Beakers of the Upper Thames District

by E. T. Leeds

In his review of British beakers in the first of his two volumes on *Bronze Age Pottery* Lord Abercromby cited seven examples from the Oxford district, obviously not a very substantial foundation upon which to build up theories about their origins or their relationship to neighbouring groups: all the less so, because, as his maps show, the Oxford group stands divided from the other main groups in every direction by considerable intervals, whether in Northamptonshire, Cambridgeshire, or even the Lower Thames Valley and Wiltshire. Nevertheless any beakers found round Oxford must from their centrality derive from one or other direction, and actually Lord Abercromby detected in most of them secondary phases of the two main classes A and B, classes which still hold good for general purposes of differentiation.

As is well known, Lord Abercromby placed the starting-point of the diffusion of beaker-pottery in England in the south, particularly in Wiltshire, and traced its spread in a northerly and north-easterly direction. Since that time (1912), however, many doubts have been expressed about the correctness of Lord Abercromby’s deductions,† and the belief that the chief point of arrival of a part at least of the invaders was by the east coast has gradually asserted itself.‡

The scarcity of material from the Oxford district was explained by Lord Abercromby as being due to the inhospitable nature of much of the country (forest, marsh, clay, etc.) which deterred man from settling on it,§ but, if any justification were needed for the more intensive research of recent years into the prehistoric archaeology of the district, it lies in the possibility of removing the false impression which he was led to present about conditions in the Upper Thames Valley in the Early Bronze Age.

Already in 1928 I felt able to criticize that conception,¶ and every year brings forward additional evidence, alike from excavations and from aerial photography, to demonstrate how incorrect was the picture which he drew.

---

§ *Bronze Age Pottery*, i, 81.
¶ *Geography*, xiv, 527.
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This research has demonstrated the presence of an active population throughout the Bronze Age, and indeed earlier, living on the gravel terraces of the Thames and of the lower reaches of its tributaries. There still, however, remain gaps in the map of beaker-distribution, for example between the Thames and Cambridgeshire and, in a lesser degree, in the lower levels of country between Oxfordshire and the main centres in Wiltshire. Here physiographical and geological causes are at play; for nowhere do the beakers leave a continuous trail. The interval between Oxford and Northampton is notoriously barren of early prehistoric discoveries, but nevertheless evidence, as will be seen later, can be adduced to show that between the upper waters of the Cherwell and of the Nene the ironstone ridge served as a highway through the intervening forest-land.

In the following review I have confined myself to an area which includes the whole of Oxfordshire and the northern part of Berkshire up to and a little beyond the Ridgeway on the Berkshire Downs. The choice of these limits is not so arbitrary as might at first appear, since they embrace all the country between the almost beakerless Warwickshire plain and the Northamptonshire forest-land on the one hand, and, on the other, all the land immediately visible or accessible from the ‘green road’ leading from the eastern counties to the Wiltshire Downs.

This (see map, FIG. 1) involves taking two beakers found at Lambourn, Berks. (possibly from the Seven Barrows which lie between the Ridgeway and the modern village) and included by Lord Abercromby in his Region I and transferring them to his Region II, of which the area under review forms a very small part. From this latter area he only cited seven beakers: actually at the date at which he wrote some seven more were available, known from literature or from actual specimens in museums. In a paper ‘On two beakers of the Early Bronze Age recently discovered in South Wales, with a record of the distribution of beaker-pottery in England and Wales,’ published in 1925, Sir Cyril Fox added three more to northern Berkshire and three to Oxfordshire, taken from the extra seven mentioned above. The grand total recorded in 1925 amounted to fourteen specimens, whole or fragmentary, including that omitted in Sir Cyril Fox’s list. We can now schedule no less than 30 additions represented either by more or less complete examples, or in a few cases by single sherds, from the same area.

An important factor in this great increase has been the discovery of two beaker-cemeteries, the one at Cassington in 1933, recorded in Antiquaries...

1 *Bronze Age Pottery*, i, nos. 7 and 41.  
2 Ibid., nos. 22, 43, 64, 75, 77, 79, 292.  
3 *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, lxxx, 1 ff.  
4 Drayton in this list is placed incorrectly under Berkshire; it refers to Drayton St. Leonard, Oxfordshire.
Journal, vol. xiv, the other at Foxley Farm, Eynsham, the first recorded grave in which was excavated by the writer in 1930 and which has, since June 1937, produced several more. These have for the most part been excavated, photographed, and fully recorded by Capt. C. Musgrave, who has kindly supplied the details which together with those of the earlier grave are incorporated in Appendix I (PLATE II and FIGS. 4–5). The Cassington cemetery produced 5 (or 6) beakers in 11 (or 12) burials: that at Eynsham has yielded 8 beakers in 18 burials. The reason for the alternative figures at Cassington are explained below (p. 18).

These beaker-cemeteries are a new feature in local archaeology. That they have previously been encountered is likely enough, but owing to the slower processes of gravel-digging employed in the past, their nature appears to have passed unrecognized: the graves may have come to light at long intervals and their mutual connexion was missed. There are records of two or three graves from one site, as at Summertown, and a group of beakers was more recently discovered at Stanton Harcourt, but no evidence exists to show that the graves from which they came formed compact groups, such as are taken to constitute beaker-cemeteries.

One characteristic of these cemeteries is the absence of any sign of a tumulus. Such may have existed, but, if so, they were small enough to have been subsequently levelled without leaving a trace. In neither of the two known cemeteries has aerial photography revealed anything to indicate their existence, in this respect presenting a marked contrast to conditions on such a site as Radley (below, pp. 31 ff.), where aerial photography, observation on the ground and even the name ‘Barrow Hills’ have combined to prevent a cemetery of a later period of the Bronze Age from escaping the foreknowledge of the archaeologist.

The Eynsham cemetery came to light too late for inclusion in the Victoria County History, Oxfordshire, vol. i: it is, therefore desirable that publication should not be unduly delayed, the more so because the discovery not only confirms ideas that had long been incubating in the writer’s mind, but also affords a favourable opportunity for passing in review the greatly enriched material—44 beakers (see Appendix II) instead of 7—that is now available for study. At the same time the new material presents some interesting novelties, and throws fresh light on conditions within the area in the Early Bronze Age.

1. Form and decoration. (a) The A beakers. To his main typological groups A and B Lord Abercromby added a third C, while recognizing numerous shades of development within the two first groups. As, however, Dr. Clark has pointed out in a valuable paper on ‘The Dual Nature of the Beaker
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Invasion, the C type is in reality a late variant of A, and its insertion in the scheme tends to confuse rather than to illuminate Lord Abercromby’s original typological differentiation. Actually the shades of variation are quite minute, as must naturally be the case in any hand-made pottery, which is also essentially home-made. One can meet with such variation in almost any peasant pottery, e.g. English mediaeval, where, for example, the so-called ‘baluster’ pitchers from London, Oxford or York respectively are quite distinctive in outline and could never be confused.

Following Dr. Clark’s argument, I have taken from the A beakers scheduled in this paper, three specimens actually illustrated by Lord Abercromby (B.A.P., I, nos. 7, 64 and 43) and arranged their contours (FIG. 2) in the order employed by Dr. Clark in his figure. The main feature of the development is the movement of the point of greatest constriction in an upward direction.

The third is the only example from southern England assigned by Lord Abercromby to his category C, which becomes the more frequent the farther the diffusion of beakers is followed northwards over Great Britain. But this illustration is not quite satisfactory, for even between \(a\) and \(b\) comes the handled beaker (PLATE III, B) from Appleford, Berks. (B.A.P., I, no. 292) and in the new material there are several grades of variation which must intervene between \(b\) and \(c\). As can be clearly demonstrated from the beakers of the district, the C type is a hybrid form and marks the interaction of A and B beakers, for the operation of which the district was favourably situated. A second diagram (FIG. 3) based on the augmented material will illustrate the shades of development. \(^2\)

\(^1\) Antiquity, v, 415 ff.
\(^2\) The C beaker from Abingdon (FIG. 2, c) is in FIG. 3 replaced by \(h\) from Stanton Harcourt (Oxon. no. 28: PLATE III, C).
The addition of a handle (except when, as on the Appleford beaker (FIG. 3, d), it is attached to one element, namely the neck) naturally affects the moulding of the vase by producing a secondary constriction between the points of attachment, designed to increase the depth of the hand HOLD. This feature has to be mentally eliminated in order to arrive at a true conception of the position occupied by the handled beakers in the scheme of form. Thus Oxon. nos. 14 and 16 (Eynsham: PLATES III, H and IV, A) must clearly rank with form f, while Oxon. no. 6 (Cassington) must be related to form g (Eynsham), where the greatest diameter has risen to its maximum height, and the lower half of the vase has lost its globular form and has been given a truncated conoid shape. At the end of the series there appears a marked emphasis of the rim, expressed either by a strong inward curve as on the handled beaker Oxon. no. 16 (Eynsham) or by bevelling accompanied by ornamental definition as on Oxon. no. 19 (Eynsham). On the large Wytham sherd, Berks. no. 11, both features are present; the interior wall of the rim is markedly concave, while the exterior is decorated with the zig-zag motif of Oxon. no. 16 (Eynsham). In Oxon. no. 6 (Cassington) the rim is deepened and modified owing to the addition of a handle. This assertion of the rim is encountered in other districts, for example in Northamptonshire (B.A.P., I, no. 66, and at Fengate, Peterborough: Antiq. Journ., II, 225, fig. 5), in Staffordshire (B.A.P., I, nos. 55, 59 and 60), Huntingdonshire (ibid., no. 76) and Yorkshire (ibid., no. 107), to cite only a few examples. Its germs may be seen in beakers like that from Suffolk (ibid., no. 46). It does not, I believe, occur on A beakers in Wiltshire.

In all these the true A ancestry can be traced. Even the anomalous beaker from Hardwick, (Oxon. no. 22), almost biconoid in form and with a collar at the junction of neck (or rim) and body, can be brought into line with Oxon no.
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6 (Cassington) and Oxon. no. 16 (Eynsham : PLATE IV, A) if in the latter the handle be eliminated and with it the collar which, coinciding with the upper end of the handle, divides the exaggerated rim from the neck.

The noticeable feature of all these beakers is the variety of their decoration; lozenges, hatched or plain, hexagons, triangles and zig-zags. This multiplicity of ornamental motifs is a characteristic of the A groups of beakers, and even in the small number known from the Oxford district it comes out well, though it lacks the fine execution that is, for example, to be seen on A beakers from the Cambridge region.

(b) The B beakers. In this category the interesting fact that emerges from a survey of the new material is the smallness of the variation either of form or decoration. In form there is the same tendency for the graceful curves of the earlier shape as represented by the Cholsey beaker (Berks. no. 4 : PLATE III, G) with its widely everted rim and curving body to assume an angular line at the middle of the body, as in Oxon. no. 2 (Cassington) and Oxon. no. 29 (Stanton Harcourt). In decoration, the recognized conservatism of the makers of B beakers, with their adherence to a series of horizontal lines usually impressed with a toothed implement, e.g. Berks. no. 9 (Sutton Courtenay) and Oxon. nos. 2, 11 and 26 (Cassington, Clifton Hampden, and Summertown), is not infrequently modified by the insertion of bands filled with a herring-bone arrangement of comb-impressions, as Berks. no. 4 (Cholsey : PLATE III, G) and Oxon. nos. 1, 31 and 32 (Cassington, Stanton Harcourt and Yarnton). A kind of ladder pattern is similarly used on Berks. no. 8 (Radley) while Berks. no. 2 (Abingdon : PLATE III, F) is decorated with seven laddered bands without intervening single lines. One new feature is the addition of a collar to the clumsy Sutton Courtenay beaker (Berks. no. 9), thus defining the rim, a feature which is more marked on zonally decorated beakers in Yorkshire (B.A.P., 1, nos. 144 and 149).

The only other style of decoration in vogue among the B potters is that of vertically stabbed incisions, either roughly arranged in lines or scattered over the surface. A beaker (Oxon. no. 27) thus decorated was actually found at Summertown with another with the common linear ornamentation (B.A.P. 1, pl. ix, no. 75). The same decoration has appeared again on an unquestionable B beaker from Stanton Harcourt (Oxon. no. 30) and on poor specimens from Sutton Courtenay (Berks. no. 10), Cassington (Oxon. no. 3), and Polstead Road, Oxford (Oxon. no. 24).

(c) Hybrids. It is only natural to include in this review consideration of the mutual interaction of the two groups, both in form and in decoration. In the main it would seem that they did not produce any vital effect on one another in
form. Lord Abercromby’s type C, as Dr. Clark maintains, merely expresses
an elongation of the body at the expense of the neck, so producing oval bodies
like Berks. no. 1 (Abingdon), Oxon. nos. 15 and 28 (Eynsham and Stanton
Harcourt; PLATE III, D : III, C and FIG. 3, h). What is noteworthy is that, while
the B beakers show no sign of having adopted the A decorative schemes, it
seems certain that the zonal decoration of the three A beakers mentioned above
must be attributed to the influence of the B group.¹

2. Distribution and Origins. Here the material, enlarged as it is by striking
accessions, is particularly informative. When plotted on a map, it produces an
interesting and suggestive picture (FIG. 1). The A beakers have with the exception
of three (one from Appleford, and two from Lambourn) been found on the left
or Oxfordshire bank of the Thames, while the B beakers, though greatly pre­
dominating on the right bank, overflow to the other. If the picture presented
by this map is a true one, it at once raises three questions, (i) From what quarter
did the A and B elements respectively reach the district? (ii) Which of them
arrived first? and (iii) Which, if either, eventually predominated?

(i) To answer the first question it is necessary to cast back a little in time
and examine the conditions before the arrival of the beaker-folk. The area
covered by this review was at the close of the Neolithic Age more intimately
connected with the west (south-west) than with the east. In the west occurs a
culture, which is linked up with the pottery now known as Neolithic A, but
formerly as Windmill Hill after the hill-top camp near Avebury, where first
it appeared in any quantity and in its earliest recognisable forms. Its wide­
spread occurrence in Southern England has emerged from discoveries in
Sussex, Dorset and Devon (Hembury Fort), while its intimate relationship
with a series of ceramic output from Land’s End to Orkney is now a common­
place of archaeology. It also occurs in the Oxford district, but as yet is only
known at an advanced stage of development by a sherd (A.M. 1928.583) from
Wayland’s Smithy, on the Berkshire Downs, and by the extensive finds in the
mutilated camp at Abingdon Fishponds.² All this material, especially the
last, falls under the designation Neolithic A 2. Neolithic A 1 is still to seek in
the district.³

With A 2, however, an interesting stage is reached, one at which a new
element begins to appear represented by Neolithic B (formerly Peterborough)

¹ Three examples of Lord Abercromby’s C, namely B.A.P., 1, nos. 115, 122 and 123 from
Yorkshire, in which the lengthening of the body is exaggerated, have this scheme of decoration.
Compare also three more recent discoveries, Gellygaer, Glam., Baginton, Warwicks., and Inkpen,
Berks. (Antiq. Journ., III, 21–3, fig.; XII, 171, fig.; and XVI, 97, pl. xxxii, 2).
³ On the distribution of Neolithic pottery see Mr. Stuart Piggott’s valuable paper in Arch.
Journ. lxxxviii, 67–158.
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ware, a class which occurs at various sites in the Eastern Counties, and also in an appreciable quantity along the lower course of the Thames up to Reading, and is represented in the Oxford district by bowls from the river at Mongewell, numerous sherds from Asthall, Eynsham, Cassington, and near Astrop, Northants., and by two small fragments from the encampment at Abingdon. It occurs also in Wessex. At Windmill Hill this ware was found along with beaker-ware separated by a sterile layer from both Neolithic A and B.¹

A find (see Appendix III) at Cassington provides a somewhat different context. A small hut-pit, only a few yards from the site of a discovery of typical Neolithic B sherds produced an interesting assembly of fragments (Plate V, B). Some of them are difficult to place: they are not quite like anything else from the district, and, to judge from the firing of several pieces they may represent that long-sought material, the other local domestic wares of the Early Bronze Age, for these can hardly be covered entirely by beakers together with the one or two food-vessels, the relative date of which it is difficult to determine. Among the Cassington sherds particular attention is called to three items: (a) four sherds of a brown, summarily fired, vessel, with rounded rim, hollow neck with a slight bulge below, and a faint finger-nail decoration, parts of a vessel in which can be detected a Neolithic A 2 tradition, if not indeed an actual A 2 form (Plate V, B, 4); (b) two sherds (possibly from one vase) of black, greasy ware with a red exterior layer and incised linear decoration, too small to admit of certain definition, but suspiciously reminiscent of some local beakers (Plate V, B, 9–10); and (c) a small sherd of well-potted beaker-ware mixed with finely triturated shell-grit, and neatly decorated with horizontal and diagonal lines, impressed by a thin implement with flat, rectangular teeth, and with fine, stabbed incisions (Plate V, B, 12). In the quality of its ware and delicacy of its ornamentation it differs from any other beaker so far discovered in the district. It must be an import, but whence? Its decoration, zonal in character, is that of the B beakers and thus, as Dr. Clark has shown, belongs to a group which pervades the south-east and south of England from eastern Suffolk and Essex to Wiltshire and the West Country, and penetrated up stream to the Upper Thames. The ware is harder to place, but with its pounded shell it might well come from the Berkshire Downs or even from Wiltshire.² Shell-grit was the material normally used by the Abingdon Neolithic potters.

There is no entirely parallel comparative group on the A beaker side, but postulating acceptance of an original thrust (so far as it affected the southern Midlands and beyond) of beaker-folk from the east coast between northern

¹ Ibid., p. 83.
² Mr. Stuart Piggott, who had seen the fragment and remarked upon it, inclines, in answer to an enquiry, to the latter source.
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Suffolk and the Wash, the Astrop find may have some significance, because along with familiar types of Neolithic B pottery was one unusual piece of greasy black ware, from the lower part of a vase that can hardly be other than an imitation of a beaker by a native (i.e. pre-beaker-folk) potter. Such a discovery high up the Cherwell on the Northamptonshire side of the valley marks a stage on the road south-westwards from the Wash. It is most probably from the Nene Valley that the bulk of the A beaker potters spread to the Upper Thames, rather than from Cambridgeshire. Several affinities in form and decoration exist in the former region, though it must be remembered that there is little reason to believe that the beakers under review were other than locally made. As a group, leaving entirely aside the Lambourn beakers, that from Appleford and possibly even the smaller specimen from Oxford (Polstead Road), the rest, in spite of their often elaborate decoration, are typologically late. This is to some extent confirmed by the similarly late facies of the B beakers found in close proximity to them in the Cassington and Eynsham cemeteries.

(ii) Which group arrived first? On all counts one would expect it to be the B group, but, strangely enough there are faint indications that it was the A group, though it made but a passing visit (p. 17). One of the Lambourn beakers (PLATE III, A) is typologically as early an A beaker as could be desired. It stands on a level with some of the finest examples of both A and B, the occurrence of which in Wiltshire led Lord Abercromby to postulate an earliest incursion of both groups by way of the south coast. One objection noted by Dr. Clark is the comparative rarity of A beakers on or near that coast, and the existence of a marked block of B beakers between the coast and Salisbury plain. It would seem that, even if the B beakers arrived by the south coast, or at any rate along a southern line, the A beakers came across country from the East. Whatever the real facts may be, may not the occurrence of examples of both groups side by side in Wiltshire be explained by an equally insistent urge on both parties of the newcomers to establish their footing by that surest means, seizure and occupation of the principal religious centres, of the existence of which they must have been fully apprised already long before their landing in force?

The two beakers from the Downs have actually little in common with those from the Valley and it is doubtful whether the priority of settlement in the Oxford district can be safely claimed for either group, for no other beaker whether of the A or B class, unless it be the Cholsey beaker (PLATE III, G) or the thin-walled, neatly decorated example from Radley (Berk. no. 8), appears to stand on a level with the Lambourn beaker. Any favourable balance, however,

1 The whole question of the B beakers has been raised anew by Mr. Stuart Piggott in 'The Early Bronze Age in Wessex,' Proc. Prehist. Soc., 1938, pp. 52 ff., published since this paper was written.
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must be given to the B group who, arriving from the south, managed to establish themselves even on the left bank at Summertown, Yarnton, Cassington and Stanton Harcourt, at each of which places have been found one or more beakers ornamented with a closely similar zonal decoration, which includes two bands filled with a herring-bone arrangement of comb-impressed lines. The Cassington example (Oxon. no. 1) was found over 200 yards distant from the compact group of burials, which constituted the cemetery and yielded all the A beakers from that locality. Near by was found the neat B beaker with the characteristic horizontal lines (Oxon. no. 2); this latter type again was found at Summertown in association with a smaller beaker covered with stabbed incisions. The truth is that the decoration of the B beakers is no reliable criterion of date; the combination of lines with herring-bone was evidently a favourite and long-lived ornamental system: it recurs in almost every district and at every period of the beaker's life.

One thing, however, does seem certain. Settlement by makers of A beakers was initially desultory and sporadic; it is only late in the A beakers' history that they appear in any number and are then heavy and often clumsy pieces of work. They belong to people who encroach from the north-east on an area which was gradually being occupied by settlers from the south and south-east, but this encroachment was possibly only of temporary duration.

The discoveries at Cassington and Eynsham suggest that the beaker-cemeteries are due to the A group; burials of B beakers in similar groups have not so far been recorded. At Cassington grave included in the cemetery was the only one containing a B beaker, and again this grave (see Antiq. Journ., xiv, pl. xlii) actually lay some 30 yards away from the rest.

(iii) Which of them eventually predominated? The short answer to this is, neither. In support of it two lines of argument are available. In the first place the Early Bronze Age settlers on the Thames terraces were essentially mixed.whatever they may have been on Salisbury Plain. The dictum ' round barrow, round skull ' has no meaning in the Oxford district. As already recorded (Antiq. Journ., l.c.) the skeletal material from the Cassington cemetery revealed a remarkable range of skull-types, extending almost to the limits of brachycephaly and dolichocephaly. Of seven skulls which were capable of measurement, the cephalic indices recorded are: Male, c. 65, 68, 71, 72, 79 and 87, and Female, c. 88. Skulls from the new cemetery at Eynsham have shown indices of: Male, 72.5, 74.45, 77 (2 exx.) 78.72, 80, 80.3, and Female, 73.5,
74.5, 77.84. This evidence points at any rate on the A side to that process of intermingling and absorption, which, seen in its earliest stages at Fengate, Peterborough, was responsible for the disappearance of the round-headed invaders among the later population of Britain.

Similar evidence about the owners or makers of B beakers is scantier. At Sutton Courtenay was found a woman with cephalic index of 82 with the beaker, Berks. no. 9, but in close proximity there were numerous burials, without beakers or with sub-neolithic pottery, of moderately dolichocephalic individuals. From Wytham Rolleston records a burial in a grave of unusual dimensions (8 ft. deep, 10 ft. long and 5½ ft. wide) of a brachycephalic, adult man (cephalic index, 82), accompanied by a fragment of a polished stone axe and flints. It is, however, unfortunately not recorded what human remains, if any, were found with the large sherd from Wytham (Berks. no. 11) and, equally regrettably, the skull from the Summertown burial (Oxon. nos. 26 and 27) is not preserved in the Department of Human Anatomy.

3. Evidences of Contact. Sir Cyril Fox in surveying the handled beakers interpreted the occurrence of one at Cwm-du, Brecknockshire, as indicative of a westerly advance of beaker-folk across the Lowland to the Highland zone, and marked the Abingdon beaker (Berks. no. 1) as a milestone on their road. Recently the 80-mile gap between the two places has in some sense been filled by the discovery and recording of beakers in the Cotswolds. Nevertheless, his choice of Abingdon as marking the route of movement was at least prophetic. When compared with the recently discovered beaker from Eynsham (Oxon. no. 16: PLATE IV, A) the Cwm-du beaker presents such striking analogies of form and decorative composition—even though the latter differs in details—that their close relationship appears to be beyond dispute. Equally suggestive is a comparison of the Cassington beaker (Oxon. no. 8) with one from Brigmston, Wilts. One of the latest finds at Eynsham (Oxon. no. 20) associated with a flat bronze knife, the bone pommel and bronze haft-rivets of which were also preserved (FIG. 6), points in a most significant manner in a backward direction and that by reason of its ornamentation. The upper half is decorated with vertical columns of A motives, incised by the nails of the thumb.

2 The condition of affairs observed in the Upper Thames Valley is paralleled in Yorkshire, but it has been noted that the skulls from round barrows in Wiltshire are in the main brachycephalic, as are those from the short cists in Aberdeenshire (T. Rice Holmes, *Ancient Britain*, p. 420).
3 Arch. Cambrensis, LXXX, 13, fig. 3.
5 The pommel may be compared with that from Manton, Wilts., (Proc. Prehistoric Soc., 1938, p. 70, fig. 8, 12). Mr. Piggott in the same paper (pp. 59-60) makes some pertinent observations about flat daggers or knives.
and one finger operating together, and the same technique is repeated in horizontal bands around the rim and the junction of neck and body. There is nothing peculiar in the technique itself, but the disposition of the ornament can hardly be other than a reminiscence of the rusticated ware\(^1\) which is known not only in complete beakers \(\textit{e.g.}\) Harston, Leics.\(^2\) (\textit{Plate}\ IV, D) and Snailwell, Cambs.\(^3\) but also from an occupation-site at Fifty Farm, Mildenhall Fen, in the same county, and Clacton, Essex.\(^4\) Both the feebleness of the reminiscence and the use of B beaker nail-impressions over the lower part of the vase bear additional witness to the lateness of the inroad from farther north and east.

When Sir Cyril Fox published his paper in 1925 the intermediate links in the chain of westward movement were lacking. These have now been supplied in ample measure from the Oxford district, and this group is again linked up with the west by the Cotswold route, on which there appears at Bourton-on-the-Water, Gloucs., a beaker closely related in form to Cassington and Eynsham examples.\(^5\)

In the Middle Bronze Age the movement appears to have slackened off. Fine food-vessels like those of the Derbyshire and Yorkshire moors are entirely wanting. Their place is taken by miniature copies of the overhanging-rim urn, or atypical vases that in some cases seem to hark back to a native neolithic tradition. A minor instance, however, of this half-way rôle is afforded by the discovery at Wytham\(^6\) of one of those curious shell (or ivory, according to Thur- nam) hooks, of which three are preserved in Devizes Museum,\(^7\) two from cremation-burials at Normanton, Wilts., the third from an unknown site, and two are known from Yorkshire, from Wath and Slingsby, found in cinerary-urns.\(^8\) But broadly speaking the disassociation of north and south becomes more and more pronounced and the Oxford district ceases to act as an intermediary, when in the Late Bronze Age it comes under the stress of new immigrations from the south. These first introduced the uncouth vessels with knobs and applied bands like those from Long Wittenham urn-field,\(^9\) and later the

---

\(^1\) \textit{Cambridge Ant. Soc. Comm.}, xxxv, 125, pl. ii, at Fifty Farm, Mildenhall Fen, Cambs.
\(^2\) Ashmolean Museum, 1927,620. The site is not quite certain; the beaker was presented by Miss Marsh of Beeston, Notts., with other antiquities collected by her uncle from ironstone-workings at Harston, Leics., Desborough, Northants., and elsewhere. The provenience was communicated to the writer by Miss Marsh after her uncle's death, but the vase certainly came from an east midland site.
\(^3\) \textit{B.A.P.}, 1, pl. viii, no. 65.
\(^4\) \textit{Proc. Prehistoric Soc.}, 1936, pp. 189-190, fig. 3, no. 5.
\(^6\) British Museum, Greenwell Collection, no. 1785.
\(^7\) R. Colt Houre, \textit{Ancient Wilts.}, 1, 200, pl. xxiv; \textit{Catalogue of the Museum at Devizes}, Pt. 1, nos. 103, 124 (fig.) and 124c.
\(^8\) \textit{Archaeologia}, xlIII, 441, fig. 144; Greenwell and Rolleston, \textit{British Barrows}, p. 352, fig. 7.
\(^9\) \textit{E.g. Antiq. Journ.}, ix, 153 f. and fig.
pottery with finger-tip decoration, like that from Stanlake. This is the fore­
runner of the Iron Age A pottery, the early arrival of which in the Upper
Thames Valley was described by Mr. H. N. Savory in the last volume of
Oxoniensia. The Late Bronze Age wares are brought by immigrants who can,
as the final event shows, have introduced no pronounced brachycephalic element
into the population as did the beaker-folk. Their larger ceramic products are
repeated in miniature by clumsy, uncouth vases which must have served as
goblets and the like. The beaker, and with it its makers, is already lost in the
mists of prehistoric antiquity.

At Eynsham a further discovery (Appendix i, p. 25) marks the passing of
the beaker-age. This is a cremation-burial contained in a large vase of the over­
hanging-rim type (Plate v, A). The vessel has a deep rim, an equally deep
hollow neck, and a body tapering rapidly towards the base. The lip is bevelled
interiorly and decorated transversely with short cord-impressions: on the rim
are three horizontal lines and three rows of vertical impressions in the same
technique: the neck has four similar rows: the body is plain. The urn
measures \(11\frac{3}{4}\) ins. in height and \(10\frac{1}{4}\) ins. at its greatest diameter. It belongs
generically to the earliest class of the Bronze Age cinerary-urn, in which the
tripartite structure, rim, hollow neck and body, is well marked, preserving
the traditional features of some Neolithic B or Peterborough ware. Other
examples from the district are urns from Stanton Harcourt and Stadhampton,
and the three specimens well illustrate one of the changes this class of vessel
underwent. The Stanton Harcourt urn is decorated with vertical zigzag lines
executed in cord-impressed technique, in a style of decoration prevalent on
Neolithic B pottery; on the Eynsham urn the zig-zag has faded out into simple
vertical lines, while the maker of the Stadhampton vessel though preserving the
scheme of decoration has been content to produce it by simple incision.

The later fortunes of the Eynsham settlement have in part been revealed by
Major Allen's air-photographs of the two fields immediately east of that con­
taining the beaker-cemetery.\(^1\) Only excavation can disclose all its secrets, but
comparison with other local sites of a similar character where excavation has
taken place suggests that at no time in the Bronze Age did the settlement lose
its identity; as time went on, it merely shifted to clean ground some hundred
yards away.

The same phenomena have been even more fully demonstrated at Cassing­
ton. North of the Oxford Northern By-pass is the site of discoveries of Ne­
olithie B pottery and of the pits which contained the group of sherds described
above (Plate v, B): beakers were found sporadically on the line of the by-pass

\(^{1}\) Antiquity, vii, 293, pl. iv.
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itself close to the Cassington-Eynsham crossing, while the beaker-cemetery, as already stated, lay 200 yards away south-eastwards. West of a line uniting these three points cremation-burials and ring ditches came to light in the same field south of the by-pass: westwards again, Major Allen’s aerial photography has shown this later phase of the Bronze Age occupation to extend as far as Cassington Mill. In the Iron Age, to judge from pits excavated more or less continuously since 1931,1 the settlement shifted back to the ground previously inhabited in late Neolithic times.

APPENDIX I (PLATE II and FIGS. 4-5)

SCHEDULE AND DESCRIPTION OF GRAVES IN THE BEAKER-CEMETERY AT EYNSHAM, OXON., WITH NOTES BY CAPT. C. MUSGRAVE

Only the depth of the grave in the gravel is given: the overlying soil was uniformly 1 ft. deep, except in grave 1, where it was 1 ft. 6 ins.

Skeleton-numbers are those allotted to them in the Department of Human Anatomy, University of Oxford.


2. About 7 ft. × 5 ft.; depth 3 ft.; orientation c. 310°. Ash on floor and up to 6 ins. on walls. Male, c. 50 yrs. (E. 11.3/262); cephalic index 77; stature 5 ft. 6 ins. No grave-goods. Partly excavated by workmen, June, 1937.

3. 8 ft. × 5 ft.; depth 3 ft. 6 ins.; orient. 320°. Ash on floor. Male, 25–30 yrs. (E. 11.3/263), lying facing l. and almost face downwards; arms fully flexed in front of chest; l. leg three parts flexed, r. fully flexed with heel drawn up under hip; knees respectively slightly below and above line of pelvis. Dolichocephalic (skull warped); stat. 5 ft. 7½ ins. With handled beaker (Oxon. no. 16: PLATE IV, A) in front of pelvis. Partly excavated by workmen, June, 1937 (PLATE II, D).

4. 3 ft. × 4 ft.; depth 2 ft. 9 ins.; orient. 90°. Layer of ash 4 ins. to 6 ins. deep round sides and head of grave. Male, c. 50 yrs. (E. 11.3/264), lying facing l., almost face downwards; r. arm fully flexed with hand under r. shoulder; l. arm extended, hand under r. knee; knees fully flexed, heels a few inches from the pelvis. Dolichocephalic (C.I. c. 74.4%, skull slightly warped); stat. 5 ft. 8½ ins. Large beaker (Oxon. no. 17: PLATE IV, B) behind pelvis, standing on and partly surrounded by ash. Excavated by C.M., June 28, 1937.

5. 6 ft. × 4 ft.; depth 6 ft. 2 ins.; orient. 345°. Ash on floor surrounding and piled 1 ft. high in front of skeleton. Male, c. 50 yrs. (E. 11.3/265), lying on l. side, arms fully flexed; l. knee drawn up to chest; r. knee in line with pelvis. Mesoccephalic (C.I. c. 80, but skull badly warped); stat. 5 ft. 8 ins. Cervical vertebrae synostosed owing to arthritis. No grave-goods. Excavated by C.M., July 5, 1937.

1 Antiq. Journ., xv, 33 ff.
6. 8 ft. 3 ins. × 5 ft.; depth 5 ft. 4 ins.; orient. 320°. Ash on floor. Male (E. 11.3/266), lying supine, with knees fully flexed, extended in line with body, feet turned up under r. hip; l. arm flexed with hand to chin, r. arm extended, hand on pelvis. Stat. 5 ft. 7½ ins. No grave-goods. Excavated by C.M., July 18, 1937 (Plate II, A).

7. 7 ft. × 5 ft.; depth 2 ft. 6 ins.; orient. 320°. Little ash on floor, but signs of burning reaching nearly 1 ft. up walls. Female, c. 50 yrs. (E. 11.3/267), crouched on r. side; l. arm fully flexed, hand on l. shoulder; r. knee fully flexed and clasped to r. shoulder by fully flexed r. arm; l. knee fully flexed with knee drawn up to r. elbow, and heel touching pelvis. C.I. 74.5; stat. 5 ft. 5 ins. No grave-goods. Excavated by C.M., August 11, 1937.

8. 5 ft. × 4 ft. 6 ins.; depth 4 ft.; orient. 360°. Disturbed during holiday. Examined by C.M., August 4, 1937.

N.B.—A beaker (Oxon. no. 18: PLATE III, E) found (September, 1937) concealed in bushes, evidently abandoned by discoverer after its collapse, may have come from this grave (or possibly no. 7).

9. 6 ft. × 4 ft.; depth 3 ft.; orient. 355°. Black and grey ash on floor around skeleton and for 6 ins. up walls. Female, c. 50 yrs. (E. 11.3/268), lying on r. side, r. arm fully flexed with hand under r. cheek; l. arm partly flexed, hand on r. arm-pit; both legs fully flexed, knees level with hips, heels almost touching pelvis. Dental disease (caries and apical abscesses). C.I. c. 73.5 (skull slightly warped); stat. c. 5 ft. 3 ins. No grave-goods. Partly excavated by workmen, September 1, 1937.

10. 7 ft. × 4 ft.; depth 6 ft.; orient. 320°. Black and grey ash covering floor except beneath skeleton; small patch of black ash on chest. Male, c. 30 yrs. (E. 11.3/269), facing l. with chin on l. shoulder; r. arm partly flexed, hand under l. arm-pit; l. arm extended, elbow slightly flexed, hand on pelvis; knees drawn up level with hips. C.I. 72.5; stat. 5 ft. 10½ ins. No grave-goods. Excavated by C.M., September 6, 1937 (PLATE II, B).


13. 3 ft. × 2 ft.; depth 3 ft.; reported orientation, c. 150° (?). Child, sex not ascertained, c. 5 yrs. No grave-goods. Excavated by workmen, January 19, 1938.

14. 6 ft. × 4 ft.; depth 3 ft.; orient. 5°. Ash on floor. Male, c. 35 yrs. (E. 11.3/272), lying in contracted position on l. side. C.I. 80.3; stat. 5 ft. 10 ins. Beaker (Oxon. no. 19) behind pelvis. Dug by workman, January 19, 1938.

15. 5 ft. 6 ins. × 3 ft.; depth 2 ft.; orient. 360°. Dark-coloured sand, but no ash on floor. Male, c. 60 yrs. (E. 11.3/273), lying on l. side with limbs fully flexed and so tightly contracted against the trunk that they must have been bound in that position before burial. Right tibia and fibula synostosed 2 ins. above ankle; teeth very worn and decayed (caries). C.I. 77; stat. c. 5 ft. 8 ins. Beaker (Oxon. no. 20: PLATE IV, c) behind pelvis; bronze dagger (FIG. 6) on chest between upper arms. Excavated by C.M., February 23, 1938 (PLATE II, c).
16. 7 ft. x 5 ft.; depth 5 ft. 6 ins.; orient. 330°. Black and grey ash on floor. Male, c. 50 yrs. (E. 11.3/274), lying on l. side with knees fully flexed and drawn up level with hips; l. arm extended to knees with hand turned inwards; r. arm half flexed with hand turned up towards shoulder and lying along l. forearm. Skull (badly

FIG. 4
FOXLEY FARM, EYNHAM, OXON.
Plan of gravel-pit, showing site of Bronze Age cemetery.
FIG. 5
FOXLEY FARM, EYNSHAM, OXON.
Plan of Bronze Age cemetery.

24
FOXLEY FARM, EYNSHAM, OXON.
Bronze Age graves, nos. 6, 10, 15 and 3 (see pp. 21 ff.).

Pho. C. Musgrave,
PLATE III

BEAKERS.

Plks. A, B, G British Museum; C-F, H Ashmolean Museum.
PLATE IV

BEAKERS.
A–C, Eynsham, Oxon.; D, Harston, Leics. (3).
See Appendix ii, pp. 26 ff.
Phk. Ashmolean Museum.
PLATE V

A. EYNSHAM, OXON. Bronze Age cremation-urn; see p. 25 (a).

B. CASSINGTON, OXON. Sherds from an Early Bronze Age pit; see p. 15, and Appendix III (b).

Phx. Ashmolean Museum.
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warped) has been trephined. No grave-goods, but lightly cremated bones of a young adult female behind and in contact with the pelvis, in the position normally occupied by a beaker. Excavated by C.M., March 17, 1938.

The overhanging-rim urn (A.M. 1938.217: PLATE V, A, and see p. 20) was said to have been found about 10 ft. west of this grave, in a pit resembling the graves, about 3 ft. deep. It contained a cremation-burial.


18. 5 ft. 6 ins. x 4 ft.; depth 2 ft. 6 ins.; orient. 10°. Ash on floor. Female, c. 40 yrs. (E. 11.3/279), lying on I. side in contracted position. C.I. 77.84; stat. c. 5 ft. 4 ins. Teeth very worn and decayed (caries and apical abscesses). Beaker (Oxon. no. 21) at feet; bronze awl on body. Excavated by Mr. John Daniell, August 9, 1938.

Although their cephalic indices range from 72.5 to 80.3, the occupants of the graves seem to belong to a uniform and readily recognisable type, fairly tall and rather slenderly built with coffin-shaped skulls and narrow, rather retreating foreheads, with massive brow-ridges, a feature common to both sexes, though less pronounced in the females. The latter especially display considerable uniformity, having cephalic indices of 73.5, 74.5 and 77.84, and statures of 5 ft. 3 ins, 5 ft. 5 ins. and 5 ft. 4 ins. The males range in stature from 5 ft. 5 ins. to 5 ft. 10½ ins., the two tallest having the greatest cephalic index, 80.3, and the least, 72.5, respectively. The adults had mostly lived to a ripe old age, seven having died at the age of fifty or over, and four at ages between twenty-five and forty. Their teeth were strong and in good condition, a sign of good health and a good mixed diet, only the oldest male (he with the bronze dagger in grave 15) and two of the females showing any sign of dental disease (caries or apical abscesses), which in the case of the latter may perhaps be attributed to child-bearing. A damaged shin (no. 15) and a stiffened neck due to arthritis (no. 5) are the only other signs of disease discernible upon their bones.

The graves were orientated more or less N.–S., except no. 4, which was E.: nos. 11, 12, 13, not seen by a trained observer, are inserted as reported by the workmen, whose observations may not be reliable. Nine bodies lay on their left side, two on the right, one on the back inclined to left.

The graves, with the exception of no. 15, were uniformly rectangular in shape and varied in depth (in the gravel) from 2 ft. 6 ins. to 6 ft. 2 ins. On the floor a layer of grey, or sometimes black, ash completely surrounded the skeleton (it never lay beneath or upon the bones) and extended a little way up the walls. In every case the skeleton itself lay upon a thin layer of soft, grey sand, apparently in the attitude in which death had found it (again with the exception of no. 15, which had apparently been tightly bound into a bundle before rigor mortis set in). The surrounding layer of ash would appear to be derived from faggots of brushwood placed round the walls of the grave and fired after the body had been laid in position, perhaps with the idea of driving away the spirit of the dead person so that it should not linger near the body and disturb the surviving members of the community.

There is no sign of any mound or barrow having been erected over the graves, each having been filled with the material dug out in making it. The only depressions
discovered in the gravel in the vicinity were four large post-holes (A–D) 3 ft. in diameter and 1½ to 2½ ft. deep, one of which (C) contained the charred outline of the butt-end of a post 2 ft. in diameter; two others (A, B) are said to have contained charcoal, the fourth (D) was blank. There were also some shallow ditches containing Romano-British pottery.

Apart from the first grave in 1930 credit for discovery of the cemetery belongs to Mr. S. Russell, foreman for Mr. Baskerville, of the South Oxford Garage, who with Messrs. Dix of Freeland, has worked that part of the gravel-pit in which the graves occurred. He recognised as human the skeletons in graves 2 and 3, and as ancient pottery the beaker found in grave 3, and promptly reported the matter. Thanks are further due to him for having kept the Museum advised of all subsequent discoveries, and for preserving the remains, when, as sometimes occurred, conditions of work did not allow them to be left in position until they could be scientifically excavated; also to the lessees of the pit and their employees who have given every facility for the work, and especially to the owner of the land, Mr. W. Hoskins, of Abbey Farm, Eynsham, for permission to excavate courteously granted and for having most generously presented to the Museum the resultant finds.

APPENDIX II

SCHEDULE OF BEAKERS FROM THE OXFORD DISTRICT

Abbreviations: A.M. = Ashmolean Museum.
B.M. = British Museum.
Rouletted = Made with a toothed implement, but probably not a wheel.

**Berkshire.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>B Chelsey.</td>
<td>[B.M. 1893, 4-26, 8]. Rouletted horizontal lines and herringbone; H. 6 ins.; D. 6 ins.; PLATE III, G. V.C.H. Berks., 1, 194; B.A.P., 1, pl. vi, no. 22; H. Peake, Berkshire, pp. 48, 187.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H. Peake, Berkshire, p. 171, also records: 'Bronze Age...; gravel-pit, Radley Road, beaker (Proc. Soc. Ant., 2 ser. ii, 248–9)'. 'This is not a beaker, but a miniature cinerary urn of "overhanging-rim" type.' I am indebted to the Keeper of the Department of British and Mediaeval Antiquities in the British Museum for this correction.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lambourn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[A.M. 1936.330]. Fragmentary; horizontal lines executed with a blunt point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Radley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[A.M. unnumbered]. Fragment of large beaker with bevelled incurved rim; incised lozenges and lines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Oxfordshire.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Cassington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27
No.  Type   | [A.M. 1935.63a]. From a pit. Sherd with shell-grit; fine stabs and rouletted horizontal lines.
9.  B Cassington. | [A.M. 1935.66]. From same pit as no. 9. Two sherds without grit; incised lines.
10.  | [A.M. unnumbered]. Fragment; handled; incised triangles above, zig-zag band below.
15.  | [A.M. 1937.1619]. Lightly incised; hexagons, triangles (above), trellis (below); H. 9 ins.; D. 7½ ins. PLATE IV, B. (Appendix I, no. 4).
18.  A | [Private]. With triangular flat bronze knife (L. 2½ ins.) with bone pommel and three bronze rivets from a decayed wooden handle (fig. 6). Below a flattened rim a slight hollow with a band of nail-incisions arranged in > pairs, though for the greater part of the circumference only one nail has made contact; on the upper part of the vase similar pairs of nail-incisions are arranged in closely-set vertical columns of A; the lower half decorated with single vertical nail-marks impressed haphazard; H. 8½ ins.; D. 6 ins. PLATE IV, C. (Appendix I, no. 15).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[A.M. 1889.7]. Vertical stabs; H. 8 ins.; D. 5½ ins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FIG. 6**

FOXLEY FARM, EYNSHAM, OXON.

Bronze dagger with bronze tubular rivets from haft and bone pommel from grave 15; see Appendix 1 (4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[B.M. Greenwell Coll., no. 1789]. From same grave as last, with flint arrow-head; vertical stabs; H. 4½ ins.; D. 4 ins. Archaeologia, lxxvi, 93, 97.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No.  Type

APPENDIX III
CONTENTS OF AN EARLY BRONZE AGE OCCUPATION-PIT AT CASSINGTON, OXON.

(Ashmolean Museum 1935.66;  plate v, b)

1–2.  Rims, brown ware, tinged red; one showing groove of coil-made pottery.
3.  Rim of small vase, deep red ware; angled moulding on outside, bevelled interiorly.
4.  Sherds of bowl ?; brown ware with reddish tinge; rounded rim, with hollow below succeeded by a wider hollow above the shoulder; decoration apparently consisting of columns of faint twin nail-impressions arranged in a manner similar to that on the Eynsham beaker (plate iv, c).
5.  Sherd, red exteriorly; diagonal and horizontal incised lines.
6.  Sherd of thick pale red ware, from base of neck; stab-decoration.
7–8.  Sherds; light red; incised V decoration.
9–10.  Sherds, possibly from the same vase, thin, red exteriorly (the one black inside; the other pale red due to secondary firing after breakage); thin, incised trellised lines.
11.  Sherds of thick, red ware, with faint decoration similar to that on no. 4.
12.  Sherd of beaker, ware mixed with finely pounded shell; fired red on outside only; thin, rouletted lines and small stabbed incisions.
13.  Sherd of thick, light red ware; flat, horizontal mouldings with traces of three bands of diagonal incisions in the grooves.
14.  Sherd of thick, red vessel of large size; undecorated.
15.  Flint scraper; flat 'duck-bill' type, 3/8 in. long.
16–17.  Flint flakes; the one with serrations, the other with some secondary chipping along one edge.