

7.6 ASSESSMENT OF WORKED FLINT

Tania Wilson

Summary

- 7.6.1 A small assemblage of worked flint was recovered during the excavation. All of the pieces were found in post-Roman contexts and are therefore residual. Due to the size of the group and the provenance, further analysis of this assemblage is not considered worthwhile although a short note highlighting their regional value is suggested.

Introduction

- 7.6.2 A total of 24 worked flints were recovered from the site (excluding the small quantity of material collected by MoLAS during evaluation). The majority of the assemblage was retrieved by hand during excavation but four pieces were recovered during the processing of environmental samples.
- 7.6.3 Analysis of this assemblage is unlikely to address the Fieldwork Event Aims, as these are targeted largely towards the more intensive Anglo-Saxon and medieval phases. However, the assemblage does augment the ceramic evidence for activity in the area prior to the late Iron Age.

Methodology

- 7.6.4 The assemblage has been quantified and scanned, but has not been catalogued. Each individual artefact has been assigned to basic categories, as shown in Table One.

Quantification

- 7.6.5 The assemblage composition is shown in Table One. There appears to be no observable bias in the collection of the material and it is likely that the assemblage is fairly representative for the site.

7.6.6 Table One
Worked Flint

<i>Artefact Type</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Group %</i>	<i>Total %</i>	<i>Period</i>
Scrapers	1	50	4	
Piercers				
Burins				
Projectiles	1	50	4	Neolithic
Leaf-shaped arrowhead				
Denticulates				
Fabricators				
Microliths				
Core tools				
Other tools				
Misc. retouch				
Tools - sub total		2	8	
Flake cores & core frags	1	25	4	
Blade(let) cores & core frags	1	25	4	Mesolithic
Rejuvenation tablets				
Crested pieces				
Microburins				
Chips	2	50	8	
Production - sub total	4	17		
Blades & bladelets	1	6	4	
(inc. no. broken)				
Flakes (inc. no. broken)	15	94	63	
Blades & flakes – sub total	16	67		
Debitage	2	100	8	
Fragments – sub total	2	8		
Total	24			

Provenance

7.6.7 The provenance of the individual artefacts is shown in Table Two. As can be seen in the table, the artefacts are fairly evenly distributed and were almost exclusively recovered from contexts of Anglo-Saxon or medieval date.

7.6.8 Table Two
Worked flint by context

<i>Context</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Period</i>	<i>Comments</i>
0	1		
316	1		
330	1		
414	2		
423	1		
478	1		
483	1		
485	1		
506	1	Mesolithic	Blade Core
548	1		
557	1	Scraper	
562	2		
563	1		
565	1		
567	1		
569	1	Neolithic	Arrowhead
608	1		
609	1	Core	
632	2		
639	1		
658	1		

Comparative material

- 7.6.9 Other finds from the vicinity have been recorded previously and are of roughly contemporary date. From Aldington has come a scatter of flint implements, probably Mesolithic in date (Bradshaw 1968, 251), and a fragment of a Neolithic ground and polished flint axe (Alpin 1995, 219). A stone mace-head from Smeeth is likely to be late Neolithic or early Bronze Age in date (Kelly 1988, 302).
- 7.6.10 A substantial struck flint assemblage was recovered near Ashford at Waterbrook Farm. This dates to both the Mesolithic and late Neolithic or Bronze Age periods and represents more intensive activity within the area (Wilson 1998).
- 7.6.11 For other significant evidence of Mesolithic activity one must look further afield, to Park Farm at Ashford (Clark 1996, 37). The only other substantial finds of Neolithic date were made some distance away at Brabourne (Bradshaw 1975, 203; Kelly 1969, 259; 1976, 230).

Potential for further work

- 7.6.12 The potential of this assemblage to address the Fieldwork Event Aims and the Landscape Zone Priorities is fairly minimal, as these are more applicable to the more intensive phases of occupation in the Anglo-Saxon and medieval periods.

7.6.13 Given the size of the assemblage, its provenance and the paucity of other contemporary artefacts or features, further analysis is not considered worthwhile. In regional terms, however, it is worthy of note that this assemblage was recovered, and a short note to this end would be desirable, accompanied by illustrations of the diagnostic and formal tools.

7.6.14 Bibliography

Alpin, J., 1995; A Flint Axe from Aldington, *Kent Archaeological Review* **119**, p219.

Bradshaw, J., 1968; Reports from Local Secretaries and Groups. 'Aldington', in Investigations and Excavations during the Year, *Archaeologia Cantiana* **83**, p251.

Bradshaw, J., 1975; Reports from Local Secretaries and Groups. 'Brabourne', in Investigations and Excavations during the Year, *Archaeologia Cantiana* **91**, p203.

Clark, P., 1996; Park Farm, Ashford, in P. Bennett (ed), *Canterbury's Archaeology 1994-5*, Canterbury p37.

Kelly, D. B., 1969; Archaeological Notes from Maidstone Museum. 'Brabourne', in Researches and Discoveries in Kent, *Archaeologia Cantiana* **84**, p259.

Kelly, D. B., 1976; Archaeological Notes from Maidstone Museum. 'Brabourne', in Researches and Discoveries in Kent, *Archaeologia Cantiana* **92**, p230.

Kelly, D. B., 1988; Archaeological Notes from Maidstone Museum. 'Smeeth', in Researches and Discoveries in Kent, *Archaeologia Cantiana* **105**, p302.

Wilson, T., 1998; *Waterbrook Farm, Ashford (WBFA 92/3). An Assessment of the Lithic Artefacts*, Canterbury Archaeological Trust, unpublished.

7.7 ASSESSMENT OF BURNT FLINT

Tania Wilson

Summary

- 7.7.1 A small assemblage of burnt flint was recovered during the excavation. The size of the individual pieces and their distribution suggests that this material was largely residual and hence further study would not be worthwhile.

Introduction

- 7.7.2 A total of sixteen fragments of burnt flint, weighing some 1.145kg was recovered during the archaeological excavation at Mersham. The assemblage was retrieved entirely during manual excavation.
- 7.7.3 Given that this material is likely to be residual it is unlikely that any further study could address the Fieldwork Event Aims.

Methodology

- 7.7.4 The assemblage has been quantified and weighed; the results are shown in Table One.

Quantification

- 7.7.5 In total, sixteen pieces of burnt flint were recovered. There is no observable bias in collection, hence it is likely that this assemblage is fairly representative for the site.

Provenance

- 7.7.6 The provenance of the individual fragments is included in Table One. The table shows that there are no apparent concentrations of burnt flint and that the material is sparsely distributed throughout the features of Anglo-Saxon or medieval date although a small scrap (not tabulated) was recovered from the single prehistoric feature identified.

7.7.7 **Table One**

Burnt Flint

<i>Context</i>	<i>Sub-Group</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Weight (g)</i>
573	101	4	2	1	110
640	75	3	2	1	350
328	33	10	3	1	5
488	157	6	3	1	20
515	180	6	3	1	60
564	109	13	3	1	140
567	107	13	3	1	95
568	104	13	3	1	55
569	112	12	3	1	65
600	161	13	3	1	10
609	161	13	3	2	150
629	73	10	3	2	75
639	70	8	3	1	5
370	36	26	4	1	5

Conservation

7.7.8 It is unlikely that any further analysis of this material would be worthwhile. As it has been fully recorded in terms of quantity, weight and provenance, it is recommended that the assemblage is not retained.

Potential for further work

7.7.9 It is almost certain, given the size of the assemblage and its distribution, that further study of this assemblage would do little to address the Fieldwork Event Aims or the Landscape Zone Priorities.

7.7.10 It is impossible to assign a meaningful date to this assemblage.

7.7.11 Given that any further study is unlikely to be worthwhile, no further analysis is recommended.