1.1 Humanly Modified Stone

ARC BBW00

by Ruth Shaffrey

Introduction

1.1.1 From an assemblage of approximately 70 samples of stone retained during the excavations at Beechbrook Wood, there were ten pieces of probable worked stone.

Methodology

1.1.2 All retained stone was examined. Each sample was examined with a x10 magnification hand lens, weighed and recorded by small find number and or context and with regards to description, lithology and probable function.

Quantification

1.1.3 A large variety of stone specimens were retained during the excavations which would suggest that a comprehensive retention procedure was followed. Ten potentially worked specimens were recovered. The worked stone is described briefly in Table 2.3. The unworked stone specimens are listed in Table 2.4.

1.1.4 A fragment of lava quernstone was found in the subsoil of Area C (1034); this has to be early Roman or later as lava rotary querns were a Roman introduction. Another quern fragment was found in a pit dating to the Bronze Age (1200) and a complete saddle quern made from ironstone was recovered from Late Neolithic context (1909), in the very base of pit [1910].

1.1.5 Also amongst the worked stone were two probable rubbers, one of which may also have been used as a pestle. This latter rubber was recovered from context (230) in ditch sub-group 1972, interpreted as enclosure ditch to Middle/Late Bronze Age activity area 1952 (Area C), and the former from pit fill (446) in group 3038, part of Middle/Late Bronze Age activity area 2442 (Area A). Another probable pestle or small hammerstone was found in a Beaker period pit [1374] (group 3022), and a well used polisher was unfortunately unphased as a surface find (1671). Small fragments of ironstone were recovered but their size and the fact that they were not concentrated within any particular context or phase suggests that they are unlikely to be associated with iron working or smelting and that they were naturally occurring.

1.1.6 A variety of lithologies were present including ironstone, lava and probable greensand. The ironstone and Greensand are most likely both local originating in the Weald Clay and the Cretaceous Beds respectively. The lava was imported from the Niedermendig region. Most of the stone was fairly weathered as demonstrated by the lava which was very friable.

Provenance

1.1.7 Several items of worked stone were recovered from unphased contexts such as the subsoil. The remainder were largely from Iron Age and Bronze Age pits.

Conservation

1.1.8 No conservation is required. Only the worked or possible worked specimens need to be retained following assessment.

Comparative material

1.1.9 The single lava quern fragment can be compared with other lava querns found widely on sites across Kent including Waterloo Connection, Thurnham Villa (Shaffrey 2000a and

b) and Springhead Roman town (Roe 1999, 31). Nearer by, lava querns have recently been found at Westhawk Farm, Ashford (Roe 2000).

1.1.10 Closer examination of the Greensands utilised would be needed before a source can be identified and comparative material produced.

1.1.11 The well utilised possible axe sharpener/polisher is an extremely interesting example but as it was unstratified, a decision would need to be made about whether to pursue further investigation of it.

1.1.12 Saddle querns and rubbers are common on many prehistoric sites but the saddle quern from the base of pit [1910] is made from a purple, probably limonite cemented, ironstone. The use of ironstone for saddle querns is not common but nor is it unheard of; ironstone was apparently used for saddle querns at Gravesend in a Bronze Age context (Roe 1994, 399) and Hayes Common, Hayes (Philp 1973, 51).

Potential for further work

1.1.13 Though there are few humanly modified stone finds from the excavations at Beechbrook Wood, mainly from Bronze and Iron Age contexts, they are able to contribute to the Landscape Zone Aims for the Wealden Greensand and North Downs zones in period categories 2 and 3, specifically with regard to the following issues:

Early Agriculturists (4,500-2,000 BC)

- Define ritual and economic landscapes and their relationships
- Determine the nature of changes in economic lifeways, eg. relative importance of hunting-foraging and agriculture

Farming Communities (2,000-100 BC)

- Determine how settlements were arranged and functioned over time

1.1.14 The well used polisher, although a surface find, is an excellent example and worth further study for comparable material. The discovery of an ironstone saddle quern from the very base of Late Neolithic pit [1910] is significant and worthy of discussion, while the artefact itself warrants proper description and illustration. Discussion would be needed in conjunction with the other artefactual deposits in the pit.

1.1.15 The rubbers need further examination and discussion. The one rubber which may be a small pestle and the other possible pestle need to be carefully looked at and comparative material sought. Pestles are not widely recorded so these could be of particular significance.

1.1.16 The lithologies of all the artefacts need to be investigated thoroughly to determine whether all the material utilised was locally available. The lava quernstone is a poor example and very weathered, so is not deemed not worthy of illustration. Comparable material would not be required so long as its presence was recorded.

ARC BWD98

by Ruth Shaffrey

Introduction

1.1.17 Six fragments of worked stone were recovered by hand excavation during Fieldwork Event ARC BWD98.

Methodology and Quantification

1.1.18 All fragments were examined. Each sample was examined with a x10 magnification hand lens, weighed and recorded by small find number and or context and with regards to description, lithology and probable function. The results are presented in Table 2.5.

Provenance

1.1.19 Five of the six fragments originated from one context, fill (223) in posthole [224], part of group 3056, alongside the western extent of possible causeway group 3055. This is the only find-spot for this material for both ARC BBW00 and ARC BWD98 and may indicate that the postholes may have supported a grindstone. Although undated, this group is spatially associated with the later development stages of enclosure 3072 in Target Area A (sub-phase 7.1), which also features two four-poster arrays (groups 3050 and 3056) east of group 3055. SF11 is of unclear provenance, since double-numbering in the field has resulted in a re-numbering which could not be located on the revised site plan.

Conservation

1.1.20 The material is stable and requires no further conservation

Comparative material

1.1.21 Millstone grit is a common stone type utilised for quernstones in Kent, and a wide range of comparanda should be available for further analysis, if required.

Potential for further work

1.1.22 The assemblage is limited by its small size, and offers no potential for further analysis. However, in the wider context of the interpretation of enclosure 3072, its presence is of interest for the functional analysis of the site and in that way may contribute to the Landscape Zone Aims for the Wealden Greensand and North Downs zones in period categories 4i, specifically with regard to the following issue:

Towns and their rural landscapes sub-period 1 (100 BC.-AD 410)

- How were settlements and rural landscapes organised and how did they function?

Bibliography

Philp, B. 1973 Excavations in West Kent 1960-1970. The Discovery and Excavation of Prehistoric, Roman, Saxon and Medieval sites, mainly in the Bromley area and in the Darent Valley. Second Research report in the Kent Series.

Roe, F. 1994 Worked Stone. A. Mudd. The Excavation of a Later Bronze Age site at Coldharbour Road, Gravesend. *Archaeologia Cantiana* **CXIV**, 363-411

Roe, F. 1999 The Worked Stone. In A. Boyle and R. Early. Excavations at Springhead Roman Town, Southfleet, Kent. *OAU Occasional Paper* **1**, (29-31).

Roe, F. 2000 Assessment of the humanly modified and unworked stone. Oxford Archaeological Unit Assessment Report on Westhawk Farm, Ashford.

Shaffrey, R.L. 2000a Assessment of the humanly modified and unworked stone. Oxford Archaeological Unit Assessment Report on the Waterloo Connection.

Shaffrey, R.L. 2000b Assessment of the humanly modified and unworked stone. Oxford Archaeological Unit Assessment Report on the Thurnham Roman Villa

Table 2.3. Quantification and breakdown of worked stone assemblage by context from ARC BBW00

URL	Context	Small Find No	Material	Comments
1	1200		Hard quartzitic well cemented stone	Probable quern fragment One smooth flat surface but no edges
2	230	225	Poorly sorted sandstone	Possible rubber / pestle Well used as a rubber and possibly as a pestle
3	446	401	Greensand?	Rubber? Weathered chunk with one smooth edge
4	1034		Lava	Rotary quern Very weathered. Unphased but ERB at earliest
5	1377		pebble	Small hammerstone or pestle? Bashed on one end suggesting use as a hammerstone or pestle.
6	1671	232	Siltstone	Large polisher Extremely well used with 2 very concave faces and one long grooves. Also iron deposits. Probably also burnt. Surface find
7	2247	407	quartzitic sandstone pebble	Natural? Has one very smooth edge but this may be tbe natural edge of the pebble and the other edges are just broken
8	1697	234	Limestone	Possibly used? Has one smooth face but no clear evidence of working
9	1909	244	Ironstone	Saddle quern Not especially shaped. Making use of a large lump of stone. Has one fairly well used, concave surface
10	1669	231	Greensand	Unworked? Large chunk of greensand which may have been used for building but has no particular evidence of having been worked

Table 2.4. Quantification and breakdown of the unworked stone assemblage by context from ARC BBW00

URL	Context	Material	Comments
6	201	Slag	Not stone
5	210	Small chunk of grainy ironstone	
7	210	Thin ironstone chunk	
14	210	Chunk of thin ironstone	
15	210	Chunk of thin ironstone	
3	212	Slag	Not stone
42	216	Slag	Not stone
4	218	Thin chunk of ironstone	
36	219	Ironstone	
37	219	Ironstone	
24	221	Slag	Not stone
40	227	Chunk of stone	Very sharp edges, probably broken when excavated?
1	238	Chunk of flat ironstone	
13	244	Very tiny chunk of ironstone	
29	259	Grainy ironstone	Fairly worn
31	259	Grainy ironstone	
16	277	Unworked	Very weathered
17	277	Unworked	Very weathered
18	277	Unworked	Very weathered
10	561	small chunk of limestone	Weathered
11	561	small chunk of limestone	Weathered
12	561	small chunk of limestone	Weathered
38	711	Unworked	Very worn chunk
39	711	Tiny chunk of ironstone	
9	713	Thin ironstone chunk	
33	729	Thin ironstone	
22	735	Well rounded chunk of ironstone	
26	735	Ironstone	
27	735	Ironstone	
28	735	Ironstone	
35	735	Grainy ironstone	1 slightly flatter surface but not worked
32	746	Tiny chunk of ironstone	
34	746	Very tiny chunk of ironstone or slag	
41	1042	Grainy ironstone	
25	1345	Siltstone	
2	1377	Small chunk of grainy ironstone	slightly flat on one side
30	1441	CBM/pottery	Not stone
21	1491	Tiny chunk of ironstone	
8	1498	Slag	Not stone
43	1498	Very fossiliferous limestone	very weathered
19	1506	Slag	Not stone
20	1506	Pebble	Broken
23	1506	Large chunk	Sub rounded, looks quite bashed but not worked
49	1524	Slag	Not stone
55	1659	Thin chunk of ironstone	
57	1703	Several chunks of ironstone	
50	1909	Tiny chunk of thin ironstone	
56	2162	Thin ironstone	

46	2213	Thin ironstone	
47	2213	Thin ironstone	
44	2247	Chunk	
45	2269	Grainy ironstone	
51	2293	Grainy ironstone chunk	
54	2358	Slightly grainy ironstone chunk	
52	2365	chunk of grainy ironstone	
53	2365	chunk of grainy ironstone	
48	2430	Tiny chunk from a pebble	

Table 2.5. Quantification of worked stone by context from ARC BWD98

Context	Special No.	Count	Weight (g)	Material	Comments
223	13	2	462g	Millstone grit	Quern fragments
223	12	3	379g	Millstone grit	Quern fragments
(199)	11	1	778g	Millstone grit	Quern fragments