt_2008

⁵³ Bethell 2007. Since the compilation of Bethell's report there has been further work on and off site, including a topographical survey by a landscape architect (Teasdale 2006) that included calculating the views from certain key points in the villa, assuming the absence of the present adjacent woodlands.

⁵⁴ The much-reproduced 1964 drawing by Sheila Gibson (e.g. Claridge and Gibson 1991) has been superseded by a number of others, most recently in 2006 by Bryan Byron (Bethell 2006, 1).

⁵⁵ Work by GSB Prospection, 1998–9.

transformed by tying together existing elements with a portico to create the garden court and projecting the north and south corridors to form the lower court described above. The garden court itself was made possible by modifying the slope in front of the west wing by means of a massive earth-moving operation, contained at its lower edge by deep retaining works where the east walk of the portico divided the upper and lower courts. A room near the centre of the west wing that has thicker front and back walls has yielded evidence for burning — perhaps a wooden staircase — suggesting a tower or other element higher than the rest of the range.⁵⁶ Contrary to previous impressions, the overall transformation of the villa occurred over a relatively short period, though, it would seem, with the sort of changes of detail one would expect with successive owners in the course of the late Roman period.

Perhaps the most unexpected results of recent work have come from the corridor in the previously-untouched east end of the south wing. The contrast between its two main phases could not be greater. The first revealed the existence of a hypocaust to heat the corridor (doubtless very welcome, as the lie of the land in this steep-sided combe renders the south wing particularly cold, but unusual). Adding this to the presence of tesserae in the south wing, excavation renders obsolete the previous theory that the south wing was entirely given over to lower-status occupation, perhaps providing accommodation and working-space for indoor or outdoor staff. As in the north wing, the south side of the lower court was clearly devoted to high-status activity. The second main phase proved to be quite different. The evidence now was of agricultural use, with post-Roman dating material. There seemed a strong possibility that when the rooms behind the corridor were already derelict this section of the corridor roof remained intact or was repaired, permitting re-use for new purposes.

The overall interpretation of the site in the Roman period as a large villa as conventionally understood has been challenged in the past, notably when Graham Webster argued⁵⁷ that it was a hostel for pilgrims to a nearby temple.⁵⁸ Bethell concludes that the work from 1977 to 2006 does not provide sufficient evidence to shift the balance of probability for the present.

So far no activity on site in the immediate pre-Roman period has been detected, though an infant burial of fourth-century B.C. date was discovered in the lower courtyard. Post-Roman activity later than that in the south wing is indicated by scattered sherds of sixth- to eighth-century date, while plough-marks on the rubble of the south wing suggest medieval arable. The sequence is completed by walling in the same area thought to represent post-medieval sheep pens.

Much more is now understood about the present state of the monument, important in estimating the potential for future research and in guiding how best to explain the site to the public. Following a survey of the mosaics currently reburied and not on show,⁵⁹ it appears that the Victorian diggers normally stopped within rooms whenever they came down onto a mosaic or other floor, preserving intact stratigraphy below. It is now suggested that there were originally at least 20 mosaics at Chedworth, if one includes an estimate for the section of the south wing so far unexcavated. Cataloguing of the worked stone fragments — over 600 in all — revealed a very large number of architectural pieces and many fragments of sculpture, tables and other items. A photogrammetric survey of the exposed walls⁶⁰ suggested that — other than within the nineteenth- and twentieth-century shelters — much of the masonry that can be seen by the visitor has been built up to its present height in the past 150 years, though on

⁵⁶ This would have provided a dominant feature at the culmination of the long uphill approach from the river through the lower and upper gates. The artificial platform on which the 1860s Shooting Lodge and Museum stand (thought to be made up from spoil from the Victorian excavations) today masks the very sharp difference of level between the lower and upper courtyards and conceals what must have made a canyon-like impression on anyone entering through the lower gate — perhaps deliberate — caused by the fourth-century raising of the level when constructing the upper court and the narrowness of the valley.

⁵⁷ Webster 1983.

⁵⁸ It may also be observed that the identification of the substantial Roman structure south-east of the villa towards the River Coln as a temple (St Clair Baddeley 1930) is not as certain as is generally observed. It could have been a mausoleum, or possibly a hybrid, as at Lullingstone. Furthermore, its dating is not necessarily the same as that for the villa at its fullest extent, the phase on which the Webster theory rests. Another alternative to the conventional view was put forward by J.T. Smith (Smith 1978), including Chedworth in the list of villas he identified as designed for multi-occupancy (the 'unit-system' theory).

⁵⁹ Work by Cotswold Archaeology, 2005.

⁶⁰ Work by the (then) Cotswold Archaeological Trust, 2000.

surviving footings. However, despite this extensive rebuilding, early photographs make it clear that the present appearance of the site does not accurately reproduce the Victorian romantic garden, as there has been much subsequent repair and alteration of the masonry in a number of mutually-inconsistent styles, while only the timber frames of the Victorian shelters are original, the museum interior has been substantially altered, and little of the original garden planting survives. Twentieth-century attempts to mark out buried walls have further detracted from the Victorian ambience, whilst failing to assist the visitor's understanding.

In addition to the above assessment of work at Chedworth since 1977, the Trust is preparing two other documents for early deposition on the web as basic tools for future work on the site. Both will be kept up-to-date. The first is a Gazetteer, a room-by-room and area-by-area description of the site. This is intended to provide a reference framework for all activity, whether it is straightforwardly archaeological or educational, or related to the conservation and management needs of the monument. It has, indeed, often been difficult to distinguish between research and conservation, and many of the discoveries have been made in the course of repairs to the upstanding fabric or evaluations before work on site-services not primarily intended with research in mind. The second document is an annotated Bibliography.⁶¹ This is as far as possible a comprehensive list of published and unpublished articles and notes on Chedworth, including both 'grey literature' and miscellaneous notices. The latter range from 'Roman Britain in xxxx' in this journal to popular articles and press notices, as it has been discovered that much of the past activity on site generally thought to have been lost can be tracked through such varied and surprisingly numerous sources.

Stanton Harcourt, Oxfordshire
salwaypg@btinternet.com

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bethell, P. 2006: *Chedworth Roman Villa, Gloucestershire*, National Trust property guide, Swindon
- Bethell, P. 2007: *Chedworth Roman Villa Archaeological Assessment: Summary of Recent Archaeological Interventions 1977–2006*, unpub. Atkins Heritage report
- Claridge, A., and Gibson, S. 1991: *Archaeology and Architecture: Catalogue of an Exhibition of the Work of Sheila Gibson*, British School at Rome
- Goodburn, R. 1979: *The Roman Villa: Chedworth*, National Trust property guide, London
- Rutter, E. 1957: 'Chedworth Roman Villa: an exploratory trench', *Trans. Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeol. Soc.* 76, 160–4
- St Clair Baddeley, W. 1930: 'The Romano-British temple, Chedworth', *Trans. Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeol. Soc.* 47, 255–64
- Shoesmith, R. 1978: *Trans. Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeol. Soc.* 96, 84
- Smith, J.T. 1978: 'Villas as a key to social structure', in M. Todd (ed.), *Studies in the Romano-British Villa*, Leicester, 174
- Teasdale, J. 2006: *Chedworth Roman Villa Landscape Survey*, unpub. Teasdale Environmental Design report
- Webster, G. 1983: 'The function of Chedworth Roman "Villa"', *Trans. Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeol. Soc.* 101, 5–20

The Latest Roman Coin from Hadrian's Wall: a Small Fifth-century Purse Group. Rob Collins writes: In May 2007, Barry Seger recovered eight copper-alloy *nummi* while searching a field in the Great Whittington area of Northumberland with a metal detector. The coins were found individually, separated by a distance of 10–50 cm, in a zig-zag linear arrangement. He reported his finds and an accurate findspot to the local Finds Liaison Officer (Rob Collins) for the Portable Antiquities Scheme. Investigation determined that the distinct linear distribution of the coins is almost certainly due to the

⁶¹ This combines separately-compiled bibliographies by P. Bethell and P. Salway (internal National Trust documents).