this is now the start of file 5edfyf4a pjf 30/3/96

EXCAVATION: ODX: the settlement perimeter and its related features

We shall first describe the excavations dealing with the surroundings and then with those searching for and finally defining the perimeter of the excavated settlement.

A new para, not necessarily to stay here pjf 18.i.96.

Ironically, during the great drought of 1995, the line of the ditch down the E side of the enclosure was distinctly clear in the grass as a parch-mark, a phenomenon that never appeared in the the 1960s when a considerable effort went into defining the exact course of the ditch (fig. 5.00). An ill-defined area of parchmarking, wider than but across the line of, the ditch was apparent approximately in the area of cutting X/7 (fig. 5.00).

At the time, 1963-67, most of this work was secondary to the excavation of lynchets and the settlement area within what turned out to be an enclosing ditch. That ditch had been easily located around its northern arc early in the investigation when, simultaneously and subsequently, work on the interior settlement also developed. This thrust of the work was well advanced before serious attention was directed to establishing the exact nature and whole course of the perimeter structure. This happened when it was realised that the shape, size and exact location of the settlement was important not just for their own sakes but in relation to the Project's main aims. It became apparent that there was a close relationship locationally and even structurally between the settlement enclosure and subsequent developments.

Ironically, during the great drought of 1995, the line of the ditch down the E side of the enclosure was distinctly clear in the grass as a parch-mark, a phenomenon that never appeared in the the 1960s when a considerable effort went into defining the exact course of the ditch (fig. 5.00). An ill-defined area of parchmarking, wider than but across the line of, the ditch was apparent approximately in the area of cutting X/7 (fig. 5.00).

A relationship or relationships of the hypothesised (EIA?) settlement with surrounding and supposedly superimposed `Celtic` fields was basic to the whole exercise. It was natural, therefore, to give priority to elucidating as quickly and simply as possible the landscape stratigraphy in which the hypothetical settlement was embedded. In particular, it was crucially necessary to test the correctness or otherwise of the initial hypothesis i.e.whether or not the curved scarp was a lynchet relating to a bank, palisade or ditch: hence cuttings ODX /4 and /2 which were excavated first.

Once the existence of a ditch had been established, cutting X/1 was excavated to check whether the slight bank curving around to the S was part of the perimeter construction or a field bank; cutting X/5 was excavated alongside it to test whether or not the break in the bank at this point indicated an entrance.

All the other cuttings were specifically to check the course of the perimeter ditch; many were nothing more than test pits to pick up the line of the top edge of the ditch and were not further excavated. Cuttings X/14 and X/15, however, respectively cut through the lynchet outside, as it subsequently proved, the SW corner of the settlement enclosure, and sectioned the ditch itself near the centre

of the south side to demonstrate its relationship to the lynchet immediately, as it proved, S of the ditch. In both cases, it will be appreciated, it was initially thought at the time that the lynchet might well be on the line of the southern edge of the settlement, and in neither case did this prove to be so (*see* below p. !!).

Thoughout this exercise of trying to find the line of the enclosure ditch, and indeed simultaneously in exploring the nature of the archaeological evidence within the enclosed area, a battery of resistivity meters, magnetometer and dowsing rods was deployed. Their use was spot-specific and line-recognition rather than overall pattern building; but all anomalies were investigated by at least lifting the turf and looking underneath. Many such 'spots' proved to be shrapnel fragments or other modern metalwork, but Gully 1 in South 1, and several pits, were first detected from this systematic sub-terrestial remote sensing. None of the methods proved satisfactory in detecting the enclosure ditch and indeed were positively misleading in indicating a course for it just to the south of South 1. That said, there is perhaps enough strength in the negative evidence of the 'blank' areas within the ditched enclosure to infer that the three excavated structural complexes with their adjacent pits may well be the core of the settlement. No other major anomalies were recorded.
Though there was a certain pragmatic logic day-to-day in the way the excavation developed over five annual seasons, it makes more sense (subjectively of course, but then the whole exercise was subjective) to deal with the work in an order which might best make sense to a reader. This is a *post hoc facto* pattern, of course, but the purpose of this report is to communicate as well as record.

Only one cutting was in no way concerned with the perimeter and so it, cutting ODX:3 north of the settlement, will be described first.

Secondly and thirdly, we shall make two clockwise circuits around the settlement enclosure.

In the first of these, we shalll deal with seven cuttings primarily concerned very much with establishing the course of the perimeter ditch, but they also investigated the relationship of the enclosure to the **surrounding** fields. Cuttings ODX/2 and 4 begin the circuit, followed (despite the fact that its label is ODXIA) by the easterly extension called East 4 projecting from Area ODXI/A, East 3. They will be followed by X/15 and X/14 and then, on the NW where an entrance was possible, by X/5 and X/1.

Thirdly, on our second clockwise circuit, all the other cuttings concerned with the perimeter itself will be briefly described. All were relatively minor, some minimal. The account begins with small cuttings down the eastern perimeter and ends, at 10 o`clock as it were, with a small cutting crucial in establishing the course of the ditch.

Cutting X/4 was laid out across the foot of the scarp of the curved lynchet towards the centre of its curve. Its primary purpose was to establish the existence or otherwise of a ditch. The existence of such a ditch, and specifically

of a ditch enclosing a settlement, was of course fundamental to the hypothesis about the origins of the curved lynchet and a land-use sequence involving cultivation of a former occupation area at this place.

A slight surface depression along the foot of this length of the curved lynchet suggested the presence of a ditch, and such indeed proved to be the case. The ditch was very much underneath the tail of the lynchet and towards the N end of the cutting. It proved to be some 9 ft. (3 m.) wide across its mouth and 4 ft. (00 m.) deep to the flat bottom which was only 9 ins. wide; though the `ankle-breaker` profile subsequently noted at the bases of other sections of this ditch was not quite so apparent here (fig. ^^). The profile was asymmetrical, the shorter, steeper side being on the southern, inner side, whence appeared to come a disproportionate amount of the earlier filling.

The ditch contained only three layers. Covering the bottom was a fine greyish silt without chalk lumps (layer 5). This was clearly not a `primary silt` and was different from the lowest material in any of the other ditch sections. The ditch had been cleaned out, perhaps several or numerous times, for none of the typical granular chalk infilling from early frost action was present. Indeed, the material appeared best interpreted as deliberate infilling, possibly shovelled down from the outer surface of a weathered, cemented bank (by analogy with the Overton Down Experimental Earthwork, Bell *et al.* 1995, p. 000). Perhaps, though, it originated as wind- or rain-deposited ploughsoil. Since the layer seemed to come in mainly if not entirely from the inner side i.e. inside the settlement, then the point is of some interest.

Above it was a crumbly chalk infill (layer 4) tipping in from high on both sides of the ditch and probably the product of a `natural` process. Bulky though the layer was, however, it could easily all have accumulated within a few years judging by the nearby Experimental Earthwork. On top of it an assemblage of flints suggested either a period of destruction as flints were torn up and rolled down a tip line or, more probably, a period of stability as material gradually accumulated on a surface which developed over the ditch infilling. Nearly 2 ft. of greyish humus with chalk lumps (layer 3) then built up in an homogeneous infill, looking very much as if either the ditch was being overploughed or was at least right on the edge of an arable field from which it was receiving ploughsoil. Much of layer 3 could have come from the N where a lynchet was accumulating outside the ditch and was indeed mirroring its shapely curve.

Layer 3 was overlaid by a brown humus (layer 2), clearly the ground surface which, perhaps after centuries of arable infilling of the ditch, developed over the top of the now almost level ditch surface. As it developed, however, a lense of flinty soil trickled down on to it from above and to the N, presumably indicating renewed or continuing cultivation of the field there. It might well be of medieval date. Here, no characteristic `layer 2` in the sense of a thin but dense flint layer at the bottom of the topsoil occurred. At this point, the topsoil lay directly on the

former landsurface of layer 2 and was a rendzina which could well have formed since the cessation of medieval cultivation in the (?)14th century (*above* p. 00).

South of the `inner` lip of the ditch, the central part of the cutting contained no features at all for some15 ft. (5 m.). This `blank` was covered only by a topsoil up to 6 ins (15 cms.) thick, with a flinty `layer 2` barely developed above a natural Chalk surface which was more or less level before dropping abruptly to the south. These phenomena were interpreted as indicating the area where a bank had stood, preserving the Chalk a little higher because it was protected for centuries by, first, a maintained bank and then the lowest remains of that bank until they were finally removed by cultivation in either Roman or, more probably, medieval times.

Some support for this interpretation can be adduced from the presence, right at the break from `raised` to `normal` Chalk surface, of a post-hole, 11 ins. both in girth and depth; it might have just marked the back of a bank. Probably more significant was the fact that, after the `blank`, it was the first of eight chalk-cut features to appear in a cluster occupying the southern 14 ft. of the cutting. This phenomenon was probably the beginning of occupation features immediately inside the bank *cf.* evidence and discussion of it from Area ODXI East 3. It was also taken as significant elsewhere on the site, in the light of X/4, that the absence of occupation features in cuttings placed for other purposes was nevertheless a useful negative pointer to the likely spread of settlement within the enclosure. On a larger scale, for example, cutting XIA/East 3 bears out the hypothesis.

Cutting OD XI/A East 4 (fig. 00. 00) was taken out across the line of the `bank` and ditch on the eastern side of the enclosure, partly to see whether the `ditch line` suggested by magnetometer survey did in fact exist: hence the length of the cutting. This was late on in the excavation of the settlement itself but before it was finally appreciated that the enclosure, far from being circular or oval, was defined by a straight eastern side between sharply angular NE and SE corners. They were in fact searched for and found after the location of the ditch in East 4 (*below* p. 00). The discovery of the ditch here so close to the E side of the complex of buildings and other settlement features in Area ODXI/A, East 1-3 (*see below* p. zz), was gratifying in itself, for there was no trace of the ditch hereabouts at all on the surface. Indeed its presence was totally masked by NW-SE ridge-and-furrow which blankets this part of the Down and much (but not all) of the settlement (*see* p. $$ and fig. $£$). (CHECK this statement cf. OGSC AP and orig. field plan). Its presence also provided an unexpected opportunity to relate the perimeter features to those of the interior as well as the surroundings.

Nothing was found by excavation outside the ditch cut into the surface of the Chalk. Though this part of the trench was but a small sample of the whole, given the plethora of features just a few metres to the W, this absence of evidence

suggested that the ditch did indeed both bound the enclosed settlement and lie beyond the limits of any earlier occupation that may have existed (*below* p. 00).

The mouth of the ditch, a mere 9 ins. below the present grass, was 10 ft. 3 ins. wide at the surface of the bedrock Chalk, below which the narrow, flat bottom of the ditch occurred at a depth of 5 ft. 2 ins. This base, rather like an ankle-breaker in section and only 5 ins. wide, contained freshly-broken chalk lumps and decomposed natural Chalk, the sort of material which would have fallen in during the first winter after construction or after maintenance ceased. Layer 6 contained animal bone and sarsen fragments, suggesting that occupation material was entering the ditch as it filled up - or as it was filled up. A granular pinky-brown soil, slightly clayey in consistency, homogeneous with small to medium chalk lumps and a few scattered flints, layer 6 here was very similar to layer 6 in the ditch fillings exposed in cuttings X/5 and X/15 (*below* p. 00, 00).

Similarly, layer 5 in all three cuttings was comparable and in each case interpreted as a `turf-line`. Here, its profile indicated that the ditch had by this stage, probably in the centuries around 1BC/AD, become a (presumably linear) depression only some 40 cms. deep below Chalk subsoil level, perhaps less than 60 cms. below the the ground surface at the time of the Roman Conquest. This depression was then infilled and almost levelled off by layer 4, the equivalent of layer 4 in X/5 but layer 3 in X/15. In all three cuttings this layer of homogeneous infilling, deposited on top of an old land surface representing a period of stability, was interpreted as a ploughsoil. It is probably of the (?early) Roman period (though this remains to be firmed up: CHECK). Layer 3 in XI/A, East 4 was also interpreted as a plough soil, being the equivalent of layer 3 in X/5 and probably the top of 3/bottom of 2 in X/15. Here as elsewhere, the whole ditch - and indeed the rest of the cutting, - was blanketed by layers 2 and 1, the familiar layer of flint at the bottom of the topsoil and the topsoil itself.

Overall, the layering of the ditch fill was fairly symmetrical, there being no particular indication of the settlement immediately to its west. The main asymmetry was indeed in the ditch sides themselves. The inner side, facing NE, was at a shallower angle, and therefore seemed perhaps more weather-affected, than that on the outside, facing inwards towards the SW. This is the opposite of the observation on the Overton Down Experimental Earthwork, where the inner, SW-facing side is more affected by, largely, frost-action than the outer, NE-facing side; but there a substantial bank lies along the NE side of the ditch whereas in East 4 a bank, if it existed, would presumably have been on the inner, SW side. Maybe a bank and its position relative to a ditch, rather than anything else such as climate or aspect, is a critical factor in post-constructional degradation on Chalk.

If there was a bank on the inner side of the ditch, here the westerly side, then its dimensions as suggested in Cutting X/4 (*above* p. kk) would place at least part of it on the space occupied by settlement features along the eastern side of Area

East 3 (*below* p. //, where the excavation and its features are described). Interestingly, perhaps, this eastern strip about 5 m. wide was excavated without thought of a possible relationship to a settlement perimeter, let alone a bank: either or both were thought at the time to be well out to the east. Nor was there any thought that the features were on the extreme edge of the settlement: again, at the time excavation was merely `following` eastwards the spread of occupation evidence in 50 ft. squares.

No intrinsic evidence of a bank was found in East 3. But the possible bank`s width as suggested in cutting X/4 would place its rear line just to the E of Gully 8 and across the W edge of Pit 22 which would therefore be `underneath` it (fig. **: a special fig. to be drawn to make the point: though NB I am not now at all sure about this: the rear of the bank could have just missed P22, and indeed P22 could be precisely where it is precisely because of that 25/v/95)). P23 and P8 were also in its space. (and one of those contains a poss. EBA cremation: add a sentence on this with x-ref p. 00). It is, however, argued below (p. 00) that the particularly good preservation of ard-marks specifically in this area could be the result of their protection under a bank, so another piece of circumstantial evidence for the existence of a bank can be adduced.

Cutting X/15 was conceived when it became apparent that the settlement enclosure`s southern ditch did not run through area XI/B (or to its N: fig. **). The next working hypothesis was, fairly obviously, that it ran under or just behind the lynchet forming the northern side of the double lynchet track now forming the southern edge of the site (fig. **). Fortuitously, but perhaps for other reasons, a cutting that was only 12 ft. long was put down blindly and almost exactly centrally over the ditch. Since the main point of the exercise was to locate that ditch, the trench was neither extended nor widened. It was taken down the 5 ft. 6 ins to the bottom of the ditch in order to obtain a section and, if possible, dating evidence (fig. $$). Two complete runs of soil samples from top to bottom of the ditch were also taken, and although one has apparently been used without record to explain its disappearance, the other remained intact in storage for some 30 years and has been used to advantage in preparing this report (*below, Ch. 8,* p. 00). There was no RB or later material from this cutting.

The section exposed 10 layers, described here in reverse order to their deposition, together with the GF numbers for each (to be read in conjunction with fig. $$).

Layer 1 - topsoil of brown humus with hardly any flints: ?medieval ploughsoil

Layer 2 - worm-sorted flinty layer at base of topsoil: ?residue from medieval ploughsoil

Layer 3 - brown greyish soil with chalk flecks and small flints, deposited asymetrically with its lowest point off-centre towards the south, reflecting the `tipped` surface of layer 4 on which it formed. Interpreted as material coming downslope from the N, it was suggested at the time of excavation as ploughsoil, probably the material piling up into the lynchet immediately to the SE,

and probably of RB date. Allen (*below, Ch. 8, p.* 0) confirms its nature as a ploughsoil, based on examination of soil sample **GF512/3.**

Layer 4 - large flints and chalk flecks in a humic matrix, a layer slightly dipped in its upper surface and markedly tipped asymetrically towards the S along its base. Interpreted as either a ploughsoil in its own right or part of a ploughsoil of which layer 3 is the upper part. Only EIA sherds with some flint flakes and bones occurred (**GF512).** Could be interpreted as renewed arable activity, most probably in mid-1M

Layer 5 - `very dark brown soil with medium flints and small chalk lumps`, it is a turf line, probaby formerly grass. Contained **GF513**: 'prehistoric pottery, bone'.

Layer 6 - 'light brown soil with chalk flecks' and `light brown loam with chalk flecks and small and medium flints`, identified in the field as a ploughsoil of EIA date. No finds; **GF513/6**: soil sample.

Layer 7 - medium sized flints and small, rounded chalk fragments, interpreted in the field as a `weathering tip-line` and `top of silt`, the uppermost layer at which deposition stabilised, at least for a period. **GF514**, `flint, bone`,

Layer 8 - 'Fine light brown chalk soil near bottom of ditch. Large flints in among soil'. **GF517**: 'prehistoric potsherds, bone, snail'.

GF517/9: soil sample.

Layer 10 - 'Fine light brown chalky soil near ditch bottom'. **GF517/10**: soil sample.

Interpretation

The following brief discussion follows the sequence of deposition i.e. it is in reverse order compared to the description above.

A clear implication of the asymmetry of the infilling of the ditch is that the source of much of the material is on its N side i.e. on its inner edge which is where a bank of a settlement enclosure could reasonably be expected to be. This appears to be a particularly strong inference from the profile of Layers 7-9. Layer 10, which is deposited symmetrically, can readily be explained, by comparison with the nearby Overton Down Experimental Earthwork (Bell *et al* 1996, p. 00). It was most probably natural infilling from frost action during the first year or, at most, two years. Interpretation, following the same analogy, would then be looking at Layers 9-7 as representing fairly rapid deposition, probably within ten years. Layer 7 was seen when recorded as a `weathering tipline`, analogous to what happened on ODEE some 10-14 years after construction. Overall, up to this stage, all the evidence points to natural processes infilling the ditch, with virtually no interference, human or otherwise.

There were no finds from layers 7-9. This strongly suggests that occupation had ceased and that nothing was happening on the site to move occupation debris into the ditch i.e. a phase of desertion happened after the settlement was abandoned, sealed by a naturally deposited layer 7 before renewed activity.

Layer 6 then represents a phase of consolidation and stabilisation as the ditch develops a rounded surface profile instead of the asymetrically angular one at the top of layer 7. Layer 6 is nevertheless seen as anthropogenic rather than just natural like its predecessors. Its development as a ploughsoil, probably in the EIA and perhaps even immediately after the settlement`s end, is a preferred interpretation. Any dating evidence from it would be valuable, but it should not have RB material in it (THIS can now be CHECKED: do so).

Layer 5 was a turf line i.e. a surface not only sufficiently stable for long enough for grass to grow on it but for the habitat to remain undisturbed long enough for a genuine humus to develop. It could therefore represent a period of a century or more (do we know how long it takes to create a`turf line` on a chalky ploughsoil? - well within a century I`d guess). It could have developed within the EIA, since settlement desertion was early within that period; or it could have occured in the mid/late pre-Roman IA, except that we have almost no evidence of activity on the site during the last five centuries BC. Either way, it represents a quiet phase after the Layer 6 post-settlement cultivation.

It was on to the stable sward of Layer 5 that the flints of layer 4 were deposited when disruptive activity began, probably adjacent rather than actually on the silted up but still visible ditch. Layer 4 represented renewed cultivation in the last centuries BC and/or, more probably, C1 AD. This cultivation was deep and vigourous enough to disturb and deposit not only largeish flints but also fist-sized sarsen stones. This suggests very much that it was this ploughing, not that of Layer 6, which was biting into the EIA settlement deposits and probably THEREFORE THAT IT WAS **THE** PLOUGHING WHICH WAS DEPOSITING LAYER 4 WHICH WAS ALSO CAUSING THE POST-Settlement ARD-MARKS. Can we please date Layer 4? - this is crucial (*see below)* (**GF513** is the vital context).

Layer 3, also a ploughsoil layer, is (almost) certainly RB, the tail end of the accumulation in the upper part of the lynchet to the SE. It could begin in mid/late C1 AD. Unfortunately, any finds are probably not going to be helpful since GF512 is the only recorded context, embracing layers 1-3 (check whether this contains the hearsay medieval sherds).

Layers 1-3 are essentially lying in the same plane, sloping very slightly with the natural slope towards the lynchet immediately to the south. None of them follow the contours of the ditch or its fillings i.e. the ditch was only a slight earthwork at the start of the accumulation of layer 3 and was effectively invisible by the time of its completion. **GF 512** came from all three layers, consisting of only a small amount of entirely EIA potsherds (CHECK - med??), flint flakes and animal bone. In view of the presence of a scatter of RB material across ODXI as a whole, this suggests that the ditch was dug, filled up and covered over by the tail of the lynchet growing to its immediate S within the mid-1M.

Layers 1-3 together constitute 2 ft. of deposit, so they are unlikely to represent one single phase of activity or a short period of time. Layer 3 being RB in at least some sense, Layers 2 and 1 could well be an accumulation developing between say C4 and C13. It was then cultivated to produce the ridge and furrow in the C13, subsequently sorted out over 700 years into the two layers that we found. Alternatively, all three might be entirely post-Roman, with layer 3 being an early medieval ploughsoil and layers 1/2 being cultivated as a single ploughsoil in C13, subsequently dividing under 700 years of sheep-cropped grass.

Cutting X14 (SW angle) was initially merely a row of sondages 54 cms. wide attempting to locate the line of the enclosure ditch. Once the outer lip of the ditch had been defined, the ditch itself was not further excavated. The measured profile and the cutting across the double lynchet trackway to the south east were, however, extended, relating the ditch and enclosure to their immediate surroundings.

Towards the `Celtic` field corner, the narrow trench clearly cut through ploughsoil accumulated behind either or both the `old` (*see* p. 00) lynchet running NW and the later lynchet running NE on the N side of the double lynchet track (fig. ^^). In section, this was reflected by layers 3 and 4, stretching more or less uniformly along the length of the cutting under the familiar layers 1 (topsoil) and 2 (flints). Layer 3 was a typical ploughsoil, thickening slightly to form the upper layer of the lynchet on the N of the track. Layer 4, also typically a ploughsoil, was a pinky-grey fine soil with chalk lumps and flint chips. As it too thickened, it characteristically contained some larger flints as if they had moved down the slope of the arable field to end up at the field edge. That edge itself was sharply defined by an abrupt, steeply-sloping forward edge to both layers 3 and 4, forming a `classic` front of a `Celtic` field lynchet.

Further back up the slope layer 4 lay directly on the Chalk subsoil. 10 ft. back from the lynchet front was a pit-like feature and S of it a layer 5, a pinky-brown clayey material containing small flints, occurred between layer 4 and Chalk subsoil. The `pit` or hollow was probably natural, appearing in plan in the surface of layer 5, itself interpreted as a former land surface protected and preserved by (?fairly rapid) lynchet accumulation on it. Whatever the date of layer 4, however [and here it should be late prehistoric or early RB BUT CHECK], layer 5 should be to some degree anthropogenic in view of the long history of land-use in this area (*below* p. 00).

In the narrow trench through the lynchet above the trackway (fig. 00), layers 1-3 continued but layer 5 projected for only 2 ft. in front of the lychet face before ending just above a sharp `nick` 3-4 ins. deep into the Chalk surface. This was most likely to be a negative lynchet, indicating a phase of cultivation probably related, in view of its juxtaposition, to the lynchet over layer 5. It could have occurred either before or after the double lynchet trackway. Though certainly is impossible, the favoured interpretation would be that the `nick` is very late in the

sequence, going with a phase of ploughing over the top of the double lynchet trackway when it would most plausibly respect the already obvious lynchet on the N side of the trackway. The earthworks here have a somewhat rounded, slightly rubbed out appearance and a `late` but pre-medieval cultivation phase was suggested on fieldwork evidence alone (*above* p. 00). The date might be in the 4th/5th centuries, associated with OD XII (*below* p. 00). No structural or dating evidence, however, came from the small cutting on the S side of the double lynchet trackway.

Cutting ????? (fig. 00) was laid out primarily to investigate a possible entrance through the NW arc of the enclosed settlement, suggested by a break about halfway along the small, low bank apparently continuing to the S the curve of the curved lynchet to the NE. The cutting located the enclosure ditch lying behind the break in the earthwork and showed no evidence of an entrance (BUT CHECK THIS WHEN THE PLAN OF THE CUTTING COMES TO LIGHT - AT THIS MOMENT I ONLY HAVE THE SECTION).

The ditch was similar in profile, dimensions and filling to the sections already described in X/4, East 4 and X/15 (*above* pp. 00, 00). The lowest layer of infill, 7, was of angular chalk lumps deposited along steep, short tip-lines i.e. one or two winters` infill after construction or after the last cleaning. The material was presumably mainly from the E-facing outer side on which the angle of the `slot` was quickly protected from erosion by the rapid deposition of chalk rubble.

Layer 6 was very similar to its counterparts in other ditch sections; layer 5 was the pale grey-brown soil noted elsewhere and interpreted as a turf line. That is, here as elsewhere around this ditch e.g. layer 5 in East 4, the ditch witnessed a period of stability long enough for natural infilling to cease and a grass-covered surface to develop. Then, as also seen in other sections, the bulk of the upper filling, here layer 4, was a very fine humus confidently interpreted as a ploughsoil. Layer 4 presumably accumulated over a period as its material was dragged into the ditch during cultivation which disturbed occupation deposits. (*Unless it contained objects independently datable, the question remains as to whether this significant ploughing was soon after the end of the Phase 3c settlement (C6-5 BC?) or around the time of the Roman Conquest.)*

Layer 3, a brown humus with flints lying at all angles, also contained many `chalk peas`, the characteristic small roundels of chalk produced by abrasion of the Chalk subsoil surface. Here they presumably had been dragged across the ditch filling by cultivation with implement(s) scraping the top of the Chalk, perhaps on both sides of the ditch but more probably on the SE only. Like layer 3 in X/15, this should have been in the C1 BC/AD if the overall interpretation of ODX/XI is correct (*below* p. 00).

Cutting X/1 was simply designed to section the low bank running in a gentle arc S from the `Celtic` field corner at the end of the curved lynchet to its NE. It was

not intended to find the enclosure ditch which, at the time, was not known to exist, though it was subsequently useful in defining the point E of which the ditch must lie (fig. 00).
CHASE UP THE FIELD RECORD ESP. THE SECTION DRAWING; tho` not vital, this little bank is a minor enigma on the site.:

This is the end of the file, but purely for logistical reasons. It continues, with the rest of the perimeter cuttings second time round, on file FYFOD 43b.doc, now 502fyf.doc 27vii95
end file 5edfyf1.doc, continues on 5edfyf2
now continues on 5edfyf4b 30/3/96pjf