

Editorial Notes

Not in any particular order at this stage or at all thought out systematically:

1. Subsoil types with capital letters = Subsoil or bedrock, thus `Chalk` has a specific meaning, whereas `chalk` could be used adjectivally, as in `chalk rubble` or would need some explanation e.g. `the post-hole was packed with chalk and cut into Chalk`.
2. Original field and site record book numbers have been consistently used throughout the whole write-up operation, 1995-7, which produced this Monograph and the deposition of a publicly available archive i.e. the original numbers are used for cuttings, excavated areas, context and all finds etc., so that there is 1:1 correlation between the texts up to immediately before this text was printed out, texts which are now in the Archive on disc and hardcopy.
3. For this printout, we have begun the process of correlating text and the new layer numbers on the graphics, numbers which we were forced to insert at a fairly late stage because too many of the layer numbers on the field drawings were just too nonsensical when transferred to the printed page and publishable graphic. This will all have to be explained somehow, briefly here and more lengthily in Appendix 2; and the correlation of text with the layer nos. which appear on the published graphics will have to continue during the editorial phase. Ultimately, though a chore, it will make for a tighter publication, particularly as the layers nos. and graphic codes are so specific that some textual description can now be removed and replaced simply by e.g. fig. 57, layer 32a.
4. Measurements, dimensions and similarly factual metrical info. are not provided as a matter of course in the text if they are present in a graphic e.g. the size of an excavated area, the width of a gully, the depth of a pit, the distance of one feature from another. This is both to save space and on the assumption that users will be able and willing to `read a graphic` if they need such info. It is, however, usually spelt out in the archive texts and, of course, the site records as appropriate. Such data are, however, provided selectively, where they are not otherwise directly available in a published graphic, where they are seen to be significant e.g. the diameter of a structure, the depth of a find in a feature, or to help an argument or the flow of the text.
5. Similarly, spatial relationships are not necessarily spelt out if they are readily apparent in a graphic, though again significant ones will almost invariably have attention drawn to them e.g. ard-marks overlie many features on Site OD XI and such is indicated in several graphics; but the relationship is not mentioned in the text except where it is of general significance and where it is important to emphasise that a particular feature is earlier or later than a particular ard-mark.
6. To summarise re excavations, it is policy NOT to include textually metrical data clearly contained in figs. and plates where they are easily recoverable therefrom e.g. dimensions of cuttings, heights/depths of layers etc; nor of minutiae such as PH widths and depths, unless they are significant, where they are ordered and easily accessible in the archive. SO there are two main filters in front of the excavation text: data only get in if they are significant (for a host of reasons) and also contribute to the main story.
7. A note necy. on how and why we have treated `small finds` as we have.
8. AC will want a note on how and why she/we have veered consciously from some aspects of a conventional excavation report to make the whole, if possible, somewhat more readable. Crucial suggestions on structure and style have also been made by GA (and followed by pjf!).