Channel Tunnel Rail Link

London and Continental Railways

Oxford Wessex Archaeology Joint Venture

Small Finds from Tollgate, Cobham, Kent

(ARC 330 98 C)

by Jackie Keily

CTRL Specialist Report Series

2006

©London and Continental Railways

All rights including translation, reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of London and Continental Railways

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURE

1 INTRODUCTION

Twenty-three artefacts were recovered by the Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS) during excavations at Tollgate (site code ARC 330 98).

Material	*Quantity*
Bone	2
Ceramic	4
Copper alloy	2
Flint	1
Iron	9
Stone	5

Activity on the site dates from the Neolithic period through to the medieval period and the small finds reflect this range. The first section of the report is a brief chronological narrative, placing the artefacts within the context in which they were found. There then follows a discussion of them by functional category, drawing in parallels from surrounding sites and, where possible, placing them within their regional and national context.

2 CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

2.1 Prehistoric features

2.1.1 Late Neolithic/early Bronze Age area of sarsens

Group 41015; sub-group 4118

Context 666 produced SF 108, a large fragment of sarsen used as a saddle quern and associated with a small scatter of sarsens, which may be part of a late Neolithic/early Bronze Age monument. The stone measures approximately 920 mm x 360 mm x 340 mm. Its upper face is smooth and concave and tapers to a point at one end, measuring *c* 710 mm x 365 mm. The scatter of sarsens is one of three groups found during the excavation and may either be part of a natural sarsen field or part of a megalithic monument. The saddle quern may therefore either be a naturally occurring fragment that was utilised as a quern at some point from the Neolithic to the early Roman periods or may be part of a monument that at a later date was reused as a quern.

2.1.2 Late Bronze Age well

Group 41020; sub-group 4173

Context 529, the fill of late Bronze Age well 537, produced small fragments from four perforated slabs (SF 79, SF 106, SF 107 and SF 111) and pottery dating to the mid- to late

Bronze Age. Perforated clay slabs or plaques are a typical find on late Bronze Age sites in the Thames valley (Champion, 1980, 237-8; also see discussion in Cobham report). Their precise function is unknown although it has been suggested that they were used in relation to ventilation, cooking or manufacture. The fabric of perforated slab fragments SF 79 and SF 106 is the same as that identified as late prehistoric pottery fabric F7, whilst slab SF 107 has no pottery fabric parallel. The fabric of slab SF 111 meanwhile is close to early Iron Age to early/middle Iron Age briquetage fabrics, although no exact match could be found. (Thanks to Dr. Elaine L. Morris for comments on comparisons between the slab, pottery and briquetage fabrics).

2.1.3 Late Bronze Age/early Iron Age pits

Group 41027; sub-group 4082

Context 373 is the fill of an early Iron Age to early/mid Iron Age pit 374. This pit had a base lined with flint cobbles and contained pottery dating to the 6th-5th and 4th-3rd centuries BC and the remains of four iron objects and two stone implements. The most interesting of the iron objects is a near complete La Tène I brooch, SF 90, with a low arching, almost straight bow. The head has four large coils with an external cord and an axial rod through the coils. The reverted foot is missing and therefore it is impossible to identify if the foot was reverted horizontally or in a slant (and thereby to differentiate between Hulls type 1C a and b). The brooch can therefore only be identified as belonging to Hull's form IC (Hull and Hawkes 1987, 116; Hattatt 1985, 10-11), which dates to the 4th to 3rd centuries BC.

The remaining iron, SF 66, comprises two narrow shaft fragments and a small triangular fragment. All are very corroded, but are possibly the remains of tools or implements: the triangular fragment appears to come from a blade and the shaft fragments may come from small rod-like tools, such as awls. One of the latter certainly thickens towards its centre and may be part of a small punch or awl. The Iron Age hillfort at Danebury, Hampshire produced a large selection of small rod-like tools (Sellwood 1984, 354 and 355, fig 7.13, for example no. 2.65; Cunliffe, Jope and Palk 1991, 340 fig 7.11).

Two stone implements were also recovered: SF 60 and SF 85. Small find SF 60 is part of a large flat, natural pebble, which has been roughly chipped around its outer edges to form an oval (only half of which survives). It is fine-grained light grey calcareous glauconitic sandstone, probably Cretaceous Lower Greensand from Kent, perhaps the Maidstone area. The upper surface is worn smooth and flat and has been used as a surface for grinding or working on. Although this face is flat and not at all concave, it is likely that it was used as a small saddle quern, as examples with flat faces are known from other sites (see discussion below). Alternatively, it is possible that it was used for another purpose, such as the processing of cloth or hides or the working of implements. Small find SF 85 is a small

fragment of a sarsen pebble used as a whetstone or smoothing stone. It has one broken edge and wear on the three remaining edges and the two faces. One of the edges has a quite a deeply worn indent. This may have been used in the production of maintenance of bladed implements, but could also have been used in cloth processing or as a rider for a saddle quern. If the latter then it is possible that it was used with SF 60.

The deposition of this group of objects within the pit is of interest. The brooch is in good condition and nearly complete with only the foot missing. The latter appears to have occurred post-deposition and not in antiquity, although the foot was not recovered from the pit. It is, therefore, perhaps possible that the complete brooch was purposefully placed within the pit, perhaps with the other finds. The remaining artefacts, all of which appear to be incomplete may argue against this and it may be that the brooch was accidentally lost. However, the large size of the brooch and the fact that it was probably in good working condition may infer that accidental loss was less likely, as it could be argued that the loss of such an item would have been noticed at the time.

The remaining iron artefacts are all in a very corroded state and the possibility that they were in a more complete state when originally buried cannot be ruled out. The two stone implements, the possible quern and tool, are both incomplete. Querns, with their associations with food production, are found in ritual placements throughout the prehistoric period (Proctor 2002, 97), often in a broken or fragmentary condition. This group of finds bears some similarity to the group of artefacts recovered from the Iron Age cremation burial at White Horse Stone, which produced a number of iron tools, a whetstone and six pottery vessels. It is thought that the tools and whetstone may perhaps have been symbolic of or associated with the deceased's trade or status (Glass 2003(?), 22). Since the present group of artefacts was not found with a cremation or burial, it may be better to parallel them to other possibly ritual or placed deposits in pits. This is, however, problematic since analysis of pit groups and their deposition has been mainly confined to Wessex (Hill 1995). An exception to this is the study undertaken by Sue Hamilton of the Iron Age pit deposits at the Caburn, East Sussex and associated sites (Hamilton 1998, 23-39). Finds from the pits there included pottery, iron weapons and knives, loomweights, weaving combs and quern fragments. It is interesting to note that whilst most of the pits contained middle Iron Age pottery, some contained both middle Iron Age and late Bronze Age pottery, suggesting the inclusion of what has been interpreted as 'curated rubbish' in at least some of the pits (ibid, 25). The inclusion of slighted or damaged/incomplete objects, a late Bronze Age/Iron Age tradition, was also noted, including fragments of broken quern stones (ibid, 32). Analysis of the material seems to indicate a differentiation in the types of artefacts deposited in pits depending on the type of site, so that on settlement sites there is less emphasis on tools and weaponry is completely absent. Such sites and deposits indicate the existence of 'everyday rites and traditions of

deposition' (ibid, 37-8). It may be that the pit at Tollgate with its brooch, iron artefacts and quern fragments belongs to this more low-level form of ritual deposition. Since only a small slice of the landscape at Tollgate was exposed during the archaeological investigations it is more difficult to identify how this pit related to others and to its surrounding landscape.

Group 41023; sub-group 4083

Context 566, the fill of pit 435, contained two sherds of flint-tempered later prehistoric pottery and a worked antler tine SF 110. The tine is probably red deer (Alan Pipe, MoLSS, pers comm.) and has been trimmed along its length, one end rounded and a small central hole drilled into the other end. Such simple antler tools are common on Iron Age and earlier sites (for example, Meare Village East (Coles 1987, 88-105)), although no exact parallel could be found for this implement, which may be assumed to have been intended for use as some form of handle.

Group 41025; sub-group 4085

Context 741, the fill of pit 740, produced pottery dating to the early Iron Age (*c* 500 to 300 BC), a plain open iron ring (SF 25) and a small waste fragment from antler working (SF 109). The iron ring is of interest as it measures approximately 65 mm in diameter and is open with one terminal missing and the other hooked back and extending outwards at a right angle to the ring. Although iron rings are found utilised for a variety of purposes on Iron Age sites (for example, Danebury (Sellwood 1984, 365, fig 7.22, nos 2.147-2.154)) an exact parallel for this example has not been found and its function remains unknown. The fragment of antler SF 109 is a small off-cut from antler-working. It is too small to identify its species type (Alan Pipe, MoLSS, pers comm.).

Group 41025; sub-group 4087

Context 1186, the fill of pit 1172, produced a small naturally occurring flint sphere (SF 46) and a small stone fragment with one smoothed, utilised surface (SF 59). The latter is hard medium-coarse grey/light grey glauconitic sandstone, probably Cretaceous Lower Greensand. The one remaining 'worked' surface is very smooth and flat and it probably formed part of a saddle quern, although due to is fragmentary nature its use as a rubbing or smoothing stone cannot be ruled out.

2.1.4 Fill of prehistoric ditch

Group 41049; sub-group 4104

Context 811, the fill of prehistoric ditch 810, produced a single sherd of flint-tempered pottery and an iron ring with a nail attached (SF 33). The latter is part of a swivelling fitting and may have been used as part of a suspension mechanism.

2.2 Roman features

2.2.1 Roman dew pond

Group 41035; sub-group 4120

Context 633, the fill of a re-cut Roman dew pond, produced fragments of later prehistoric pottery and five fragments of a lava stone quern SF 82. The fragments are all small, worn and very abraded, with no original surfaces or diagnostic features remaining. The lava stone is imported from the Eiffel region of northern Germany and is commonly found on Roman and early medieval sites in Britain.

2.2.2 Fill of Roman well

Group 41040; sub-group 4166

Context 538, the fill of Roman well cut 539, contained abraded Roman pottery dating to *c* AD 120-300 and ceramic building material dating to *c* AD 50-160, as well as a fragmentary and very corroded fragment of iron (SF 76). The latter has a solid circular section at one end that flattens and widens towards the other end. It is too corroded and incomplete to be able to identify its form or function.

2.2.3 Roman track way

Group 41036; sub-group 4193

Context 988, a Roman track way wheel rut in 990, produced no pottery and only a fragment of iron (SF 57). It consists of two joining pieces of iron plate, too corroded and fragmentary to identify.

2.2.4 Fills of Roman pit 861

Group 41029; sub-group 4207

Context 862, the fill of Roman pit 861, contained pottery dating from the Late Iron Age to the early Roman period and a fragmentary and corroded iron object (SF 47). This object consists of a long, tapering bar with a square section at one end, changing to a circular section along its length.

Context 863, another fill of Roman pit 861, produced pottery of the same date and a flat iron fragment with up-turned edges (SF 48). This fragment could possibly come from the socketed end of a tool such as a billhook or reaping hook.

2.3 Medieval features

2.3.1 Medieval firepit for destruction of prehistoric sarsen stones

Group 41042; sub-group 4125

Context 1149, the fill of 1148, a medieval firepit for the destruction of the prehistoric sarsen stones, produced Late Iron Age to early Roman pottery and two small lumps of iron slag and a corroded nail fragment (SF 24).

3 DISCUSSION

3.1 Prehistoric small finds

3.1.1 Objects associated with food processing

Saddle querns

Among the finds from Tollgate/Singlewell is a possible large sarsen saddle quern, SF 108. The stone was found in association with a group of sarsens which has been considered as a possible late Neolithic/early Bronze Age monument, but largely dismissed as such in the course of analysis. The possible saddle quern was the only potential prehistoric artefact found in association with the sarsen group and is therefore important to it's interpretation. Specialist views on interpretation of the stone is divided – It is certainly saddle quern shaped, but is larger than any known example and has little sign of a worked surface (Shaffrey, R, pers.comm.). The evidence for the sarsens being humanly modified is discussed in detail below.

The stones (including the saddle quern) were identified as sarsens on site by Richard Ellison, British Geological Survey and by David Bridgland. The origin of the sarsen stones, however, has been a matter of some debate and there appear to be two possible explanations: either they originated at or near to the site or they originated further away (perhaps in the area of the Medway) and were transported to the site.

Sarsens are more commonly found to the south, for example, around the Medway, as well as to the west and to the north of the Thames. The nearest megalithic monuments to Tollgate/Singlewell are the group clustered around the Medway valley (Evans 1950, 63-81; Holgate 1981, 221-234; Philp 1981, 77-92 and fig 1) and it could be argued that this is where the present stones originated. Groups of sarsens occur in areas around Blue Bell Hill and towards Westfield wood, both to the south-west of Rochester (Evans 1950, 68-9; Holgate 1981, 234). However, it is also possible that they originated nearer to the present site. Donald Aldiss, District Geologist for London and the South-east at the British Geological Survey, comments:

'It is not unusual to find sarsens on the Chalk of Berkshire and Wiltshire, for example, remote from outcrops of either the Palaeogene or the clay-with-flints. The Chatham memoir (Dines et al 1954, 104 et seq) notes that sarsens occur in the clay-with-flints in that district. The older Dartford Memoir (Dewey et al 1924, 56) records that cemented sandstone does occur locally in the Thanet Formation, but it is likely to occur in the Lambeth Group as well. It states that 'The Thanet sand of this neighbourhood is locally cemented into siliceous sandstone and some of the sarsens of the Pleistocene deposits may have come from this source ...'. However, it is, at best, very unusual to find sarsens 'in situ', within their original sequence, even in areas where they are common and so the general absence of beds of siliceous sandstone in the Lambeth Group ('Woolwich Beds') or Thanet Sand Formation in that part of Kent is not particularly significant. Although sarsens are most common around the northern and western fringes of the London Basin, they are known to occur on the Downs in Kent, including the Gravesend area (Summerfield and Goudie 1980, 72, fig 1) and these can be assumed to have been derived from one or other of the sandy units in the Palaeogene. Potter (1998) notes that small amounts of sarsen have been used in the construction of churches at Chalk and Shorne, only a few kilometres east and north-east of Singlewell. He suggests that there is a small cluster of Thanet-derived silcrete-type rocks (which when weathered out would normally be identified as sarsens) in west Kent.'

Just to the south-east of the present site, at Cobham, a sarsen stone was built into the church there (Jessup 1930, 64-5) and a large group of stones was removed from Cobham in the 18th and 19th centuries (Evans 1950, 75). These may have formed part of a monument or possibly more likely a group of natural sarsens (Holgate 1981, 233-4). To the south at Meopham and Trosley possibly naturally-occurring stones were noted by Jessup in 1930 in the local churchyards (Jessup 1930, 65).

The use of sarsen stones as saddle querns is known from other sites in the general area, although the present example appears to be larger than normal. At the late Bronze Age enclosure at Queen Mary's Hospital, Carshalton fragments of sarsen were found used as saddle querns (Adkins and Needham 1985, 38, nos 409 and 410; 39, fig 15), the stone thought to have derived from naturally occurring sarsens in the Croyden area (ibid 40). To the west of Tollgate/Singlewell, the late pre-Roman Iron Age farmstead at Farningham Hill above the Darent River produced a small fragment of probable sarsen stone, which was too small to identify as to its use or whether it had been worked (Parfitt in Philp 1984, 36). And at Danebury, in Hampshire, 18% of the saddle querns were made from sarsen boulders and had flat, slightly concave or very concave grinding surfaces (Laws, Brown and Roe 1991, 396).

The present example is also very large compared with the majority of saddle querns (it measures approximately 920 mm x 360 mm x 340 mm; the smooth, upper grinding surface is concave and tapers to a point at one end, measuring *c* 710 mm x 365 mm). There are

problems with estimating complete dimensions as many examples are so fragmentary. At Queen Mary's Hospital, Carshalton the examples found are smaller than the Tollgate/Singlewell one, with the larger measuring *c* 400 mm x 200 mm (Adkins and Needham 1985, 38, nos 409 and 410 and 39, fig 15). A virtually complete example found associated with the Bronze Age barrow at Buckskin, Hampshire, in a coarse-grained stone, is estimated at 450-500 mm in length, 250 mm wide and around 40 mm in thickness (King 1995, 173). The measurements were estimated from a photograph as the stone could not be located at the time of writing the report. As with the Tollgate/Singlewell example its surface tapers towards one end.

Such a large stone may also have been used as a 'polissoir' or sharpening/working surface for flint and stone axes. The smoothness of the upper, working surface and the lack of any deep linear grooves may argue, however, that it is more likely to have been used as a saddle quern.

Two small fragments of probable saddle quern were also recovered from the Tollgate/Singlewell site. Small find SF 60 has a flat grinding surface and is made from fine-grained light grey calcareous glauconitic sandstone, probably Cretaceous Lower Greensand, from Kent, perhaps in the Maidstone area. Saddle querns with both flat and concave surfaces were found at the later Bronze Age site at Coldharbour Road, Gravesend (Roe 1994, 399-400), made from iron-rich sandstone. Flat saddle querns made from ferruginous sandstone have also been found to the west of Tollgate at Hayes Common, near Bromley, at the site of a probable Bronze Age farmstead (Healey 1973, 44-45). Here a flat lower stone was used with a flat upper stone instead of the more typical bolster shaped rider. The lower stones are approximately oval in shape and measured approximately 180 mm x 350 mm (ibid 45) and there was no deliberate shaping of the underside of the lower stones, as with the example found at Tollgate/Singlewell, which has a width of *c* 160 mm. A small fragment, SF 59, has part of a smoothed, flat surface remaining and probably also came from a saddle quern. It is hard, medium-coarse grey/light grey glauconitic sandstone, probably Cretaceous Lower Greensand, from Kent, perhaps in the Maidstone area.

The dating of saddle querns is problematical, as they were used from the Neolithic period through to the early Roman period (for example, Major 1998, 88). To the east of the present site fragments of broken saddle querns, probably greensand, were recovered from a Late Bronze Age settlement site on the Isle of Thanet (Perkins 1994, 304). Further fragments were found with Bronze Age cylindrical loomweights at Itford Hill and Park Brow, both Sussex (Burstow and Holleyman 1957, 200-4; Wolseley, Smith and Hawley 1927, 4-5 and fig D).

Tools

Small find SF 85 is a small fragment of sarsen used as a whetstone, smoothing stone or possibly as a rider for a saddle quern. It is interesting that it was recovered from the same pit as probable saddle quern SF 60. Antler tine SF 110 shows signs of having been trimmed and shape, as well as having a small hole drilled into one end. It is thought that this tine may have been intended for use as a handle or perhaps as some form of tool or implement.

Objects of personal adornment

The only item of personal adornment from any period is the near complete La Tène I brooch, SF 90, with a low arching, almost straight bow. The head has four large coils with an external cord and an axial rod through the coils. The reverted foot is missing and therefore it is impossible to identify if the foot was reverted horizontally or in a slant (and thereby to differentiate between Hull's type 1C a and b). The brooch can therefore only be identified as belonging to Hull's form 1C (Hull and Hawkes 1987, 116; Hattatt 1985, 10-11), which dates to the 4th to 3rd centuries BC. It is quite a large example with a length of *c* 100 mm and as the break on it reverted foot appears to have occurred post deposition, the question of whether it was accidentally lost or purposefully deposited remains.

La Tène I brooches are rare in Kent. Hull and Hawkes published three (1987, 80, no. 3646; 114, no. 6705 and 119, no. 4991) and since then a further three have been recorded (Professor Tim Champion, pers comm.).

Hull's Type 1C bow brooches are found in both copper-alloy and iron and have wide distribution in Britain. Of those he and Hawkes recorded and published (1987) the majority are found in Wiltshire and North Yorkshire, but examples occur as far west as Devon and Somerset and as far north as Perthshire in Scotland. Few examples, however, come from the south-east of England and the only example from Kent is in bronze (Hull and Hawkes 1987, 119, no. 4991 and plate 33). This is a more elaborate example (the bow having a decorative disc with coral inlay in its middle), found on the chalk ridge to the south-west of Deal in east Kent. Two examples came from Sussex: one of bronze wire from east Dean in east Sussex (ibid 125, no. 4280 and plate 36) and an iron example from Findon Park, west Sussex (ibid 120, no. 3101 and plate 34; Wolseley, Smith and Hawley 1927, 11, Fig G). The latter is closer to the present example, being plainer and made of iron, however, it is also smaller with a more rounded bow.

Antler working waste

A single small off-cut from antler working (SF 109) came from the fill of pit 740, which also produced early Iron Age pottery. This is the only evidence from the site for bone or antler

working and, unfortunately, the fragment is too small to identify the species of deer it came from.

Objects of unknown function

Ceramic

The only ceramic small finds are the fragments of four perforated slabs found in a pit fill. These objects are of uncertain function but are commonly found on late Bronze Age sites along the Thames. A fuller discussion of their form and possible functions can be found in the report for Cobham (ARC CGC 98). It is interesting to note that two of the four have fabrics that are the same as one of the late prehistoric pottery fabrics (Dr. Elaine L. Morris, pers comm.) and that at Cobham the slabs were also made from pottery fabrics. This indicates that at least some of the perforated slabs were being produced at the same time and probably by the same people as the pottery.

Stone

A naturally occurring flint sphere (SF 46) came from the same pit fill as stone tool SF 59. It has a diameter of *c* 16 mm and may either be a naturally occurring stone on the site or may have been kept in antiquity and then discarded or lost in the pit.

Metalwork

Late Bronze Age/early Iron Age pits produced a triangular fragment of iron that may come from a blade, as well as two shaft fragments, possible remains of rod-like tools, such as awls. One of the latter certainly thickens towards its centre and may be part of a small punch or awl. The Iron Age hillfort at Danebury, Hampshire produced a large selection of small rod-like tools (Sellwood 1984, 354 and 355, fig 7.13, for example no. 2.65; Cunliffe, Jope and Palk 1991, 340 fig 7.11). The plain open ring, with one end bent back and out, SF 25 from the pit that produced the antler off-cut and the early Iron Age pottery, is a rather enigmatic object. No direct parallel has been found for it. A complete plain iron ring with a nail attached (SF 33) may be a swivelling fitting, possibly from a suspension mechanism or perhaps associated with harness. This object was found in a prehistoric ditch but its date is uncertain. It may have been used on a chain, for example to suspend a cauldron, although these are more usually found with an elongated oval loop rather than a ring (for Roman examples see Manning 1989, 138, nos S4 and S5, plate 64). Ring and swivel examples dating to the Roman period also come from Fishbourne (Cunliffe 1971, 130, fig 57, no 23) and Catterick Bypass (Mould 2002, 98, fig 277, no 204), the latter a double-pierced example. The present example is smaller than most of the quoted examples and may have been used for hanging a smaller lighter object.

3.2 Roman small finds

3.2.1 Objects associated with food processing

Small, abraded fragments of lava stone (SF 82) came from a re-cut Roman dewpond. They are all that remains of a rotary quern stone and is of a type imported from the Eiffel region of northern Germany, which is commonly found on sites from the Roman through to the early medieval periods.

3.2.2 Objects of unknown function

A Roman well fill produced SF 76, a fragmentary and very corroded fragment of iron with a solid circular section at one end that flattens and widens towards the other end. It is too corroded and incomplete to be able to identify its form or function. Two joining pieces of iron plate, SF 57, too corroded and fragmentary to identify, came from a Roman track way. A pit fill produced a long, tapering bar (SF 47) with a square section at one end which changes to a circular section along its length and a flat iron fragment with up-turned edges (SF 48). The latter may come from the socketed end of a tool such as a billhook or reaping hook, tools that are found in both the Iron Age and Roman periods (for example, Sellwood 1984, 348, fig 7.9, nos 2.19, 2.22 and 2.33; Manning 1985, 54, fig 14).

3.3 Finds of unknown date

Two small fragments of iron slag and a corroded nail fragment (SF 24) came from the fill of a medieval fire pit for the destruction of the prehistoric sarsen stones. It also contained late Iron Age to early Roman pottery and so the date of the slag and nails cannot be refined.

4 CATALOGUE

The following standard typology was used for the brooches: Hull and Hawkes (1987).
The catalogue entries are classified by period. Each entry includes the small find number (SF), the material, the object description and the context number (Cxt). The number (I-) visible at the end of each catalogue entry refers to the unique record ID which can be found in the database.

4.1 Prehistoric finds

SF 25. Unidentified. Iron. Open ring fitting; oval section ring with an opening; one terminal broken off and missing; other now broken off but survives and indicates that this arm is folded out almost at right angles to the ring. Probably some form of fitting. The ring's section tapers at either end of the opening to 6 mm x 6 mm. Cxt 741. I-15.

SF 33. Swivel Hook. Iron. A plain pierced ring with a swivel hook with a globular terminal through the hole; for use on a chain, for example to suspend a cauldron. More usually found with an elongated oval loop rather than a ring (for Roman examples: Manning 1989, 138, nos S4 and S5, plate 64). Roman ring and swivel examples: Fishbourne (Cunliffe 1971, 130, fig

57, no 23); Catterick Bypass, a double-pierced example (Mould 2002, 98, fig 277, no 204). The present example is smaller than most of the quoted examples and may have been used for hanging a smaller lighter object. Cxt 811. I-21.

SF 46. Unidentified. Flint. Naturally occurring sphere; Diam 15-16 mm. Cxt 1186. I-11.

SF 59. Quern? Stone. Small fragment; one smoothed surface; possibly part of the grinding surface of a saddle quern; but such a small fragment may also have come from a large smoothing stone or rubber/rider. Cxt 1186. I-23.

SF 60. Quern? Stone. Approximately half of a stone with a smoothed, flat surface; the stone would have been roughly oval in outline with roughly worked edges to form the shape; the lower surface remains that of the natural large pebble it was worked from. W 145-160 mm; Th 15-46 mm. Probably part of a small saddle quern with a flat grinding surface. Stone identification by Dr Ian M Betts: Fine grained light grey calcareous glauconitic sandstone; Probably Cretaceous Lower Greensand; Quarry source: Kent, perhaps Maidstone area. Cxt 373. I-25.

SF 66. Unidentified. Iron. Three very corroded fragments; two shaft fragments, possibly from small rod-like tools, such as awls; and a triangular fragment (possibly part of a blade). Cxt 373. I-19.

SF 79. Perforated clay slab fragment (263 g); uniform red/brown colour; corner fragment (140 mm x 65 mm and 21 mm thick) in 3 joining pieces; remains of one round hole (Diam 18 mm) *c* 50 mm and 65 mm from the two surviving edges. The corner is sharp and fairly right-angled; the longer edge tapering slightly as if to wards a rounded corner. Thickness along part of edge *c* 27 mm.
Fabric identification by C. Thompson: Hard fabric with a slightly silty micaceous matrix; moderate fine to very coarse (up to 3 mm) ill-sorted crushed calcinated flint; sparse medium to very coarse rounded or streaked red iron-rich clay inclusions; very rare very coarse sub angular calcitic inclusions. Exterior surfaces are coated in abundant fine to very coarse (up to 2 mm) ill-sorted crushed calcinated flint. Dr. Elaine L. Morris comments: This fabric is the same as later prehistoric pottery fabric F7. Cxt 529. I-10.

SF 85. Tool. Stone. Fragment of stone; smooth, flat upper and lower faces; one edge broken, other three also worn from use. One edge has a worn indent. This object may have been used to work or maintain bladed implements, but may also have been used as a smoothing stone or as a rider for a saddle quern. Cxt 373. I-12.

SF 90. Brooch. Iron. Brooch with low arching, almost straight bow; head with two or four large coils, an external cord and an axial rod; foot is missing and therefore impossible to tell if it was reverted horizontally or in a slant; La Tene I, Hull type IC (Hull and Hawkes 1987, 116; Hattatt 1985, 10-11) dating to 4th to 3rd century BC. Cxt 373. I-20.

SF 106 Perforated clay slab fragment (298 g); uniform light brown/red colour; corner fragment measuring 110 mm x 75 mm and 20-27 mm thick; with remains of two round holes (Diam *c* 19 mm); one hole is *c* 35 mm from one edge and *c* 50 mm from the other; other hole is *c* 80 mm and *c* 60 mm from the same edges. One edge is fairly flat whereas the adjacent one has a shallow horizontal groove; corner rounded. This fragment is made up of 8 joining pieces (and four small fragments) and therefore all measurements are approximate.
Fabric identification by C. Thompson: Hard fabric with a slightly silty micaceous matrix; common medium to very coarse (up to 2 mm) well-sorted crushed calcinated flint; rare coarse sub-rounded red iron-rich clay pellets; rare coarse sub-angular ‘pink’ flint.
Dr. Elaine L. Morris comments: This fabric is the same as later prehistoric pottery fabric F7. Cxt 529. I-2.

SF 107 Perforated clay slab fragment (53 g); uniform orange/brown colour; three small fragments (two join); 60mm x 60mm and 21mm thick; remains of two round holes: (Diam *c* 18 mm). No outer edges surviving.
Fabric identification by C. Thompson: Hard fabric with a slightly silty micaceous matrix; moderate very coarse (up to 6 mm) well-sorted crushed calcinated flint; sparse to moderate very coarse (up to 3 mm) elongated and elliptical (organic and shell?) voids; rare coarse rounded or streaked red iron-rich clay inclusions.
Dr. Elaine L. Morris comments: This fabric has no pottery parallel. Cxt 529. I-3.

SF 108. Quern. Stone. Saddle quern; found with a group of Sarsen stones; probably late prehistorice in date. The upper surface is worn, smoothed and concave (measuring approximately 700 mm by 365 mm). Cxt 666. I-24.

SF 109. Waste. Animal bone. Antler; small off-cut from antler-working with one cut edge; too small to identify species. Width tapers from 28 mm to 17 mm. Cxt 741. I-9.

SF 110. Handle. Animal bone. Antler; some smoothing along shaft; one end sawn from a number of faces and snapped with a central hole, presumably for the tang of a metal implement; the other end is chapped or pared leaving a rounded butt. Diameter is 13 x 17 mm at narrower and 19 x 19.5 mm at butt end. Cxt 566. I-7.

SF 111 Perforated clay slab fragment (49 g); uniform pale orange/brown colour; small fragment (51 mm x 44 mm and *c* 25-30 mm thick) with remains of one outer edge with shallow horizontal groove and remains of a round hole (Diam 20 mm) *c* 30 mm from outer edge. Th at outer edge *c* 30 mm.
Fabric identification by C. Thompson: Hard fabric with a slightly silty micaceous matrix; very common very coarse (up to 2 mm) well-sorted elongated and elliptical (leached shell?) voids; sparse medium to coarse rounded ill-sorted red iron-rich clay pellets; very, very rare medium (crushed calcinated flint?) inclusions.
Dr. Elaine L. Morris comments: This fabric is close to early Iron Age to early/middle Iron Age briquetage fabrics, but none are actually the same. Cxt 529. I-4.

4.2 Roman finds

SF 27. Coin. Copper alloy. Sestersius; ?AD40-180? Corroded. From Chainage 43+020-43+720 (metal detected). Unstratified. I-5.

SF 47. Unidentified. Iron. Part of a pointed rod or spike; square section changes to a circular section along its length; very corroded; broken at either end; diameter tapers from 1 mm to *c* 4 mm. Cxt 862. I-17.

SF 48. Unidentified. Iron. Slightly convex sheet metal strip; width tapers from 27 mm to 25 mm. Presumably a casing or ferrule for something or possibly part of a socketed implement. Another possibility is that this is part of a gouge. These tools are found in both the Iron Age and Roman periods (Manning 1985, 24; a similar fragment to the present piece comes from from Bainesse, Catterick (Mould 2002, 119, fig 288, nos 17 and 18)), though the present example is shallower; it may however be part of the socket from a socketed tool, for example a billhook or reaping hook, tools that are found in both the Iron Age and Roman periods (for example, Sellwood 1984, 348, fig 7.9, nos 2.19, 2.22 and 2.33; Manning 1985, 54, fig 14). Cxt 863. I-16.

SF 57. Unidentified. iron. Part of a flat iron plate comprising two joining fragments. Heavily corroded. Width tapers from 42 mm to 36 mm. Cxt 988. I-14.

SF 76. Unidentified. Iron. Solid circular section at one end that flattens and widens towards the other end. Too corroded and incomplete to identify form or function. Maximum width 22 mm. Cxt 538. I-22.

SF 82. Quern. Stone. Small fragment made up of five joining pieces; rounded and arbaded; no diagnostic features remain. Cxt 633. I-13.

4.3 Post-Roman finds

SF 3. Jetton. Copper Alloy. Half; Nuremberg jetton of Hans Krauwinckel II, AD 1586-1635. From Chainage 41+160 (metal detected). Unstratified. I-6.

4.4 Undated finds

SF 24. Nail. Iron. Part of a nail shaft; circular section; very corroded; broken at one end. Also two fragments of iron slag. Cxt 1149. I-18.

5 LIST OF ILLUSTRATED FINDS

5.1 Prehistoric finds (Fig. 1)

SF 25. Plain open iron ring. Cxt 741. I-15.

SF 33. Iron ring with a nail attached. Cxt 811. I-21.

SF 66 Iron fragments (x 3). Cxt 373. I-19.

SF 90. Iron La Tène I brooch. Cxt 373. I-20.

SF 59. Small fragment from a probable saddle quern. Cxt 1186. I-23.

SF 60 and SF 85. Stone implements. Cxt 373. I-25 and I-12.

SF 109. Waste fragment from antler working. Cxt 741. I-9.

SF 110. Worked antler tine. Cxt 566. I-7.

6 ASSESSMENT DATA

The following finds were examined during the post-excavation assessment and were not subjected to detailed analysis. Please refer to the post-excavation assessment report for further details (URS 2001).

Material	Author
Glass	Jackie Keily

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adkins, L, and Needham, S, 1985 New Research on a late Bronze Age enclosure at Queen Mary's Hospital, Carshalton, *Surrey Archaeological Collections* **76**, 11-50

ADS, 2006 CTRL digital archive, Archaeology Data Service, http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/projArch/ctrl

Allen, M J, Morris, M, and Clark, R H, 1995 Food for the living: a reassessment of a Bronze Age barrow at Buckskin, Basingstoke, Hampshire, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* **LXI**, 157-189

Burstow, G P, and Holleyman, G A, 1957 Late Bronze Age settlement on Itford Hill, Sussex, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* **XXIII**, 167-212

Coles, J, M, 1987 *Meare Village East; the excavations of A. Bulleid and H. St. George Gray 1932-1956,* Somerset Levels Papers no. 13

Cunliffe, B, Jope, M, and Palk, N, 1991 The Iron in Cunliffe, B, and Poole, C, *Danebury: an Iron Age hillfort in Hampshire; Vol.5, the excavations, 1979-1988: the finds*, CBA Res Rep **73**, London, 333-354

Dewey, H, Bromehead, C E N, Chatwin, C P, and Dines, H G, 1924 The geology of the country around Dartford, *Memoir of the Geological Survey of Great Britain, Sheet 271 (England and Wales)*

Dines, H G, Holmes, S C A, and Robbie, J A, 1954 Geology of the country around Chatham, *Memoir of the Institute of Geological Sciences, Sheet 272 (England and Wales)*

Evans, J H, 1950 Kentish megalith types, *Arch Cant* **LXIII**, 63-81

Glass, H, 2003 *Tracks and traces: the archaeology of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link*, Oxford Wessex Archaeology, Oxford

Hamilton, S, 1998 Using elderly databases: Iron Age pit deposits at the Caburn, East Sussex and related sites, *Sussex Arch Coll* **136**, 23-39

Healey, E, 1973 Loom-weights, in Philp1973, 44

Hill, J D, 1995 *Ritual and rubbish in the Iron Age of Wessex*, Oxford, BAR **242**

Holgate, R, 1981 The Medway megaliths and Neolithic Kent, *Arch Cant* **XCVII**, 221-234

Hull, M R, and Hawkes, C F C, 1987 *Corpus of Ancient Brooches in Britain: pre-Roman bow brooches*, BAR British Series **168**

Jessup, R F, 1930 *The archaeology of Kent*, London

King, A C, 1995 Stone artefacts in Allen, M J, Morris, M, and Clark, R H, 1995

Laws, K, Brown, L and Roe, F, 1991 Objects of stone in Cunliffe, B, and Poole, C, *Danebury: an Iron Age hillfort in Hampshire; Vol.5, the excavations, 1979-1988: the finds*, CBA Res Rep **73**, London, 382-404

Major, H, 1998 The querns in Carter, G A, *Excavations at the Orsett 'Cock' Enclosure, Essex, 1976*, East Anglian Archaeology Report no. **86**, 87-8

Manning, W H, 1985 *Catalogue of the Romano-British iron tools, fittings and weapons in the British Museum*

Parfitt, K, 1984 The Quernstones and stone-weight, in Philp, B J, *Excavations in the Darent Valley, Kent*, Fourth Research Report in the Kent Monograph Series, Kent Archaeological Rescue Unit, 35-7

Perkins, D J R, 1994 Querns and whetstones, in Perkins, D J R, Macpherson-Grant, N and Healey, E, Monkton Court Farm Evaluation, 1992, *Arch Cant* **CXIV**, 304-5

Philp, B J, 1973 A Bronze Age site on Hayes Common, in 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 (ed B J Philp), Second Research Report in the Kent Series, Kent Archaeological Rescue Unit, 30-52

Potter, J F, 1998 The distribution of silcretes in the churches of East London, *Proceedings of the Geologists Association* **109**, 289-304

Roe, F, 1994 Worked stone, in Mudd, A, The excavation of a later Bronze Age site at Coldharbour Road, Gravesend, *Arch Cant* **CXIV**, 399-400

Sellwood, L, 1984 Objects of iron, in Cunliffe, B, *Danebury: an Iron Age hillfort in Hampshire: Vol 2, The excavations, 1969-1978: the finds*, CBA Res Rep **52**, 346-371

Summerfield, M A, and Goudie, A S, 1980 The sarsens of southern England: their palaeoenvironmental interpretation with reference to other silcretes, in *The shaping of southern England*. (ed DKC Jones), Institute of British Geographers Special Publication **11**, 71-100

URS, 2001 CTRL Area 330 (Zone 4) Tollgate (ARC TLG98): Archaeological post-excavation assessment report, unpubl. report prepared by MoLAS for Union Railways (South) Limited, in ADS 2006

Wolseley, G R, Smith, R A, and Hawley, W, 1927 Prehistoric and Roman settlement on Park Brow, *Archaeologia* **LXXVI**, 1-40)

Green Lane, Farnham, Surrey: Lowther 1939: A survey of the prehistory of the Farnham District