

This now becomes 5edfyf2 and the rest of what was in it (re XIA) becomes 5edfyf3 pjf 30iii96

this now superceded: File 5edfyf2b.doc, a subdivision of 5edfyf2 made 24.ii.96 when printed out (@ 5400 wds) to follow 5edfyf2a and be followed by 5edfyf3. Embraces ODXI/A, underneath the lynchet, and East 2 and 3. pjf.

### The lynchet across OD XI/A (fig. 00)

Eventually, quite a large area of both the lynchet and the area underneath it was excavated on OD XI/A (fig. 5.00). In addition to Pits 1-3, PHs 5-10 and Gullies 1 and 2, many other features, mainly PHs, were recorded in plan, with few exceptions cut into the Chalk. These have all been catalogued and the data are available in the Archive (the catalogue contains the data of all features recorded **Beneath the Lynchet** , FWP %%, including those from OD XI/ B and C, *below* p. 00 and 00).

On XI/A, the most significant feature apparently associated with and underlying the lynchet was a line of post-holes (fig. 5.00). A similar phenomenon appeared in OD XI/B but not, significantly, so it is argued, in XI/C. On XI/A, the PHs picked out for interpretation as a line of posts are highlighted on fig. 5. 00: obviously the process is selective and, in the absence of conclusive evidence contained within them, any one PH could belong to any phase of activity on the site. Furthermore, while a convincing line can be perceived, its members are not exclusive: other post-holes immediately to either side could well represent replacements or adjustments in what is envisaged as a structural field boundary i.e. the post-holes are envisaged as marking some form of fence. This lay across the former settlement area, perhaps only recently abandoned, as it was reclaimed for arable farming. The evidence for this interpretation was primarily that PHs 43 and 31, arguably part of the line, were cut respectively into Pit 2 and Gully 1 (fig. 5.00, !!!!!). The line was also persuasively taken up again in the cutting immediately S of Gully 1 where PHs 1, 3, 4 and 5, all cut into Chalk, seemed to represent the continuation of the `fence` after its intersection with the settlement features.

### The Stratigraphy in Area East 1 (fig. 5.00)

*For GFs not mentioned below, see ARCHIVE FWP2, Underneath the Lynchet (now 503fyf.doc).*

#### Layer ①/②

Layer 1 and 2 were essentially the same layer in origin, sorted since medieval or earlier times by worms. The result is an upper structureless dark brown rendzina topsoil above a thin layer of debris from it consisting mainly of flints and man-made objects.

The RB date of the topsoil's cultivation was again indicated by iron nails (**SF1**, **GF 201**, **GF216**).

#### Layer ③

Contained imitation samian, Savernake ware, EIA sherds (**GF211**, which also records a brooch otherwise unmentioned) and some metal objects .

**SF3 (fig. 00)** was an iron ploughshare fragment of Iron Age type, presumably used here and possibly broken (and discarded?) in use. It may, like the nails and some of the pottery, also be of RB date/use but, like the bulk of the artefacts in layer 2, it could equally well, and more probably, be of EIA date and use. Either way, it seems likely that it may have scored some of the ardmarks later recorded over the site but unconceptualised at the time of the recovery of this object, the nature of which was not recognised until 1995.

**GF233**, and probably **GF234**, included an RB nail

**SF4** was an unidentified coin.

**SF5** was an oval iron ring

### **Layer ③**

Layer ③ was a fine light grey soil with fewer flints and small fragments of chalk

**GF375** included an RB nail among! EIA potsherds, flint flakes, animal bones and snail shells.

**Layer ③a** was the soil below flints over the forward face of the lynchet.

### **Layer ③/④**

### **Layer ④**

**GF256** included an RB nail

The presence of RB nails in all four layers indicated deposition from domestic midden(s) of manure on arable, here represented by layers 1 and 2. It also strongly suggested subsequent disturbance resulting in movement thence to layers 3 and 4 which, in this area, were only a few centimetres lower. Rabbits had been active here.

**Miscellaneous:** two parallel shallow grooves c 1 m apart and hollowed into the surface of the Chalk lay across the area N of Gully 2. After `disappearing` in a disturbed area, they re-appeared to lie over Gully 1. They seemed the latest `structure` on the site, everywhere cutting all settlement features and ard-marks; but the record shows the more westerly being cut by a PH and the more easterly overlaid by an ard-mark. Nevertheless, they are probably modern, probably something to do with the military activity here in the 1940s. They are not therefore shown on the published plans.

### **Area XI/A East 2 & 3 (but excluding East 4, above p. 00; fig. ++)**

A rectangular area of c 840 sq. m. (1000 sq. yds) contained the focus of the EIA settlement area as excavated, including two successive, large timber structures. It was thought to be roughly in the centre of the enclosed settlement during much of its excavation but, as cutting East 4 showed, the area lay immediately inside the eastern perimeter ditch (fig. 5.00). It was much occupied by pits, post-holes and ard-marks, all EIA or earlier. The whole was overlaid by a scatter of RB material.

This area lay 4 (2?) ft. E of Area East 1 and consisted of two 50 ft. squares (henceforth E2 and E3) with a 2 ft. baulk between them. This was eventually removed. Overall, turf and c 15 cms of topsoil were removed mechanically; thereafter everything was trowelled, cleaned, and brushed by hand. The squares were excavated in successive years (1967-68) on an open-plan basis but, although this Area was the most extensive investigated as one, it was never all visible at the same time. A small extension made to the N to encompass a chalk gully (G8), and an extension (EAST 4) made to the E intersected the settlement enclosure ditch (*above p. \*\**).

The whole area was covered with ridge-and-furrow, scarcely visible on the ground but a reminder that this apparently `undisturbed` old grassland was arable some seven centuries ago. Partly as a result, the stratigraphy was basically uniform, as elsewhere on the site: grass, some 18-20 cms. of topsoil, layer 2 of flint and other `heavy` material such as sarsen chips, and then the surface of the Chalk subsoil, its top 2-3 cms. characteristically crumbly and sometimes admixed a little with humus (figs. 5.00, .00, .00). Nowhere in Area East 2/3 was

there any old ground surface; and indeed it was difficult not to believe that everywhere the present surface of the Chalk was below what had been the surface in the latter part of the 1st millennium BC. By how much was, however, unclear here (see above p%%).

### **OD XI / A EAST 2 & 3: Features analysis and discussion**

Essentially only three layers covered the whole area:

layer 1: turf and topsoil

layer 2: flints at the bottom of layer 1

layer 3: a thin crumbly chalk layer immediately on top of reasonably firm Upper Chalk

Almost the whole of the excavated and recorded archaeology therefore consisted of features on, into or below the surface of the Chalk. These consisted of four main types. All appeared in plan at the surface of the Chalk subsoil. They were gullies, pits, post-holes and ard-marks. The pits from E2 and 3 are dealt with together with all the pits from the site, *below* p. 00.

The ard-marks here were ubiquitously later than the settlement remains where intersections occurred to provide a relative date, though an argument is made that some might be earlier (*below* p. 00). As a phenomenon, they are described and discussed for the whole of the site, *below* p. 00.

The pits, post-holes and gullies together formed a fairly dense occupation complex. Overall, they can be generally regarded as being of an Early Iron Age occupation, though some pieces of crucial evidence clearly indicated that it was of several phases, at least in structural terms. Artefacts also indicated the presence of a succession, though probably over a short period. Many of the features were not, and cannot be, related chronologically, however, for they did not physically intersect nor were their contained materials (if any) chronologically diagnostic within an Early Iron Age phase of activity. Most of the post-holes in particular are 'floating' within the overall plan, unascrivable with any certainty to either a sub-phase or a particular structure.

In contrast, all of the seven pits are reasonably well-dated, either or both absolutely and relatively (fig. 5.00). One (P13) was fairly convincingly within a specific structure defined by Gully 4 (G4), and P19 seems almost as convincingly related to the area enclosed by G5 (P20). Both gullies belong to an early phase of occupation with the EIA, probably site Phase 3a. Pit 20, still of EIA date, was structurally later than the latest of the gullies (G8), and may well have contained an 'end of occupation' deposit (*below* p. 00). Pit 21a was of late-prehistoric date at earliest and could well be C1 AD, with P21b later than it. Pit 22 was even more assuredly of early RB date. In contrast, Pit 23 was convincingly EBA.

Four **gullies** existed in E2 and E3 (G4, 5 with 5A, 6 and 8). Their location, shape, disposition and relationships are clearly shown on fig. 5.00. The sections through them displayed on fig. 5.00 indicate their 'vertical' dimension. Salient points about them were as follows:

G4: earthy fill with large and small chalk lumps; associated with PHs 50, 53, 54 and Pit 13, which it apparently enclosed

G5: the westernmost wall trench of the E2/3 complex, describing a semi-circle 36 ft. in diameter. Fill partly of two layers of packed chalk, partly a chalky humus (fig. 5.00). Associated

with five postholes on its S arc (though all could be later) and PH52; apparently enclosed Pit 19. Contained three contexts with EIA sherds: on its top, GF355, which also contained a 'bone needle' (SF622? or 623?? on its bottom? or from the top of G5? CHECK); and, from its filling, GF404 and GF422.

G5A, extending c 3 m. across the N of G4 and perhaps part of the same rectangular structure, showed an earthy fill with large and small chalk lumps, divisible into three layers (fig. 5.00); it was cut into G5.

GF423 included sherds from layer 3.

**G6:** cut by G8 (fig. 5.00). No finds *cf.* G5. 9.60 m in diam and of slighter dimensions than G5, of a uniform width and depth with a wide 'U'- cross section, typically 23 cms wide and 10-12 cms deep. Filling basically of two layers, the upper of earthy fill with chalk lumps, the bottom of chalky fill. PHs 7, 12A, 12B, 20 and 51 were located in the gully.

A break 3.90 cms wide existed on the SE arc of G6, with PH 26 in the arc of the gully as if central to an entrance. In contrast, G6 ended with a PH on either side of a SW entrance, apparently and 'internal' one into the structure defined by G5. PH 23 was almost exactly central to the circle of G6, and presumably supported an upright at the centre of a round timber building. PH 23 lined up well with PH 27 (under HEARTH 2) and PH 22 (PH 22 and PH 23 are both 37 cms deep, though with very different diameters; though PH 22 may well have belonged to G8 structure, *see below*).

**GF455**, from dark brown earth with chalk lumps in G6, , included a typical assemblage of EIA potsherds, animal bone, flints and bits of burnt sarsen.

**G8:** in general dark brown earth and chalk lumps, within which were three layers cutting G6, layer 2a:

- 2: dark brown soil with chalk lumps, burnt sarsens and flints
- 3: chalk lumps & decomposed natural chalk (packing)
- 4: fine grey material (replacement material?)

GFs 362 (SF16), 414, 426

GF452, 455 layer 2, EIA sherds, animal bone, flints and burnt sarsen

PHs 7, 12A, 12B, 20, 51 and its unnumbered western counterpart were all in G8 and perhaps evidence of original uprights standing in it; but equally any one, even all, of them could be later and accidentally cutting G8. Nevertheless, there is just enough evidence to hint at a possible unit of length of c 2.15 m (7 ft. = about two paces) at work in the plan as recovered: it 'works' from PH51 round the S arc, including the entrance, as far as PH20, PH7 if the last is taken as 1½ 'units' distant from PH20. This observation is discussed further *below* p. 00.

A local sequence was Pit 20 cut Gully 8 which cut Gully 6.

**Interpretation:** here as elsewhere on the site these gullies are interpreted as foundation trenches for timber buildings. They were clearly not drainage ditches, nor were they 'eaves-drip gullies'. This latter possibility was very carefully tested at the time of excavation with negative results overall and a positive result on the N of G8. There, an arc of outer 'gully' was almost certainly exactly such a gully, not so much dug as created by the Chalk losing its structure through repeated dampness and, therefore, becoming an excavatable 'feature' (fig. 5.00). On the other hand, the evidence for the gullies having been in effect palisade trenches is not exactly overwhelming: the interpretation rests on general probability rather than specific, unambiguous evidence. Nevertheless, some post-holes were found in the various gullies (fig. 5.00), though nowhere was a clear run or arc of them detected: the best was of five post-holes on the S side of G5 (fig. 5.00). As the arc of Gully 1 under the lynchet showed (fig. 5.00), however, once clear of the protective cover of accumulated ploughsoil the Gullies as found elsewhere were but a much-truncated remnant of the originals. One can but

infer that few of the wall posts - if such there were, - went down into the bottom of the foundation trenches.

## **Pits**

### **PITS 13 & 19-23**

Each of the seven pits appear to have been created for different reasons, and probably over a period spanning the entire occupation of the site, EBA-RB. Three, P13, 19 and 20, were directly related to ring-groove structures; four, P22 and 23 and with P21 A and B counting as two, stood apart from the others and the ring-grooves, probably because they belong to periods before (P23) and after the EIA occupation.

**P13:** 1.75 m diam at top and 1.27 m deep, it lay within the area enclosed by G4 as if sited within an annexe to G5. It was probably visible as a slight depression late in C1 AD for its layer 1 contained RB grog-tempered ware among the EIA sherds, including two decorated sherds of 'standard' type, all presumably moved into that position by early RB ploughing. The hollow was apparently attractive enough for frogs to collect in it and, rather surprisingly, not jump out. Layers 2-4, soil with chalk, were interpreted as being a deliberate filling of the hollow left by natural deposition. Layers 5-7 were layers of chalk lumps with some flint, the natural infilling as a result of frost fracturing the pit sides. Layer 8, 5 cms thick and horizontal across the pit bottom, was a very dark brown humic layer containing minute orange specks, soot and ash, with some flints, and burnt sarsen and bone fragments (GF372). It was examined under a hand lens at the time but unforgivably was not sampled for laboratory analysis. It appeared to be formed from cess and ash.

**GF353, 376, 390**, all layer 1

**P19:** 1.50 m diam at top, 91 cms deep. Pit layers 1 (GF346, 380) and 2 filled the top of a secondary hole dug into the filling of an EIA pit. Their contents included the rounded rim of a shouldered jar and two parts (SF25 and 27) of a tanged iron knife. Layer 3, an inverted cone of dark filling, filled the bottom of this hole and contained *inter alia* an awl (SF 614). This intrusion was probably a later pit or a large central PH for the structure of G5. Layer 4, into which it was cut, contained (SF22) an ox skull, two articulated long-bones, a scapula and other bones below and around a layer of sarsen stones at c 80 cms. depth. Another ox-skull and scapula (SF23) occurred in layer 5 on the pit bottom in a humic layer 5.

### **PIT 20**

Diams. 1.05 m at top, 70 cms at bottom; 70 cms deep, cutting Gully 8 and containing the probable ritual burial of an ox-skull. Its layer 1 contained 2 hobnails (GF347), again indicating the RB ploughsoil sinking into the top of a slight hollow. Layer 2, of soil with chalk lumps and flints to a depth of c 45 cms, virtually filled the upper half of the pit. Off-centre in the layer's upper part (2a), a large sarsen sat as if it had originally lay atop the pit, marking it and then sinking into the fill. In the pit's centre, slightly below the sarsen but still in layer 2a, were the skull of a 4-5 year-old ox (SF18) and a piece of polished sarsen. Just below them in layer 2b and immediately above a horizontal layer (3) of flint nodules were a knife (SF 19), apparently deposited intact with its handle, a worn bone point (SF20), five fragments of worked or butchered bone (SF607-9, 617-18: two gouges, two incised rib bones and a grooved long bone) and some decorated EIA sherds including a body sherd with impressed wedge-shapes in fabric M31. All appeared to have been deliberately placed on or just above layer 3, the 15 cms thick 'platform' of packed flint nodules set in a fine clay-type matrix. No objects occurred in layer 3 but immediately below it, in the bottom of the pit, were a few (unidentified but EIA) sherds, bone fragments, and frog bones (GF379). The lowest two layers, 4, of chalk packing, and 5, of chalk silt with chalk lumps, were thin (together c 20 cms.), horizontal and interpreted as the remnants of the bottom of G8, otherwise sliced away by Pit 20.

### **PIT 21**

Consisted of two intersecting, roughly circular pits, 21A ( West) and 21B (East) respectively; neither were, in their physical characteristics, particularly like EIA pits on the site. Both were covered by the site layer 2. **P21A** was the shallower and was cut by **P21B**. Both were filled

with an homogeneous fine dark soil containing small chalk lumps and some flints, with sarsen pieces in 21A (layer 3) but not B (layer 4) (ploughsoil in part created out of occupation material? cf. Pit 22).

**P21A:** layer 3, its filling, contained (GF443) EIA sherds, bone fragments and sarsen chips i.e. occupation material. 22 cms into it were a worn bone needle (SF 54) and a decorated glass bead (SF55). Their conjunction might suggest a deliberate deposit, or even redeposition, in a new late prehistoric pit; but more probable is that both, a fortuitous pairing, indicate the accidental deposition of late IA material, together with earlier material, into a new small pit. The most likely mechanism for such deposition was ploughing, most probably in C1 AD.

**P21B:** its layer 4 occupied most of it, with an extra layer (5) of grey soil and chalk lumps (from natural weathering?) tipping in from the side. Layer 4 contained (GF 447) sherds (EIA but otherwise unspecified) and animal bones including those of frog and a dog maxilla; probable frog bones and sherds (EIA but otherwise unspecified) were in 5 (GF450).

These successive pits are envisaged as having been dug in C1 BC or AD, but probably the latter, through EIA occupation material, probably disturbed, and EIA cultivated soils. Two significant points arise from this interpretation. If these two pits, apparently successive in functional terms, are correctly dated to the C1 AD, then they are the only 'structural' features for a major phase of activity on the site otherwise envisaged as solely relating to fields and their cultivation. These small pits may, of course, themselves be covered by such an explanation but, while they were not obviously post-holes, neither were they obviously for storage or ritual. Given early Roman activity provides their context, then they clearly indicate that any bank which may have existed around the EIA settlement enclosure (Phase 3b *below*) had been effectively flattened by c 100 AD at latest.

#### **PIT 22**

This pit also appears to be a pit within a pit, again with crucial RB evidence. Layers 2 and 3, respectively the bottom of the topsoil and site Layer 2, sagged into the top of the pit and sealed pit layer 4. Both layers contained (GF435) EIA and RB potsherds, animal bone, flint nodules, and small pieces of sarsen i.e. occupation material cf. P21A. Layer 4 was a dark humic soil forming a 'pipe' or 'column' cut out of the filling of a much larger pit. At the base of the 'pipe' was a large sarsen stone; a piece of skull (SF60) lay beneath it. Layer 4 also contained a sherd of RB grey ware among EIA sherds (GF436) and fragments of juvenile animal bones and loose teeth. They came from cattle, sheep, pig and horse, notably from the head and legs i.e. waste matter. Similar bones were also in layer 5, part of the fill of the original pit and almost certainly the source of the ossiferous material in the secondary pit which cut into it. Layer 5 also contained the maxilla of a large cat, possibly a wild cat, together with several bones had been both gnawed and displayed knife cuts (GF437), and EIA sherds. Layer 5 was one of several alternating, roughly horizontal layers forming a markedly banded filling of the original pit, as if it had been regularly used for dumping refuse which was then covered by clean chalk rubble. This fill contained pottery of standard EIA type with parallels in Gullies 1 and 2 (Area East).

The secondary pit confirmed RB activity here, and is probably to be related to adjacent Pit 21; and like P21, it strongly indicated that the proposed EIA enclosure bank no longer existed by Roman times.

#### **PIT 23**

Bowl-shaped in profile, 95cms. in diam. and 77 cms deep, it may have been dug for, and initially held, a Beaker or EBA cremation. It contained two sherds of EBA pottery and was unlike 'typical' EIA pits in several respects. Two well-preserved, converging ard-marks cut its top (fig. 5.00).

Layer 1 (not on section drawing fig. 5. 00) was a thin layer of dark material including flints which first identified the presence of the pit as the general Layer 2 over the area was removed by hand. Pit layer 2 was of flints and dark brown soil, with (EIA?) sherds, bone and flints i.e.

occupation material ploughed over the top of the pit, by inference in RB period (see *above* P21,22). Layer 3, of dark brown fill with very few small chalk lumps and flint chips, included in GF460 a potsherd with twisted cord decoration, a thumb-nail scraper (SF604) and a bone point (SF58). Layer 4 was markedly a `charcoal layer` of fine light grey-brown soil with many white flecks, possibly cremated bones of immature human, and small lumps of charcoal; it contained (GF 461) a plain, grog-tempered red sherd (Beaker/collared urn?), some flint flakes, a few burnt grains, and frog/rodent and ?human bone fragments. Hazel, ash, pear, oak and hawthorn/apple were represented among the charcoal. (The whole of this layer was removed by hand and hand-sorted at the time since it was suspected, and as is almost certainly the case, that it might be the residue of a cremation; but the result is that none of the material, except charcoal, survives now for more informed analysis). Layer 5 consisted of fine light grey soil with small chalk lumps i.e. not typical primary fill weathered from the pit sides, and contained bones and flints (unspecified, GF474).

### **Post-holes**

Fewer than 50 postholes, other than those in other features such as G5, were noted over the whole area, a low total in comparison to some other sites (>>>>>>>>>>). No particular post-hole structures were obvious. Other than those arguably associated with the ring-groove buildings, as discussed *above* p. 00, the detached post-holes did not appear to occur at random. Few occurred W and E of G5 and G8 respectively, or N of either; conversely, they formed a marked pattern with a concentration NW-SE across an area where the areas contained within the three gullies overlapped and SE from there to S of the entrance to G8. The latter may have been related to some form of structure or activity outside that entrance but, in the absence of stratigraphical evidence, no certainty was possible. Nevertheless, it is tempting to think of the concentration in general belonging to a phase earlier (or just possibly later) than the structures represented by G8 and G6, even though no convincing pattern is apparent within the concentration.

### **Stakeholes**

A number of stakeholes, other than those already noted in relation to the gullies, were recorded but no pattern in their occurrence was apparent and in general they represent nothing more than the holes to be expected from the continual sticking of stakes and sticks into the ground around a farmyard.

### **Miscellaneous features**

Note here, very briefly, the curious non-ardmarks forming a radial pattern

#### **Is there anything else? - check plans for oddities**

#### **Relationships:**

Three significant ones were observed:

- a. in general, ardmarks overlay everything (but see *below* p. 00)
- b. several short local sequences included (from latest backwards):
  - Pit 20>Gully 8>Gully 6
  - Gully 4>Gully 5
  - PH 25b>PH 25a>Gully 8

#### **Others to be added**

- c.the clutch of well-preserved ardmarks on the east of E4 is interpreted as so-preserved because the grooves, like Pits 22 and 23, lay under the hypothesised enclosure bank.

### **Ardmarks**

Slight, shallow linear depressions c 60 cms apart were noted in the surface of the rotten chalk where no occupation layer existed *in situ* in the SE corner of

East 1 beneath the flints. Similar lines appeared in area NE, with grooves running at right-angles to them. The marks showed up partly as slight grooves in the crumbly surface of subsoil Chalk but mainly as earthy lines; they also showed as lines of flints, often small shattered flints set on edge or an irregular line of larger ones. These marks proved to be c 8-15 cms across and at the most 3 cms deep. They were on average 23-30 cms apart but overall appeared extremely irregular.

Areas East, North1 & North 2 to the east were opened up to examine what it was hoped would be a more extensive pattern of what were being interpreted as ard-marks. After brushing or trowelling, all visible or probable ard-marks were marked and then plotted objectively, but paying particular attention to intersections. Because of the crumbly nature of the Chalk surface in which the grooves survived, and because of their generally slight and greyish filling, it proved impossible, first in plan and then in section, to be certain which groove preceded which at most intersections. Sufficient relationships A palimpsest of intersecting grooves was built up, showing several phases of cultivation, the two main ones being slightly at an angle to one another. Marks running N-S down the slope were easier to observe. All were plotted before other features such as post-holes, most of which only became visible when the crumbly Chalk surface was trowelled off. In general the ard-marks were presumably later than other features: in one or two cases ard-marks visibly cut features.

The significant fact about the ard-marks on the E side of East 3 may well be, not their relationship to a ditch line, but THEIR PRESERVATION i.e. there are nearly as many marks, several of them close together as if from the same ploughings, on the line of the presumed bank as there are for the rest of East 1 and 2 i.e. they are exceptionally well-preserved exactly where the bank could have been. Ergo, are they well-preserved BECAUSE of the bank, and therefore earlier than it; and, by a circular argument, can the fact of their existence be used to strengthen the argument for there having been a bank here?

The only comparable extent of well-preserved a-ms - and it may be a significant support of the point just made, - is towards the W side of Area 1, esp. in its NW `quadrant`, where to an extent to Chalk surface was protected by the build-up of the tail of the lynchet. This preservative factor up here on the exposed SW slope of Overton Down is, incidentally, one good reason why the **absence** of a-ms underneath that lynchet can be taken as good negative evidence that they did not exist there, with the corollary that the a-ms immediately NE of the lynchet **do** go along with the `fence` field boundary and the accumulation of ploughsoil against it.

The a-ms may be pre-bank: we cannot assume that all of them are of the same cultivation phase since the overploughing of the site after its occupation cannot seriously be doubted; but if some were under the bank, then there must be both a cultivation phase and occupation before enclosure.

However, the point has to be proved from the primary evidence that the ard-marks really are prehistoric or RB (in itself a tricky point) and not medieval. The bulk of them, NW/SE, are on same alignment of r-&-f as clearly demonstrated in OGSC's AP and the RCHM map (fig. 00), with the most southerly respecting the CF lynchet .



end of file