

VOLUME 8ii FIELD REPORT FOR FAR EAST SECTOR INT 20, 32, 38

Authors: Andy Copp, Madeleine Hummler and Martin Carver

For illustrations , see Research Report and *Site Atlas*

CONTENTS:

1. **Summary** (M.Hummler)
2. **Strategy** (M. Carver, A.Copp)
 - 2.1 Location and Character of the Area
 - 2.2 Aims and Objectives
 - 2.3 The Workforce
 - 2.4 Operations Undertaken
 - 2.5 Analyses Undertaken
3. **Methods and Results** (A.Copp, M. Carver)
 - 3.1 Pre-excavation surface and sub-surface surveys
 - 3.2 The trial trench, Int.20
 - 3.3 Recording and Recovery Levels
 - 3.4 Removal of the ploughsoil
 - 3.5 The Experimental Evolution of 'Horizon' definition
 - 3.6 The Experimental Evolution of 'Feature' definition
 - 3.6.1 Method of recognising features
 - 3.6.2 Natural features
 - 3.6.3 Features other than graves
 - 3.6.4 The definition and recording of graves
 - 3.7 Surface Mapping of Int.38 (MRH)
 - 3.8 Comment on the excavation of Int.32
 - 3.8.7 Quality control listings for graves excavated in Int.32
 - 3.9 The Assemblage (M. Hummler)
4. **Establishing the Sequence** (M. Hummler)
 - 4.1 Stratigraphic Sequence
 - 4.2 Radiocarbon Dating
 - 4.3 Finds Distribution and Model of the Sequence
5. **Selected Studies: The Prehistoric Period** (M. Hummler)
 - 5.1 "Postholes" F2/111, F3/112 etc.
 - 5.2 Double ditch boundary F133 and F135
 - 5.3 The Beaker pit F175, adjacent features and tree pit F178
 - 5.4 Ditch F1/130 and palisade F213 boundary
 - 5.5 Tree pits
6. **Selected Studies: The Roman Period**

None
7. **Selected Studies: The Early Medieval Period** (M. Carver)
 - 7.0 Definition of Early Medieval features
 - 7.1 Burials in Int. 32 (group 1)
 - 7.1.1 Burial 17, F9

- 7.1.2 Burial 18, F39/101/245/246
- 7.1.3 Burial 19, F40/102/247
- 7.1.4 Burial 20, F106/248/249
- 7.1.5 Burial 21, F108/251
- 7.1.6 Burial 22, F109/252
- 7.1.7 Burial 23, F137/1
- 7.1.8 Burial 24, F137/2
- 7.1.9 Burial 25, F146/258
- 7.1.10 Burial 26, F154/259
- 7.1.11 Burial 27, F161/260/261
- 7.1.12 Burial 28, F163/262
- 7.1.13 Burial 29, F166/263
- 7.1.14 Burial 30, F173/264
- 7.1.15 Burial 31, F231/237
- 7.1.16 Burial 32, F227/1/238
- 7.1.17 Burial 33, F227/2/239
- 7.1.18 Burial 34, F235/240

- 7.2 Burials in Int. 52
- 7.2.1 Burial 35, F4/34
- 7.2.2 Burial 36, F37/71
- 7.2.3 Burial 37, F25/72
- 7.2.4 Burial 38, F35/75
- 7.2.5 Burial 39, F36/74

- 7.3 Other Early Medieval features
- 7.3.1 Timber foundation in Int.52
- 7.3.2 Features at the focus of the graves
- 7.4 Empty, failed or unexcavated graves

- 8. **Selected Studies: Medieval and Later**

- 8.1 The Anti-glider Ditch, F220

1. SUMMARY (M. Hummler)

A sector of the Sutton Hoo sample, located to the East of the scheduled monument and to the East of the modern farm track, labelled Zone F, is the subject of a series of Interventions reported upon here.

Intervention 20, excavated in 1984, was originally a trench, 2m wide and nearly one hundred metres long, designed to test an eastwards fall-off pattern in density of archaeological occupation. This it did. After the discovery of a first grave and “sand-body” (F9 of Int. 20, later renamed F118 of Int. 32), Int. 20 was somewhat extended and subsumed, in 1985, in the area of excavation of Int. 32.

Intervention 32, excavated in 1985 and 1986, consists of an area 24 m long on a W-E axis and 16 m wide on a S-N axis: all features identified within it were recorded and excavated. The bulk of the present report is concerned with the features of Int. 32.

In 1986, three further areas of excavation, each 24 x 16 m, were laid out alongside Int. 32. Int. 39 to the East of Int. 32 was fully recorded and excavated (see vol. 8iii). Int. 38 to the North of Int. 32 was stripped and mapped, but features were not excavated: the results from this exercise are incorporated in the present report. Finally, Int. 40 to the South of Int. 32 was partially stripped of its topsoil and finds were recovered in sieved metre squares, before the exercise was abandoned. Int. 40 is not reported on further in vol. 8, apart from a short entry in section 2.1.1 of this volume.

In 1991 a fourth area of excavation, Int. 52 - the track excavation - was opened, mapped and excavated to the West of Int. 20/32 and 38. It is summarised in vol. 8i.

Between them, Int. 20/32 and 38 have proved remarkably productive: for the **Anglo-Saxon period** a (in 1984 unexpected) flat grave cemetery of 18 graves (Burials 17-34) (to which a further 5 burials in Int.52 should also belong) perhaps surrounding a gibbet or hanging tree was uncovered, some 50 m East of the nearest burial mound (see section 7 of this vol.). For the **prehistoric period**, a series of successive boundaries and pit deposits were excavated and put in sequence. The archaeological remains left by blown-over or felled trees - our treepits - were also better understood as a result of excavation (see section 5 of this vol.).

The eastern sector, being the first area excavation of the new research programme in 1984, was also the trial ground for many methodological advances and procedures developed at Sutton Hoo. It is in this area that the various results of remote sensing - proton-magnetometer, fluxgate magnetometer, resistivity - could be compared with the excavated sample, in this case resistivity being the most successful method (see fig. 16 of *Bulletin of the Sutton Hoo Research Committee* 4, 1986). Int. 20/32 also saw the emergence of “horizon mapping” in “lanes” (later “modules”), the eventual abandonment of detailed context plans in favour of outline plans, the greater reliance on fast capture of defined horizon surfaces through oblique overhead colour photographs and the controlled spraying of surfaces using a frame-sprayer (the “Berry-rainer”). Last but not least, methods of excavating and capturing ephemeral shapes of decayed bodies in graves - the so-called “sandmen” or “sand-bodies” of Sutton Hoo - were developed and monitored in Int. 20/32: they include excavating and planning in stages, systematic sampling for the Leverhulme body-decay project (see vol.9), silicon-rubber moulding and construction of fibre-glass replicas amongst them.

2. STRATEGY (M. Carver, A. Copp)

2.1 Location and Character of the Area

2.1.1

This report covers the area excavations in the ploughed field immediately to the east of the barrow cemetery. The field is known as Zone F and the excavations as INTERVENTIONS 20 and 32. Int. 20 is a trench, excavated in 1984, 2m wide along the 145 northing and nearly 100m long from the 207 to the 300 easting. Int. 32, excavated in 1985 and 1986, incorporated the western part of Int. 20 within its boundaries: it consists of an area of excavation 24 m long on a West-East axis (207/145 to 231/145) and 16m wide on a South-North axis (207/145 to 207/161).

To the North of Int. 32, a zone of the same size was stripped: INTERVENTION 38. The latter intervention is also reported upon in this volume. To the South of Int. 32, INTERVENTION 40 was laid out as an area 24 x 16 m but was never stripped in its entirety: its topsoil and ploughsoil were excavated by hand in m2 and all finds dry-sieved as an exercise in recovery. A strip only 2m wide (207 and 208 easting) and 16m long (129 to 145 northing) was thus cleared, producing a large number of finds records (4028 in the finds index, i.e. nearly 3000 pieces of burnt flint, over 900 fragments of flint waste and a handful of pottery sherds, brick and tile fragments, modern glass, metal, etc.). Int. 40 is not reported on

further in vol. 8. As for adjacent areas, namely INTERVENTION 52, see vol. 8i; for INTERVENTION 39, see vol. 8iii.

2.1.2

Int.32 covered a rectangular core area 16m x 24m. The intervention incorporated the earlier trench, Int.20 along its southern edge. Initially Int.20 was only two metres wide but for a variety of reasons was extended in the latter part of the 1984 season to incorporate an area 10m (N-S) x 11m (E-W) at its SE end. This extension also enveloped an earlier smaller trench laid out around the first grave, F9, 1.5m (N-S) x 2m (E-W). All these extensions were incorporated in the 1985-6 area of Int. 32 and the features within it re-labelled: thus F9/118 refers to the same grave, recorded as F9 of Int. 20 and F118 of Int. 32.

2.2 *Aims and Objectives*

There were a number of reasons for the location of these excavations in Zone F:-

- a) the evidence from the field-walking (Int.19) suggested a concentration of prehistoric finds
- b) the topography of the field adjacent to the barrow cemetery indicated a slightly raised plateau which might have been favoured for settlement
- c) to test the validity of various geophysical surveys conducted over the ploughsoil: results from the proton magnetometer, fluxgate gradiometer and resistivity surveys were assessed by Cathy Royle in 1986 (*Bulletin of the Sutton Hoo Research Committee* 4: 15-23 and fig. 16)
- d) to see whether any correlations between features excavated by Longworth and Kinnes could be identified and to incorporate the whole of this northern area of the barrow cemetery into a large E-W transect, thus linking up all the earlier trenches and placing their features within a firmer context.
- e) to find the limit to and record the variety within both the presumed Saxon cemetery and the prehistoric settlement
- f) to excavate all the graves to recover the structure of the cemetery
- g) to develop and utilise experimental methods of excavation, such as recording the shapes of complex 3-dimensional sand stains.

2.3 *The Workforce*

2.3.1

The work on Int.20 was principally supervised by P. Leach. Under him was a set of experienced excavators - J. Cane, C. Cane, N. Oakley, P. McCullough, C. Royle, T. Rankama, N. MacBeth and A. Copp, a specialist illustrator M. Birkeland and photographer M. Sharp. The remaining workforce consisted of local volunteers and university students, some on training courses. Recording was left to the most experienced excavators - P. Leach and J. Cane, but after more experience on site most of the excavators became recorders. A finds office was opened under the supervision of M. Newman and M. Hummler to deal with the indexing of all finds.

2.3.2

No-one who was digging on Int.20 had worked at Sutton Hoo before, for everyone it was a new environment and no one knew quite how and when the features, if there were any, were going to define themselves. Combined with our caution was the important objective of identifying at the earliest stage the level at which feature outlines first became visible. We could then assess the impact of ploughing since the Second World War and compare it with the evidence from the barrow cemetery site.

2.3.3

The chief supervisor for Int.32 was P. Leach. Under his control were a number of Lane supervisors - S. Foster, A. Favaro, M. Cooper, P. McCullough, W. Filmer-Sankey, specialist illustrators M. Birkeland and E. Hooper and the photographer N. MacBeth. The bulk of the workforce was formed by university students and local volunteers. A supervisor was allocated a number of excavators and was responsible for recording a particular "Lane". Logistical support was provided

by our Site Manager, P. Berry who furnished the excavation with various pieces of useful furniture, such as the 'Berry rainer', and carried out repairs to other equipment.

2.4 *Operations Undertaken*

2.4.1

The excavations covered three summer seasons from 1984. In terms of weeks worked, Int.20 (1984) involved sixteen weeks, Int.32 (1985) eight weeks, Int.32 (1986) nine weeks. Int.20 covered a single season's work when an exploratory trench, 100m x 2m was opened in Zone F. The source of data for this report comprises the primary records i.e. the Context, Feature Cards, the site notebooks kept by the chief supervisors, the drawings at A1 and A4, the finds' indexes, and personal memory.

2.4.2

The excavation of the trench Int.20 and its northern extension occurred between 14th May and the 18th August 1984. Initially, the working conditions proved quite difficult with regular rain interruptions. During the season, however, the weather improved to such an extent that conditions became too dry.

2.4.3

The season on Int.32 in 1985 lasted from 3rd August to 3rd October. The working conditions varied between cold rain and the occasional warm interval. The unsettled nature of the weather affected not only the morale of the workforce but also increased the effort needed to keep the site tidy. At one stage a low polythene fence was erected along the western edge of the northern extension (later known as Int.38). Before the introduction of Int.38 in 1986, the northern extension comprised Lanes 5-8 inclusive.

2.4.4

In 1985, the Finds Office was situated away from the Barrow Cemetery in the front room of 1 Red Cottages, Broomeswell. The running of the office was under the supervision of A. Copp and was staffed by a rota of volunteers and students. The finds came to the office straight from the site without any preparation. Here the finds were indexed and entered onto the computer.

2.4.5

In 1986 the Finds Office moved to the Farm office at the entrance to the farmers driveway. The finds were treated in the same manner as in the previous year with no pre-treatment on site, but the general supervision of their processing was left under the supervision of a Diploma student, N. Jaffa. The season ran from 7th July to 12th September.

2.4.6

All the features recognised in the 2 x 100m trench of Int.20 were excavated. After the northern extension was opened this policy altered. Only those features interpreted on the surface as graves were excavated with the exception of the large ditch F1 which was emptied up to Northing 157. Any other features were only recorded in outline up to the second Definition planning stage. They were subsequently excavated within Int. 32.

2.4.7

In 1985, we had expected to excavate all the features within Int.32 (Lanes 1-4). In practice, the concentration and variability of these features, particularly the graves, together with the uncertainties of the excavators meant that a few features were left unexcavated. These features can be picked up by comparing the hachure plan of excavated features drawn up in 1985 at 1:50 to the recent plan of all the features drawn up in 1986. In 1985, all the effort was concentrated on recording the graves. The revisiting of this area in 1986 completed the excavation of all the features and pushed the boundary between Int.32 and 38 north by one metre to allow the excavation of F235.

2.4.8

It should be noted that when particular features are discussed their original feature numbers are utilised. For example, the ditch F1 was also recorded as F103, F110 and F130, in this case the ditch would only be referred to as F1. A feature

is also treated with a single feature number as long as it is continuous, even if it cuts or is cut by another feature, but if it is interrupted by sterile subsoil it becomes a structure with two separate feature numbers. For example, the northern palisade trench running NW-SE diagonally across site is one feature F5 (with equivalence F114, F135, F158, F174, F196) but the southern palisade running parallel to F5 is composed of F15 and F133.

2.5 *Analyses Undertaken*

(Referred to numbered paragraphs in this Field Report)

2.1 Location of Int. 20, 32, 38-40

3.1 Geophysical surveys over Int. 32

3.4.4 Surface collection in Int. 32, outside features

3.5.2 Int. 20, 32, 38, 39 and 52: quadrant and lane layout

3.5.3 Int. 20, all excavated features

3.5.5.1 Int. 32, all excavated features

3.5.5.2 Int. 20/32, 38 and 39, all excavated features

3.9.1 Int. 20/32, pottery assemblage

3.9.2 Int. 20/32, flint assemblage

4.1 Int. 32, stratigraphy

4.2 Int. 32, where C14 dates were taken

4.3.1 Int. 20/32, 38 and 39: distribution of datable ceramic

4.3.2 Int. 20/32: distribution of flint implements

4.3.3 Int. 20/32, 38 and 39: model of the sequence

4.3.4 Boundaries' map

5.1 "Postholes" F2/111, etc.: plan and profiles

5.2.1 The double-ditched boundary F133 and F135: plan and profiles (S)

5.2.2 The double-ditched boundary F133 and F135: plan and profile s(N)

5.3 Beaker pit F175 and tree pit F178: plan and profiles

5.4.1 Ditch F130: plan (extract)

5.4.2 Ditch F130: sections and profiles

5.4.3 Palisade F213: plan and profiles

7.1.1 - 7.1.18 Burials 17-34: sequence, plan, burial rite.

7.1.21 Pit F243: plan and section

3. **METHODS AND RESULTS** (A.Copp, M.Carver)

3.1 *Pre-excavation surface and sub-surface surveys*

The area to become Int. 20/32 was used as a testing ground for a variety of remote-sensing techniques: proton-magnetometer, fluxgate gradiometer and resistivity. The results from these surveys have been assessed by Cathy Royle in 1986 and summarised in *Bulletin of the Sutton Hoo Research Committee* 4 (15-23 and fig. 16). In the particular environment of Int. 32, it appears that resistivity was the technique able to pick up most anomalies subsequently proved by excavation, but no remote sensing technique, not even resistivity, could pick up graves consistently or reliably.

The far-eastern sector, or Zone F, had also been the subject of a number of evaluation exercises, including field-walking (INT. 19) and air-photographic coverage by the Cambridge Committee for Aerial Photography. For a discussion of the evaluation of the far-eastern sector, see vol. 3. For an interpretation of the (prehistoric) boundaries picked up by aerial photography, see sections 4.3 and 5.4 of this volume.

3.2 *The trial trench, Intervention 20*

No separate report is submitted for Int. 20, as the results from the 1984 trench have been incorporated in the report for Int. 32. The map of excavated features (*atlas*) shows clearly the fall-off pattern in archaeological feature density as one moves eastwards towards the 300 easting.

3.3 *Recording and Recovery Levels*

3.3.1

The recording system evolved during the three seasons work. During the first season the BUFAU context and feature packages were employed with only minor amendments, for example sections were drawn at 1:10 instead of 1:20. A

revision of the whole recording system was undertaken by the director in the spring of 1985 and led to the development of a comprehensive and computer compatible system. This was taken a stage further in the following spring when a comprehensive but flexible thesaurus and field description list was amended to the revised recording system.

3.3.2

For each intervention, wooden grid pegs were laid out a metre back from the baulks. There were no permanent grid pegs on the actual excavation surface. Instead rather temporary grid points were marked by 6" nails surveyed in from the baulk.

3.3.3

The recovery levels employed at Sutton Hoo for the various stages of excavation have remained fairly constant over the years (BUFAU guide no. 6). Any finds recovered from level C, the ploughsoil, have been recorded to the nearest metre square. Any finds from Level D or finer recording are recorded in 3-dimensions to the nearest centimetre. Except for the graves, all the features should have been excavated at Level D. However, because of confusion, many features from 1985 were reported to be recorded at Level E. This finer recovery level should be limited to the graves. In 1986, the on site finds recording was slightly modified by the introduction of two star symbols (* *) after the easting and northing reading (which was only recording the metre square) to distinguish between finds that were recovered in the sieve at Level D and finds recorded at Level C. A comprehensive sieving regime was vigorously enforced in 1986 for each context.

3.3.4

In 1986, each feature was allocated a context(s) and was drawn in plan on A4 permatrace before and after excavation, and in section during the excavation at 1:10. Again this was a modification from previous years when the initial outline of a feature was caught by one of the several definition plans drawn on A1 permatrace for each module. Outlines were also added retrospectively to the A1 plans. The recording of the graves shows greater variety and alone merits a separate report.

3.3.5

The responsibility for the photographic recording of the features and contexts in 1984 and 1985 belonged with the photographic specialist. The recording involved the photographing of the definition levels on the subsoil surface prior to feature excavation; the recording of features before and after excavation and in section during the excavation; and the aerial photographs taken from the kite, highlift, balloon or helicopter. The responsibility became curtailed in 1986 with the specialist being responsible for the general Lane shots, any aerial shots and general 'publicity' shots. Feature photographs became the responsibility of the Lane supervisors except where special set-up shots were required such as the graves. One attempt using a video camera to record the excavation of a grave, F137, was tested. The video being set up in a permanent position and rolled at intervals to record the vertical progress of the grave excavation. Various other photographic and physical enhancements were tested against the graves and over the Lanes (e.g U.V.) by specialists E. Morgan and C. Brooke.

3.4 *Removal of the Ploughsoil*

3.4.1

A variety of methods was employed to remove the ploughsoil above the excavation surface. In 1984, the ploughsoil was removed by shovel, in 10m lengths at a time. The soil was placed in a long line parallel to the trench on the southern side. The latter extensions in 1984 were also opened by shovel but this time a large spoil pound was created on the northern side. The area opened in 1984 was backfilled using a forklift truck with a bucket attachment. Only one small area was left open. This was around the grave F40, which was to be part of a display for the public the following spring. In 1985, the ploughsoil was collected by a JCB with a 2m wide toothless bucket and removed using a team of dumper trucks. The JCB uncovered two areas of 16m x 24m adjacent to each other north-south (Int. 32 and a northern part later renamed Int. 38). A single pound was created to the north of this area. After three weeks work, a further extension, slightly larger 16m x 29m was opened on the eastern side of Int.32, immediately adjacent to this core area (Int. 39). The ploughsoil from the extension was removed by a caterpillar Drott pushing the soil onto the eastern end of the spoil pound. This technique provided the cleanest initial working surface. In comparison, the JCB tended to leave a greater depth of overburden. At the end of the 1985 season all three areas were backfilled by JCB.

3.4.2

In 1986, the strategy was to remove all the ploughsoil by shovel using the MSC team from Ipswich. The team, together

with supervisors, students and volunteers shovelled for a week with very little impression. After a week, the ploughsoil was machine stripped. The same area opened at the end of 1985 was cleared by Drott. Apart from Int.32, these areas were redesignated Int.38 to the north and Int.39 to the east. One slight difference should be noted. Int.39 continued up to E255. In 1985, this area was cleared to E260. The soil from Int's. 32 and 38 was piled up beyond the northern side of the later intervention.

3.4.3

The surface left by the different methods of soil stripping varied. The dominant factor appeared to be the skill of the driver under supervision. Once the mechanical stripping had been completed, any remaining soil over an intervention was shovelled off to the interface between the base of the ploughsoil and the top of the disturbed subsoil. The only visible damage caused by the mechanical clearing and covering of the ploughsoil apparently occurred during backfilling in 1985. Wheel ruts and truncated features were clearly visible during the cleaning of the subsoil surface in 1986 (see F228, Int.32).

3.4.4

Due to the disturbed nature of the soil and the method of removal, no finds were recovered from the ploughsoil clearance in 1986. However, in 1985, finds were recovered from the shovel scraping operation after the machine stripping. The resulting plot compares the density of different classes of artefacts (excluding all those found within features) as recovered and against a 1:9 random sample filter. Although some patterns do emerge from the plots, they cannot be read in a straight-forward manner, since the density of finds outside features is complementary to that inside features. The finds from 1984 were recovered as they were seen during shovelling. As an experiment in assessing the number of finds lost by large scale mechanical clearing, it has been recorded that a 4m x 2m strip (Lane 8) was removed by shovel with 1:10 barrow loads being sieved through a 1cm square mesh. This was subsequently amended so only one bucket from each wheelbarrow was being sieved through a fine 0.5cm square mesh.

3.5 *The Experimental Evolution of 'Horizon' Definition*

3.5.1

The principal challenge of excavation on the sand and gravel at Sutton Hoo was to produce a legible, stable surface from which all ancient activities could be detected and mapped.

3.5.2

Our ability to do this evolved over the three seasons spent in Int.20, 32, 38 and 39.

In 1984 control was exercised through the gradual uncovering of 2m x 10m stretches in stages along the trench known as Int. 20. From the outset, attempts were made to create a stable environment in which to work. In order to control the drying and disfiguring action of the sun, wind and rain, a polyspan was erected over the western side of Int.20. Although this did create a humid and workable environment, the method proved too temporary. Major problems were encountered in trying to anchor the polythene against the wind without using large posts driven into the subsoil. Unfortunately the polyspan only lasted two working days before collapsing, it was withdrawn from use. The new method introduced at the beginning of 1985 in Int. 32 was to divide the 16m x 24m areas into four Lanes each 4m wide and 24m long. These Lanes were subdivided alphabetically into lengths of only 8m, creating a series of 4m x 8m modules. The condition and excavation of these modules could be controlled more strictly than the large area of the extension opened in 1984 (an identical strategy was employed for Int.39).

3.5.3

On Int.20, a series of 'definition' plans were drawn on A1 at each cleaning stage beneath the ploughsoil. Once each 10m stretch was opened, it was planned and then photographed overhead using the farm forklift. Any feature outlines were then investigated.

The initial series of A1 plans were drawn after the removal of the ploughsoil c1000. These 'pre-definition' plans record the pattern of plough furrows and subsoiler grooves cut at the base of the ploughsoil and into the top of the subsoil. The drawings show the majority of the furrows run north-south and between E207-210 these furrows were excavated. Subsoiler grooves could be distinguished from the furrows by being wider spaced and narrower, they also ran across the furrows NW-SE.

A further 10cm was removed by trowel to get beneath this ploughing disturbance and resulted in our definition plans. As an experiment, on plan D3, on the extreme western side of Int.20 was recorded using coloured pencils to give a naturalistic impression of the surface. A reason behind this decision was that monochrome pencils were not easily able to record the general merging of colours visible on the ground, at least not without employing sensitive conventions. After some discussion colour planning was abandoned for the large scale Lane surface recording, in favour of traditional surface planning methods. The reasons for abandoning these colour plans is not recorded but from memory involved disagreements over the identification of colours in the ground, the style of each planner, and the equation between the time it would take to draw and the information that could be retrieved.

A series of second definition plans were drawn after a further 2cm had been removed by trowel. Wide variations in the nature of the subsoil were quite apparent from the surface achieved at the first definition, gravel occurred in various concentrations together with patches of clean buff-yellow sand. The aim of the second definition plans was to remove any overburden and to investigate any suspicious areas of soil discolouration..

3.5.4

The sub-ploughsoil definition levels were drawn for Int.32, Lanes 1-4. Although there was some repetition in planning, definitions 1 and 2 were principally recorded beyond the area covered by Int.20. As noted earlier, one of the recurring problems when employing large scale definition levels was that a consistent surface was difficult to achieve. Gravel occurred in different concentrations across the site, thus certain areas demanded more definition. For example, the objective of the third Definition plans was to remove a stony layer which occurred over the west side of the area. A single fourth Definition plan was drawn because the third Definition surface was seen at a later date as part of the 1984 backfill.

Lanes 5-8, located in what was to become Int. 38, were already cleaned back to their first Definition level as early as 13th August. This had been completed to assess the scale and extent of the feature concentration to establish whether we would have enough time to excavate this area. No plans were drawn at this definition but the surface was photographed. After photography, the surface was left to weather partly as an experiment to see whether new features appeared or became clearer in outline. The weathering affect was recorded on 5th September again by photography after lightly brushing the surface. On the 10th September, the second Definition trowelling began. The subsequent plans of this second Definition are a record of this surface and echo the methods used to define the surfaces for Int.39. There is no report on why the southern edge of Lane 5 was left unrecorded. The planning for these Lanes was given to students in contrast to Lanes 1-4 which were either drawn by the supervisors or students under tight control from the supervisors. This may also account for the lack of continuity between the modules within Lanes 5-8 where context outlines would often end abruptly at the interface of two plans.

3.5.5

Eventually the Lane system of recording was abandoned (Lanes 1-4). Features were now being defined which went across many lanes. In some cases, a single feature was given different reference numbers (see above) and the experience gained from excavating part of a feature was not being transmitted or utilised to excavate the remainder of the feature, for example the palisade trenches. Discreet features, such as the graves, were sometimes positioned between two lanes e.g. F106. The earlier definition plans drawn for Int.20 meant that surface planning for Int.32 was out of step from the beginning. For example, by 8th August Lanes 1-2 and 3A were straight down to the third Definition, but Lane 4 was only at first Definition stage. This problem was eventually compounded by the variation in the concentration of certain features, particularly the graves which required many man-hours to excavate, and meant certain modules advanced at a slower rate than others.

In 1986 no further definitions were required over the surface. Feature excavation began once the ploughsoil had been removed and the surface trowelled 'clean'.

3.6 *The Experimental Evolution of Feature-Definition*

3.6.1 Methods of Recognising Features

3.6.1.1

Features were identified by their shape on the surface. The recorders were responsible for defining and recording the outline of these features, often in consultation with the chief supervisor, P. Leach. The criteria used to define these features on the surface are outlined below. It is worth noting that not all the features were recorded to the necessary degree for this analysis to be comprehensive.

3.6.1.2

The greatest number of features were identified by their surface discolouration. In fewer instances the texture of the fill also contrasted against the natural. Occasionally, a feature would only become visible once the fill of another feature had been partly or totally removed, thus the grave, F9, was only recognised during the excavation of the palisade F4. Many features along the two parallel palisade trenches running NW-SE (F15 and 133, F5) only became visible once the fill of the trench had been removed. For other features the contrast between the natural and the feature fill became more outstanding if other attributes could be identified. Some feature fills were relatively stone free on the surface, for example F4, F5, F165. On the surface some features recorded evidence of burning. Red burnt sand and charcoal was visible along the northern half of F1 (© 2014, 2024); burnt sand and stones on the surface, for example F134, 138, 140, 147, 153, 194. A limited type of feature, the graves, contained evidence of mottled sandy 'iron-pan' concretions (natural blocks), for example F39, 40, 235. It should also be noted that not all the grave fills contained this evidence. The definition of the posthole F3 was 'enhanced' by the concentration of ceramic debris on the surface and similarly the grave F106 was enhanced by the identification of a line of pebbles (? cairn) along the E-W axis. Some features were recognised by their differential drying qualities, for example F10 was moisture retentive whereas F181 was moisture deficient. Only one feature, F183, was defined by a concentration of gravel. Another peculiar feature, F241, was marked by an iron staining and by differential drying. Compaction of the fill was rarely recorded as a significant attribute but for certain features particularly animal burrows, F203, 214, 216, 217, it was important to record. Finally, a form of artificial enhancement was applied to three features, F226, 227 and 228, as part of the Leverhulme Trust Project's attempt to help delimit features. A chemical phosphate enhancement containing two chemicals was used to discolour the sand.

3.6.1.3

After analysing the excavation records I separated the features into a set of genuine archaeological features and a set of 'non-features' of natural or non-archaeological origin. In this way it follows the guidelines laid down in the report for Int.39 which also separated these into sets, by analysing attributes of the fill, morphology of the feature and the mapping of the feature within the intervention.

3.6.1.4

A discussion of the feature population will illustrate the range of features which are likely to be encountered on the barrow cemetery site in the future. Out of the 126 individual features excavated only twenty can be categorised as 'non-features'. This is in contrast to the results from Int.39 where out of the population of 84 excavated, at least 33 belonged to the non-feature category. A number of factors may account for the contrast, Int.20 and 32 were under the supervision of a more experienced excavator who was able to distinguish more clearly what anomalies in the subsoil surface should be investigated. Also our experience of discovering new features in areas already opened in previous years was a major motivating force behind the rigorous investigation of any subsoil anomaly within Int.39.

3.6.2 'Natural' Features

3.6.2.1

Even though recorded on subsequent cleaning the fills of some features proved to be indistinguishable from the adjacent subsoil. After their initial planning, three features F181, 182, 183 were not excavated, they were thought to be of natural origin. The fills of another four features, F10, 38, 215, 218 were indistinguishable from the subsoil. In these cases the recorders often note their inability to follow any genuine edges into the natural. Two of the features, F38, 215 were potential graves but were abandoned during excavation. The coincidence that many of these non-features were initially recognised as differential drying patches echoes similar evidence from Int.39.

3.6.2.2

F241 and 243 were of geological origin. Both were clearly defined upon the surface but on excavation the orientation of pebbles and sand grains within their fills indicated a natural origin. F243 was only half excavated before being abandoned. It is possible the activity around the heath during the Second World War also had an impact upon the subsoil surface and may also help to account for the unique staining surrounding F241.

3.6.2.3

F16 and 172 are extremely shallow features (the hachure plan in this instance being very misleading) and lack any

evidence for negative cuts. A more plausible explanation being that they were artificially created by the sitting of hollows on the subsoil surface.

3.6.2.4

During the machine backfilling at the end of the 1985 season many tyre ruts were produced. A number of these were easily picked out and cleaned during the initial surface trowelling in 1986. However, one rut was recorded as a feature, F228 and from its shape on the surface was thought to be a grave.

3.6.2.5

From Int.39, two clear tree pits were identified by the shape of their fills on the subsoil surface. Using the experience and with hindsight F178 from Int.32 can be interpreted as another tree pit. Certainly this would help to account for the difficulty experienced during the excavation of this feature. The final shape changed in 1986 with the complete excavation of F178.

3.6.2.6

Burrowing animals have made another type of 'non-feature'. Already the loose nature of their fills has been commented upon but they have also been judged by their irregularity in plan and their distinct dark fill (F129, 147, 197; also 203, 214, 216, 217). The concentration of the latter group around the tree pit may also be more than coincidental.

3.6.2.7

Without doubt the experience of excavating Int.39 where many 'non-features' were investigated provided a sound base from which to identify similar features from Int.20 and 32. A recurring impression is the confirmation that differential drying patches within the subsoil has a stronger correlation to 'non-features' than with archaeological features. The distribution of these 'non-features' is already widespread, covering Int.32 and 39 and will undoubtedly be encountered during future work.

3.6.3 Features other than graves

3.6.3.1

The archaeological features have been divided into a number of traditional morphological groups depending upon their final shape. Out of the 106 archaeological features, the vast majority (60) are post holes. The remaining groups include the stakeholes, ditches, palisades, pits, scoops, graves and a single hearth which cover this intervention. Many features can easily be assigned a morphological group. However, there must also be a certain degree of hesitation in assigning features to particular groups at the boundary of their types, for example between the pits and the scoops. All features whether of natural or archaeological origin have been truncated by c. 0.30m as a result of regular ploughing across Zone F after the Second World War. The attrition features have suffered may well have altered the group to which they should be assigned. Some features must have disappeared altogether.

3.6.3.2

Six of the postholes F139, 165, 167, 189, 191, 198 had clear evidence for post pipes within the fill. These were identified by discolouration within the fill - the post pipe for F189 was seen on the surface, and by contrast against the surrounding packing, (for example the packing around the pipe within F167 was much stonier than the actual pipe). In F165 the pipe was surrounded by a looser fill. The pipe in F198 appears to have been burnt leaving a black charcoal stain. Evidence of burning within a posthole is indicated from F165 where an amount of charcoal and burnt flints were recovered. F3 was a particularly interesting posthole since it contained the remains of a ? complete vessel of Neolithic/Iron Age date. A great deal of effort was expended in the detailed three-dimensional recording of the sherds of this vessel. Plans were drawn at 1:5, sherds were levelled using a millimetric rule and regular photographs were taken to record the orientation of each sherd eventually with a view to reconstructing/modelling various destruction 'trajectories'.

3.6.3.3

Only two ditches were identified (F220 and F1). Both features were relatively obvious once the ploughsoil had been removed. F220 certainly originated in the Second World War (1942) and was part of a system of Ant-glider ditches that were dug in a grid iron pattern across the heathland. In 1985, F220 was used as a major routeway for works entering or

leaving the site, it was also only rather quickly excavated using shovels. Not surprisingly, archaeological evidence was obscured by the trampling.

3.6.3.4

Three palisade trenches were recorded. Two of these, F15 and F133, F4, 219, 213 and F169, are composed of interrupted trenches. Timber uprights from these trenches were not consistently recovered during their excavation. Some lengths appear devoid of timbers, such as F5, where as others contained detailed evidence for uprights, for example F15, 213, 169. Where timbers were recorded they were only identified by the circular discolourations and cavities remaining after the main fill of the trenches had been removed. No post pipes were recorded on the surface. Why certain stretches of those palisades were devoid of post impressions is a difficult question to answer. In part it may reflect an original lack of posts though I feel vigorous excavation by inexperienced excavators may sometimes have destroyed the evidence. The delicate nature of the archaeological evidence is clearly indicated by the palisade trench which had been trowelled almost to extinction for F123 and which had disappeared for F219. The trench for the palisade slots comprising F219 had disappeared because of repeated surface cleaning to define the grave F173. The northern termination of F213 appears on the hachure plan to have been cut by F161, the 'ploughman' burial. However, the initial surface definition plans drawn for F161 clearly indicate the continuation of the palisade across the grave. Presumably the termination of F213 did lie within the grave fill: repeated investigation of the subsoil surface between F161 and F220 failed to locate any archaeological disturbance. There is more tentative evidence from the initial definition plans for the grave F173, to indicate that the palisade F219 also ran across this grave.

3.6.3.5

One of the most interesting groups of features on site are the pits - F8, 168, 233 - and scoops - F175, 176, 179, 229. The former are distinguished by their steeper slope and deeper profile. The fill of F168 was quite unusual with clear evidence of in situ burning of the sand at various stages of its accumulation. The evidence suggests a certain degree of correlation with F84, Int.39 in which similar evidence was recovered. The scoops in contrast contained rather homogenous fills. One surprising discovery was the recovery of large pieces of prehistoric pottery (Rusticated Beaker) from the fills of F175 and 176. Apart from F3 and the artifacts in the graves this concentration of finds particularly from this limited morphological group is in total contrast to all the other features which produced few diagnostic and datable finds.

3.6.3.6

Apart from the evidence already outlined for the repeated evidence of burning on site, only one hearth was recorded, F132. This is located in the NW corner of the site and appeared as an area of reddened sands and stones. Its shape indicates it probably sunk into the natural subsoil and in this respect it is similar to the hearth from Int.39, F36.

3.6.4 The Definition and Recording of Graves

3.6.4.1

The graves in Int.20/32 were the first to be encountered by the excavators of the 1983-92 Campaign. Their excavation and recording was experimental, in two senses. First, methods of definition and recording were continually varied in an attempt to produce an accurate account of bodies which had survived in the form of three-dimensional sand-stains. Secondly, these graves were approached by a variety of excavators of widely differing experience: professional excavators who offered well-trying procedures and novices who brought an innocent eye. These experiments often resulted in regrettable inconsistencies and omissions in the records, but were to lead to the more disciplined procedures successfully employed in Int.41, 44 48, 50 and 52 [MOHC].

3.6.4.2

Altogether 18 graves were excavated, not all of which contained bodies. F180 and 226 were empty, but the body in F226 may have been destroyed by the construction of the anti-glider ditch, F220, during the Second World War. The bodies survived as sand-stains within the acidic environment of the graves. Very little bone survived with the bodies. In a few instances, the bodies were accompanied by grave-goods, which were in all cases organic and also survived only as a stain. A wide variety of orientation and posture of the body was recorded.

3.6.4.3

Almost all the graves were recognised on the surface as areas of soil discolouration. Frequently the areas were of a

distinctive rectangular shape. Combined with this discolouration were patches of iron-pan sandy concretions which had been dug out from the bedded natural sands and graves. These patches were recorded as the surface of fewer graves e.g. F146, 154, 39, but it is a distinct possibility that this attribute was not isolated by the recorder during excavation of other graves. The patches of sandy concretions are only recorded within the fill of graves which suggests that these were a class of feature that were immediately backfilled with the material dug out from the pit (and contrast to many of the other classes of features which probably silted up gradually).

3.6.4.4

Due to the close proximity and homogenous fill, three sets of intersecting graves could not initially be separated on the surface; thus F108 and F109 were recorded as F105, F154 and F146 as F154, and F163 and F166 as F156. On the surface of the latter features F156 (which became F163 and F166) and on the surface of F106 were recorded an alignment of stones which were termed cairns. The cairn of F156 is particularly dubious. However, the stone alignment along F106 is more distinct, whether this was a deliberate cairn ought to be questioned. Why was not it discovered in 1984? Could the stones result from migration down the ploughsoil? Since the upper fill of the grave has been truncated by some 30cm through ploughing, did the original 'cairn' reach down into the grave fill?

3.6.4.5

In 1986, at least one new grave was found across the bottom of the ditch, F227. In 1986 another grave, F231, was discovered within the lower fill of the largest ditch F1 that runs NE-SW across the site. The plans drawn at the initial definition of this ditch give no indication that a grave was cut into the fill. However, it had been noted that a great deal of evidence for burning had been noticed on the surface by the grave. Unfortunately these records also state that the burning was never planned before being removed in 1985.

During the 1985 season some 0.25m of the upper fill of F1 had been excavated up to the northern baulk. The evidence of burning comprised charcoal flecks and apparently in situ red burnt sand (c. 2024). From these records it is difficult to establish when after the initial siting of F1, the grave was inserted into the ditch.

3.6.4.6

The standard one metre square planning frame was used to record the shape of all the graves and the location of internal discolourations within the fill. The frame was also used as a horizontal gauge to measure off levels within the grave F163, using a plumbob. There is only one recorded instance where the planning frame was superseded by a different surveying method. Probably because of the depth and complexity of F161 a baseline was employed to measure in stones by offset methods.

In 1986, the Psion 3-D recording technique was adapted for use on the grave excavations. Using the planning frame to draw the internal structures of a grave and the outline of the grave was not always accurate. Either the site grid around the grave was disturbed, leading to set-ups at slightly different positions, or the recorder suffered from parallax when leaning over the frame. From the vertical progression of a grave excavation therefore outlines of shapes noted on the drawings were seen to shift around. This state of affairs was far from ideal especially if we are trying to record the outline of shapes which cannot be left standing until it is completely exposed. The Psion, therefore, was targeted onto the recording of the shapes within the grave. This year (1986) the Psion recording the method still tended to play a back seat role. Instead of recording the outline of shapes the excavators principally applied it to recording the exact position of body samples/soil samples within the grave. Although the grid references produced are accurate within the overall site grid their location on the annotated body plan must be questioned. The body outlines were to my knowledge still being planned using a planning frame sitting along the site grid. We have already noted the problems of using the intrasite grid for achieving consistent grid points and consequently I cannot help feeling that many of the Psion readings although accurate will not be positioned on the bodies as illustrated on the drawings. To reconcile these difficulties, the planning frame must be located each time it is used by the Psion method.

3.6.4.7

The body outlines have been recorded on the drawings in two distinct manners - by the application of colour conventions to record the distinction between bone and body stain and by the application of colour keyline conventions to record the subtle shades of the body stain. Both sets of conventions were developed in 1985 from our experience of the previous season by the illustrators and recorders, and they were applied from 1985. Only impressionistic colour keyline plans were drawn in 1984 and even these used a separate set of coloured pencils. The body outlines were of a much greener tone. Probably the best illustration of the conventions can be seen with the bodies from F39 and F40.

3.6.4.8

Various inconsistencies in the application of these conventions to particular body outlines can be noted. Obviously, no body outlines exist for those graves which are empty - F180 and F226. F9 which was the first grave excavated by the present campaign only has a pencil keyline, impressionistic plan of the body outline. A separate colour scheme appears to have been applied to the body stain within F154 which is in marked contrast to the standard conventions which were employed at the time in 1985. The keyline plan for the body outline within F109 has been appended to the feature package F105. Finally, F239, the northern body within the grave F227 excavated in 1986 does not have a colour convention plan. This is remarkable, given that the second body in the grave (F238) has been drawn at this stage. No explanation is given for this anomaly.

3.6.4.9

The graves excavated using sections or employing profiles provide valuable information concerning the methods of excavation. If we separate the different types of sections and profiles drawn it is possible to distinguish certain trends. An analysis of the division of the section drawings (Table 1) illustrates a trend away from the use of multiple sections, whether transverse or longitudinal, across the grave. From 1986, the method in vogue is the single longitudinal section which was composed from the removal of continuous spits removed from alternative sides of the grave as it is dug in plan.

3.6.4.10

Those graves with no sections were often the graves which had complicated internal structures e.g. F137 and F161 but it still does not explain why before and during excavation sectioning was abandoned. Occasionally, the reason is obvious, for example, if the grave was too shallow. Multiple sections were fashionably employed to establish the stratigraphic relationship between intersecting graves before each feature was separated. For example, transverse and longitudinal sections, even if they were incomplete and shallow were used to record the upper fills of F156 before it separated into F163 and F166, and F154 before separating into F146 and F154. The sections across all the graves were abandoned once the body outline was encountered.

3.6.4.11

The profiles frequently replaced the sections as they were often used to record the position and attitude of the body within the grave. However, there is no straightforward correspondence between the types of section and the profiles employed. Indeed, the table (Table 2) illustrates the gradual abandoning of profile drawing. No profiles were taken in 1986. The difficulty in recording profiles was always in achieving accuracy during our traditional excavation methods. There were also other factors which hindered 'careful' recording. The body stains were not always sharply outlined particularly if the stain had been disturbed or had not survived clearly; even where the outline survived the body contours were quite subtle and it was difficult to pick up subtle changes in slope over the body; finally the depth and shape of the grave provided difficult working conditions.

3.6.4.12

The excavation of graves by section (rather than with sections which have continued to be used) was abandoned on 25th August 1985, as recorded in the intervention notebook. Instead, the excavation of the graves was undertaken in plan employing horizontal arbitrary spits. The number of arbitrary spits to achieve definition levels within the grave varies widely between every grave and depending upon a variety and combination of factors such as the original depth of the grave, the depth of the spit removed (the heights on the plans at each definition illustrate the variety of spit depths removed), and the clarity with which the graves were discovered. For each new definition a fresh new colour plan should have been drawn. We have already noted that different spit depth were removed. Spits generally tended to get thinner once the body outline was encountered. In the fill of one grave F166, the arbitrary nature of each spit was ignored. Instead, the determining factor for the depth of each spit removed was recorded as the variability within the fill of the grave. The new definition level was achieved and the plan drawn only after a visible change occurred within the fill.

3.6.4.13

It is often difficult to distinguish and tabulate those graves that were excavated in plan. Only rarely were explicitly methodological strategies discussed. Much of the evidence must be reconstructed from the feature packages. The best indicator is probably to count the number of definition levels drawn as plans for the fill of each grave. A general trend towards excavation by arbitrary definition levels has already been outlined.

3.6.4.14

In 1985, not all definition plans would be recorded with coloured pencils, and after they had been introduced each grave was at a different stage of completion. Thus the use of colour conventions did not begin at a regular position for each grave. For some graves colour drawings were introduced only after a number of pencil drawings had been completed.

3.6.4.15

Hachure plans were drawn of the empty grave and of the body outline. The latter was used to record the shape of the body, to give the contours a 3-D feeling and to complement the profile drawings. Apart from the profiles and concentrated levelling across the body this has been almost the only way of recording body contours. In 1986 with the introduction of the Psion recording system, it was hoped that contours could be easily recorded. In practice, the equipment proved too cumbersome for this sensitive task and so we are left with the hachure plans as our best expression of the contours of the body, at least on a drawing. The table (Table 3) illustrates that the hachure plans of the empty grave and body outline were consistently recorded for each grave. However, there are some graves without any hachure plans. The two most recent graves, F227 and F235, were excavated at the end of the 1986 season in a rather rapid fashion which may account for their lack of a hachure plan, also the empty graves were subject to rigorous sampling into the natural below the grave. The bodies from F40 and F161 were treated in a unique manner in contrast to many of the bodies which were easily removed as samples the year they were excavated. F40 was left until 1985 before removal and F161 was consolidated and lifted as a whole grave complex by the British Museum team in 1985.

3.6.4.16

In 1984 and 1985, the bodies were divided into general anatomical portions for removal as separate finds. The number of portions removed varied according to the condition and position of each body, and probably to an extent the experience of the excavator in identifying separate anatomical portions. Often the portions removed were recorded on an outline plan of the body with a key appended to the plan with the appropriate find number correspondence (e.g. F Lee not only provided a very detailed anatomical chart describing each portion removed but tabulated to correspond to find numbers - F163).

3.6.4.17

The body sampling strategy dictates the way the bodies are removed. A major change occurred in 1986 with the development of particular research strategies within the Leverhulme Trust Project. No longer were large anatomical portions removed. Although it remains unrecorded on ANY document I had read (AJC), it appears smaller samples were now taken much more comprehensively across the body outline. The drawings indicate samples were taken roughly at 10cm intervals over the body irrespective of the anatomical location. The samples were located using the Psion recording system but the correspondence between sample numbers and actual find numbers on the drawings appears to have been abandoned.

3.6.4.18

Unfortunately, very few written records exist which describe the sampling strategy and procedure within the grave fill. Occasionally, the sections or definition plans will record the location of certain samples within the fill, but frequently these do not appear to have been taken or recorded consistently. There is no discussion for this state of affairs. A major innovation of the 1986 season was the introduction of regular and comprehensive column sampling within and below the grave fill. Yet nowhere on the written records or drawings is this recorded. We are left to guess where on the plans subsoil sampling occurred.

3.6.4.19

Although sampling within graves was appallingly recorded, it is possible from some slight evidence to outline certain trends. In 1984 and 1985, the samples from any grave fill appear to have been taken in five places, three along the central longitudinal axis and two at right angles across the centre (transversely). One of the few statements concerning sampling strategy are appended as written notes to the feature package of F173 but even these only record the strategy to the third definition level. In 1986, the sampling became more detailed, at least for F231 where seven samples were taken at each definition, three again along the central longitudinal axis but two either side between the central sample.

3.6.4.20

In 1984, the original BUFAU context and feature cards were used to record the attributes of the grave. The cards were altered the following year when a new SUTTON HOO recording system was introduced. These were only slightly amended in 1986, the principal distinction being the addition of a list of field descriptions and keywords.

3.6.4.21

During the first two seasons all the discolourations and texture changes were recorded as separate contexts. All the bodies and any organic grave goods were recorded by a single context number, even if there was colour and texture variety across the body. At a recording meeting in the spring of 1986, this approach to recording was criticised. Subsequently, the recording packages were altered, graves were now to be structures composed of a feature cut and separate feature fills. Any distinct shapes which could be recognised within the fill were now given separate feature numbers. Not only could shapes be distinguished and recorded more clearly but finds and samples could be related to more specific contexts within the feature complex. This new approach was applied in 1986 but still does not negate the need of careful and rigorous recording (as a contrast to the requirements, see F227).

3.6.4.22

Various explanations have been proposed to account for the empty graves, F180 and F226. The severe truncation of F226 as the result of the digging of the anti-glider ditch F220 in 1942 will have destroyed all evidence, at least macroscopically, of a body outline. The grave fill which remained was only very shallow and the feature had nearly been totally destroyed. F180 is perhaps more difficult to explain as an empty grave, particularly since we had solid experience of the texture and shape of a body outline. In contradiction to a natural origin of this feature, the recorder thought that the method of excavation may have had a detrimental impact upon the recovery of a body outline. Indeed, the excavator believed a faint body outline of a child had been destroyed. Unfortunately, the feature package contains no positive proof a body was buried in the feature but perhaps chemical analysis of the soil samples may show which of the suggestions is correct.

3.6.4.23

Most of the graves were orientated either N-S or E-W and were often filled with extended inhumations (Table 4). It must be remembered the attributes tabulated are by no means an exhaustive list. Other attributes probably worthy of analysis are the depth of burial, position of head etc., type of coffin.

3.6.4.24

Some bodies had rather peculiar postures which attracted critical and public attention. The evidence that the bodies were tied in particular postures comes indirectly from the shapes of the body rather than from direct evidence of the ropes themselves. Three of the bodies are in an upright but crouched position F163, F240 c1114, F137 c2059 which might indicate they have been tied prior to burial. The recorders of the grave F146 believed that the feet had been crossed and tied together. Similarly, the recorders of the grave F137 c2023 recovered a head in a rather peculiar position which led them to speculate that the person had been hanged. In all these instances, it is worth noting that the bodies may have suffered from post-depositional movement as the body and coffin cavity rotted and collapsed. This may account for some of the more dubious interpretations. Clearly the body in the most unusual posture must be the 'ploughman' burial F161. The body posture was reminiscent of a hurdling or low ploughing posture and he was possibly attached to an organic artifact, possibly a plough, thrown into the grave. The grave diggers obviously carefully gauged the size of the grave required for each burial as all were dug to a close fit. Another unusual grave good in a burial was recorded during the excavation of F106 when a joint of meat was recovered at the feet of the body. Again the grave had been dug especially long to accept this offering.

3.6.4.25

A variety of coffin types and sizes are witnessed by the stains they have left in the grave fill. Not all graves contained coffins. Only four coffins have been identified. Two of these are quite distinctive. The body from grave F106 was apparently bedded on a tree trunk coffin which had been interpreted from the organic stain left after the removal of the body. Two planks from a very clear coffin were recognised over the body of F240 within the grave F235. Although end and possible side pieces were recognised, no base to this grave furniture was identified and led the recorders to interpret the shape as a barrel or bed upturned over the body.

3.6.4.26

A rather high coincidence of intersecting burials can be noted from the excavation plan. Graves have cut each other in four instances, F146/F154, F163/F166, F108/F109 and F137 2023/2059. Although their stratigraphic relationship has been clearly recorded there must be some explanation afforded to this phenomenon. Why were so many graves located over the outline of stratigraphically earlier graves? Does this indicate some form of conscious memory by the grave diggers? Or were there totems or cairns marking the position of graves?

3.6.4.27

Because of the fragile nature of the body stains it has been necessary to take moulds in order to preserve the body shape. A crude attempt in 1984 to preserve the body outline by the application of vinamyl succeeded. The first genuine mouldings occurred in 1985 when G. Edens of K & C Mouldings Ltd painted silicon rubber over chosen bodies. Once the rubber had set, it was reinforced and peeled off to a negative impression of the body shape. A positive was taken by lining the negative with strips of fibreglass. The bodies moulded by silicon rubber are tabulated in Table 4. It was impossible to predict the posture of any bodies before excavation and it is coincidence that only extended burials were moulded.

3.6.4.28

A team of conservators under N. Williams also lent their skills to help preserving the bodies. Instead of directly moulding, the shapes were consolidated before being covered in polyurethane foam. Both the animal joint within F106 and the whole of the ploughman complex were lifted once they had been so treated and boxed. The varying success of both techniques - the silicon rubber was rather bulky and during removal it tended to destroy the body outline, and the consolidation process did not penetrate deeply enough - were superseded in 1986 by the introduction of latex moulds. The latex was also covered by polyurethane foam but during removal less damage was caused to the body outline. Apart from public display and until we are able to record the subtle 3-D outline of the bodies, the moulds have produced fine reproductions of the body shapes. The potential for recording using the Psion should not be underestimated and the moulds could provide a useful template on which to develop the method.

3.6.4.29

No major catastrophe has destroyed the shape of the body outlines. This is rather surprising, given the depth of some graves, the crowding of the surface and the hostile environmental conditions. Minor collapses affected the south side of F161 and F166 but the excavation of the graves was protected and improved by the construction of various shelters and harnesses above the graves by Mr P. Berry. These pieces of site furniture also provided a helpful platform for the detailed photographic recording of the grave. All the photographs of a grave are the responsibility of the specialist photographer. The application of various photographic techniques such as stereoscopic pairs and enhancements such as U.V. have been tested with some degree of success, although a limited scale. Finally, photographs have been taken as a way of duplicating the site plans drawn in coloured pencils for the various definition levels within each grave.

3.6.4.30

One of the key objectives of this report is to outline ways in which future excavation of the graves can be improved. Complete standardisation of our excavation methods is probably not desirable. The evidence which is encountered varies between graves and we must allow for some adaptation and fine tuning to cope with particular circumstances.

It is important to qualify the guidelines below (Table 5). They have been constructed using the evidence produced and presented from 1984, 1985 and 1986. A fundamentally new approach to the excavation of the graves may be designed if either the Leverhulme Trust Project and/or The British Museum Project are able to introduce new recording methods or are able to state quite specifically certain attributes they require recording. One of the main conclusions drawn from the evidence presented is that our recording and excavation methodology has grown experimentally depending upon the complexity of the graves encountered, and the alteration in the sampling strategy which occurred as a result of new questions being asked of the database. Another conclusion must be that a variety of evidence has been recorded in a variety of ways, all to a different standard. Of particular concern is the lack of explicit statements concerning the methods of excavation and the interpretation discussed at the different stages of excavation. For example, is the body from F163 human or animal? There is no positive indication what interpretation was favoured by the recorders. The moderate number of grave diggers who even changed on individual graves, such as F161 and F137 has probably been one of the causes of the lack of recording discipline. So far the best results have been achieved by excavators (F. Lee and P. Leach), who concentrated on single graves and produced coherent and consistent feature packages often with appended notes.

3.7 *Surface Mapping of Int.38 (MRH)*

Int. 38 was the name given to the northern area of 16x24m located between the 207 and 231 eastings and the 161 and 177 northings, re-opened on 10 July 1986 by removing topsoil with a mechanical Drott. This is the area previously known as "Lanes" 5-8 of 1985, the defined as part of Int. 32. After initial clearing, the 1986 Int. 38 area was left fallow, to be cleaned in September 1986 for overall balloon shots on 11 September 1986. No excavation took place in Int. 38, the surface defined remaining that mapped in September 1985 (see section 3.5.4 of this vol).

The surface of Int. 38 only shows the major features transecting the area, namely the anti-glider ditch (F220 of Int. 32) and the northern run of ditch F130 and accompanying palisade F213. In addition, a short run of an ESE-WNW ditch survived in the triangle between anti-glider ditch and ditch F130: this short stretch may be the same ditch as one encountered further West in Int. 52 (see vol. 8i, F63 cutting the earlier double boundary F57 and F58). By extension, it is possible that it belongs to the F130 system, labelled "Iron Age" (because it is at right angles to F130 and because it may cut the earlier Bronze Age double boundary).

Finds from the surface of Int. 38 were recorded in 1985 as part of the Int. 32 Finds' Index. Their distribution shows a concentration of Neolithic pottery in the SW corner of Int. 38 (see section 3.9), mirroring a similar concentration of Neolithic pottery - this time in features - in the SW corner of Int. 20/32 (the "postholes" F2/111 etc., see section 5.1), some 15-20m further South.

No obvious graves were detected within the area of Int. 38. The possibility that the eastern cemetery (Burials 17-39) extended further North cannot be discounted. In 1991, the last full season of excavations at Sutton Hoo, Martin Carver had made the proposal to re-open Int. 38 to check for the absence of graves. But this remained an intention, given the pressure to complete work on Int. 50, 48, 44 and 55.

An indication that graves existed within Int. 38 is given by an entry by AJ Copp in the site notebook (12 August 1986): "At the NW corner of Int. 32 [around 207/161], Ann Trewick cleaned an area to reveal a series of features left over from 1985....[The palisade trench F158] had been cut by a pit/posthole F233 which in turn had been cut by a less distinct feature, F234, which is possibly a grave". On 14 August 1986, he notes: "F234 much clearer with well defined edges. Instead of running N-S along axis of the features, [F234] which is probably a grave, runs NE-SW, still cutting F158 and F233." On 17 August 1986, the site notebook records the excavation of pit F233: "The question arises as to whether we have overdug F233 into a deeper feature *containing a body*. I don't think this is possible because of the *recovery of part of the body* in the upper fill along the edge, an area which is not at all adjacent to the probable grave F234. [...] I think we are dealing with a body dumped into a grave or pit which only backfilled gradually by natural weathering". There are no further entries by Copp, as P. Leach then took over the supervision of Int. 32, leaving A. Copp to concentrate on Int. 39.

3.8 *Comment on the Excavation of Int.32*

3.8.1

The excavation of Int's.20 and 32 showed that we must exercise control over the surface environment if we are to record and recover the total feature population. Based upon our experience in Int.32, it became possible to identify and separate certain categories of non-features which did not require recording. This increased the pace of excavation, and with a group of people who had knowledge of the variability of the feature types, we expected to be able to record and excavate the evidence in more detail and clarity.

3.8.2

The overall distribution of the archaeological features shows a marked concentration toward the western side of the intervention. This side is dominated by two parallel palisade trenches F5 and F15.133 which run diagonally but parallel NW-SE. Although post/stake holes were only recovered intermittently along the palisade trenches, this probably reflects inexpert excavation. The evidence does not indicate a structure of monumental dimensions, as perhaps envisaged by the high ranking sites of southern England. Instead the palisades do signal some form of land division not unlike that reconstructed from Fengate (Pryor 1978) in the LN/EBA where palisades were constructed to form droveways and enclosures of large scale land management schemes.

3.8.3

At one time, a fairly substantial bank must have been formed from the earth removed from the large ditch, F1. This ditch appears along the same alignment as the interrupted palisade trenches F4, 169, 213, 219. It is plausible that the latter acted as an outer retaining wall for the earth work. However, other explanations are possible. A berm possible existed between

the ditch and palisades, the latter acting as an inner retaining wall. Whatever the position of the bank, the complex cannot be dated independently. We have already noted that the grave, F231 was cut through at least the bottom fill of the ditch and respected its alignment indicating that the ditch was at least visible. Yet two other graves F161 and F173 were apparently cut by palisades. Therefore, if all the graves are generally contemporary, it could be argued that the ditch and palisades are not a contemporary structure. The palisade may instead have been an independent structure continuing a traditional boundary to a ? ritual area of the site. In relation to the palisades, it is worth noting all the N-S burials are distributed 'within' this boundary, whereas the palisade cuts the E-W graves F161 and F173.

3.8.4

It is ironic given the concentration of postholes that few structures can be picked out by mapping. Three large postholes F165, 167 and 230 constitute a possible 4-poster structure just west of the large ditch F1. A fourth possible posthole must be assumed to be present just inside the border of Int.38. All three features share similar attributes apart from their mapping. All are large and deep and all show evidence that their posts leant over to the east.

Given the number of postholes in the NW corner of the site, it is not surprising that combinations of 2-3 posts can be lined up, however, none form convincing patterns. On the eastern side one clear fence line is visible composed of F202, 199, 221 and from Int.39 F34. These stand out clearly against less 'background' noise.

3.8.5

A major contrast between the nature of occupation between Int.20/32 and Int.39 is the lack of burials in the latter intervention. We have managed to define the limits of the graveyard, at least in the northern sector of Zone F. The edge of the graveyard follows the alignment of both the ditch F1 and the palisades. From this we can postulate that the further north we excavate, the further east the graveyard will stretch.

3.8.6

If features cut across each other, they often could not be separated stratigraphically by their distinctive fills. In this case, we relied upon the pattern of distribution of particular feature types across the area in order to pick up structures. Considering all the activity attested by the features it was surprising that more structures were not discovered. Many of the types of features uncovered from 1984 had been recovered during previous work at Sutton Hoo, (Longworth and Kinnes, 1980). From Int.32 we had evidence for land division using timber structures and earthworks, but slender evidence of actual occupation. A similar dichotomy from the Early Medieval period was noted, where all the evidence came from burial ritual.

3.8.7 Detailed Evaluation and Quality control of the recording of graves excavated in Int.32 (A J Copp)

Key to Attributes recorded for each grave

FEATURE No.

- 1a Recorders
- b Excavators

- 2 HOW RECOGNISED

- 3 RECORDING METHODS

- 3a Planning
- b Context
- c Feature
- d Finds i.e. sampling along the body
- e Sampling procedure within grave fill
- f Levels of excavation
- g Method of excavation

- 4 HOW THE BODY WAS FOUND

- 5 CONDITION OF BODY
- 6 ORIENTATION
- 7 POSTURE
- 8 TREATMENT
- 9 GENERAL COMMENTS

3.8.7.1 Burial 17 F9 (1984)

- 1a P. Leach
- b J. Cane; P. Leach
- 2 During excavation of palisade F4 in section; body outline of pelvis and left leg.
- 3a Planning frame; 1:10
 - Plan
 - Plan 'impressionistic' outline of body shapes in pencil
 - MAB
 - Section - transverse
 - Hachure of empty grave D110
 - Finds located D69ii
- b Allocated to Fill 1016
 - Body 1048
- c Allocated to Grave cut F9
- d Body divided into general anatomical portions, allocated find numbers and removed.
- e No explicit statement of sampling procedure. From section (D41) samples taken from northern baulk, two columns down either side every 5cm. Yet notebook records samples as taken from above the body and to the west side of the body.
- f None. Grave identification at late stage, even extension lacks intermediate planning.
- g Methods uncontrolled considering accidental nature of discovery. The grave fill removed to outline of legs before grave recognised. The section across the grave fortuitously formed by the northern baulk of Int.20. Baulk also afforded sampling positions through the grave. Extension opened to the North and probably dug in plan but not in spits, fill taken straight down to body outline.
- 4 As 3d.
- 5 Clear body stain. Few pieces of fragmentary bone.
- 6 N-S. Head at north end.
- 7 Extended position though head tight up against north end of grave and leaning on the chest; Legs turned slightly to the west.
- 8 Heavily vinamuled
 - U.V.
 - Stereo pairs.
- 9 Not recorded under controlled circumstances. Methods were developed using this grave as test. Body used for many different experiments. Displayed during the excavation season for the public. Birmingham University chemist identified stain as principally organic. Finds of body outline sent for c14, see D124

April 1985.

No levels across body.

Drawings lack adequate grid referencing.

3.8.7.2 Burial 18 F39 (1984)

- 1a P. Leach
- b P. Leach
- 2 Surface discolouration; iron-pan concretions.
- 3a Planning frame; 1:10
 - Two plans primarily recording coffin stain at different definitions.
 - Two colour plans of coffin and body outline.
 - Two sections, one longitudinal, one transverse.
 - Hachure plan of grave D123.
- b Allocated to upper fill 1063, 1065
 - Coffin fill 1064
 - Coffin stain 1066
 - Body stain 1067
- c Allocated to grave cut F39
- d Body divided into general anatomical portions, allocated find numbers and removed; illustrated on colour plan D111.
- e No explicit statement of sampling procedure. Recorded on longitudinal section. Four sample points down the grave fill at the west, centre. East end at 10cm vertical intervals. Not column samples, see D114.
- f Two definitions of coffin at 10cm spit intervals. Two further definitions in colour recording body and coffin outlines. NB not 1985 colour codes.
- g Fill of narrow coffin removed to reveal body outline within grave. Remaining grave fill removed from either side of coffin. Notebook records the section laid out longitudinally with alternate halves removed at spit intervals of 10cm.
- 4 18 stain samples removed of body and coffin outlines.
- 5 Poorly preserved body outline, damaged by animal burrowing.
- 6 E-W. Head at west end.
- 7 Extended position slightly flexed at knees
- 8 U.V.
- 9 No explicit methodological notes. Few intermediate plans drawn. Not adequate levelling across body or sampling within the grave fill

3.8.7.3 Burial 19: F40 (1984)

- 1a P. Leach
- b P. Leach
- 2 Surface discolouration; iron-pan concretions.

- 3a Planning frame; 1:10
Two plans at body outline definition (one of ? flesh stain).
Two sections. Longitudinal and transverse.
Profile. Transverse.
- b Allocated to Fill 1062
Body 1069
- c Allocated to grave cut F40
- d Body stain divided into general anatomical portions - indicated on colour plan of body outline D121. Body removed in 1985 as 1018 in F102.
- e No explicit statement of sampling procedure. Illustrated on longitudinal section where samples taken down profile at west, centre. East end at 10cm vertical intervals.
- f No intermediate definition stages illustrated, only recorded body outlines on plan.
- g No statement of methodology to explain lack of intermediate plans. Sections obviously used to record detail of grave fill.
- 4 18 body samples removed in 1985, no indication ? flesh stain sampled.
- 5 Well preserved body outline with ? flesh stain.
- 6 E-W. Head at East end.
- 7 Extended but slightly flexed at the knees. Lying face down with right arm up behind the back.
- 8 Heavily vinamuled.
Not removed in 1984 but heavily insulated with polystyrene chips and newspapers in sandbags.
- 9 Lack of intermediate plans. Possible decayed flesh not given separate context number or apparently sampled. No final hachure plan of empty grave. Lack of levels across body. Grave is particularly deep and long

3.8.7.4 Burial 20: F106 (1985)

- 1a M. Cooper, P. Leach
- b M. Cooper
- 2 Surface discolouration; pebble cairn along centre of Longitudinal axis.
- 3a Planning frame; 1:10
Three colour plans from definitions 2-4, D126, D127, D130
One colour keyline plan D176
Three sections, one longitudinal D122, two transverse D123, D124
Three hachure plans, body outline, coffin outline, empty grave. (These also record the excavation of the grave at different definitions).
Profiles across body outline - one longitudinal D344; four transverse D165, D429, D430, D431.
- b Allocated to Fill 1016, 1065, 1066 and 1068
Coffin walls 1067 (north edge), 2041 (east side of north edge)
Carbonised wood remains of coffin 2092
'Organic stain' 2007
Decayed body skin 2009
Body outline 2091
Animal limb outline 2093
- c Allocated to grave cut F106
- d Body divided into anatomical portions (depending upon survival) and removed as separate finds.

- e No explicit statement or illustration of sampling procedure.
- f Change in excavation strategy indicated by plans. Once the sections drawn, presumably after a number of unrecorded definitions, four spits removed to achieve total body outline.
- g No records about methodology. Appears sections used to record fill of grave until shapes recognised i.e. a coffin and thereafter transferred to excavation in plan with four definitions. First coffin outline reached at a depth of c20cm. The excavators Level 1 refers to the level at which the first shape identified within the grave. Subsequently colour plans replaced the sections as the principal recording mode.
- 4 Nine separate finds numbers to record body outline, animal outline and coffin stain.
- 5 Surviving body outline well preserved, though lower left leg not recovered, skull disturbed by animal burrow.
- 6 NW-SE. Head at west end.
- 7 Extended position
- 8 Animal limb consolidated and lifted by The British Museum 29th October 1985. Square box pit dug around limb to facilitate removal.
- 9 Methodology not explicit enough, particularly as it appears to have altered during the course of excavation. The recording of the shapes both in plan and on written record cards is poor. General lack of heights on the various contexts within the grave.

3.8.7.5 Burial 21: F108

- 1a M. Cooper; B. Noble
- b B. Noble
- 2 Surface discolouration; surface 'humic' body stain. F108 only defined at an alter date, the area of discolouration originally defined as F105.
- 3 Planning frame; 1:10
 - Colour convention plan at second definition of complete body outline D100.
 - Colour keyline plan of body outline D156
 - Colour plan of grave after removal of body.
 - Two sections - transverse
 - Profile - longitudinal
 - Two hachure plans - one of body outline, one of empty grave.
 - Find location plan
- b Allocated to fill 1069
 - Body stain 2000
 - Organic stain 2048
- c Allocated to grave cut.
- d Body outline divided into general anatomical portions and removed as separate finds.
- e No indication of sampling procedure within this feature.
- f No intermediate definitions between initial definition of feature and outline of the body (Very shallow grave).
- g Shallow grave, fill only recorded in section by transverse drawings. Methodology determined by shallow grave which require no intermediate definitions. Clear excavation of this grave interrupted by close association of F109 which lies across the grave.

- 4 Fragmentary bone lifted with body stain; fifteen finds associated with the body outline. The sixteenth find is a stone which the person was holding.
- 5 Clear body outline: Lacks a head.
- 6 E-W. Head (if it had not been removed at west end).
- 7 Body lying in an extended position with arms along either side. Body lacks a head, it was recovered in F109 which had cut through F108. Why was the person clutching a stone - find 2395?
- 8 Silicon rubber moulding.
- 9 No clear methodological procedure stated. Again, this is reconstructed from the feature package. Not enough attention devoted to written records and recording and context forms not completed. Plans of shapes lack heights, not one level taken across body outline, no clear indication of the position of the 'organic' stain or whether or where it was sampled.

3.8.7.6 Burial 22: F109

- 1a B. Noble
- b M. Cooper, J. Lawrence
- 2 Surface discolouration; surface 'humic' body stain. F109 only defined after continued cleaning over F106.
- 3a Planning frame: 1:10
 - Plans
 - Find location plan D133
 - Hachure plan of empty grave D134
 - (F105 package contains relevant plans and the keyline plan of F109 body outline).
- b Allocated to fill (F105 1064), below body stain 2008
 - Body stain 2001
 - Extra head 2002
 - ? Shroud 2003
- c Allocated to grave cut F109.
- d Body outline divided into general anatomical portions.
- e No indication of sampling strategy.
- f Including the colour keyline plan drawn F105, four planning definitions drawn in pencil (see F105). No clear indication of spit depth. Some drawings are just copied overlays.
- g No explicit statement of excavation procedure. Running section lines illustrated on plan but none recovered against feature package. Feature taken down in plan in an unrecorded number of spits.
- 4 Fifteen samples taken to remove body outline.
- 5 Body not well preserved in outline, bone fragments among body stain.
- 6 E-W. Head at west end.
- 7 Lying extended, extra head present, derived from F108. Head on top of left leg and shroud.
- 8
- 9 Upper fill of grave unrecognised and recorded as F105. This has lead to confusion during the recording. Shape of body not fully recorded, no profiles, sections or colour plans drawn, no indication of sampling strategy, no indication of position of the possible shroud outline over the body, all the plans lack height

3.8.7.7-8 Burial 23 and Burial 24: F137

- 1a R. Beesley, C. Cane, S. Foster
- b R. Beesley, C. Cane, S. Foster
- 2 Surface discolouration
- 3a Planning frame: 1:10
 - Pencil plans to fourth definition.
 - Colour plans fifth to fourteenth definition for fill over 2023.
 - Keyline plan of both bodies 2023 D232
 - 2059 D339
 - Profiles across 2023 (transverse) D214, D448 and along (longitudinally) D213.
 - Hachure plans - empty grave; body outline.
 - Finds location plan 2023 D450
 - 2059 D449
 - Location of eighteen level points across body 2059 D340
- b Allocated to fill 1079
 - Coffin stain 1071 (from third definition)
 - Coffin edges along north and south sides 2020 (from seventh definition)
 - Coffin end 2021 west side (from ninth definition)
 - Body stain 2023
 - Coffin end 2053 east side
 - Coffin base 2070 (beneath 2023)
 - Second body stain 2059 (from twelfth definition)
 - Coffin at east end 2057
- c Allocated to grave cut F137
- d Bodies split into general anatomical portions.
- e No clear sampling strategy.
- f Fourteen definitions required for the outline of 2023, intervals between spits described in notes as c. 4cm. Outline of 2059 retrieved immediately below for fourteenth definition.
- g Grave dug in plan with the removal of numerous spits, each definition stage drawn and levelled, from the fifth definition colour planning introduced. 2023 cuts 2059, steps visible on the east side between these bodies. The deep nature of the total grave posed problems for recording and access.
- 4 Twenty-four samples taken to remove body 2023 (D450) includes seven soil samples from beyond the body outline. 2059 sampled in identical manner to 2023 though no soil samples recovered.
- 5 Both bodies well preserved in outline and contained fragmentary bone.
- 6 2023 NW-SE. Head at east end
2059 E-W. Head thrown forwards onto pelvis.
- 7 2023 extended body. The head is in such a position to indicate a possible broken neck. There is no hard evidence, such as a noose, but only the 3-D outline of the skull 2059. Crouching body, left arm beneath body, right arm beneath the back, head forward over the pelvis. Possible the body bound up in this crumpled position.
- 8 2023 moulded by silicon rubber.
- 9 In comparison to other graves F137 has been comprehensively recorded which is surprising given three separate excavators/recorders. Recording and excavation proved difficult given the deepness and complexity of the grave which contained two bodies. My criticism would be that more levelling was required to record the slopes of the bodies etc. also no sampling procedure was described and finally the profiles across 2023 were not adequately referenced to the plans.

3.8.7.9 Burial 25: F146

- 1a A. Favaro, P.J. Leach
- b A. Favaro, W. Filmer-Sankey
- 2 Surface discolouration; iron pan concretions. Before separation F146 treated as F154.
- 3a Planning frame; 1:10
 - Four colour plans at different definitions including the body outline plan.
 - One colour keyline plan.
 - (Pencil plan of feature outline as F154).
 - Section - transverse; (also longitudinal section recorded and located within F154 feature package.
 - Find location plan.
 - Hachure plan of empty grave.
 - Plans with levels across body shape.
- b Allocated to fill 1035
 - Body outline 2060
- c Allocated to grave cut F146.
- d Body outline divided into general anatomical portions and allocated find numbers D332.
- e No record of sampling strategy even on appended notes. The longitudinal section from F154 indicates sampling within fill at north west, centre, south east points. The site notebook states soil samples taken from east, centre, west ends at 10cm vertical intervals through the grave.
- f Once feature separated from F154 four definitions required to achieve the total body outline. The definition plans indicate that spits were c. 5cm deep and is in contrast to the notebook which states that 10cm spits removed.
- g Initially excavated as one feature with F154, upon separation (see D47) these features were dug in plan. Body outline only initially exposed in two places,
 - a) the legs
 - b) the upper torso.Remainder of body left covered by another body outline within F154. This latter body has cut across the body within F146.
- 4 Fourteen body samples removed - ribs and shoulders not sampled.
- 5 Well preserved body outline with occasional bone fragments surviving. Ribs and shoulders only faintly preserved and NOT removed as samples.
- 6 NW-SE. Head at SE and sloping downhill.
- 7 Extended body posture, the right leg is slightly flexed, the right foot crosses the left which lead the recorders to note that the feet had been tied together.
- 8 Moulded in silicon rubber - upon removal head disturbed and re-excavated from rubber mould. Left to weather until F154 dug.
- 9 The excavation of this grave probably marks the trend away from recording detail of the grave fill in section and toward spit excavation. However, a number of errors can be isolated, the sections are incompletely referenced and recorded, there is no hachure plan of the body outline and no sampling strategy has been discussed even on the helpful notes kept by P.J.L. and appended to package. The colour keyline plan lacks grid references.

3.8.7.10 Burial 26: F154

- 1a A. Favaro; P.J. Leach
- b A. Favaro
- 2 Surface discolouration; iron pan concretions. Initially treated as one feature with F146.
- 3a Planning frame; 1:10
Pencil plan (at initial separation of F146 D47).
Colour body outline plan D53.
Find location plan D330
Hachure plan of empty grave D331
Profile - longitudinal through grave recording body D462
Section - transverse D49. Longitudinally of upper fill (with F146) D50.
- b Allocated to fill 1059
Body outline 1080
- c Allocated to grave cut F154.
- d Body outline divided into general anatomical portions and each removed as an individual find.
- e Sampling procedure not described. The sections illustrate sampling at either end and in the centre of the grave fill at intervals between 5-10cm.
- f No intermediate colour plans/definitions drawn for very shallow grave.
- g This feature initially described the surface discolouration which later separated into two graves F146 and F154. The recording of transverse and longitudinal sections across this grave were abandoned fairly rapidly as the body outline was only buried in a shallow grave. This would obviously explain the lack of intermediate definitions from the planning stages. NB for an undisclosed reason the body outline plan is shaded using unconventional coloured pencils e.g. the body is in red-brown in contrast to the 1985 colour scheme which indicates it ought to be green.
- 4 Fifteen samples removed (See D330).
- 5 Where the stain survives, it is clear much of the trunk of the body could not be defined.
- 6 E-W. Head at west end.
- 7 Extended body position with the head across to the north side of the grave; the left leg is slightly flexed and raised; arms are folded across the lower abdomen.
- 8
- 9 Sections were used to control the excavation of the initial surface discolouration. However, even these have not been adequately recorded. The lack of definition plans due to the shallow nature of the grave but many of the records are inadequate. The recurrent theme is the lack of levelling - the final hachure plan and earlier plans lack levels. Although a colour drawing of the body outline exists, it has not been drawn using the convention sheet nor has an adequate colour keyline been drawn.

3.8.7.11 Burial 27: F161

- 1a A. Favaro, C. Williams, W. Lockyer, R. Beesley, S.Foster
- b C. Williams, W. Lockyer, R. Beesley
- 2 Surface discolouration.
- 3a Planning frame; 1:10; offset planning
4 pencil plans
6 colour plans

1 keyline colour plan D228
1 hachure plan of body and plough outline.

- b Allocated to fill 1090 (=1073)
Body stain 2065
Grave good - 'Plough' 2066
- c Allocated to grave cut F161.
- d In 1985, body stain and grave goods not removed as samples, thus no Find Location plan.
- e No discussion of sampling strategy. Sampling positions recorded on plan from definitions. Five samples from each definition, taken across the centre of the grave longitudinally and transversely.
- f The grave was excavated in plan. Apart from the initial feature outline, there are four further definition plans drawn in pencil before colour planning began at definition five and continued to definition ten. The eleventh definition is a hachure plan of the body complex. The tenth definition plan does not illustrate the fully exposed body outline. This is only achieved in colour on the keyline plan D228. Depth of spit removed outlined by C. Williams (first definition achieved after removal of first spit), decided upon at depth of 4cm which was removed in twenty-five stages. A change in this policy is noted when plans were only to be drawn and definition levels only achieved once a noticeable change in the fill occurred.

NB The recorder noted on the surface of this grave an area of discolouration which survived until the third definition - D77. "There appears to be a possible feature cutting the grave North-South in the central area" This has been interpreted in the excavation report for Int.32 as positive evidence that the palisade trench F4/219/213/169 cuts the grave. It should be remembered that the grave was dug before the outline of this palisade trench was noticed.

- g Methodology discussed only by Carol Williams. The excavation of this feature illustrated the different methods. At the time some graves were being dug with a pattern of sections but there are no sections from this grave (or profiles) instead the grave was dug in plan using coloured pencils to record the changes in the fill.
- 4 See 2d. In 1986 the cushion provided by the polyurethane foam was removed in spits 20cm thick. After the yellow sand packing was removed the ploughman impression was clear. The mould was excavated backwards as the box had turned over, thus the body was approached from below the grave. Little of the grave complex survived the lifting operation from 1985. An organic crust was visible around the head of the ploughman but also the skull, upper arm and part of the 'plough' survived. These surviving portions of the grave were sampled intensively, the whole of the skull was removed. The find numbers corresponding to these samples are outlined below.

Find Number Material Description

3243 Organic Left hand
3244 Organic 'Plough'
3247 Organic Right foot
3248 Organic 'Plough' handles - west terminals
3249 Organic Plough Ard
3250 Organic Left foot
3251 Organic Upper Vertebrae
3252 Organic Shoulders
3253 Organic Neck
3254 Organic Arm
3255 Bone (H) Head

- 5 Well preserved body outline, occasional pieces of bone - particularly the skull survived.
- 6 ? E-W. Head at west end facing north.
- 7 Body? attached to a 'plough' in a hurdling position.

- 8 Polyurethane foam mould now at British Museum. Consolidated 26 September 1985; Pit dug 29 September 1985; Shuttering erected 1 October 1985; Lifted by JCB with block and tackle 3 October 1985.

Grave outline collapsed on south side.

Stereoscopic pairs.

- 9 A very deep and peculiar burial. Many people involved in the recording and excavation of the feature - no sections or profiles drawn, no hachure plan of empty grave, no indication of how and where samples removed in 1986 on a plan, no levels across bottom of grave once body and plough outlined achieved.

3.8.7.12 Burial 28: F163

- 1a J. Cane, A. Favaro, W. Filmer-Sankey, F. Lee
b J. Cane, A. Favaro, W. Filmer-Sankey, F. Lee
- 2 Surface discolouration; iron-pan concretions: charcoal flecks. Together with F166 this feature treated as one - F154 on the surface before the two graves separated.
- 3a Planning frame; 1:10
8 pencil plans - 6 of these drawn as F156
3 sections - with F156. One longitudinal and two transverse
Located on plan D83
7 colour plans - only drawn once body stain encountered
Colour keyline plan D144
Profile with body outline D296
3 levels plans - spot heights of ?disturbed body at different stages
Hachure plan - body outline D143
2 Finds Location plans D325, D143
(one polaroid photograph of J. Cane in body posture).
- b Allocated to fill 1093
Body stain 1096
- c Allocated to grave cut F163
- d Body outline divided into general anatomical portions and removed. The two plans D325 and D463 illustrate body divided into twenty-nine samples. The sample are not keyed to find numbers on the drawings but tabulated notes by F. Lee does convert sample to find numbers with a clear anatomical interpretation.
- e No explicit sampling strategy described. Reconstructed from the plans - three samples taken at irregular positions on the west, centre and east side of the grave fill.
- f Once F163 defined from F156 spits below 4cm removed to achieve definitions. This evidence is not stated but has been pulled from the levels across the definition plans. Seven definitions required to achieve the total body outline once F163 separated. Combined with F156 fifteen definitions planned to body outline.
- g Incorporated with F166 as F156 on the surface. F163 only excavated in plan the shallow sections belong to F156. A single profile drawn along the grave to reveal attitude of body within grave. All profiles located on a location plan D225 attached with F166 package.
- 4 Complex body position required two separate plans to record the series of samples removed.
- 5 Poorly preserved body stain, not improved by the cramped position of the body.
- 6 Crouched.
- 7 Peculiar crouched position (see interpretation on Polaroid) backside in the air and right arm out alongside the right leg. Our plans make 3-D recovery of body position difficult.

8

- 9 The lack of a notebook with descriptions and interpretations of the body outline is surprising given the contradictory statements about this grave. I still do not know whether it is a human or animal burial or whether it was both. The description on the context card 1096 suggests the presence of an animal.

The early definition plans particularly those drawn for F156 lack levels.

3.8.7.13 Burial 29: F166

1a A. Favaro

b A. Favaro

- 2 Surface discolouration; iron-pan concretions. Together with F163 this feature initially treated as one - F156 before separation at a lower level into two graves.

3a Planning frame; 1:10

(see F163 for relevant list of plans associated with F156)

Seven colour plans - begin at the seventh definition.

Hachure plan of empty grave (also incorporates hachure for F163).

Three profiles - two transverse showing head D297 and pelvis D499, one longitudinal D298.

Keyline plan in colour of body outline D231

Find Location plan D337

b Allocated to fill 1099

Body stain 1089

c Allocated to grave cut F166

- d Body stain divided into general anatomical portions and removed D337. Eight samples removed keyed on drawing to particular Find numbers.

e No explicit statement concerning sampling within grave fill. Plans indicate samples taken from either end and in the centre of the grave but only irregularly down the profile. No sample positions illustrated from definitions eleven to fourteen inclusive.

f Fourteen definition levels drawn in both pencil and colours. The fifteenth definition plan really only shows the location and profiles drawn across F163 and 166. The levels across the definition plans indicate spits removed at c. 6cm intervals which contracted to a depth of only 2cm once the body outline was approached.

g Once this grave was separated from the general disturbance recorded as F156, a series of seven spits removed to reveal a body outline. Initially the grave was dug in section as F156 but this strategy was abandoned once separation was achieved.

4 As 3d.

5 Surviving body outline clear but disturbed by later grave F163, except for the feet no leg stains survive

6 E-W. Head at west end.

7 Peculiar posture, body in extended position but the left arm is extended and flexed behind the left side of the head.

8

- 9 Method of excavation and sampling strategy reconstructed from the drawings. The particular coloured pencils used on the plans should indicate that some stains within the grave fill are wood but there is no further written discussion of these. This grave is very deep and the grave particularly long to accommodate the peculiar posture the body has achieved.

- 3.8.7.14 Burial 30: F173
- 1a P. McCullough, F. Lee
 - b P. McCullough, F. Lee
 - 2 Surface discolouration
 - 3a Planning frame; 1:10
 - Colour plans - eleven definition plans
 - Keyline plan of body D269
 - Hachure plan of body outline at level eleven.
 - Find Location plan D318
 - Hachure plan of empty grave D319
 - Profiles - of body longitudinally, and four transverse; four transverse of empty grave.
 - b Allocated to grave fill 2030, 2034, 2036;
fill beneath body 2039
Body outline 2038
 - c Allocated to grave cut F173
 - d Body outline divided into general anatomical portions for removal (1-22). The samples are keyed to the find numbers on the plan D318. NB see 4 for amendment to normal sampling procedure.
 - e Sampling procedure outlined on appended notes. No samples taken from first definition, samples below this definition removed from the west, centre and east areas within the grave as illustrated on the appropriate definition plans by the position of the levels. Were samples taken in identical places down the fill of the grave? No discussion of sampling from notes below the third definition.
 - f Depth of spits removed only occasionally noted e.g. 2cm between second and third definition. Definition ten is described as an intermediate level, recorded on discovering a discreet layer above the body. The levels across the plans indicate spit depth vary from 2 to 10cm.
 - g Grave excavated in spits with plans drawn at each definition. Profiles were laid out once the total body outline achieved to record the attitude of the body and after removal the geometry of the grave cut. A description of each definition is recorded in the detailed log kept by the recorder including impressions on whether the true edges to the grave had been reached, whether soil stains are significant etc.
 - 4 Before body removed, body stain was excavated/peeled off to reveal a well preserved but very friable bone skeleton. This suggests that the body stain is a flesh rather than bone stain. The notes record that the head and lower right leg were consolidated by the British Museum so they could investigate the structural difference between the stain and the bone.
 - 5 Well preserved body stain and skeletal stain.
 - 6 E-W. Head at west end.
 - 7 Extended body posture, arms crossed over pelvis, head turned to face south.
 - 8 Head and lower right leg consolidated by British Museum. Lifted 27 September 1985.
 - 9 Well documented excavation with extra freehand notes appended to feature package. These record relevant observations made during the excavation, orientation of the body, preservation of bone, sex, age, comments on lifting. Plans consistently recorded to a high standard e.g. careful keys appended showing the conventions applied to the colour plans. (However, I note the first definition plan has abandoned the usual site convention colour scheme; but this is stated on the drawing and an appropriate key is provided).

From the plans drawn at the initial or early definition levels for the fill of this grave, it is quite possible that the palisade trench F4/219/213/169 cut across the grave. The grave was dug before this palisade was recognised but a surface discolouration was noted at the eastern end of the upper grave fill which probably corresponds to the fill of the palisade trench.

3.8.7.15 Burial 31: F231

- 1a P.J. Leach, C. Williams
- b C. Williams
- 2 Encountered during excavation of ditch F1.130 as a body stain; grave cut confirmed by subsequent trowelling of ditch fill.
- 3a Planning frame; 1:10; Psion to record body samples on D467.
 - Plan in pencil of pre-excavation stage.
 - Plan showing sampling points down grave.
 - Colour plans - two. One a duplicate of pre-excavation plan D410.
 - One keyline plan D474
 - One outline of body in pencil D465
 - Section - longitudinal along central axis.
 - Plan of charcoal staining within grave D412.
 - Plan showing position of soil samples after removal of first spit D464
 - Find Location Plan D467
 - (Final hachure plan of empty grave appended to hachure plan of F1/130).
- b Allocated to fill of grave 1103
 - Body shape F237
- d Sampling positions across the body outline are illustrated on D467. On D465 the samples removed from anatomical portions are illustrated. Samples recorded in position by Psion. Body samples taken every 10cm along the body, except the head which was divided into quarters.
- e Clear statement and illustration of sampling points for the grave fill on a plan. Seven samples removed at each definition. Three along the central longitudinal axis and two on either side in between the central and either northern or southern points.
- f Since grave only recognised at a late stage during the excavation of F1/130 most of the fill had probably been removed. Thus only an intermediate definition level was required between the initial identification and the final outline of the body. The depth of the spit removed to this intermediate stage was 10cm.
- g Excavation was straightforward because of the amount of disturbance that had apparently removed the upper fill of the grave. The eastern side of the longitudinal section was removed allowing section to be drawn before whole of grave excavated to the same depth. At this stage, the body outline was almost complete and so any surviving fill was removed with recourse to another definition.
- 4 Body outline sampled every 10cms.
- 5 No bone recorded on keyline plan or context record. Clear body stain.
- 6 N-S. Head at north end.
- 7 Extended position, face up, arms across the pelvis.
- 8 Latex mould by British Museum and CW
- 9 Initial cut for grave unrecorded due to unexpected nature of discovery. Possibly cut visible on surface of ditch F1/130. The records for the ditch indicate charcoal and in situ burning in this locality but unfortunately they also reveal that no planning was undertaken. Instead the fill of the top 25cm removed in 1985.

Initially tried to contour survey the body using the Psion but the equipment - air staff - was too large to position carefully. Instead Psion used to record the position of the body samples. The key showing the correspondence between the sample and the find numbers has not been written.

3.8.7.16-17 Burial 32 and Burial 33: F227

- 1a P. Bethell
- b P. Bethell
- 2 Surface discolouration.
- 3a Planning frame; 1:10
 - Two plans in pencil from the initial definition.
 - Four colour plans (one duplicates a pencil drawing).
 - Keyline plan
 - Hachure plan of bodies.
 - Two Find Location plans - One of each body.
 - Section in colour - longitudinally. Unfinished.
- b Allocated to fill 2088
 - body outline 1112 (southern body F238)
 - body outline 1113 (northern body F239)
- c Allocated to grave cut F227
 - Body shape F238 - southern
 - Body shape F239 - northern
- d No written notes explaining body sampling procedure. Reconstructed instead from drawings. Two Find Location plans D541 and 542 illustrate a series of specific sampling points, but in contrast to 1985 they are not keyed to particular Find numbers on the drawing.
- e No indication on drawings or written records for sampling procedure.
- f Five definitions. The depth of spit removed for each definition varied ranging from 1cm between first and second definition to 11cm between the second and third definition.
- g One significant change to the recording method is illustrated by the introduction of feature numbers for the body shapes. This allows clear referencing and recording of contextual variety within the geometry of a shape. Also the method of body sampling has altered from removal of large anatomical portions in separate bags to intensively sampling at shorter intervals the shape of the body. The central longitudinal section remains unreferenced but was abandoned once the body outline encountered.
- 4 Body outline sampled in situ to destruction.
- 5 Bodies well preserved, even rib bones clearly distinguishable within the stain.
- 6 E-W. Heads at west end.
- 7 Double burial in narrow grave. F238 face down in an extended position. F239 also in an extended position possibly face down.
- 8 Both bodies latexed by CLR and NMB.
- 9 Peculiar double burial within a narrow grave. Western end of grave cut by Anti-glider ditch F220. Much of the written recording has been ignored. Many of the recording fields are left unentered. During the excavation all the drawings were left without captions or drawing numbers. There is no final hachure plan of the grave and no indication of the sampling procedure within the fill, or of the position of subsoil sampling positions. F239, the northern body has not been drawn using the colour conventions, apart from the keyline plan. Finally, a 'wooden' object was noted as a black line on the colour plans but there is no further discussion of this shape.

3.8.7.18 Burial 34: F235

- 1a K.H. Spandl, P.J. Leach
- b K.H. Spandl, P.J. Leach

- 2 Surface discolouration; iron-pan concretions
- 3a Planning frame; 1:10; Psion
 - Eight colour plans of different definitions
 - One colour keyline plan D489
 - One hachure plan of body outline with detailed levels across body and grave outline
 - Section in colour - longitudinal D425
 - Location of soil samples D495
 - Plan in pencil of intermediate interpretation of body and coffin outline
- b Allocated to grave fill 2095
 - Coffin outline 1108 (F236)
 - Body outline 1114 (F240)
- c Allocated to grave cut F235
 - Coffin shape F236
 - Body shape F240
- d Body outline sampled every 10cm, not recovered in general anatomical portions, points recorded using Psion and illustrated on D477 and D483, the levels belonging to these points listed on paper and appended to F235 feature package, but no correspondence between sample and find numbers.
- e Position of soil samples illustrated on D495, removed in identical position every spit to achieve column samples. Samples taken at 5cm vertical intervals in contrast to depth of each spit which was 10cm.
- f Eight definition levels recorded. According to levels across definition plans each spit c10cm deep until the sixth definition when only 5cm removed.
- g After surface definition a section was laid out longitudinally along the central E-W axis of the grave. A composite section drawn as each spit was removed. Each spit was removed in alternate halves divided by the section line. Section continued until body outline and coffin encountered. Two clear horizontal planks covered the body which were c5mm thick, also recovered were two end pieces. No base to the coffin was discovered which led the excavators to think the body had been buried in a barrel or cut up bed.
- 4 Body sampled to destruction at 10cm intervals.
- 5 Well preserved body stain containing pieces of fragmentary bone.
- 6 E-W. Head at west end.
- 7 Crouched posture lying flexed upon its right side but facing south with the head to the west and contained within a coffin.
- 8
- 9 Unusual crouched burial in a deep grave which had clearly been dug to predetermined dimensions. The coffin stain was very clear but not of normal construction. Different suggestions were proposed to account for the peculiar shape. The body outline was misinterpreted at an intermediate cleaning stage. Before the final outline was achieved the excavator thought the body had been cut off at the pelvis and thrown into the east side of the grave. Final cleaning of the body revealed that what initially were interpreted as the pelvis was in fact the feet.

Lack final hachure plan of empty grave.

3.8.7.19 Empty Grave: F180

- 1a S. Foster
- b S. Foster

- 2 Surface discolouration.
- 3a Planning frame; 1:10
 - Two colour plans D93 and D94
 - Section, longitudinally along centre of grave D117
 - Hachure plan of empty grave D510
 - Profile of empty grave D137
- b Allocated to fill 1077
- c Allocated to grave cut F180
- d
- e No statement, nor indication on drawings of sampling procedure.
- f No intermediate definition levels achieved. The two colour plans are of a single definition achieved at the initial outline of the feature on the surface.
- g After definition the grave was sectioned, presumably all the fill from the northern half was removed to reveal the north facing section which was drawn. Later it was discovered that the feature had not been totally excavated on the west side. Consequently, the section was amended. The recorder noted that the method of excavation using a single section might not have provided enough control over the removal of the fill and could have resulted in the innocent destruction of a body outline - presumably of a child. There is no record of intermediate spits being removed from this feature.
- 4 No body.
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9 As 3g. Recorder believed the feature was an Early Medieval grave:-
 - (i) E-W alignment
 - (ii) Shape of empty feature
 - (iii) Stratigraphic relationship cutting the palisade.

3.8.7.20 Empty Grave: F226

- 1a P. Bethell
- b P. Bethell
- 2 Surface discolouration.
- 3a Planning frame; 1:10
 - Plan in pencil at initial definition D387
 - Colour plans of three definitions removed from grave
 - Colour section - longitudinal D417
 - Hachure plan of empty grave D418
- b Allocated to fill 2087
- c Allocated to grave cut F226
- d

- e No indication of sampling strategy on plans or records.
- f After definition a longitudinal section was laid out along the central axis of the grave. Either side of the grave was taken down alternately which allowed a composite section to be drawn while the feature was dug in plan. The sections are not referenced.
- g
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8 Phosphate enhancement chemical spray applied to surface outline - staining the fill greeny blue for two days, appears to define edges clearly. Little discussion in this report since controlled conditions were not enforced during its application.
- 9 No body within this grave. High probability the grave and body stain heavily truncated by the digging of the Anti-glider ditch F220 which intersected the feature. In section the fill appears as genuine and the final shape of the grave is another indication for the presence of a grave.

3.9 The assemblage (M. Hummler)

Note: the finds indexes, inventory sheets and other finds records were compiled independently for Interventions 20 and 32. These data have been amalgamated here, since the area once represented by Int 20 was largely incorporated within that of Int 32. Also, it appears that *no* finds records were made for Int 38, but that the finds recovered while stripping the area of Int 38 were entered on the index of finds from Int 32 (eg a concentration of Neolithic pottery at around 208/165 indexed as finds 1796 etc in the Int 32 index). The totals and proportions of finds reported upon here, therefore, represent the finds made in all three operations.

A total of 5720 finds records were made. However, 331 of these records represent ‘non-finds’ (finds whose number had been pre-allocated but which never materialised). Thus the actual finds population of Interventions 20, 32 and 38 is 5389 finds.

The composition of the finds assemblage is given in the attached table, which shows, firstly, the relative frequency of categories of finds and, secondly, how often these finds were recovered in superficial (‘floating’) contexts or within features.

The composition of the assemblage exhibits no surprising pattern: by far the most common artefacts are the ubiquitous burnt flint (44%) followed by flint (20%, mostly waste products but including 47 implements) and ceramic (11%). Each of these categories is found roughly half in superficial contexts and half in features.

The remaining quarter of finds records is made up of soil samples, human bone, organic remains of human bodies and wood charcoal, nearly all recovered within features. A few modern rabbit bones, metal finds, stone, shell and glass fragments complete the assemblage.

Table 6 Int 20, 32 (and 38), contents of finds index

No. of finds records:	5720	Found in ‘Floating’ Contexts	Found in Features
<u>less</u> no. of ‘non-finds’:	331		
TOTAL OF FINDS RECOVERED:	<u>5389</u>	<u>2263</u> (42%)	<u>3126</u> (58%)
Total Bflint	2555 (44%)	1240 (49%)	1375 (51%)
Total flint	1084 (20%)	540 (50%)	544 (50%)
Total ceramic	579 (11%)	261 (45%)	318 (55%)
Total matrix	661 (12%)	183 (28%)	478 (72%)
Total bone (H)	243	(5%) ---	243 (100%)
Total organic (body)	137 (3%)	---	137 (100%)
Total wood (charcoal)	88 (2%)	5	83 (94%)
Total bone (A)	15	12	3
Total stone	15	13	2
Total metal	7	5	2
Total shell	3	2	1
Total glass	1	1	-

The Location of the Assemblages

The finds recovered in *superficial contexts* (topsoil, ploughsoil, definitions to Horizon 2) number 2263 finds, somewhat

less than those found in features (42% against 58%). They are nearly all prehistoric, namely burnt flint (1240 or 55% of all the finds recovered in superficial contexts), flint (540 or 24% of all finds recovered in superficial contexts) and ceramic (261 or 12% of all finds recovered in superficial contexts). Note amongst the ceramic finds a small group of modern pottery, brick, tile and claypipe (41 fragments). Note also that, amongst the prehistoric pottery recovered in the ploughsoil, there are two groups of ceramic, probably derived from feature complexes of Neolithic date: a first group of around 40 sherds of neolithic coarse Grimston ware bowls is centred around 208/165 in the area of Int 38 to the North of palisade trench F135/158; a second group of 14 sherds, probably all from one single pot (of Mildenhall ware?) was recovered around 219/155 in the centre of Int 32, to the West of palisade trench F213. The remaining 9% of superficial finds is made up of soil samples, rabbit and bird bones, lumps of charcoal, modern nails and ammunition (and a pair of pliers!), fragments of stone and shell and a sherd of a modern glass bottle. These few recent finds are compatible with moderate disturbance caused by recent ploughing of fields to the East of the Sutton Hoo track.

The finds recovered *within features* number 3126. Of these, 1062 finds (or 34% of all finds recovered from features) were made during the excavation of Anglo-Saxon features, and 2064 finds (or 66% of all finds recovered in features) were recorded during the excavation of features thought to be prehistoric (or of unknown date).

No actual Anglo-Saxon object was found amongst the 1062 finds stemming from *Anglo-Saxon features*: three-quarters of the finds records refer to human bone, organic remains of human bodies, or wood and soil samples. The remaining quarter represents prehistoric finds (burnt flint and flint with a small scattering of pottery) redeposited in the backfill of graves.

2064 finds were made in *prehistoric features* (or features of unknown date). Around 140 such features were identified within the area of Interventions 20/32/39 (and 38). Most contained only a handful of, often undiagnostic, flint flakes, pieces of burnt flint or minute pottery crumbs. In fact, significant assemblages were concentrated in only 17 features, listed below. These 17 features, between them, contained 1760 finds (or 85% of all the finds emanating from prehistoric or unknown features).

The major prehistoric features of Int 20/32 are:

Ditch F1/130:	774 records (58 ceramic sherds)
Scoop/posthole? F2/111:	16 records (62 ceramic sherds, all neolithic)
Scoop/posthole? F3/112:	63 records (62 ceramic sherds, all neolithic)
Scoop F4/113/177:	20 records (5 ceramic sherds)
Scoop/posthole? F11/120:	16 records (7 ceramic sherds, neolithic)
Scoop/posthole? F13/121:	45 records (27 ceramic sherds, neolithic)
Palisade F15/133:	346 records (11 ceramic sherds, Bronze Age?)
Hearth F132:	33 records (all burnt flint and a soil sample)
Palisade F135/158/174:	101 records (22 ceramic sherds, Bronze Age?)
Posthole? F157:	12 records (4 ceramic sherds, Bronze Age?)
Posthole F165:	95 records (mostly burnt flint, no ceramic)
Pit F168:	130 records (27 ceramic sherds, (Early) Bronze Age)
Pit F175:	24 records (12 ceramic sherds, Beaker)
Pit F178:	15 records (3 ceramic sherds, Bronze Age?)
Posthole F211:	8 records (4 ceramic sherds, Bronze Age?)

Palisade F213:	233 records (3 ceramic sherds, Bronze Age?)
Pit F214:	39 records (10 ceramic sherds, Bronze or Iron Age?)

The composition of the finds assemblage

Not all categories of finds listed as forming the assemblage of Int 20/32/38 will be commented upon here. Beyond mentioning the ubiquity and frequency of burnt flint, these will be ignored. Human bones, organic remains belonging to human bodies or remains of wooden artefacts (eg the plough in grave F161) in Anglo-Saxon contexts will also be ignored as they form part of separate selected studies (see Section 7 of this Volume, by M O H Carver).

Our commentary, therefore, concentrates mostly on prehistoric finds and their ability to date the prehistoric sequence: for this, ceramic, flint and other artefacts with dating potential will be considered.

The ceramic assemblage

579 fragments of ceramic were recovered in the area of Int 20/32 and 38. Of these, 41 fragments were pieces of tile, brick, claypipe and modern pottery recovered in the topsoil. This leaves us with 538 sherds of *prehistoric pottery*. Just under half of these, or 241 sherds, remain unidentified, being small undiagnostic fragments: to assign them to a datable type on the basis of fabric alone appeared too risky a procedure and was not pursued. This leaves us with 297 sherds which could be assigned to type: their relative contribution to the corpus of identifiable pottery is listed below:

Table 7: Int 20/32/38 - Composition of the ceramic assemblage

Total number of ceramic sherds:	579	
<u>less</u> modern brick, tile, claypipe, pottery, etc:		41
Total number of prehistoric sherds:	<u>538</u>	
<u>less</u> unidentifiable prehistoric sherds:		
(also includes 6 fragments of daub)	241	
Total number of identifiable prehistoric pottery:	<u>297</u>	(100% of identifiable sherds)
Neolithic coarse pottery:	144	(48% of identifiable pottery)
Other Neolithic (incl. 19 Mildenhall):	27	(9% of identifiable pottery)
Beaker:	13	(4% of identifiable pottery)
Bronze Age:	86	(29% of identifiable pottery)
Iron Age?:	27	(9% of identifiable pottery)

Almost half of the identifiable pottery is dated to the *Neolithic* period and belongs to coarse bowls in the Grimston tradition.

Most of the sherds of coarse Neolithic pottery of the Grimston tradition are found in two discrete concentrations: the first group is located in the SW of Int 32 (formerly Int 20) in features 2/111, 3/112, 7/116, 11/120, 13, 121, 18/123 and F171 as well as in ploughsoil and definition contexts bearing the same grid references (roughly 210-212 easting, 145-147 northing). These, together, produced 100 sherds of Neolithic coarse pottery. Two features in particular were very rich: F3/112 with 62 sherds of what is thought to be a single Neolithic pot (expedited to the British Museum for conservation) and F13/121 with 27 sherds. The other features of the group contain much fewer sherds, but are undoubtedly part of the same group. This group of neolithic 'pot-bearing' features, initially interpreted as postholes by their excavators, form an arc in the SW of Int 20/32, cut by the later large ditch F1/130. In nature and in the composition of its assemblages, this group of features mirrors exactly another group of pits forming an arc, found in Int 50 (see Volume 7, Section 5.4): there too, two pits within a group of ten were particularly rich in Neolithic bowl fragments.

The second concentration of some 40 sherds of Neolithic pottery cannot be ascribed to a group of features, since it was recovered from the stripping of ploughsoil in the area of Int 38 which was subsequently not excavated. Nevertheless, its concentration and arc-shaped distribution between 207 and 211 eastings and 162 and 168 northings strongly suggests that a similar feature complex would once have been present, containing both coarse Neolithic bowls and fine Mildenhall ware.

Fine Neolithic *Mildenhall ware* is indeed found associated with coarse bowls: a fine example is fragment 2070/2071/2072;

less certainly, also sherds 1937 and 2073. Fourteen sherds belonging, seemingly, to a single pot (but few joins could be found) were found at a point located in the centre of Int 32 at 2129/155, immediately to the West of F213. The sherds (Nos. 2405-8, 2412, 2414-15, 2419-21, 2423-4, 2426, 2459) show a simple straight rim with a single horizontal groove below, followed by a zone of stabbed point decoration (done by bird bone?); a zone of horizontal grooves follows, continued by vertical grooves. The fabric and decorative vocabulary seems to be compatible with Mildenhall ware, but the rim shape and patterning seems atypical: compare, for example, with P144 at Spong Hill (Healy 1988: 88 Fig. 72). The attribution to Mildenhall must, therefore, remain tentative and confusion is not lessened by the remarks of Healy (1988: 72 “Beaker-like fabrics and zoned decoration may simply be normal but rare elements of the Mildenhall repertoire”.) Since “...the duration of the style is uncertain...” (*ibid.*), Healy suggests that some Mildenhall variants may be quite late.

Finally, to conclude with Neolithic wares, eight sherds are recorded in the finds index as possibly belonging to Grooved Ware: none has the characteristic decoration but the fabric, which contains grog and vacuoles, may be compatible with such an attribution. It is, however, possible that such sherds belong to vessels of Iron Age date.

The pattern of features containing a single distinctive pottery tradition appears to continue in the Earliest Bronze Age, though to a lesser degree. A pit, F175 in the South of Int 20/32, was found to contain the only late *Beaker* assemblage of the eastern periphery of Sutton Hoo. Although only a dozen sherds are present, they represent very substantial parts of very large, coarse rusticated vessels, sometimes referred to as ‘potbeakers’. One, in particular, (sherds 2143-2146) shows all-over but fairly superficial fingernail impressions. Parts of at least three other rusticated vessels are represented in the assemblage, exhibiting much deeper plastic rustication (eg sherds 1597 and 2029). The coarse vessels were found together with a sherd of Beaker fine ware decorated in zones of horizontal and diagonal comb impressions and a ring motif. The only other sherd of Beaker fine ware from Int 20/32 is a rim sherd (No. 1131) recorded from the top of ditch F1 at 215/150. Pit F175 is located close to a large irregular hollow, F178, most likely to be a tree-pit. The association of Beaker-bearing pits with tree-pits appears to be a common trait at Sutton Hoo (eg F311/330 complex in Int 41, cf Vol. 4, Section 5.6 or the F6 complex in Int 55, cf Vol. 5ii).

Also, probably of Early or Earliest Bronze Age date, but lacking somewhat in characteristic decorative elements, is the ceramic assemblage from pit F168, located in the North-East of Int 32: among its 27 sherds of ceramic of Bronze Age fabric feature a number of fingernail-decorated sherds. This pit was rich in flint waste flakes (72) accompanied by two implements, a knife and a scraper.

Just under a third of the identifiable pottery has been attributed to the Bronze Age, without attempting any finer classification. The attribution is mostly owed to the appearance of the fabric, which is thick, medium-coarse, generally reddish-brown or orangey-brown, predominantly grog and sand-tempered. It is likely that many of these rather nondescript sherds belong to large urns but, in the absence of characteristic features, no systematic attempt has been made to classify them into urn forms. It is likely that they represent an earlier rather than a later Bronze Age horizon. A few sherds do, however, warrant special mention. *Collared urns* are represented by two rim sherds (No. 4, a very thick, heavy, plain sherd from the ploughsoil 1002 at 210/155 and No. 995, from the palisade trench F157 at 211/157, decorated with vertical and horizontal twisted cord impressions). *Food vessels* are also present in the form of two rim sherds (No. 1024 from Int 20 found in the ploughsoil 1007 at 212/151, a very heavy rim with stab-and-drag decor on the surface of the flattened rim, and No. 2121 from Int 32 found in posthole F198, a plain moulded rim). Finally, two sherds with fingertip impressions on cordons (Nos. 1045 and 1158 of Int. 32 found in ploughsoil 1002 at 208/172) may possibly belong to *Ardleigh urns*.

A small amount of pottery sherds have been assigned to the Iron Age in the finds indexes of Interventions 20/32/38. This identification must remain extremely tentative, given that they are nearly all small abraded (ploughed?) fragments without any diagnostic features, recovered in the ploughsoil: of the 14 remaining ones, 7 sherds were recovered in ditch F1/130 and 3 in the palisade trench F174 at 217/149 (a point where the trench is cut by another later palisade trench, F219). It is hoped that C14 dating of contexts within ditch F130 will help with dating its ceramic assemblage, not only because an Iron Age date for ditch F130 (and accompanying palisade F213/179?) has important implications for the entire history of field boundaries at Sutton Hoo (see Section 5.4), but also because it may help identify future Iron Age assemblages in the Sandlings, where distinguishing between Neolithic and Iron Age domestic pottery is notoriously difficult (pers. comm. Ed. Martin and John Newman: note, in passing, that the Neolithic pot from F3 of Int 20, sent to the British Museum for restoration, was first thought to be of Iron Age date by Ed. Martin but then re-assessed by him as of Neolithic date).

The flint assemblage

Of the 1084 flint finds made in the area of Int 20/32/38 (this excludes all burnt flint), the vast majority (1037 finds) are

waste products, mostly waste flakes, with fewer cores or core fragments. Their recorded location has not been plotted out, but the impression gained from the finds indexes is that they are fairly evenly spread and are found equally frequently in the ploughsoil and within prehistoric or later features.

47 *flint implements* were recovered in Int 20/32/38, 26 from superficial contexts - topsoil, ploughsoil and definition splits - and 21 from excavated features.

The most prolific of features, because excavated over a large stretch, was ditch F1/130 which produced 9 implements: 3 arrowheads (a chisel arrowhead, Int 20/1129; a barbed and tanged arrowhead, Int 20/1215; an oblique arrowhead, Int 32/2296), and end-and-side scraper (Int 20/1373); a utilised flake (Int 20/1395); a blade (Int 32/2859); a roughout (Int 32/2869) and two miscellaneous implements (Int 32/2884 and 2927).

The Neolithic pit or 'posthole' F13/121 produced a serrated blade (No. 417) and an end-scraper (No. 418). The Early Bronze Age pit F168, rich in flint waste flakes, also contained two flint implements, a scraper (No. 2756) and a plano-convex knife (No. 2541). Posthole F139 produced two cutting flakes, while another six features each contained a single implement (F40, 168 and 220, a scraper each; F5 a cutting flake; F157 a plano-convex knife; F213 a pick).

In the superficial contexts, various forms of utilised or cutting flakes or bifacials were recovered (7), as well as scrapers (7), mostly discoidal, but also end, side or denticulate. Plano-convex knives and 3 implements listed in the index as piercers continue the list. Amongst less common finds, notice two leaf-shaped arrowheads (Int 32/318 and 940), two serrated implements (Int 20/954 and 1975) and a hammer stone (Int 32/2836).

All in all, the implement assemblage recovered in Int 20/32/38 reflects well the two main early periods of activity present in the eastern field of Sutton Hoo, that is a Neolithic facies represented mainly by the leaf-shaped arrowhead, serrated implements and end-scrapers, and an Early Bronze Age facies in which oblique, chisel and barbed and tanged arrowhead, plano-convex knives and discoidal scrapers feature prominently. A selection of these implements is illustrated in the RR.

The remainder of this section of the field reports contains a few general remarks concerning the composition of the assemblage recovered, but is of little use in determining the sequence of events in Int 20/32/38 which, for the prehistoric record, relies on flint and pottery identification.

Large numbers of *soil samples* (661) were taken in Int 20/32/38: most (just over 600) are batches of soil samples taken from Anglo-Saxon graves or from contexts associated with them. Some 50 soil samples were taken from prehistoric features as back-up for pollen content analysis. None were taken for flotation or are suitable for flotation. Therefore, *no* information is available concerning macro-botanic remains in that part of Sutton Hoo. Notice, however, that one body-sherd of plain pottery (Int 32/2068 from context 1003 at 208/165, ie in the Neolithic pot concentration in Int 38), most probably of fine Neolithic ware - Mildenhall? - exhibits on its interior face a very fine set of grain imprints (sherd to be sent to Allan Hall, EAU York in November 1995).

Charcoal was picked up during excavation where fragments were sufficiently large to be trowelled up and were treated as single finds. For the prehistoric sequence, it appears that sufficient charcoal - ie more than one find or sample - is available from features F30, F130, F15/133, F165, F168, F187 and F189. Their desirability or suitability for C14 dating is discussed below (Section 4.2).

Finally, note amongst miscellaneous finds two sandstone implements referred to in the finds index as 'hammer stones': one (No. 1153) was found in F105 (Anglo-Saxon grave complex), the other (No. 2911) in the backfill of ditch F130. Unfortunately, neither of them could be traced. As for metal finds, most are modern (ammunition, nails, etc.) Two fragments are reported as *slag* from Int 32 (No. 1450 from ditch F130 at 216/155). If this slag turns out to be iron slag, then this would add a further element to the Iron Age dating of the ditch F130 (unless, of course, it is a later fragment intrusive in context 2028 of ditch F130).

4. ESTABLISHING THE SEQUENCE (M. Hummler)

4.1 *Stratigraphic Sequence*

A glance at the plan of Int 20/32 (and 38) reveals the most obvious elements of the sequence (see RR and *Site Atlas*), summarised in words here.

The modern anti-glider ditch F220 (a.k.a. F12 of Int 20) cuts a number of earlier features, including the double grave F227 (Burials 32 and 33), ditch F130 (a.k.a. F1 of Int 20, F103 and F110), and its eastern parallel palisade trench F169/F213.

Some Anglo-Saxon burials cut earlier features: grave F231 (Burial 31) cuts ditch F130 and is aligned on the same axis. Its parallel, eastern palisade trench F169/F213 is cut by the ploughman's grave F161 (Burial 27) which is set across and perpendicular to its axis. The southern stretch of the same intermittent palisade trench, there known as F219, is cut by the foot of grave F173 (Burial 30), also set at a right angle to it. Further South, the same palisade trench, by now known as F113 (or F4 of Int 20), has a grave, F118 (a.k.a. F9 of Int 20: Burial 17) cut against its western, inside edge. Finally, the superimposed graves F109 and F108 (Burials 21 and 22) cut the gully F133 (a.k.a. F15 of Int 20 and F122).

Ditch F1/130 - from now on referred to as F130 - is undoubtedly the latest of the linear features of Int 20/32/38 (disregarding the anti-glider ditch). The parallel trench that accompanies it - from now on referred to as F213, though it consists of stretches F4, F113, F219, F213 and F169 from South to North - runs at an interval of c. 2m further East. There is no direct stratigraphic link between the two, except that they are both cut by Anglo-Saxon graves and respect each other's alignment. Although earlier interim reports - by A J Copp and P Leach in 1986 - refer to a putative bank between the two, there appears to be no remnant bank material on the subsoil in the interval, nor a significant difference in height of the surviving subsoil. Tip lines in sections through ditch F130 may need to be investigated (see Section 5.4, this Volume).

There are three possibilities: *either* palisade F213 is an earlier boundary, replaced later by ditch F130 and the resulting bank material thrown up to the West or East; *or* the two are contemporary. In this latter case, the palisade could have functioned as a fence in front of a berm followed by a ditch and bank further West; *or* the palisade functioned as the earlier revetment of a bank bounded to the West by ditch F130; *or*, thirdly, palisade F213 is later than ditch F130, replacing, in the form of a fence, the filled-in ditch F130. All three possibilities have arguments in their favour, but on stratigraphic grounds alone, one has to assume that they are contemporary.

Undoubtedly earlier than the SSW-NNE system represented by F130 and F213 - because cut by both of them - are the parallel 'gullies' or palisade trenches known as F15/F122/F133 (from now on, F133) and F5/F114/F135/F158/F174/F196 (from now on F135) running SE-NW across Int 32. Their course meets just to the West of Int 32, in Int 52 (q.v.) with two further parallel gullies set at right angles to them - F182 and F155 of Int 50. The junction of one of these parallel gullies was excavated in Int 50 (see Vol. 7, Section 5.2) at its meeting point with the main W-E ditch system: it was found to be compatible with an Early Bronze Age date.

Also stratigraphically earlier than ditch F130 are a number of small scoops and postholes, F121 and F170-172. These contained Neolithic pottery, as did F111, 112, 116, 120 and 123.

In summary, 4 phases can be shown to be cutting each other in Int 20/32: Neolithic pits and scoops, a Bronze Age parallel palisade running SE-NW, a later ditch and palisade running SSW-NNE, and Anglo-Saxon burials. An anti-glider ditch, dug in 1942, slices through this sequence and the field was under cultivation by the time it was excavated in 1985.

4.2 *Radio Carbon Dating*

At present (1995), two C14 dates derived from human bones are available for Anglo-Saxon burials uncovered within the area of Int 20/32. One is F9 of Int 20 (=F118) or Burial 17 with a C14 date of between 540 and 700 AD (HAR 6800). The other is F109, or Burial 22, the later of two superimposed graves, which produced a C14 date ranging between 680 and 820 AD (BM accelerator date). (See RR for more)

Very little *charcoal* was uncovered or kept during excavation of features in 1985 and 1986. It is doubtful whether any of it is sufficient to submit for analysis.

Of possible *Early Medieval* features, posthole F165 produced 17 records of charcoal (Nos. 1841, 1856, 1863, 1917, 2024, 2236 onwards, 2277, 2344-5), plenty to ascertain whether this is indeed an early medieval or prehistoric post. If the former, then it may be part of a structure around a 'gibbet' or 'hanging tree' (F243), as proposed by Martin Carver in Sections 705.1 and 7.3.2 of this volume. Other postholes of this same group, F138 and F189, also have sufficient charcoal listed in the finds index (Nos. 1384, 1778, 1781, 1785, 1788, 1798) to render C14 dating possible, should it be necessary.

Very few postholes thought to be *prehistoric* have charcoal recorded as having been found and kept. The sum total of all charcoal retrieved is listed below:

F14 (Int 20): 1 sample, weight unknown (No. 704)

F30 (Int 20):	1 sample, weight unknown (No. 724)
F130:	6 records, total 32g (Nos. 1623, 1759, 1763, 1769, 1868, 2819)
F133:	5 records, total less than 2g (Nos. 2056, 2081, 2113, 1017, 1032)
F135:	1 record, 0.6g (No. 2111)
F140, 143, 147:	1 record each, total c. 10g
F168:	2 records, total 16g (Nos. 2332, 2743), also 3 soil samples said to contain charcoal (Nos. 2444, 2487, 2533)
F186:	4 records, total 2.4g (Nos. 1635, 1640, 1730-1)
F187:	5 records, total c. 13g (Nos. 1729, 1756-7, 1760, 1762)
F190, 192, 193, 194, 196:	1 record each, total less than 3g
F206, 211:	1 record each, total less than 2g
F212:	1 record, 157g (No. 1642)

Thus, of all the features that it would be possible *and* desirable to date, only two survive: ditch F130 and the pit F168 in the NE corner of Int 32.

Pit F168 is thought, on the basis of its assemblage, to be of Early Bronze Age date. The dating of ditch F130 is, on the other hand, more uncertain: it postdates the (Early Bronze Age?) parallel gullies F133 and F135 and pre-dates the Anglo-Saxon grave F231. But by how much? There is a suggestion that it may still have been visible, or only partially filled in by the time the burial was inserted, as was its parallel palisade F213 which is intersected by three burials along its course. An Iron Age date - a distinct possibility since a few sherds thought to be of Iron Age pottery and some slag were found in the ditch (see Section 3.9, this volume) - rather than an earlier date would render this suggestion more likely. A C14 date for ditch F130 would therefore be desirable, even more so, as the Cambridge University Committee for Aerial Archaeology air photograph of Sutton Hoo's linear boundaries (c.f. *Bulletin of the Sutton Hoo Research Committee* 6, 1989, Fig. 8) shows that it forms the main N-S axis through Sutton Hoo.

Unfortunately, at the time of writing (1995), the charcoal samples from F130, though listed as having been kept in boxes SCS-3, SCS-6, SCS-8 and SCS-9, cannot be found: they are not in York nor, seemingly, in the lock-up container at Sutton Hoo. The date of F130 must, therefore, remain uncertain and its position in the sequence rest upon more or less convincing arguments regarding its orientation and relationship to the landscape (see below).

4.3 *Finds Distribution and Model of the Sequence*

The distribution of *prehistoric* finds in Int 20/32/38 reiterates many of the points made in the assemblage summary (Section 3.9 of this volume, q.v.) and will therefore only be presented in summary form here.

The *Neolithic* occupation of the area is located in two, perhaps three, discretely located foci, 10-15m apart from each other: one in the SW of Int 32/30, where around 100 sherds of coarse bowls in the Grimston tradition were recovered, associated with an arc of pits and scoops (rather than postholes) known as F2/111, F3/112, F7/116, F11/120, F13/121, F18/123 and F170-172, cut by the later ditch F130. The second focus is located in the West of Int 38, its centre being at 208/165: there, over 40 sherds of Neolithic coarse bowls but also a few sherds of Mildenhall ware were uncovered but, because Int 38 was not excavated beyond surface stripping, in this case the pottery concentration is not associated with a set of features. An arc of pits or scoops is nevertheless possible. Finally, a third, smaller, concentration of 14 sherds, possibly of Mildenhall ware, is located in the centre of Int 32, at 219/155, again unassociated to any features.

The distribution of flint implements which can be considered compatible with this Neolithic occupation - leaf-shaped arrowheads, serrated implements, narrow end-scrapers - is more diffuse.

The *Earliest Bronze Age* occupation of the area starts off with a single pit, F175 in the centre-South of Int 32, containing *Beaker* pottery, namely late 'potbreakers' as well as a find Beaker sherd. One single fine Beaker sherd was also found

redeposited nearby in the later ditch F130. Perhaps not fortuitously, pit F175 (and perhaps also its poorer neighbour F176) is located next to a hollow considered as a tree-pit (F178/214), a situation observed elsewhere at Sutton Hoo: indeed, Beaker-rich deposits and irregular hollows or treepits seem to be a recurrent theme, eg on Mound 2 (c.f. Vol. 4, pit F330, Section 5.4) or in Int 55 (c.f. Vol. 7ii).

Ceramic considered to be of *Bronze Age* date, without further referring to its typological affinities but suspected to derive mostly from Early Bronze Age domestic urns, is by far the most common pottery distributed over Int 20/32: it is confined mainly to an area West of the 220 easting, ie in close proximity to the parallel palisade trenches or 'gullies' F15/133 and F5/135, also considered to be of (Early) Bronze Age date. Amongst definitely Early Bronze Age wares, note fragments of Collared Urns at 210/155, 211/157 and 208/160, fragments of Food Vessel at 212/151 and 212/156. Somewhat later are sherds thought to belong to Ardleigh urns at 211/156 and 208/172. Two outliers lie East of this main concentration, namely pit or scoop F168 and the 'treepit' F178/214 (both most likely to be Early Bronze Age), as well as a less dense scatter of Bronze Age ceramic in Int 39.

The distribution of Bronze Age ceramics appears to confirm that the main areas of activity were focussed upon the parallel palisade trenches and perhaps many of the postholes in the interval, but also that occupation was quite widespread. The latter impression is also that given by the distribution of flint implements thought to be compatible with a Bronze Age date, namely barbed-and-tanged, chisel and oblique arrowheads, discoidal scrapers or plano-convex knives, widely scattered over the areas of Int 20/32 and 39.

It is more difficult to pronounce upon a putative *Iron Age* phase in Int 20/32 as so little pottery (some 27 sherds and even these may be misidentified) thought to be of Iron Age date is distributed over the areas investigated. Nevertheless, it is possible that ditch F130 (and its accompanying palisade trench F213?) was filled in, or partially filled in, during the Iron Age, receiving, amongst other earlier finds, a few sherds of Iron Age pottery and a fragment of slag. It is further plausible, but not documented, that this infilling was the result of bank material - from a hypothetical bank between ditch F130 and palisade F213 - being pushed in, or having slipped in to the ditch. The most likely explanation for such ditch infilling would be that it was due to ploughing: the very thin scatter of sherds tentatively dated to the Iron Age which occurs both to East and West of, as well as in, ditch F130 could be explained in terms of ploughing. But then, how could a ploughed-up bank and ditch still form a visible boundary in the Anglo-Saxon period, half a millennium later? (see below). Perhaps the thin scatter of Iron Age pottery represents casual deposition if ditch F130 acted as a trackside boundary.

Indeed, ditch F130 and its eastern parallel palisade F213, are part of the main NNE-SSW axis of boundaries visible on the air photograph taken by the Cambridge University Committee for Aerial Photography (part-reproduced in Bulletin, Vol 3). Its axis, direction and sense of purpose would suggest that it is not just a simple boundary, but an axis of communication running N-S across the Sutton Hoo promontory. If so, the ditch (and bank) may have bounded a line of communication West of it: 'track' or 'droveway' spring to mind as possibilities as, much later, the 'medieval hollow-way' that snakes through the Sutton Hoo mounds has shifted westwards.

Whatever the date and function of ditch F130 and palisade F213, it may still have been visible by the time the *Anglo-Saxon* burials belonging to the eastern cemetery (or Group 1 of Martin Carver's classification) were laid out. How else could grave F231 be cut straight in the centre of the ditch infill, grave F9/118 along the palisade trench and the two graves F113 and F161 straight across the palisade F213? Pure coincidence seems to be asking for imagination to stretch a little too far. *But* the line of ditch and palisade did not act as a boundary to the Group 1 cemetery, since at least four burials, F137, double grave F227 and F235 were laid out a few metres to the East.

The Group 1 cemetery intercepted in Int 20/32/38 consists thus of 4 burials to the East of palisade F213; 4 burials associated with the line of ditch F130 and palisade F213; a further 9 burials to the West - to which should be added another 5 burials in Int 52 (c.f. Vol. 8i). This western part of the Group 1 cemetery, with its intriguing 5m gap between the 154 and 159 northings, has been interpreted by Martin Carver (this volume, Section 7) as being centred around a structure whose central point is the hollow F243 (at 213/156). This central point, perhaps the site of a tree (if F243 is an acceptable treepit) or the site of a gibbet (if the cluster of postholes around F243 is to be believed), is itself at the centre of four posts (F165, 167, 191, 189) which, by their nature, differ from all other postholes thought to be prehistoric. It is thus possible that these 4 posts belong to an Anglo-Saxon rather than a prehistoric structure.

Why should a cemetery, and a sacrificial cemetery to boot, let alone the site of a hanging tree or gibbet, be located so far from the main barrow cemetery, at least 50m from the nearest barrow (Mound 14)? Although the arguments advanced are extremely weak, it may be that the answer lies, once again, with axes of communication. Let us assume that ditch F130/palisade F213 is the eastern boundary of a line of communication: a droveway or track could have existed to the West of it. By the Iron Age or later, when the ditch if partially filled in, this track could have gradually shifted westwards

to, say, the largely archaeologically blank eastern part of Int 50, between the 170 and 200 easting. Martin Carver's suggestion that Group 1 represents a roadside gibbet and cemetery would then make sense. The continued existence of a NNE-SSW and westwards-shifting axis of communication has its last manifestation in the form of 'medieval hollow-way' snaking further West through Int 50 at the xxx easting.

In summary, the sequence apprehended in Int 20/32/38 consists of:

- A scattered neolithic occupation represented by 3 foci, 10-15m apart.
- A Beaker and other Early Bronze Age pits (F175, F168).
- Widespread and extensive (Early) Bronze Age occupation associated with a NW-SE double palisade (F133, F135).
- A NNE-SSW axis of communication and eastern boundary (ditch F130, palisade F213), established before or during the Iron Age, disused during or after the Iron Age. Possible ploughing and shift westwards of a putative trackway.
- The Anglo-Saxon cemetery established to the East of a trackway originating in previous phase. Burials laid out on line of and somewhat beyond former eastern boundary and surrounding a gibbet or hanging tree.
- Trackway shifts westwards to become the 'medieval hollow-way' of Int 50.

If some of the above exposé is peppered with 'possible', 'plausible', 'likely', 'putative' or 'hypothetical' events, the defence offered is that, firstly, we are squeezing the last drop out of a severely eroded and recently ploughed area and, secondly, that, for the prehistoric period at least, dating is most often uncertain: charcoal is insufficient or unsuitable to submit to C14 analysis and, of over 5,000 finds listed in the finds indexes, less than 300 finds could be assigned to a recognisable type.

5. SELECTED STUDIES: THE PREHISTORIC PERIOD (M. Hummler)

5.1 'Postholes' F2/111, F3/112, etc.

In the SW corner of Int 32 - and first encountered in May 1984 when opening the two-metre trench known as Int 20 - is located a series of eight pits labelled F2/111, F3/112, F7/116, F11/120, F13/121, F18/123, F170 and F171. A ninth irregular hollow, F172, is not thought to be part of the series, but the eroded edge of the later (Iron Age?) ditch F1/130 that transects the group. The approximate grid references of these pits are between 209.50 and 212.50 along the eastings, and 145 to 148 along the northings, ie an area of c. 9m².

Between them, the pits have produced just over 100 sherds of pottery, all of which have been identified as fragments of large, coarse round-bottomed bowls or pots in the Neolithic Grimston ware tradition, as well as some 30 flint flakes, an end-scraper and a serrated blade (both from F13/121, Nos. 417-418 of Int 20) and a thin scatter of burnt flint (around 20 fragments). The contention, therefore, is that this group of 8 pits represents the remains of a single episode in the Middle-late Neolithic period, almost identical to the pit group encountered in Int 50, some 70m further West (c.f. Vol. 7, Section 5.4, referring to pits F300, etc.).

The pits are described as 'postholes' in the field records and indeed, superficially, they could be construed as such. But their position, shape, profile, type of infill and finds assemblages would suggest to this writer that they were *not* postholes and never supported a structure. A devil's advocate could, however, argue that the corner of a rectangular structure is represented by F18/123, F7/116, F11/120: all three 'postholes' are relatively poor in finds. The 'slot' F13/121, rich in finds, and the hollow F3/112 - containing a whole pot smashed *in situ* - would then be further, open, elements of this structure. Finally, F2/111 (which cuts F11/120), F170 and F171 would be an unrelated set of posts cutting diagonally the earlier structure.

A table (see Table 8) has been drawn up, listing the main attributes of each feature and forms the basis for the suggestion that the group represents a series of interconnected *pits* rather than postholes. It can be seen from the table that there is little consistency in the shape and profile of these holes: only F2/111 and F171 exhibit the vertical sides one might expect from a post.

Some elements do, however, emerge from the records. Firstly, only two features contain a rich assemblage: F3 with the remains of a pot smashed into 64 sherds, nearly all contained in the south-eastern quarter of the feature, and F13 with a substantial amount of pottery, also contained within a small central patch of the feature, and a flint industry consisting

of flakes, a core fragment, blades and an end-scraper. F11 could be considered intermediate with 20 finds. The remainder of the features (F2, F7, F18, F170 and F171) reveal much poorer assemblages. The unequal distribution of artefacts amongst the features of a groups is a trait that was also observed in the Neolithic pit group of Int 50 and later in the Beaker pit group of Int 55.

None of the descriptions of the fills supports the hypothesis that the holes once contained posts: homogeneous sandy, single backfills with a typical Munsell value of 10YR4/4 are the norm. If posts had once existed, then one would have to assume that they were all pulled out and later backfilled with soil incorporating neolithic occupation debris.

Most of the holes that are oval or circular exhibit a diameter of between 0.50 and 0.65m on the surface of the subsoil and they 'bite' into the subsoil by c. 0.20 - 0.28m. Two features, F2 and F170 (the two features most likely to be 'real' postholes) are somewhat deeper with depths of 0.35 and 0.30m. But, one has to remember that these are truncated features cut from an original ground surface, now lost through modern ploughing.

A conservative estimate would place this ground surface at, at least, 33.00 AOD, thus rendering the original features around 0.60m deep and exhibiting expanded diameters, certainly over 0.60m. If posts had once occupied these holes, then they would have been very substantial, or the post-pits would have had a diameter much greater than the post itself: nothing that could be construed as packing has, however, been recorded from the fills of the holes.

In summary, it is suggested that the F2/111 etc. complex represents an arc of 5 pits (F3, F7, F11, F13, F18), contemporary and interconnected, cut by a row of three later, unrelated postholes (F2, F170, F171) which contain in them a moderate amount of occupation debris once associated with the neolithic occupation episode. But what function would the 5 original pits have fulfilled? In the absence of any environmental or macrobotanic data (no flotation was undertaken in 1984-5), interpretation is a matter of pure guesswork. The unequal distribution of artefacts amongst pits on the one hand and the very dense concentration of large parts of pots in two pits (F3, F13) on the other hand may indicate a series of separate yet related activities such as food preparation. The two 'pot-pits' may, conceivably, have functioned as 'slow-cooking' pits: but the very low density of burnt flint and the absence of any trace of burnt sand would preclude the existence of a hearth or fire above: surely, even if the whole hearth had later been ploughed away, some traces of burning in the vicinity of the pits would have survived. One is therefore left with the suggestion that the pots were used for storage in otherwise permeable pits. Of course, a 'ritual' or 'votive' explanation may be preferred but, in the absence of any other elements supporting such an explanation, the hypothesis has not been retained.

Table 8: Attributes of pits or postholes F/2111, etc.

F2/111:	Shape:	oval, steep-sided, sloping base in profile. Cuts F11/120.
	Size:	c. 0.50-0.65m in diameter
	Depth into subsoil:	c. 0.35m
	Levels:	32.76 AOD (top); 32.39 AOD (base)
	Fill 1004:	"homogeneous backfill"; 10YR4/4
	Comment:	"no evidence for postpipe"
	Assemblage:	1 neolithic bodysherd, 5 flint flakes, 10 burnt flint pieces
F3/112	Shape:	circular, sloping sides, rounded base
	Size:	0.55m in diameter
	Depth into subsoil:	0.20m
	Levels:	32.74 AOD (top), 32.54 AOD (base)
	Fill 1005:	"secondary deposit associated with complete pottery vessel"; 10YR4/4
	(Fill 1033:	context given to soil inside pot, not described)
	Comment:	"complete broken pot occupying much of the fill", feature "used as a receptacle for vessel", "secondary use of a posthole?"
	Assemblage:	62 sherds of a single neolithic vessel sent for conservation to British Museum and a further 2 sherds from context 1005 retrieved later in Int 32 (Nos. 2797-8). 1 soil sample.
F7/116:	Shape:	oval, stepped irregular sloping sides and base
	Size:	0.50-0.65m in diameter
	Depth into subsoil:	0.28m
	Levels:	32.73 AOD (top), 32.41 AOD (base)
	Fill 1015:	"homogeneous, silty fill"; 10YR3/3
	Comment:	"no visible post-pipe"

	Assemblage:	1 neolithic bodysherd, 2 burnt flint and 1 flint flake recovered above in context 1013
F11/120:	Shape:	oval, 1 vertical and 1 sloping side, flat based in profile. Cut by F2/111.
	Size:	0.60-0.80m in diameter
	Depth into subsoil:	0.22m
	Levels:	32.69 AOD (top), 32.45 AOD (base)
	Fill 1017:	"homogeneous buff-mid brown sandy fill with much stone and pottery". No Munsell
	Comment:	"no evidence for post", "weathered profile"
	Assemblage:	7 sherds of neolithic coarse pottery (2 rim-sherds, 5 bodysherds); plus a further sherd retrieved above in context 1013 (No. 280 of Int 20), 8 flint flakes and a further 2 flint flakes from 1013 above, 1 core fragment.
F13/121:	Shape:	oblong or rectangular, irregular, shallow-sided. Cut by ditch F1/130
	Size:	c. 0.65m x 1.20m
	Depth into subsoil:	0.28m max.
	Levels:	37.67 AOD (top), 32.49 AOD (base)
	Fill 1021:	"mixed sandy silt fill, predominantly buff mid-brown, some animal disturbance"
	Comment:	"no clear evidence for use", "irregular, possibly 2 features"
	Assemblage:	27 sherds of neolithic coarse pottery (including 4 rim sherds) and a further 2 sherds from context 1059 (Nos. 1693 and 1695), 10 flint flakes, 1 core fragment, 1 waste blade, 1 serrated blade, 1 end-scraper, 4 pieces of burnt flint
F18/123:	Shape:	circular, sloping sides curving to flat base
	Size:	c. 0.50m in diameter
	Depth into subsoil:	0.20m
	Levels:	32.82 AOD (top), 32.62 AOD (base)
	Fill 1031:	"buff pale-brown stony sandy silt fill". No Munsell
	Comment:	"very similar in shape and type to F3/112"
	Assemblage:	2 sherds of neolithic coarse pottery (1 body, 1 rim)
F170:	Shape:	irregular, sloping sides, stepped and vertical cut
	Size:	c. 0.50 x 0.60m
	Depth into subsoil:	0.20-0.30m
	Levels:	30.72 AOD (top), 32.42 AOD (base)
	Fill 1042:	"loose sand and gravel", "all one fill"; 10YR4/6
	Comment:	"post-pipe and slot?"
	Assemblage:	3 ceramic fragments (1 neolithic rim-sherd, 1 bodysherd, 1 piece of daub); 2 flint flakes, 5 burnt flint
F171:	Shape:	irregular, flat based. Cuts F170
	Size:	c. 0.30 x 0.15m
	Depth into subsoil:	0.11m
	Levels:	32.72 AOD (top), 32.54 AOD (base)
	Fill 1048:	"single backfill", "loose sand and gravel"; 10YR4/4
	Comment:	"no visible remnant of upright"
	Assemblage:	1 neolithic rim-sherd

5.2 Double Ditch Boundary F133 and F135

Undoubtedly, the earliest of the linear boundaries that transect the area of Int 20/32 are the two parallel ditches running NW-SE across the western part of the excavated zone. The South-western one will be referred to as F133, the North-eastern one as F135, although a wide variety of feature numbers were allocated as excavation was carried out intermittently and in a number of stretches. The South-western ditch is recorded as F15, F122 and F133, while F136 and F184 are slots recorded in its base. The North-western ditch is recorded as F5, F114, F174, F135 and F158, while F155, F159 and F160 are depressions seen in its base and F8/117 and F196 may be earlier cuts or recuts. The information gathered from the excavation of all these various features is given in a table below.

The two ditches are parallel, some 2.50m apart. Their width is approximately 0.60m on the surface of the subsoil and they 'bite' into the subsoil by c. 0.30m (in South) and 0.20m (in North). Their highest surviving point is recorded in the

North (F158: surface at 32.92, base at 32.73) and lowest point in the South (F5/114: top at 32.69, base at 32.29).

There is little point in doubting their contemporary existence, as they are both cut by the later NNE-SSW ditch and palisade F1/130 and F213/219. They form part of a more extensive network of boundaries, likely to have originated in the Early Bronze Age.

Indeed, F133 and F135 continue North-westwards into Int 52 (where they are known as F28 and F38), to peter out simply because they were only just scoring the surface of the subsoil underneath the modern track surface that is Int 52. Or, a real gap was intended. Whatever the case, the NW-SE system F133 and F135 and the NE-SW system F182 and F155 of Int 50, which form a slightly acute right-angle, are part of the same network of linear boundaries, whose main component is the ditch system that runs WNW-ESE through Sutton Hoo, in Int 48, 41 and 50 (c.f. Vol. 4, Section 5.2 and Vol. 7, Section 5.2). The link with the main ditch system could be made in Int 50, where the junction of the main ditch (F62) with the double ditches F155 (and therefore also F182) was investigated: stratigraphically, it could be shown that the double ditches belong to phase 2a of the ditch system, originating the Early Bronze Age. Apart from differences in spacing, ie the spacing between F155 and F182 of Int 50 is wider (4.50m in S, 3.50m in N) than between F135 and F133 of Int 32 (2.50m) - all elements recorded in the excavation of one parallel ditch is corroborated by the other, including the existence of possible postholes or stakeholes in their bases, the 'two-tone' infills, and the density of postholes in the interval between each parallel member (see below).

How would such a double-ditch boundary have functioned? Int 32's parallel ditches and the interval between them seem to offer the best, albeit tenuous, evidence that the two ditches acted as retaining structures, perhaps in the form of a double palisade, containing a central *bank*. Indeed, when defining the surface of Int 32, excavators noted the presence of a 'stone-enriched' strip between the two ditches, on a natural subsoil generally poor in gravel and pebbles. Secondly, the levels taken on the surface of the inside edges of the ditches, ie the eastern edge of F133 and the western edge of F135, show that the subsoil has survived, on average, 50-100mm higher in the central strip. Such subsoil survival would be compatible with the existence of a ploughed-out bank. Thirdly, there is a far greater density of postholes located within the central strip than elsewhere on Int 32. Although, in most cases, it cannot be proved that the postholes are part of a former bank, their greater survival would indicate that a bank protected them for a while. The dense, but rather erratic positioning of postholes in this 'posthole-rich strip' (a similar concentration of postholes was also noted in the interval between ditches F155 and 182 in the South of Int 50) might suggest that posts were indeed an integral part of the bank, but perhaps more in keeping with the support and maintenance required for the upkeep of a putative hedge on top of the bank than with a definitive structure.

A bank seems therefore highly likely, but it is unlikely to have been very high, being only 2.50m wide at its base. Perhaps it supported a hedge. The two parallel ditches have, in the field records, consistently been interpreted as *palisade* trenches. There is indeed evidence for holes interpreted as stake or postholes as well as slots in the base of ditches, but this evidence is somewhat erratic. Rows of postholes can be seen sporadically in plan: the best stretch is a row of 11 postholes at the southern end of F133 (in the base of F15/122), another stretch are the depressions F155, 159 and 160 in the NW of F135 (in the base of F158). Otherwise, evidence is scant, the base of the ditches being generally described as round-based or U-shaped in profile and F5/114 is recorded as having a 'deeper cleaning slot' in its base. Longitudinal sections as well as transversal sections were recorded extensively along both ditches, but none of them showed any signs of surviving upright post-ghosts.

A glance at the descriptions of the infill of the two ditches seems to offer a satisfactory explanation: the records made for each stretch of ditch almost invariably refer to two separate infills, a lower sandy context consisting of redeposited subsoil, with a typical Munsell value of 7.5YR5/8, barely covering the base of the ditches and also filling the holes, slots and depressions encountered in the bases of the ditches (see contexts 1025 of F15/122; 1075 of F133; 2052 of F135; 1092 of F158). A second, upper backfill, siltier and darker, with a typical Munsell value of 10YR3/4-4/4, and containing nearly all the occupation debris recovered from the ditches in the form of burnt flint, flint and ceramic sherds, overlies the basal deposit (see contexts 1023 and F15/122; 1021 of F133; 1023 of F135; 1034 of F158). It therefore seems likely that the original 'posts' or stakes, if ever they existed, had been removed before the parallel ditches were backfilled. It may be that they were allowed to silt up and clog up with occupation debris, but it seems more likely that the backfill was deliberate, pushing ancient occupation soil into the ditches (and over the 'central reservation' the site of a former bank, if the distribution of Bronze Age pottery is taken into consideration). Now, the most obvious perpetrators of this dismantling, bank-flattening and backfilling exercise - probably through ploughing - are the builders of the later N-S ditch and flanking palisade, tentatively attributed to the Iron Age (see Section 5.4, this Volume). At any rate, the parallel ditches were filled in and the bank flat by the time ditch F130 and palisade F213 were built.

Dating of the parallel ditches (and bank) is reasonably secure, though not precise. We have seen that they are part of a more extensive system of boundaries linked to the main W-E ditch running through Sutton Hoo, the first phase of which

appears to have originated in Beaker times (c.f. Int 41, Vol. 4, Section 5.2). In that scheme, the parallel ditches would be added in phase 2a (c.f. Int 50, Vol. 7, Section 5.2), still in the Early Bronze Age. In Int 20/32, the artefact assemblages recovered in ditches F133 and F135 consist, when datable, almost entirely of crudely defined Bronze Age types or fabrics. In fact, nearly all the Bronze Age ceramic identified on Int 20/32 concentrates in an around the central area between the parallel ditches, a distribution pattern compatible with flattening a former bank and backfilling the ditches. It is likely that this occupation belongs to the Early Bronze Age rather than any later phase of the Bronze Age, judging by the few sherds that are identifiable to type: there are sherds of Collared Urn at 208/160 in F158, at 211/157 in F157, at 210/155 or sherds of Food Vessel at 212/151.

In summary, the scenario proposed for F133 and F135 would run as follows: sometime during the Early Bronze Age, two narrow parallel ditches are cut and a 2.50m wide bank is piled up in the interval. This bank could have supported a hedge. The two parallel ditches may have acted as retaining structures, with palisades being erected. These palisades might have been built in a fairly haphazard fashion by setting hurdles in the base of the ditches or building proper retaining fences only where needed, eg to prevent or repair occasional bank slippage: this would account for the erratic evidence for postholes in the base of the 'palisade trenches'. At a later date, either still in the Bronze Age but perhaps as late as the (late) Iron Age, the bank was flattened and the palisade dismantled and the parallel ditches backfilled, Bronze Age occupation soil and debris being pushed in and over the area, probably through ploughing. Such a scenario would fit reasonably well in the general scheme of land use over time at Sutton, where the (late) Iron Age emerges as the major period of land-reclaiming.

Table 9: Characteristics of ditches F133 and F135

F5/122 (western ditch, SE of F130):

Shape: gully or small ditch, c. 0.60m wide, fairly steep-sided U-shape (45°), round base, c. 0.30m deep into subsoil. Cut by F4/113, F9/118, F1/130.
Possibly 11 post or stakeholes in base: "line of small circular depressions suggests palisade post settings, but no pipe impressions in fill."

Levels: 32.77 (top); 32.44 (base)

Fills: 2 fills: 1023 (upper); 1025 (lower)
1023: 5YR3/4, loose silt, charcoal, "small patches of black material, heavy concentration of burnt flint in centre".
1025: 7.5YR4/6, cleaner, loose siltsand, less burnt flint

Assemblage: 261 finds in 1023, 45 finds in 1025: total 306 records, consisting of 289 burnt flint, 8 flint (7 flakes, 1 blade), 7 sherds of ceramic (all in 1023: 2 identified as Bronze Age, one possibly Iron Age, the rest unidentified), 2 soil samples.

F133 (western ditch, NW of F130):

Shape: ditch, c. 0.50 - 0.70m wide, U-shaped profile, flat base, c. 0.30m deep into subsoil. Bottom "occasionally punctured by ?post settings. Slots F136 and F184 in base "may be spurious features".

Levels: c. 32.90 (top), 32.57 (base)

Fills: 2 fills, 1021 (upper), 1075 (lower)
1021: 10YR4/4, dark brown siltsand, gravel and pebbles, "apparent spine of stones running down centre of fill".
1075: 7.5YR5/8, loose orange sand and stones, mottled with darker patches, also filling slots in bottom of feature.

Assemblage: 39 finds in 1021, 1 find in 1075, total 40 records, consisting of 26 flint flakes, 5 burnt flint, 5 charcoal fragments, 4 sherds of ceramic (2 unidentified, 2 Bronze Age).

F136 (slot in base of F133):

Shape: "footprint-like" depression, shallow, filled with orange mottled-brown sand and stones (same as 1075 of F133)

Levels: 32.64 (top), 32.55 (base). "Feature only visible when bottom reached".

F184 (slot in base of F133):

Shape: "darker U-shaped patch" in base of F133, c. 0.13m deep, not noted until bottom of F133 had been

reached. Interpreted as “one of several slots revetting a stony bank”, but excavator notes elsewhere that “F136 and F184 may be spurious features”.
Levels: 32.54 (top), 32.27 (base)

F5/114 (eastern ditch, extreme SE, formerly in Int 20):

Shape: ditch, c. 0.60m wide, shallow-sided then deeper with a “cleaning slot in base: did it comprise a series of post settings? Possible over-digging”. But later the excavator notes “no evidence for post-settings, these implied by profile only”.
Relationship with F8/117 unclear, “looks the same in section”. Cut by F4/113.
Fill: Single fill 1010, “no distinction between fill of slot and main fill”.
1010: 10YR5/8, mid-brown siltsand
Assemblage: 4 records only: 3 flint flakes and one soil sample.

F174(eastern ditch, SE of F130 and NW of F5/114):

Shape: “palisade trench”, c. 0.50 - 0.80m wide, V-shaped in profile, with broken slopes from 15° to 75° towards bottom, round base, occasionally scooped. Cut by F4/113, F177, F173, F219 and F130.
Levels: 32.71 (top), 32.29 (base).
Fill: Single fill 1043: 10YR4/3, dark brown siltsand, occasional gravel, occasional charcoal flecks but “no visible indication of posts”.
Assemblage: 50 records consisting of 34 burnt flint, 8 flint flakes, 8 ceramic sherds (1 Bronze Age, fingernail-impressed; 1 possibly Grooved Ware; 3 possibly Iron Age, 3 unidentified).

F135 (eastern ditch, NW of F130 and SE of F158):

Shape: “palisade trench”, c. 0.50m wide, U-shaped profile, “verging onto V-shape”. Much shallower at North end than at South end, through greater erosion? “Evidence for palisade slot most scanty where shallow”. “Highlighted on the West side by a very stony adjacent area. Stone concentration between F133 and F135 indicative of a former bank”.
Levels: 32.90 (top), 32.51 (base)
Fills: 1023 (upper, “more gradual silting”)
2052 (lower, “backfilled early after the trench was dug”)
1023: 7.5YR4/6, loose mid-dark-brown siltsand, relatively stone-free.
2052: 7.5YR5/8, loose mottled orangey-brown sand, mostly stone-free, “no firm evidence of palisade slots”.
Assemblage: 38 records, 34 in 1023, only 4 in 2052, consisting of 17 burnt flint, 9 flint flakes, 1 flint core, 10 ceramic sherds (4 probably Bronze Age), 1 charcoal fragment.

F196 (located at 213/153 to West of F135):

Shape: a concave depression to West of F135, possibly contiguous with it. Probably a posthole or part of the palisade trench.
Levels: 32.74 (top), 32.65 (base).

F158 (eastern ditch, NW stretch, to NW of F135):

Shape: “palisade trench”, c. 0.50m wide and 0.20m deep into subsoil, U-shaped profile, round base. Gently sloping towards SE. Slots F155, 159 and 160 in its base. Cut by F233.
Levels: 32.92 (top), 32.73 (base)
Fills: 2 fills: 1034 (upper), 1092 (lower)
1034: 10YR3/4, dark brown siltsand, little gravel and charcoal, uneven in places.
1092: 10YR5/8, light brown gravelly sand at base, also fills cuts in bottom see F155, 159, 160).
Assemblage: 13 records, all from top fill 1034, consisting of 5 flint flakes, 4 burnt flint, 4 ceramic sherds (1 Bronze Age, 3 unidentified).

F155 (posthole? In base of F158):

Shape: oval, posthole? Cut into base of F158, “no evidence of post remains”. Filled with 1034 (top fill of F158).
Levels: 32.75 (top), 32.60 (base)

F159 (hole in base of F158):

Shape: oval stone-hole, 0.15m in diameter, 0.08m deep in base of F158. “Might only be a stone socket” filled with 1092 (basal fill of F158).
Levels: 32.73 (top), 32.65 (base)

F160 (hole in base of F158):

Shape: irregular hole in base of F158, “not a posthole but a variation in bottom of F158, filled with 1092 (basal fill of F158).”
Levels: 32.73 (top), 32.55 (base).

5.3 *The Beaker pit F175, adjacent features and treepit F178*

In the South of Int 20/32 at c. 223/148, three shallow pits of scoops (F175, 176, 179) were excavated, located next to a large irregular hollow referred to as F178/F203/F214/F216/F217 (F178 hereafter), its centre at c. 225/149. The information gained is given in tabulated form below.

The three pits F175, 176 and 179 appear very similar, being shallow, oval, round-based scoops cut into the subsoil by 0.20 - 0.30m and with diameters of just over 1m. Their single sandy infills appear to be backfills of natural sand and gravel with the admixture of occupation soil and debris. They seem quite insubstantial, when encountered on the surface of the subsoil directly under modern ploughsoil at c. 32.70 AOD. But, bearing in mind a probable reduction of the original ground surface through ploughing, they may have once been deeper - say, 0.60m deep from a hypothetical ground surface at 32.90 - 33.00 AOD - with expanded diameters of around 1.50m.

What singles out pit F175 is an assemblage of Beaker pottery: only 12 sherds were recovered, but they represent substantial parts of at least 5 different vessels: one small bodysherd (No. 2041) belongs to a fine, incised Beaker, the other 11 sherds belong to rusticated Beakers, showing different types of rustication). In particular, a large ‘pot beaker’ is represented by sherds Nos. 2143-2146, another vessel is represented by conjoining sherds 1597 and 2029; the remainder consists of sherds 2031, 2042, 2135, 2254, and 2266. A dozen flint flakes and burnt flint fragments complete the assemblage. The other two adjoining pits contain a much poorer assemblage, consisting only of flint flakes and burnt flint fragments.

Unremarkable as these pits are, they nevertheless deserve attention because the pits, especially F175, and the nature of its assemblage echoes traits encountered elsewhere at Sutton Hoo, in particular the rich Beaker pit complex of Int 55 (c.f. Vol. 7ii, Section 5). There, a whole group of pits with assemblages of differing ‘wealth’ was excavated: what characterises the pits rich in pottery is that substantial parts of many different late Beakers, both fine wares and large rusticated vessels, ended up in the fills of the pits. The Int 55 pit groups has been interpreted as the secondary accumulation of domestic refuse, derived perhaps from a nearby midden. This interpretation could also fit pits F175, 176 and 179 of Int 32.

A further element is worthy of notice: the Beaker pit F175 of Int 32 is located next to a large irregular hollow - F178 etc. - interpreted as a treepit (see below). There appears to be a recurrence of association between pits with Beaker assemblages and treepits at Sutton Hoo, eg on the Mound 2 platform (treepit F330 and associated features: c.f. Vol 4, Section 5.4) or in Int 55 (the Beaker pit complex cuts a crescent-shaped feature, perhaps a former treepit: c.f. Vol 7ii). It may be that this positioning was deliberate, or that the hollow left by a former tree acted as a focus or trap for occupation debris.

The large irregular hollow immediately to the East of F175 was excavated repeatedly as several different features. Consequently, the records made are of different and sometimes inadequate quality. Nevertheless, there seems to be no doubt that features F178, (203), 214, 216 and 217 represent one single large hole occupying an area of c. 16m². Its ragged shape, irregular profiles, differing depths (F214 to the North of F178 being deeper than F178, its profile more jagged than the smoother curves of F178), the nature of its backfill - loose redeposited natural subsoil mixed with occupation debris - the sparsity of finds and the distribution of artefacts mostly around the confines of the features, all suggest that the F178 complex represents the hollow left by a tree, blown over or felled from the South. Indeed, during the great storm of

October 1988 which blew over the South of England and flattened Rendlesham Forest and Top Hat Wood next to Sutton Hoo, the features created by blown-over trees could be inspected at close quarters. The trees were blown over from the SSW, and a semi-circular hollow resulted from the uprooting of the southern roots of the trees, the northern root system remaining embedded in the soft sand, with the trunk blown over. The excavation team's efforts at clearing Top Hat Wood consisted of sawing off the trunks near the base, but leaving the stump and roots in place. If, however, the stump were to be removed, it would inevitably result in a deeper, very jagged hole to the North.

F178/214 seems to fit the description of a tree blown over from the South perfectly, with F178 being the shallower, smoother bowl left by the fall and F214 with F216/217 and perhaps also 203 being the deeper, much more disturbed ragged hole left by the removal of the roots (and stump).

The date of this event is uncertain, but it seems plausible that the tree blew over before a pit containing Beaker pottery (F175) was dug: the stratigraphic relationship between F175 and F178 is uncertain, but it would seem unlikely that a pit would be dug so close to the trunk of a living tree.

Table 10: Attributes of pits F175, 176, 179 and F178 complex

F175:	Shape:	Oval, shallow-sided, round-based. Relationship with F178 uncertain. Cuts F179?
	Size:	c. 1.20 x 1.50m
	Depth into subsoil:	c. 0.20m (+ 0.10m definition spit)
	Levels:	32.64 AOD (top), 32.42 AOD (base); top before definition: c. 32.72 AOD
	Fill 1044:	"loose, dark siltsand"; 7.5YR4/6
	Comments:	"shallow natural depression with accumulation of ceramic debris in backfill", "possibly for levelling area"
	Assemblage:	12 ceramic sherds: 1 Beaker fine, 11 Beaker rusticated from 4 different vessels, including 2 groups of conjoining sherds. 6 flint flakes, 6 burnt flint
F176:	Shape:	oval, scooped, round-based
	Size:	c. 0.80 x 1.20m
	Depth into subsoil:	c. 0.27m (+0.10m definition spit)
	Levels:	32.61 AOD (top), 32.30 AOD (base); top before definition: c. 32.71 AOD
	Fill 2033:	"loose dark brown siltsand indistinguishable from fill of F175"; 7.5YR3/4
	Comments:	"pit with accumulation of limited debris"
	Assemblage:	8 flint flakes, 1 burnt flint
F179:	Shape:	irregular ovoid, shallow-sided, round-based. F178 appears to overlap it.
	Size:	c. 0.800 x 0.90m
	Depth into subsoil:	c. 0.20m
	Levels:	32.63 AOD (top), 32.42 AOD (base)
	Fill 2032:	"loose ginger-brown sand & gravel"; 10YR5/8
	Comment:	"ill-understood scoop"
	Assemblage:	1 flint flake, 11 burnt flint
F178, F203, F214 different lobes of the same feature)	Shape:	amorphous, occupying area of c. 4 x 4m. Main, shallow F216, F217 (being southern part of feature is F178. F203 are irregular depressions (probably animal burrows) to the East of F178. The northern, deeper, 'boat-shaped' lobe is F214 which appears to overlie a N-S scoop referred to as F216/217. Records rather inadequate.
	Size:	c. 3.00m W-E x 2.00m N-S (F178) c. 1.00m W-E x 1.80m NE-SW (F203 to East of F178) c. 3.40m W-E x 1.00m N-S (F214 to North of F178) C. 1.00m W-E x 1.50m N-S (F216/217 under and to North
F214)	Depth into subsoil:	c. 0.55m (F178); c. 0.20 (F203) c. 0.65m (F214)
	Levels:	32.63 AOD (top of F178), 32.00 AOD (base of F178) 32.62 AOD (top of F214), 31.95 AOD (base of F214) 32.62 AOD (top of F216/217), 32.45 (base of F216/217)

Fills:	F178, 1045:	“brown, silty sand adhering to sides of F178”, “95% fine loose sand”, “tipped, filled from SE direction?”; 10YR4/4
	F178, 2031:	“very clean natural-looking yellow-brown sand with frequent gravel and pebbles in upper fill, no structure”, “lower part shows some silting up”; 10YR5/6
	F203, 2082:	“buff-orange, clean sand & gravel”; no Munsell
	F214, 2043-4:	“loose, medium-dark brown sand, small amounts of silt, gravel, pebbles, occ. flecks of charcoal, flint, bflint, ceramic; lense of lighter material at East end”; 10YR4/4
	F216, 2045:	“dark, silty sand, loose small amount of gravel, pebbles, occ. Charcoal flecks, bflint & ceramic”; 7.5YR3/4
	F217, 2047:	“loose, light silty sand & gravel, occ. Flint & bflint”; 10YR4/6
Assemblages:	F178:	3 ceramic sherds (1 rim in Bronze Age fabric, 2 unidentified) 3 flint flakes, 9 burnt flint
	F203:	no finds
	F214:	10 ceramic sherds (4 in Bronze Age fabric, 6 unidentified) 4 flint flakes, 23 burnt flint. 2 matrix samples
	F216:	1 ceramic sherd (unidentified), 2 burnt flint. 1 matrix sample
	F217:	1 soil sample

5.4 *Ditch F130 and Palisade F213 boundary*

5.4.1 Geometry and spatial relationship

Bracketed between the Early Bronze Age parallel system described in Section 5.2 and the group 1 graves of the Anglo-Saxon cemetery (Carver, Section 7 of this volume) lies a large *ditch*, 2.00m wide on the surface of the subsoil (at 32.90) and biting into subsoil by 0.60 - 0.70m, accompanied, at an interval of 2m further East, by a parallel *palisade*, some 0.60m wide and biting into the subsoil by c. 0.20m. The information gathered from the piecemeal excavation of this ditch (F1 of Int 20, also known as F103) and palisade (known as F4 of Int. 20, F113, F219, F213 and F169 of Int. 32, hereafter referred to as F213) in the 1984, 1985 and 1986 seasons is summarised in the table below.

Firstly, it has to be established whether the ditch and flanking eastern palisade trench are contemporary and part of a single structure or whether one precedes the other. Stratigraphically, there are no elements which could be used to argue the case either way, as they both cut the same earlier features (double ditch boundary F133 and F135) and are both cut by Anglo-Saxon graves (F231, F161, F173, F9/118). One is therefore left with geometric considerations alone. Each of the three possibilities (palisade replaced by a bank and ditch, contemporary structure, palisade replacing a former bank and ditch) have arguments in favour and against them (summarised below) but, on balance, the contemporary model seems somewhat more likely.

Relationship between palisade F213 and ditch F130: Summary of possibilities

<u>Hypothesis</u>	<u>Arguments in favour</u>	<u>Arguments against</u>
E. Palisade earlier than ditch	2m interval between E edge of ditch and palisade too narrow to accommodate Spoil thrown up by a 2m wide ditch: if palisade no longer in use, then bank could spill over	Strictly parallel layout suggests contemporaneity
E. palisade contemporary with ditch	Strictly parallel layout suggests that the ‘palisade’ is a revetment to a bank in the 2m interval between ditch and ‘palisade’	Interval of 2m is very narrow; the ‘palisade’ trench is too flimsy to be a proper revetment; certainly <i>not</i> supporting a vertical face
E. Palisade later	If bank to East of ditch had slumped or	Bank to East of ditch unlikely

than ditch	eroded into ditch, 'palisade' or fence line could have been erected to reinstate or strengthen weakened boundary	to have just eroded 'naturally' into ditch, much more likely to have been deliberately pushed into ditch; in this case, why replace with considerable labour an earthwork with a fence?
------------	--	---

The contemporary model has been selected for the sake of the discussion that follows: indeed, if we do not decide on the order in which ditch and palisade were built, it would make any discussion of the siting of bank(s) on disused earthwork encountered by Anglo-Saxon gravediggers impossible, with too many variables to choose from. So, ditch and palisade are presumed contemporary, even though alternative models are plausible. The following considerations have led to this point of view:

1. The rigorously parallel layout, traced over a 35m stretch in Int. 32 and 38 would surely have deviated somewhat if one structure had replaced the other.
2. Very faint parallel traces to the East of the ditch can be distinguished in the 1976 CUCAP air photograph, suggesting that the parallel layout is maintained for at least 50m further North.
3. The gap between the eastern edge of the ditch and the western edge of the 'palisade' is just 2m wide, rather a narrow strip to accommodate the spoil generated by digging a 2m wide ditch. One would expect a bank to be spread more widely at its base, *unless* a barrier (the 'palisade') had previously been erected to keep spoil within limits. Alternatively, a fence could have been erected at the foot of the newly thrown up bank, to prevent slippage. In either case, the 'palisade' could be relatively insubstantial or even discontinuous, as seems to be the case, since a vertical timber face or revetment would never have been intended.

5.4.2 Was there a bank or banks?

So far, we have postulated that ditch and palisade are likely to be contemporary. The second question to answer concerns the position of an implied *bank* or banks. The search for any remnants of a ploughed-out bank seems to have proved unsuccessful: although mention is made (in A J Copp's site report Y8, 1986) of a "stony layer over the West side of the area" (p.5), this appears *not* to have been the remains of a bank, but either the remnants, in 1985, of the 1984 backfill - "... the objective of a third definition ... was to remove a stony layer over the West side of the area. A fourth definition plan was drawn because the third definition surface was seen at a later date as part of the 1984 backfill" - or the uppermost stratum of the natural subsoil, which survived at a higher level over the West of the site (entry in site notebook for 17.7.86: "Examination and sampling of natural deposits ... by Agostino Favaro and Philip Bethell appear to confirm a basic tripartite division The upper deposit comprises a dark sand with many pebbles and larger cobbles In some areas, the upper stony horizon is absent or barely represented, while elsewhere it may be quite prominent in localised spreads and patches".)

So, in the absence of physical bank remains, one is left with three approaches to track down the position of former bank(s): checking the heights of the surviving subsoil along the edges of the ditch, palisade and interval (theoretically higher if once protected by a now-eradicated bank); analysing the depths of Anglo-Saxon grave cuts (assuming that, if they were cut through a former bank, their truncated remnants would be shallower) and, thirdly, examining the sections and profiles through the ditch F130 and palisade F213 or directions of tip-lines and signs of attrition of the original cut. This last approach produced the most positive results. Firstly, the ditch shows no signs of recuts: it was cut once, backfilled and then may have had a further disuse 'life' (see below). Secondly, the tip-lines or shape of backfill deposits indicate that a bank existed to the *East* of ditch F130 (in the interval between ditch and palisade). This also seems supported by the shape of the ditch cut (slightly steeper and more angular on the West edge, more rounded on the East) and the reverse pattern exhibited by profiles through the palisade (steeper on the West edge).

Thus far, we have established a bank between ditch and 'palisade', to the East of the ditch. Whether a bank existed to the West of the ditch is less clear. A look at the levels taken on the surviving subsoil along the western edge of the ditch compared to those taken on the eastern edge of the ditch shows that the subsoil is generally 30-70mm higher on the western side than on the eastern one. However, this does not necessarily prove the existence of a western bank because there is a general 'downward trend' from NW to SE (e.g. palisade F213 survives at a level generally between 50 and 70mm lower than the ditch) explained either by a natural slight slope from NW to SE in the subsoil or (and most

probably) by deeper ploughing and biting into the subsoil as one moves eastwards away from the modern track. The difference is not insubstantial: from a high point in the NW at 209/160 (where graves F146 and 154 were cut) at 32.92 AOD, the subsoil is only encountered at 32.67 AOD by the eastern edge of palisade F213 at 219/152.50, i.e. a difference of 0.25m.

An examination of the depths of Anglo-Saxon graves appears equally ambiguous. A glance through the recorded levels for the 18 burials of Int 32 (Burials 17 to 34) would classify graves as 'deep' if their bases were located between c. 31.90 and 32.20 AOD and their recorded depths (taking into account later cuts) greater than 0.60m from top of subsoil. On these parameters graves F108 and 109 (Burials 21, 22), F146 and 154 (Burials 25, 26) and F166 - with F163 deeper but this may be a special case - (Burials 28, 29) could be classified as 'shallow'. Borderline cases are graves F9/118 (Burial 17) and F106 (Burial 20, neither 'shallow' nor 'deep'. Counting as 'deep' are graves F101 and 102 (Burials 18, 19), F137 (Burials 23 & 24), F161 (Burial 27) and F173, 231, 227a and b, 235 (Burials 30-34). Thus, although it is true that most graves to the East of ditch F130 are 'deep', so are two graves well to the West (F101, 102) amongst and in line with the 'shallow' or intermediate ones. The case for a western bank is therefore not strong and further complicated by problems concerning the later topography of the western zone (see below).

5.4.3 Infill and assemblages

First, it has to be noted that, because ditch F130 was excavated in segments and at differing speeds and recovery levels over no less than three separate seasons, not all infill deposits were either recorded or indeed present over the entire 18m length of excavated ditch. Thus, for most of the ditch, only two major deposits were recognised, an upper fill 1002 and a lower fill 1003 (though the presence of other deposits might sometimes be inferred: see Section 4). Only in a section located along the 157 northing were all four infill deposits illustrated and excavated in sequence. These are (from base upwards):

- a. A basal, very stony deposit on the West (= 2072) and East (=2073) of the ditch cut, not recorded in the context cards as being present in its centre, but clearly illustrated in the centre base. This may represent "slippage of natural flint capping which surrounds F130 into its cut at an early stage after F130 is built" (note by Sally Foster, 22.09.1985), in fact more probably stone-roll from a bank. Relatively few finds (about 9% of the whole F130 assemblage) were made in this deposit but amongst them is a major group of flint waste products as well as implements and half a dozen sherds of pottery, some of which has been assigned to an Iron Age type.
- b. The lower of two backfill deposits or tips is recorded as context 2028, roughly equated with 1003. It is recorded as relatively "clean" light brown sand with few stones and much more prominent on the East side of the ditch. The descriptions of 2028 and 1003 fit an interpretation as bank material (subsoil upcast onto the eastern bank) having been backfilled or pushed back into the ditch, mixed with occupation debris. The assemblage from 2028/1003 is indeed quite substantial (some 34% of all finds records made in ditch F130) consisting of very many fragments of burnt flint waste and implements, a piece of slag(?) and 16 sherds of pottery, some of which were assigned to an Iron Age fabric.
- c. The upper backfill deposit in ditch F130 is context 1028 or 1002, in terms of assemblage recovered, the richest (54% of all finds made in the ditch) but similar in composition to the lower backfill: masses of burnt flint, some flint waste and an arrowhead, as well as a very mixed group of 36 pottery sherds ranging from Neolithic to Iron Age! It is darker, siltier, more 'humic' (through admixture of anthropogenic material) and stonier than the lower backfill. Most likely to represent deliberate backfill of occupation debris, with a little charcoal, perhaps levelling off before ploughing (see below).
- d. It seems that, for parts of the ditch, 1028/1002 is the ultimate backfill whereas, in the North of ditch F130, a much later black and burnt deposit (2014 and 2024) overlay a central strip of a still-visible ditch depression. This spread is patchy, very irregular and variable in depth. Although Sally Foster records 2014 as being present "along the entire length of F130", this only refers to her stretch of ditch in Lane 3 between the 154 and 157 northing, although it may have spread further northwards to spread *over* grave F231 ("a small patch of charcoal was encountered in the area which is now the grave at a higher level" - A J Copp notebook entry for 12.08.1986).

This charcoal spread is unrelated to the main ditch infill sequence, post-dates the Anglo-Saxon grave F231, and may represent the remains of a camp-fire or 'picnic' in the shelter of the wind, as occur in other ditches at Sutton Hoo (Mounds 2 and 14 quarry ditches, Mound 5/6 quarry pit) perhaps during the Middle Ages. The interest of 2014 is that it reveals that a grassed-over hollow may still have been visible in the Middle Ages. By extension, the Anglo-Saxons certainly encountered ditch F130 as a partially filled-in hollow (see below). Apart from charcoal samples, unfortunately untraced at present, only flint makes up the meagre assemblage from 2014.

As for the 'palisade' trench F213, etc., all the various segments that make it up appear to have a single grey-brown, stony, silt-sand backfill that also appears to fill the hollows of former postholes in its base. The assemblage consists mostly of burnt flint and flint waste as well as eight unidentified small sherds of pottery. Only two sections through the palisade were drawn: that through F4/113 exhibits an even, rounded profile, that through F169 has a steep western edge and a shallower eastern edge. An interpretation which proposes that the posts served as revetment or consolidation for a bank to the West of the palisade (but never supporting a timber vertical face) and that these posts were removed at the time when the bank was dismantled (resulting in context 2028 of F130) appears consistent with the information gathered).

5.4.4 *Disuse, or what did the Anglo-Saxons see?*

A contradictory situation has to be tackled: on the one hand, the position of graves F231 (Burial 31), F161 (Burial 27), F173 (Burial 30) and F9/118 (Burial 17) - axial or perpendicular to the ditch and palisade system - the alignment of 9 graves to the West of ditch F130 (F101, 102, 106, 108, 109, 146, 154, 163, 166 or Burials 18-22, 25-26, 28-29) surrounding a possible Anglo-Saxon posthole structure (F165, 167, 189, 191) and tree-bowl (F243, etc) interpreted by Martin Carver as the site of a gibbet (this Volume, Section 7) and finally the low level at which grave F231 was encountered cutting the ditch fill of F130 all suggest that the Anglo-Saxon grave-diggers encountered an earthwork at least partially visible and somehow arranged their burial ground (the Group 1 cemetery) around it. On the other hand, our discussion of the presence of a bank or banks and the excavation of the ditch and palisade infill sequence proposes that the bank and 'palisade' to the East of ditch F130 had been dismantled, flattened and pushed back into the ditch before grave F231 (Burial 31) was dug; consequently, graves F9/118, F173 and F161 (Burials 17, 27, 30) would be axial or at right angles to a boundary that had already disappeared!. Furthermore, a (somewhat unsubstantiated) western bank either never existed or had been so much flattened as not to be significantly reflected in the depths of graves and a gibbet aligned along its course. How can the two positions be reconciled?

One element seems clear: assuming all above-ground earthworks were flattened - either through or for previous ploughing which could be considerably earlier or directly in order to make way for the eastern cemetery - the ditch F130 still showed as a partially filled-in hollow. There are some imponderables concerning grave F231 (Burial 31) as it was encountered at 32.35 AOD when the first signs of a body were showing (Copp, site notebook entry for 12.8.1986): it was certainly cut through backfill 2028/1003 and probably through backfill 1028/1002 and definitely *not* cut through the "black layer" 2014. This suggests that the grave may have been cut from c. 32.70 AOD. The original ground surface in Anglo-Saxon times outside the ditch could not be much lower than 32.90 AOD (surface of subsoil interface with modern ploughing). Therefore, ditch F130 must have shown up as a strip some 15-20cm (6-8 inches) lower than the surrounding landscape, certainly enough to influence the siting of the Group 1 cemetery to the West and East of it. So, the proposition is: no earthworks but a linear hollow snaking through the landscape from NNE to SSW, visible on air photographs (CUCAP 1976) and also visible in the Middle Ages (?), when a campfire was scattered in it (Context 2014).

If a hollow survived by the Anglo-Saxon period, and indeed later, then one must finally ask whether it was just an insubstantial grassed-over small ditch or whether it still marked a boundary or, better, bounded an axis of communication. It must be said that there are no visible traces of a track to the West (or East) of ditch F130 but, if wheeled transport is not envisaged, a track would not be detectable in the subsoil anyway. The siting of the Group 1 cemetery, with its possible gibbet, would certainly make more sense if it was located on an axis of communication, some 50m East of the main barrow cemetery. This axis of communication could still be the "Iron Age" NNE-SSW axis visible on the 1976 CUCAP air photograph, especially as it is now thought that the 'Medieval holloway' is a more recent (post medieval or later?) trackway snaking its way through disaffected mounds.

But, of course, one would not put a cemetery and gibbet *on* a track immediately next to the ditch. The putative track would therefore have to be running some distance away from the ditch to the East of West. To the East, it would have to be sited some 7m away from the ditch (East end of Burial 32-3, F227 of Int. 32): there is indeed a convenient strip, c. 4m wide, bounded to the East by a NNE-SSW posthole configuration roughly parallel (F202, 199, 221 and 34, 35 of Int.39). To the West, there would have to be a 16 m wide gap (distance to W-end of F36 of Int.52/Burial 39) between ditch edge and a putative track sited in the archaeologically blank area at the eastern end of Int. 50 between the 180/190 and 200 easting. This may be asking credulity to stretch a little too far. In essence, the reader is asked to believe the following: "The reason why a cemetery was established in the eastern field is because a very small ditch marked a very important axis of communication which originated half a millennium before. The track that belongs to it runs actually 16m to the West and cannot be seen". At least the eastern track option appears a little less incredible. The siting of a putative track to East or West of the ditch may of course affect the various hypotheses which could be put forward for the growth of the Group 1 cemetery: linear from East to West, or *vice-versa*, or in all directions from a central nucleus (the gibbet).

In the end, perhaps the safest option is to propose that the siting of the eastern cemetery and earlier boundaries have little

in common, except that one grave was inserted into the top of a still-visible hollow. Yet one cannot help thinking that the association is more than fortuitous: why else locate this rather bizarre cemetery just here? The reader has been asked to envisage hypothetical or insubstantial banks and invisible tracks, but it still seems plausible that trackways across the soft high ground of the Sandlings, leading from the Deben towards Eyke, perhaps shifting or meandering, hold the key for much of the exploitation of Sutton Hoo over the centuries.

5.4.5 Summary table of information for ditch F130 and palisade F213

Table 11

F130 (a.k.a. F1, 103, 110)

Shape:	ditch, c. 1.50 - 2.00 (max.) m. wide, running NNE-SSW across Int 20/32/38, c. 0.60 - 0.70m deep into subsoil, rounded bowl-shaped profile, slightly steeper to West.
Levels:	32.88 (top), 32.18 (base). Levels appear slightly higher on West side, but subsoil naturally (?) Sloping from NW to SE.
Stratigraphy:	appears to cut all earlier prehistoric features. Cut by grave F231 which is <u>sealed</u> by top charcoal-rich layer 2014 and is aligned with the ditch F130. Also cut by anti-glider ditch F220. Directly under ploughsoil 1001. Internal stratigraphy consists of 2014 (top charcoal spread) over 2024 (burnt sand patch), over 1028 (= 1002) (dark brown upper main fill), over 2028 (=1003) (light brown lower main fill), over 2027 and 2073 (basal stone fill).
Fills: 2014:	5 YR 3/1 black spread of charcoal and sand in top of F130. "Noticeable over entire length of F130, very irregular, patchy, varying in depth but up to 0.11m deep, contains large fragments of charcoal". Entire length questionable. Definitely <i>over</i> grave F231. Levels in centre: c. 32.85 - 32.70. Assemblage: 16 records incl. 4 charcoal samples, 9 burnt flint, 2 flint flakes, 1 flint arrowhead.
2024:	5 YR 3/3, small spread of red burnt sand, irregular, related to 2014. Assemblage : no finds, 1 soil sample.
1028:	(= 1002): 7.5 YR 4/4 for 1028. 10 YR 5/8 for 1002, dark brown stony siltsand with very small amount of charcoal, upper fill of F130. Comment of 1002: "may represent slumping of later material into top of F1" "or latest plough-over filling a shallow silted depression representing the ditch after disuse". Levels in centre: c. 32.70 - 32.50. Assemblage: 1002: 365 records, incl. 309 burnt flint, 30 flint (flakes and 1 arrowhead), 25 pottery sherds (mostly unidentified, but incl. 1 Neolithic, 1 Beaker, 2 Bronze Age and Iron Age), 1 soil sample. 1028: 55 records, incl. 11 burnt flint, 32 flint flakes, 11 pottery sherds (mostly unidentified but with Bronze Age and Iron Age types), 1 charcoal sample.
2028	(= 1003): 5 YR 4/4 for 2028, 10 YR 5/4 for 1003, light brown siltsand, fairly homogeneous, relatively 'clean', scatter of gravel and pebbles. Lower, lighter fill of F130. Comment on 1003: "no evidence of primary silting"; "two sherds of IA pottery low down in the bottom fill". Levels in centre c. 32.50 - 32.28. Assemblage: 1003: 229 records, incl. 190 burnt flint, 23 flint (flakes, and 1 scraper, 1 blade, 1 utilised flake), 14 pottery sherds incl. 1 Bronze Age, 1 Iron Age? The rest unidentified. 2028: 35 record incl. 13 burnt flint, 19 flint flakes, 1 blade, 1 other retouched flint), 2 sherds of pottery (1 Iron Age, 1 unidentified), 1 fragment of slag.
2072 & 2073	10 YR 4/3, very stony dark sand in base of F130, extremely dense and including cobbles - 2072 represents western deposit, 2073 the eastern deposit. Comments: "possible slippage of natural flint capping which surrounds F130". Levels in centre: c. 32.28 - 32.20. Assemblage: 73 records, incl. 6 burnt flint, 58 flint waste flakes, cores and implements (roughout, hammerstones, misc. Retouched) but also 6 pottery sherds (4 Iron Age?, 2 unidentified). 1 charcoal sample, 1 soil sample.

F4/113 (palisade trench, extreme South)

Shape: trench, c. 0.50m wide, c. 0.20 - 0.25m deep into subsoil, shallow sides and rounded uneven base. E side very confused, possibly another linear feature or scoop joined to it at right angles (this may be F177 defined later): a separate definition context 1058 allocated there. Cuts F15/133. Cut by grave F9/118.

Levels: 32.70 (top), 32.48 (base)

Fills 1009: 10 YR 4/3, pale brown siltsand, scatters of flint, gravel and pebbles. Comment: "very similar to F1 (1002)".

1058: Darker brown definition context with charcoal along E side, no clear stratigraphic relationship with 1009.

Assemblage: 200 records, incl. 7 burnt flint, 8 flint flakes and 1 core fragment, 5 pottery sherds (unidentified except 1 Neolithic).

F177 (slot? scoop? Associated with F4/113?)

Shape: irregular subrectangular cut, scooped, truncated remnant of a larger feature.

Levels: c. 32.70, 32.30 (base)

Fill 2035: 10 YR 3/4, loose dark siltsand with gravel, pebbles and flecks of charcoal.

Assemblage: No finds.

F219 (palisade, S of Int 32, N of F4/113)

Shape: A series of 17 postholes arranged in 2 parallel staggered rows but not set in trench (levels too low), cut into natural subsoil and truncated. Diameter of postholes c. 0.10 - 0.20m, on average 0.10m deep. Cuts F174. Gap with F4/113 to S and with F213 to N. Cut by grave F173.

Levels: 32.66 (top), 32.53 (base)

Fill 2090: 7.5 YR 4/6 grey-brown siltsand and pebbles.

Assemblage: no finds.

F213 (palisade trench, centre of Int 32)

Shape: Palisade trench, c. 0.50 - 0.70m wide, and c. 0.20m deep into subsoil, flattened U-shaped profile, with uneven base in which some 18 post/stakeholes are set, either as double staggered row of double stakeholes, or single tow of larger postholes, irregularly spaced. Gap with F219 to South, Cut by grave F161 but continues beyond until cut by antighider ditch F220 (note by P J Leach in site book for 27 September 1982: "continues as a short segment before being cut away by antighider ditch"). This segment presumably cleared away because later records state, erroneously, that trench does not go beyond F161 and segment is missing on plan. Diameter of postholes: c. 0.10 - 0.20m (small ones), c. 0.40m (2 larger ones), depth 0.10 - 0.15m - Comments: "post pits clear, not destroyed by removal".

Levels: 32.74 (top), 32.64 (base of trench), c. 32.50 (base of posthole).

Fill 1060: (= 1070, identical): 7.5 YR 4/6, homogeneous grey-brown siltsand, stones, occasional charcoal flecks, "no postpipes identified".

Assemblage: 23 records, incl. 13 flint flakes and 1 flint pick, 6 burnt flint, 3 pottery sherds (unidentified).

F169 (palisade trench, extreme N of Int 32, continues into Int 38)

Shape: palisade trench, c. 0.70m wide and c. 0.20 - 0.25m deep into subsoil, fairly steep sides, flat uneven base with a dozen irregular hollows set in base (ill-defined post impressions?). Western edge is slightly steeper than eastern edge.

Levels: appear incorrect

Fill 1088: 7.5 YR 3/4 mixed grey-brown stony siltsand with gravel, pebbles and cobbles (on E side).

Assemblage: 10 records incl. 8 burnt flint, 1 flint core fragment, 1 misc. Retouched flint.

5.5 Tree pits

For a discussion of the evidence for treepits in Int. 32, see description of F178 in Section 5.3 of this volume. For adjacent treepits in Int. 39, see F42 discussed in Section 5 of Volume 8iii.

6. **SELECTED STUDIES: THE ROMAN PERIOD**

None

7. **SELECTED STUDIES : EARLY MEDIEVAL PERIOD** (M. Carver)

7.0 **Definition of Early Medieval Features** (see also Section 3.6 and 3.8, especially 3.8.7))

7.0.1 *The Naming of the Parts*

701.1 Burials and other features associated with them

INT 20

F 9 grave Burial 17
 F 38 empty grave ?
 F 39 grave Burial 18
 F 40 grave Burial 19

INT 32

F 101 grave Burial 18
 F 102 grave Burial 19
 F 105 grave-pit Burial 21,22
 F 106 grave Burial 20
 F 107 marker post, Burial 22
 F 108 grave Burial 21
 F 109 grave Burial 22
 F 131 = F 38 in INT 20
 F 137 grave Burial 23,24
 F 137/1 body Burial 23
 F 137/2 body Burial 24
 F 138 post-hole
 F 139 post-hole
 F 146 grave Burial 25
 F 165 post-hole

F 166 grave Burial 29
F 167 post-hole
F 154 grave for Burial 26
F 156 grave-pit for Burials 28 and 29
F 161 grave Burial 27
F 163 grave Burial 28
F 173 grave Burial 30
F 178 natural feature
F 180 unidentified
F 183 no feature
F 191 post-hole
F 198 post-hole at focus of graves
F 215 unidentified
F 226 unidentified
F 227 grave Burials 32,33
F 228 unidentified
F 231 grave Burial 31
F 233 unidentified
F 234 unidentified
F 235 grave Burial 34
F 236 coffin Burial 34
F 237 body Burial 31
F 238 body Burial 32
F 239 body Burial 33
F 240 body Burial 34
F 241 post-hole
F 242 post-hole
F 243 tree-pit ?
F 245 body Burial 18
F 247 body Burial 19
F 248 coffin Burial 20
F 249 body Burial 20
F 251 body Burial 21
F 252 body, Burial 22
F 254 body Burial 9
F 258 body, Burial 25
F 259 body, Burial 26
F 260 body, Burial 27
F 261 plough, Burial 27
F 262 body Burial 28
F 264 body Burial 30

INT 52

F 4 grave Burial 35
F 25 grave Burial 37
F 27 timber foundation
F 34 body Burial 35
F 35 grave Burial 38
F 36 grave Burial 39
F 37 grave Burial 36
F 71 body Burial 36
F 72 body Burial 37
F 73 body stain Burial 37
F 74 body Burial 39
F 75 body Burial 38
F 76 = F27

F 79 post hole in F 27
F 80 post-hole in F 27
F 81 post-hole in F 27
F 82 post-hole in F 27
F 83 post-hole in F 27

701.2 Non-burial features studied.

INT 52, F 27/76, 79-83 Timber Foundation. Unidentified

INT 32, F241-3 Tree-pit

INT 32, F138, 139,165, 167, 191, 198 Post-holes, possibly forming a gibbet

INT 32, F178, 183 Natural features

INT 32, F 38/131, 180, 215, 226, 228, 233, 234 Uncertain graves.

7.0.2 *Description of the Investigation : The Interventions*

702.1 The excavation in Zone D took place in five contiguous areas excavated with five different procedures. Int 20 was part of the evaluation; Int 32 and 38 were cleared by back-actor, but Int 38 was not subsequently excavated. Int 39 was stripped by Drott. Int 52, the excavation of the track separating Int 32 and Int 50, followed after a six-year interval.

702.2 The procedures followed on Int 20-39 were thus frankly experimental, while that followed on Int 52 was the fully-developed protocol of the main excavation programme.

The purpose of Int 20 was to validate the results of surface collection (Int 19), which suggested an edge to the prehistoric settlement some way out in the eastern field. Int 20 fortuitously produced one burial (Burial 17, F9).

Int 32 and 38 were opened to confirm that this grave was part of a peripheral group marking an eastern limit to the Sutton Hoo cemetery. It was intended to develop a technique of "strip, map and sample" (see Vol.1, Project History S. A. 1985), whereby areas were machined open, cleaned, mapped and selected graves excavated. In the event, it was discovered that at least two heavy trowellings ("first and second definitions") were required to produce 70% of the graves; the strategy was abandoned, during evaluation and before the main excavation programme began, in favour of deep-seeking multiple definition of pre-selected areas [see Project History, Vol I.4].

Int 38 was a victim of this change of strategy; it was mapped after two definitions, but not subsequently excavated. Moreover, the definitions carried out on Int 38 represent a very early example of the practice. The two graves seen on Int 38 therefore comprise considerably under 70% of its population. The two Int. 38 graves are reported upon in section 7.4 and 3.7 of this volume.

Int 40 was never fully opened: it was merely proposed as an area about the same size as Int 38 to the South of Int 32. Stripping was abandoned after a strip 2 x 16 m had been cleared manually (see section 2.1.1 of this vol.).

When graves had been defined in Int 32 to within 5m of its eastern edge, it was decided to open a further area, Int 39, to the East to ensure that the eastern limit of the cemetery was in fact located. Int. 39 was the same size as Int. 32.

N87 shows the three areas, Int 32, 38 and 39 open together.

Int 52 was opened in 1991 to complete the excavation sample, so making a continuous transect 210 m wide from West (Int 48) to East (Int 39). INT 52 contained the farmer's track, a thoroughfare in almost continuous use. The excavation was carried out in spring 1989, when there was no pressure from the harvest, and the track could be diverted over the east field, which was under turf. N593/14 shows the situation.

7.0.3 *Feature Definition*

The features were defined by trowel. Experiments were undertaken with a variety of brushes, following advice from Brian Hope-Taylor. However, although these proved successful with the larger features, particularly when followed by rain, they failed with the smaller such as graves. The gravel was soft and sandy, and generally too dry [N155/3], the colour contrast was very poor, and the continual wind lifted any loose sand and obscured the site with it. Here was another reason why brushing was not useful: only one part of the area could be worked at a time, everything to windward being lost.

For these reasons, definition eventually evolved into a procedure whereby areas (or "lanes" in this case) were trowelled after being soaked by rain or our rain/machine (built by Mr Peter Berry). This became the basis for the "horizon mapping" eventually used to record the main excavation area in Zone A.

Feature definition relied mainly on colour contrast rather than subsoil contrast. Where features coincided the stratigraphically earlier, but more strongly coloured, might be seen first, as in the case of F4, a prehistoric pit, seen before F9, the Anglo-Saxon grave which cut it; but, F146 (a burial) was seen before F154, the burial which had been cut across it, although it was the latter which had the more strongly coloured darker fill, contrasting with the natural sandy gravel (MOHC site diary 20 August 1985). The contrast which revealed a grave depended on the accident of composition of contiguous fill and subsoil, which could hardly be reliably revealed other than by repeated definition.

7.0.4 *Methods of Excavation*

704.1 All features located in the four definitions of INT 32 were excavated in Int 32 as part of the learning process. All Early Medieval graves were located in sub-rectangular pits and contained sand bodies. On this basis, there were five further graves in Int 52, and two in Int 38 (unexcavated) and none in Int 39.

704.2 The Graves were excavated using a recording protocol which initially evolved with experience. The records for the eastern cemetery are therefore not as consistent as those for the main excavation in Zone A. In general, the principal target throughout was the grave and the body posture and they were achieved in all cases where they could be read.

All graves were excavated and recorded at Data Acquisition Level E [see VOL 1.10]. The fills were removed in spits c 100mm deep, initially called "levels" [level 1 etc] and then "stages" [stage 1 etc]. The culmination of the system, varied in its experimental development, was that the horizon at each stage was recorded by colour photography and drawn if any anomalies were visible. A running section was maintained along the long axis of the grave, renewed in the same place after each horizon had been recorded.

Contact with the body was generally unequivocal; bone was very rare, but the locus of the body was indicated by hard dark sand which usually contrasted with the grave fill. Wood was similar, but softer, darker and less homogenous. The two decay products could often be distinguished; but where the body lay within a coffin or on wood it was much harder to define. There is also some indication that the decay of bodies lying on wood was further advanced than those that lay on the subsoil.

When the body had been contacted, the axial section was abandoned, and the body was excavated in three dimensions. This was found to be possible from the first burial encountered [Burial 17, F 254]. The first part of F 254 to be seen was the left leg, which was defined in the normal way of a flat silhouette. But the rest of the body was successfully attempted in three dimensions.

The 3-D form of the body with any grave-furnishing was termed a 'tableau'. The grave tableaux were recorded by colour plan and overhead photograph. Photogrammetry was tried in the early stages, but its advantages deemed insufficient to justify the immense delay of developing and drawing up. A grave tableau could be stabilised with *Vinamul*, a proprietary brand of PVA used by Suffolk farmers to inhibit erosion in light soils. Even so, the sand-bodies had a life expectancy of little more than a fortnight, by which time it had changed shape through erosion. If not *Vinamuled*, a sand body could be expected to change shape every time it was cleaned. In general, therefore, the bodies, like the horizon definitions, could only be recorded once immediately after excavation, and any records, photographic or otherwise, would have to be checked within a few days.

Permanent three-dimensional records were, however, attempted using silicon-rubber moulds [N96/34]. These were created by painting hot silicon rubber onto the sand body [N92/24] and peeling it off when set. The rubber mould took a millimetre or so of sand with it and the sand-body was effectively destroyed by the process. The rubber mould was supported on a fibreglass former and a fibreglass "positive" was made using the silicon rubber mould as negative. The

results were very true to the original. The fibreglass moulds proved most useful as a public attraction, but have found less application as a permanent record.

Excavators and their graves were protected from the continuous fallout from windblown sand using sheeted tower sections [N145/25], or frames. The graves were covered by wooden covers when not being worked on. Excavators used timber frames and planks to keep their weight off the excavated area. In the case of deep graves (Burial 27), the excavator suspended herself with admirable agility on a rope cradle [see *Site album*].

Excavators used trowels to removed the backfill in spits, generally with a running section, and excavated bodies with leaf and pastry brush. Various aspirators were also tried; however, the battery-powered car cleaner was too feeble, and the generator-driven industrial Hoover too powerful for most operations.

7.0.5 *Defining Features (other than graves) made or visible in the Early Middle Ages*

705.1 Post holes. Of the many putative "postholes" recovered, only five retained evidence for postpipes (F165, 167, 198, 191, 139/189). These occur in the gap between graves near F243 and so may be Early Medieval on the grounds of position as well as fill. The majority of features designated as postholes (Section 3) formed no pattern and were a very uncertain identification in any case [N82/13].

On the grounds of alignment and fill, one palisade trench, F59, in Int 39 was identified as possibly Early Medieval [N155/6]. But it is equally possible that this trench was part of a palisaded enclosure, similar in nature and size to other Iron Age enclosures (see vol. 8iii, section 4).

705.2 Surviving Earthworks.

7052.1 Considerable efforts had been made in the definition stage to detect relics of earthworks. An earth spread was seen over the area later to reveal Burials 25 and 26 (NW corner of Int 32), which was thought to mark the remains of a barrow. MOHC notes in the diary for 20 August 1985 that there was "slight corroborating evidence from the fact that [Burial 26] had a dark fill and was shallow, compared to all others which had a sand-gravel orange backfill". There was no further trace of such a putative barrow, and no room for one, assuming that Burials 28 and 29 were contemporary.

7052.2 A more persistent case was made for a surface feature parallel to the eventual ditch F1, consisting of stone enrichment. On 14 August, MOHC claimed to be seeing traces of earthworks marked by "stone sorting (biggest nearest the middle) and dark earth spread". But by 11 September, he was more dubious "...now very uncertain that the stone [enriched] 'strips' really exist or really represent earthworks". This was because the defined caps of heavy gravel were related to the subsoil, not a feature. It is also probable that the stone-enrichment noted as a trend at Definition 1 was caused by stones filling the hollow of the ditch F1 during later ploughing, rather than by the erosion of soil from a ploughed-out earthwork.

7052.3 The majority of the features other than graves was considered prehistoric on the grounds of their fill and/or shape. The principal elements of the prehistoric system were the parallel palisades F5, F15 running NW-SE, which were superseded by the ditch and palisade F1,4, running NE-SW. There remained a large number of unassigned unspecific pits and postholes [N83]. Of these, F178 in Int 32 and F42 in Int 39 [N156/13] were identified as "treepits", natural hollows formed by the root mantle of trees that had been blown down, or had been otherwise uprooted. By analogy, F243 is thought also to have been a treepit [N157/15].

7052.4 The parallel palisades F133, F135 were cut by ditch F1/130 and by Graves F102, F108, F173 and F9. They were gone and invisible before Early Medieval times. The ditch F1/130 was, however, respected by two graves, F9 which was parallel to it and F231 which lay within its lower fills. More controversial is the palisade F213 etc. which runs parallel to the ditch, since the records report this palisade both earlier and later than the Graves F161 and F173. The stretch of F213 etc. in the vicinity of F173 (called F219) is said to be cut by Grave F173 and palisade F5, thus creating a stratigraphic knot. AJC (Section 3.6.3.4, 3.8.3) believed that this palisade had run across the back of F 173, as well as the more suggestive F 161. These anomalies are resolved in the studies of graves (below). Only the earthwork associated with F1/130 is likely to have survived into the early medieval period.

7052.4 The phasing of the eastern area (Int 20, 32, 38, 39) is discussed in Section 4 above. The alignment of many graves towards a point between WNW and NW, and the gap running through on this alignment suggests the presence of a relic

linear feature - but none was there defined.

7.0.6 *Summary of Results*

23 bodies were recorded in 19 graves [TABLE 12, below]. In the shared graves bodies were buried one above the other or side by side.

There were no furnishings of the conventional type; all the remains encountered were decay products in discoloured sand, deriving presumably from flesh, bone or wood. Wood was generally darker than anatomical material, and on this basis the furnishings additional to the body were recognised: coffins in Burials 18, 20 and 34; a possible ard and staff in Burial 27.

Burials 32 and 34 are the easternmost and probably mark the eastern limit of burial at Sutton Hoo, there being nothing for 30m beyond. Surprisingly, Burials 39, 37 and 35 mark a *western* limit to the group, since nearly 50m of Int 50 was also cleared of burial. To North and South, the limits are less sure, although the blank 10m at the North of the carefully scrutinised Int 52 suggests that the northern limit is a real one. Note, however, the presence of two unexcavated possible graves at the junction between the NW corner of Int.32 and the SW corner of Int. 38 (see section 7.4 and 3.7 of this vol.).

The impression is that the burials encountered are not a sample of an extensive cemetery, but an isolated group, fortuitously revealed by the research strategy. This impression is enhanced by the plan of the burials which appear to respect a number of pre-existing local features (see below).

7.1 Burials in Int. 32 [Group 1]

7.1.1

BURIAL 17

Int 20/32 1984 J Cane, P Leach

Grid: 216 146

GRAVE: F9 Fill: 1016 Orientation: NNE-SSW

Cuts, or cut by, palisade trench F4 (visibility unknown); aligned with ditch F1 (probably visible)

High point:	32.76mAOD	Max. length:	1.57m
Low point:	32.20mAOD	Max. width:	0.43m
Min. depth:	0.56m	Area:	0.675m ²

BODY: F254 (1049)

Length: 1.32m (instep to shoulder); c. 1.57m to head, posture erect

Posture: Lying on back, shoulders hunched and neck upright (vertical) against the North wall of the grave. Feet parallel and turned SW. Fully extended [left] hand across abdomen. Left leg turned over to West and slightly flexed. Face [from teeth] turned nearly due South.

Identified Bone:

1988	R. innominate
1983	R. tibia
1983	R. fibula
1981	R. Calcaneum, talus & cuboid
1981	R. 4th & 5th metatarsals

C14 - bone already sent to Harwell [540 - 700 AD]

Anatomy: Young adult male (17-25 years)

Radiocarbon date from bone: 540-700 AD [HAR 6800]

Excavation

F9 was seen as a linear cut at the West side of F4, and the NE side of F15, both already excavated. No higher cut had been noted, nor was one immediately visible in the North section of Int 20 [N19/15]. There is thus a prima facie case for the palisade trench F4 having cut the grave F9, rather than the other way round, which would be expected. However, the section as drawn by the excavators, endorsed their recorded opinion that F9 had cut through the backfill of F4. This same stratigraphic order was suspected of F173 and F161 (Burials 30 and 27), and equally subsequently disproved.

The left leg of the body appeared first and was initially mistaken for a root. The sand body was then defined in two stages: the ribcage, pelvis and legs in Int 20 and the head in an extension in what (in 1985) became Int 32 [N24/11].

The completed sand-body received much publicity [N67/21, taken by Edward Morgan]. It was photographed by Ira Block for the National Geographic Society, subjected to experiments with U-V light, recorded photogrammetrically and appeared on television in our first programme, "New Beginnings".

The body was stabilised with Vinamul. It was subsequently broken into 20 samples [N55/18], of which 9 were thought to contain bone. Bone was visible only in the ankle and neck area, together with the traces of 4 teeth. A C14 determination was made by Harwell Laboratories. The result was 540-700 AD.

The body was placed in a grave which was cut to the same length as the corpse. The corpse was lowered nearer the head end so that the feet (too much space) fell sideways and the head (too little space) fell forward. The orientation of the grave respects the alignment of a prehistoric ditch, F1. The grave was rapidly backfilled with banded tips of local fill.

BURIAL 18

P Leach

GRAVE: F39 (Int 20) Fill: 1063, 1065 Orientation: Slightly N of
F101 (Int 32) W-E (head to W)

No stratigraphic context

Rectangular planks of a coffin (presumably) jointed at its right-angled corners. Survived only as vertical locus 10mm wide, and localised brown staining beneath and above the body. Minimum length: 1.55m; max. width: 0.34m; min. depth: 0.31m.

Posture: Lying on back, with left leg turned over towards South and slightly flexed. Arms uncertain. Head direction uncertain but remaining traces do not suggest a natural posture.

Identified Bone:

C14 - 2028 ?? possibly sufficient skull

Anatomy: Adult, unidentified gender.

F39 and F40 [Burial 19] were defined together against the subsoil of definition 1 [N48/10]. F39 is cited as cutting 1059, but no features were subsequently defined which were cut by F39.

Upper fill (1063, a mottled buff-yellow sand-silt) was removed and at 10cm gave way to the three contexts 1064, 1065, 1066, representing respectively the infilled coffin, the grave backfill, and between them the coffin line [N49/21].

Following our success in achieving a three-dimensional sand body (Burial 17), it was somewhat rashly decided here to empty the coffin as though it too were solid. The edges were convincing but very fragile [N51/2].

The body was much disturbed by burrowing animals and was not completely defined. The final photographs [N53/21] included a linear stretch of dark soil at the East end on the South side. This was not identified by the excavator, but is coincident on plan with the coffin line. Brown staining beneath the body is localised to the coffin area, and suggests E-W

axis of planking. One of these marks lay *above* the "skull stain" [D104] suggesting that the coffin had had a lid, as well as sides and a base.

F39 and 40 were excavated one immediately after the other and photographed together [N58/20; N75/5].

Interpretation: The deceased was buried in a simple box coffin.

7.1.3

BURIAL 19

Int 20/32 1984/5 P Leach: C Royle

Grid: 208 153

GRAVE: F40 (Int 20; Fill: 1062 Orientation: E-W (head slightly
F102 Int 32) S of E)

High point:	32.86mAOD	Max Length:	2.15m
Low point:	32.20mAOD	Max width:	0.60m
Min. depth	0.66m	Area:	1.29m ²

BODY: [F247] 20/1069. Removed (in 1985) as 1018 in F102

Length: c. 1.80m

Posture: Lying face down with legs slightly flexed, toes pointing North, head on right ear looking North, left arm bent so that hand lies, with cocked wrist, over upper vertebrae. Right arm unclear, probably lies beneath rib cage and emerges to North.

Identified Bone:

696 Fragments of skull, mandible, L & R temporal bone ? parietal bone

C14 - Sufficient material from 696

Anatomy: Young to middle-aged adult of unidentified gender

Excavation

The grave was defined as 1062 at first definition [N48/10] and the mottled yellow-buff sand-silt and pebbles of 1062 [N53/4] emptied until the first contact with the body was made [N73/18].

The sand body was generally well-defined as to member, and lay on a penumbra of stained sand which the recorder thought may have derived from decayed flesh.

The body was an exhibition piece and heavily vinamuled [N115/4,6].

It was finally dismantled by member in 18 samples and dispatched to the specialist [N73/13]. She found good bone in the right-hand side of the skull, in particular the facial region, cervical vertebrae and a single carpal bone.

Interpretation:

The deceased was placed face down with the hands trussed together behind the upper spine.

7.1.4

BURIAL 20

Int 32 1985 M Cooper, P Leach ,A Favaro

Grid: 213 152

GRAVE: F106 Fill: 1016, 1065, 1066, 1068 Orientation: NW-SE

High point:	32.79mAOD	Max. Length:	2.62
Low point:	32.21mAOD	Max. width:	0.70m
Min. depth:	0.58m	Area:	1.47m ²

No stratigraphic relations

Rectangular cut backfilled with silty sand (1016, 1066, 1068) and a band of large flints (up to 200mm), thought to have been a grave marker/cairn (1065).

COFFIN: [F248] 1067 (North edge); 2007 (collapsed, East end); 2009 (or body, unlocated); 2041 (East side of North edge)

High Point:	32.41mAOD (Level 2)	Max. length:	2.50m
Low point:	32.26mAOD (Level 5)	Max. width:	0.45m, tapering SE to 0.30m
Min. depth	0.15m		

Originally thought to have been a tree-trunk coffin, due to its apparently tapering form and the thick "barky" character of the base. However, the outlines taken at four levels descending in the 150mm of the coffin stain, report only one "tapering" side, the SW side at Level 5. Otherwise, the coffin outline is consistent with a normal collapsed rectangular box.

BODY: [F249] 2091, 2009 (or coffin, unlocated)

Length: c. 1.70m

Posture: Lying on back with arms to the side

Identified Bone:

Largely unidentifiable (one long bone, probably from upper leg)

2772 L. leg, probably tibia

C14 - doubtful sufficient available

Anatomy: Not known

Furnishing: An organic sand-shape, 2093 (Find 2770) was defined in the coffin at the SE end. It was consolidated, boxed and lifted by a BM team on 26 September 1985. A dissection by MOHC and MRH in December 1995 in York revealed that the organic shape (originally thought to have been a joint of meat) contained no animal bones whatsoever. Examination by T.P. and S. O'Connor (Bradford University) confirmed that this was not animal in origin, but probably part of the coffin surviving within a small hollow in the sandy subsoil.

Excavation

The main fill of the grave was defined as a "patch of darker siltier material" (1016) against orange sand and gravel (at definition 2). The concentration of flint and chert nodules, 1065, was reported as running parallel to the main axis of F1006 but slightly to the South (ie SW) of the centre line [N92/9, N79/8, N79/24]. These stones were "visible through 1012" (the layer cleared during Definition 2). They may therefore have originally risen above OGS to form a cairn, or dished into the grave fill, or both (see 3.6.4.4). The spread in 1012 was not otherwise recorded, which may mean that it had no shape. This in turn suggests that a larger cairn-like structure had been thoroughly spread, rather than that a concentrated group of stones in the upper backfill had been spread by truncation. The apparent selection of the stones

is more in favour of a dished cairn than a choice of backfill. The stones would have had to be chosen and gathered from a site other than the upcast, whatever their final circumstances of deposition.

After removal of the stones (1065) and backfill (1016), the fill resolved into a coffin line (1067, 2007, 2041) separating an inner fill (1066) and an outer fill (1068) [N79/30]. At this stage (Level 2, D126) the coffin appeared as a conventional rectangular plank construction.

Contact with the body was achieved at Level 4 (height unrecorded) when the feet and head appeared [N82/18].

On full excavation, the general locus of the body was reasonably clear, although it had to be defined against the dark stain of the coffin [N89/14]. The NE edge of the coffin had been excavated as a vertical face.

Interpretation of Burial Rite:

The body was placed in a coffin, with the meat offering at its foot, and the coffin placed in a grave oriented NW-SE. The grave was backfilled with upcast but the upper backfill contained a band of large sorted stones which may have derived from a cairn to mark the grave subsequently dished in.

The organic stain had appeared at the SE end, resembling one half of a pelvic girdle (pubis, ischium, ilium), or the haunch of a large mammal [N89/20]. This was subsequently consolidated and boxed [N109] by a British Museum team, and excavated in York by MOHC and MRH. This, and confirmation by T.P. and S. O'Connor, disproved the existence of a meat offering. It is more likely to be a remnant part of the coffin.

7.1.5

Burial 21

Int 32	1985	M Cooper: B Noble
Grid:	211 151	
GRAVE:	F108 [initially part of F105]	Fill: 1069 Orientation: W-E (head slightly NW of W)
High point:	32.59 [32.75]mAOD	Max. length: 1.75m
Low point:	32.30mAOD	Max. width: 0.53m
Min. depth:	0.29 [0.45]m	Area: 0.93m ²

Cut by Burial 22, which lay parallel and superimposed over the NW quadrant of Burial 21. Cutting palisade trench F133 [D357].

BODY: F251 2000, lying over stain 2048

Length: c. 1.75m (with head)

Posture: Decapitated; the trunk lies on the back with legs extended and arms by the side. The right hand appears to clutch a stone (Find 2395). The head was subsequently found in the lap of Burial 22.

Identified Bone:

2388	Fragment of innominate side unknown
2392	L. tibia
2391	R. tibia
2390	R. femur
2373	Unidentified
2394	L. tarsals calcaneum
2389	L. femur

Anatomy: The burial is that of an adult. Bone preservation too poor for further information

The grave F108 was expected since the excavation of the burial above it (F109) had contained an extra head. The excavation of F108 began when the burial above it (F109) was still intact. There was no differentiation of fill between the two. The grave F108 proved shallow and the body had been defined within 8 hours [N89/16].

N89/18 shows F108 excavated, with beside it F106 (Burial 20).

7.1.6

Int 32 1985 B Noble: M Cooper: J Lawrence

GRAVE:	F109 (initially defined as F105, which resolved into F108 & F109)	Fill: 1015, 1064	Orientation: W-E
--------	---	------------------	------------------

High point:	32.75m AOD [F105]	Max. length:	2.20m
Low point:	32.48m AOD	Max. width:	0.45m
Min. depth:	0.27m	Area:	0.99m ²

BODY: [F252] 2001 (stain), 2002 (additional head), 2003 (shroud?), 2008 layer beneath body

Posture: Probably lying on back with arms to the side. Additional head (from Burial 21) lies over the left leg just over the knee.

1722	L. foot, fragment of calcaneum
1720	L. tibia
1718	L. femur (sent to B.M.)
	L. innominate fragment
1717	R. innominate
1723	Fragment of arctic surface of ? foot

Anatomy: Adult

Other: Marker post, F107. Two shallow parallel slots (F107, fill 1062, 1063) ran South from SW corner of F109. The fill, 1062, was similar to 1064, which filled grave F109. Fill 1063 was a circular patch between the two slots which was eventually diagnosed as natural subsoil in situ. This was obviously a difficult feature to read. The similarity of fill between the grave F109 and F107 suggests they are contemporary. Since 1062 was first described as a "square silty dark patch" and 1063 as an "orange circle", F107 must remain a strong candidate for a marker post. If this interpretation is accepted, the pit for the post was 300mm square, and its lowest point (at 32.68m AOD). The post would be c. 150mm in diameter.

Excavation

The graves F109 and F108 were defined as a single feature, F105, while trowelling the (second) definition (Context 1015) in Lane 2a. The two graves had cut the prehistoric palisade trench F133, thus giving the impression of a "multiple intersection of features".

Decayed bone was evident on the surface "though not on a uniform level". Attempts to reveal the extent of the mottled patch of decayed bone led to the recognition of the earlier grave F108.

The first context numbers (1062, 1063) were allocated to F107, which appeared first as a dark square with an orange circle in the centre, and eventually (as planned) as two shallow slots. This implied that F107 ("small box-like structure") was a post in a square pit, emplaced after Grave 109 had been backfilled. The shallow slots would then be spade cuts.

The body of F109 was defined after removal of 1064, from what was then designated as F105, the two graves together [N79/34]. The additional head over the legs was noted as "possibly on its side"; a "ring of stones" (small concentration) lay adjacent [N79/21].

The sand-body was dark in texture and very badly preserved, mainly due to its vulnerability from being so high, ie at the interface zone between ploughsoil and subsoil [N79/25; N80/20]. A thin dark layer (2003) was discovered over the body (2001) and under the additional severed head (2002); it was thought to be a shroud. The remains of the body in Burial 22, including the head assigned to Burial 21, were numbered and removed for examination by the specialist [N82/24].

The body F252 had stained the backfill of the burial beneath (2008, staining 1069) [N82/34].

Burial Rite:

The grave of Burial 21 is the same length as the decapitated body. Decapitation therefore took place before the burial. The head of Burial 21 was found in the grave backfill of Burial 22, and the final backfill of the two graves (1064) was identical. The two burials had therefore occurred in quick succession. But why were two graves dug?

The sequence of events appears to be specific. The decapitated body of Burial 21 was placed in a Grave (F108) dug for the purpose. The body was covered with earth, 1069, but the grave not completely backfilled.

A second grave (F109) was cut by extending F108 in a narrow tongue running westward from the North edge of the pre-existing F108. Wrapped in a shroud, the body was placed in this narrow grave. A severed head, presumably belonging to the first corpse, was placed on its side over the legs of the second. The open part of F108 and 109 were then backfilled (1064).

A shallow square pit (F107) was dug at the South-West corner of F109 and a circular marker post inserted in it.

7.1.7

BURIAL 23

Int 32	1985	R Beesley: S Foster: C Cane	
Grid:	222 154		
GRAVE:	F137 [F137/1]	Fill: 1071, 1079; 2020, 2021, 2023, 2057	Orientation: E-W (head slightly SE of E)
High point:	32.75mAOD	Max. length:	2.10m
Low point:	31.97/32.11mAOD (top of body 2059)	Max. width:	0.80m
Min. depth:	0.78m/0.64m	Area:	1.68m ²

The grave appears to have been a single structure to take two burials in particular postures. The lower cut was the smaller, containing 2059, and cut into the floor of F137. The two bodies were in contact, with no detectable backfill

between them.

COFFIN: Intermittent references to a "coffin" (for example in site book, 3 September, 10 September 1985), but there was no recognisable coffin recorded in practice (site book 26 September 1985: "no clear evidence for coffin").

BODY: 2023

Length: 1.75m, as lying

Posture: Lying on back, with legs and right arm straight, left arm bent and wrist cocked. Head connected by body stain to torso, but lying unnaturally: rear cranium on right shoulder; face, lower jaw and teeth in opposite direction to neck, offering impression of broken neck.

Identified Bone:

2491 Skull

C14 - Skull probably sufficient

Anatomy: Adult male, 25-35 years old.

Excavation

The cut for grave F137 (containing Burials 23 and 24) was recognised at Definition 2. The fill (1079) was removed in spits or "levels" about 100mm deep by R Beesley.

At Level 3, a dark zone (1079) appeared in the centre of the grave and echoing its shape [N80/2], which persisted until Level 11 as a solid area or a perimeter line [D110-113, 139, 140, 285]. This was designated as a coffin, in the excavator's notes, and as backfill/coffin? on the record card (Context 1071). But, at Level 11, it was necessary to remove 1071 in order to reveal the second body. Thereafter some "light staining" was noted (2057) beneath the head [N96/9], but this had no recorded or persistent shape.

This makes it likely that 1079/1071 offered a typical sinkage pattern such as was later seen in Mound 17. The grave backfill consisted of yellow subsoil and brown topsoil. The brown soil (Level 11) was followed by yellow and brown (Level 10) and alternative light and dark dumps quarried for backfill. When excavated in spits, these nested dumps gave oval perimeters in the horizontal plane. The presence of a coffin is unlikely and certainly not proven.

The feet of body 2023 appeared first [D285,197], and by Level 12 the torso was revealed and, beneath the left femur, the head of Burial 24 (2059).

Since the chest and pelvis of 2023 lay over the grave beneath, it had sagged into it [N89/31].

With the head still to be revealed, excavation of F137 was taken over by S Foster. The whole of 2023 was planned and photographed and then moulded in silicon-rubber. The fibreglass positive is now on display [N96/18: D232, 210]. At this point, the cut for the lower grave was clearly visible [N96/8].

The only convincing piece of wood was a short strip 140mm long, running parallel to the right-hand forearm of 2323. It is not likely that this derives from a coffin, given the otherwise weak evidence for one (see above). It is possibly a stick backfilled with one or other of the two bodies.

Interpretation of Burial Rite: See Burial 24

7.1.8 **BURIAL 24**

Int 32 1985 S Foster: C Cane

Grid: 222 154

GRAVE:	F137, lower half [F137/2]	Fill: not given	Orientation: Feet to W
High point:	32.11mAOD (top of body)	Max. length:	1.68m
Low point:	31.97mAOD	Max. width:	0.45m
Min. depth	0.14m	Area:	0.76m ²

The upper and lower half of F137 comprised a single stepped feature (see Burial 23).

BODY: 2059

Length: 1.85m

Posture: Legs and pelvis extended; the head rests on the knee, jaw uppermost; left arm beneath trunk, right arm behind back. There are two possible readings of this posture: (1) the body was folded forward at the hips, so that the trunk is horizontal and the head rests on the knees; this would be anatomically possible with the arms positioned in front of and behind the chest, but the head would have to have been twisted through some 120° from its normal carriage for the jaw to face over the right shoulder blade. (2) the head, and possibly the trunk, were severed prior to burial, the head being deposited on the knees of the trunkless corpse. (1) is possibly the more acceptable, but the neck would have to have been broken and possibly partially severed to achieve the position recorded.

Identified Bone:

2696	Skull
2700	Lumbar vertebrae
2698	Fragment of clavicle shaft
2703	R. humerus
2704	R. radius
	R. ulna
2706	R. innominate
2705	L. innominate
2702	R. femur
2701	L. femur
2699	R. patella

C14 - sufficient

Anatomy: Male, 25-35

Excavation

The cut for Burial 24 was clearly visible below that for Burial 23 [N96/8]. After the moulding of Burial 23 (2023), the body stain of Burial 24 (2059) was reported as "very fragmentary and sandy".

Body 2059 was in direct contact with body 2023, and must have been raised proud of the lower cut provided for it. The head of 2059 lay directly beneath the left femur of 2023. Under the head of 2023 two bones of 2059 were reported (by F Lee) as a radius and ulna.

2059 was reported by the excavator as being "in a crouching position, with left arm under the body and right arm behind the back".

In fact, the body lies with the legs and pelvis extended, and the trunk and head bent double so that the head rests on the body's own knees [D339]. The position of the arms, as recorded, is equivocal, but from the excavator's description it seems that the left arm lay beneath the (folded) chest and the right arm behind the back, with the ?hand behind the sacrum/pelvis.

The stain of the arm and trunk are of 2059 were clearly very difficult to distinguish from the trunk of 2023. There is a suspicion of vertebrae in the colour drawing of 2059 [D339], but its alignment coincides with that of Body 2023, to which it could as easily belong. Apart from the head, no bone-carrying samples were identified by F Lee. The head of 2059 was drawn as jaw uppermost, the lower jaw and teeth canted slightly over to its left side [D340]. The completely excavated graves [N109] showed that the lower cut containing 2059 was placed symmetrically with respect to the upper cut.

Burial Rite for Burials 23 and 24:

The grave for both burials was cut in a single-stepped Rite: construction, excavated through topsoil and subsoil.

The lower cut was only some 150mm deep; it was long enough, at 1.68m, for an average human. The body, which had been hanged and/or garrotted, was placed with the pelvis up near the East end of the lower cut. The trunk was folded forward, left arm under, right arm above the torso. The head came to rest on the knees.

The corpse 2023 was laid on the back directly on top of the back of 2059, such that the back of 2023 lay over the (reversed) back of 2059. The legs of 2023 were not quite coincident with those of 2059. The left thigh of 2023 rested on the head of 2059.

The body 2023 had also been hanged and/or garrotted, the head being turned through 180° in the vertical plane, so that the jaw faced diametrically away from the top of the vertebrae.

Both bodies may have been decapitated and the heads replaced approximately but incorrectly in the appropriate anatomical position. The position of these heads could not be explained by post-depositional movement. Both "victims" were young to mature males.

Grave F137 was then backfilled, the post-depositional process resulting in a small amount of settling (and confusion) where the soft tissue was most concentrated.

7.1.9

BURIAL 25

Int 32 1985 A Favaro: P Leach: W Filmer-Sankey

Grid: 210 160

GRAVE: F146 Fill: 1035 Orientation: SE-NW
(subsoil & topsoil dumps)

High point:	32.92mAOD	Max. length:	2.20m
Low point:	32.44mAOD	Max. width:	0.70m
Min. depth:	0.48m	Area:	1.54m ²

Under Burial 26

BODY: [F258] 2060

Length: 1.85m head to instep as it lies

Posture: Face down with hands beneath trunk; hands not observed, but arms suggests a convergence at the abdomen. Right foot and ankle lie over the left foot; both sets of toes pointing right. The posture strongly suggests that the feet were bound - as also may have been the wrists.

Identified Bone:

2677	Skull
2674	Teeth
2676	Unidentified
2681	Tooth

2679	L & R temporal bone
2678	Sphenoid
2694	Frontal bone
2691	R. tibia/femur - fragment of long bone shaft
2689	Long bone ? R. tibia

Anatomy: Bone preservation very poor. Young adult male

Excavation

F146 was defined (and excavation commenced) before F154, which was stratigraphically later [N75/8].

F154 was excavated and recorded, but left in position and consolidated with Vinamul such that excavation of F146 could proceed. The purpose of this was to achieve a tableau [N95/4] which was used for the BBC TV feature film and other purposes relating to publicity.

F154 was subsequently removed and the whole of the grave F146, and the body (2060) contained in it were defined and recorded [N107/7]. The body was subsequently moulded with silicon rubber and fibreglass and is now on display at the site.

It was recorded (Context card 1080) that the body in F154 lay over the backfill of F146 (1035). 1035 was a series of dumps of topsoil and subsoil [D114, 121, 186, 187] while 1059 (backfill of the later F154) has a similar description (mid-brown with orange blotches) except that 1059 contains charcoal.

On balance it seems that F146, 2060 (highest point feet 32.59:D196) had been backfilled before the shallower F154 was dug to receive its corpse (lowest point 32.63:D330). The lower point of the cut for F154 is recorded at 32.59 (feature card).

The posture of Body 2060 is face down with the arms converging beneath the pelvis and the hands (not observed) set to meet beneath the abdomen. There is some ambiguity over the feet. N101/7 shows the right foot over the left foot, with the right toes pointing to the right. The left toes also, but less clearly, point right. Plans D1096/332 show the right toes pointing left with the left foot pointing right. Plans 329, 328 echo the photograph, which is presumably correct.

Both postures are wholly unnatural, and suggest that the feet may have been bound at the ankle.

Burial Rite: See Burial 26

7.1.10

BURIAL 26

Int 32 1985 P Leach: A Favoro

Grid: 210 160

GRAVE: 154 Fill: 1059(mixed) Orientation: W-E

High point: 32.92mAOD Max. length: 1.61m

Low point: 32.59mAOD Max. width: 0.53m

Min. depth: 0.33m Area: 0.85m²

The body is recorded as over 1035, the backfill of the grave beneath, Burial 25.

BODY: [F259] 1080

Length: 1.55m, head to instep as lying

Posture: On back, left leg slightly flexed, arms by the side with hands resting on the pelvis.

Identified Bone:

2466	Fragment in stain (R. Femur)
2464	L. tibia fragments
2466	L. innominate
2466	L. femur

C14 - unlikely to be sufficient material

Anatomy: Adult. bone preservation poor.

Excavation

Burial 26 (F154) lay across Burial 25 (F146), but F146 was actually defined first [N75/8]. During cleaning of F146, the presence of the stratigraphically later F154 was noticed [D47]. F154 was then excavated [N75/31], and the body (1080) recorded, stabilised with Vinamul, while the body in Grave F146 beneath was partially excavated to provide a tableau [N82/22, incorrectly signed "F146", this burial is F154; N95/4]. The body, 1080, was broken into samples [N102/27; D330] and removed. There proved to be little bone remaining in these samples (cranium, fragments of pubis and upper leg).

Burial Rite:

An adult bound hand and foot was buried face-down SE-NW in a grave which was then backfilled (Burial 25). A second grave (Burial 26), in which the body lay on its back in a relatively normal posture, was at W-E across the first.

There is no direct evidence that the diggers of Burial 26 were aware of the presence of Burial 25. But it is curious that both burials were amongst the shallowest, Burial 26 at 0.33m especially so. It might be inferred that either Burial 26 was aware of Burial 25 and kept to a discrete depth; or that both were attracted to the same place by a pre-existing feature, such as an earthwork. The latter would also explain the usual shallowness of the cuts as defined. But no earthwork was otherwise defined.

7.1.11

BURIAL 27

Int 32	1985	A. Favaro, C. Williams, S. Foster W. Lockyer, R. Beesley, P. Leach
--------	------	---

Grid: 221 157

GRAVE:	F161	Fill: 1090(1093)	Orientation: W-E
--------	------	------------------	------------------

High point:	32.80mAOD	Max. length:	1.97m
Low point:	32.07mAOD	Max. width:	0.97m
Min. depth:	0.73m	Area:	1.91m ²

The grave was cut into natural subsoil. Palisade F213 did not cross it (cf Section 3.8.7.11).

BODY: [F260] 2065

Length: 1.77m, as measured along body from top of head to instep as lying.

Posture: The individual lies on the left side, right arm forward and bent, left arm down, right leg forward and bent, left leg back and bent: a position which resembles running. The various members of the body were located with reasonable confidence on plans and photographs (note the double lines of the legs and forearms). Half of the skull was found in the predicted location, giving additional confidence that the posture of the body had been correctly read.

Identified bone:

3255	Skull & upper cervical vertebrae
------	----------------------------------

C14 - skull sufficient material but ??? PVA

Anatomy: A young adult male.

Furnishing: [F261] 2066

Anomalies were recognised from Level 9 onwards as being of wood, from their black colouration and linear character. All the wooden remains lay over the body and occupied a total thickness of less than 50mm (compare Level 9 - 32.16, and Level 10 - 32.12). This disqualifies the timber traces from being, or deriving from, a coffin or chamber. The Level 9-11 plans repeated the morphological trends with slight variations in location.

The composite plan taken from all three plans and the photographs suggest one or more jointed heavy wooden objects. There was no metal present.

The components have been distinguished as follows:

1: Flat "beaked" object with "handle". The beak is at least 550mm long, and 150mm wide. The handle is at least 550mm long, and 100mm wide.

2a-e: A series of curved or straight pieces 40-70mm wide.

3a: A heavy handle or beam 870mm long, 120-150mm wide, up to 50mm deep. Lying above it, and possibly and earlier siting of the same piece, is 3b which has 2 "pegs" projecting to one side at one edge, and 3c, which is likely to be a manifestation of the same piece at a higher level.

4a-d: A linear feature running along the centre of the long axis of the grave.

4a is its most persistent feature, a rod 50mm wide and 900mm long (with 4d it is at least 1350mm long [or 4½ft]).

4b is a fan-shaped object resembling wooden spade.

4c is a version of 4a and 4b at a higher level, without improving the interpretation.

4d is a linear strip of charcoal staining which aligns with 4a.

There may have been a second of these lying parallel to and North of the first. It does not survive on the plan, but is visible in N92/20. The interpretation of the timber remains is not at all straightforward.

Excavation

The grave appeared at Definition 1, but the edges were (and remained) unclear. At Definition 1, the palisade trench F213 was visible in plan but ending just South of F161 at 2205 1565 [D293]. At this level, there was no variation recorded in the fill of F161, which consisted presumably of dished ploughsoil.

At Level 1 in F161, a broad band of dark soil crossed the fill in a N-S direction and was noted by the excavator [D69]. This anomaly persisted at Level 2 [D70] and Level 3 [D77; N80/7].

This was held by AJC (3.8.7.11) to indicate that palisade trench F213 actually crossed the backfill, but the width of the dark band and the palisade are not comparable. The dark band does not align with the palisade, and in any case the latter was seen to butt end at Definition 1. The dark band was probably backfill.

At Level 4, the dark band has disappeared and the fill was mixed with sandy blotches.

At Level 5, W Lockyer took over from C Williams. From Level 5 onwards the fill is increasingly heterogeneous and random [D101] with increasing amounts of yellow subsoil and iron pan as the levels descend.

At Level 9, the first traces of wood (2066) and body stain (2065) and bone appeared, the highest point being at 32.14m

AOD. The lowest point reached by the previous level (8) was 32.22m AOD. At Level 9, only half the head was uncovered and the site had to be vigorously excavated (by P J Leach) to recover the true edges of the grave. This gave the full tableau eventually planned (by E Hooper) in D279. The wood traces (2066) were generally darker and often carboniferous. Wood (2066) lay over body (2065) at all points of stratigraphic contact. N92/20 shows a level intermediate between Level 10, which does not show the pelvis, and Level 11 which does show the left femur. N99/10 shows that the level corresponding to the "Level 11" as designated in Plan 279.

During this process, there was a loss of sand and consolidated remains (foot) due to jolting [Int 32 Site Book 3 October 1985], but the sand form itself survived. It was excavated and a well-preserved half-skull found to be sited where predicted [N138/9]. However, the remains of the body have been "virtually all destroyed in the lift and turning over" [Int 32 Site Book 27 August 1986].

An extra large grave was dug and the body laid out in a special position in the bottom of it. The wooden objects were then placed over the body and the grave immediately backfilled. The body position and the wooden pieces suggest that the tableau represents a ploughman buried with a plough.

BURIAL 28

Grid: 215 160

High point:	32.68mAOD	Max. length:	1.42m
Low point:	32.11mAOD	Max. width:	0.73m
Min. depth:	0.57m	Area:	1.04m ²

Length: c. 1.50m, as measured on the skeleton as it lies.

The body retained this position during backfilling, which included an arm and two legs belonging to skeleton 1069 in F166. None of these limbs was articulated, but in view of the decay rate at Sutton Hoo, the disturbance of F166 by F163 is unlikely to have been after a long interval. Some of the limb bones fell over the tibia and under a femur of 1096 during backfilling.

was heterogeneous and became richer in subsoil towards to lower level [D177-181, 223-4]. The position of F163 suggests that of F166 was imperfectly known (if at all) to the diggers of F163 [N109].

Interpretation of Burial Rite:

An especially long (2.50m) grave was dug W-E, and the body laid in it on the back, with the arms stretched above the head. This was Burial 29.

After an interval not exceeding c. 10 years, a second grave was dug through the first, damaging the ribcage and hip and detaching the right arm and both legs. The second grave (Burial 28) was shaped like a square pit. Into the bottom of it was placed a body in the kneeling position, the head placed against the ground, one hand (tied?) behind the back. The right leg of Burial 28 lay over two limbs detached from Burial 29. It is possible that the body of Burial 28 was not then dead. At least it retained its three-dimensional position during backfilling; since the pelvis remained the highest part. Other limbs of the disturbed Burial 29 were included in the backfill of Burial 28.

BURIALS 28 and 29: Tables

TABLE 13: List of Bones from Pit F 163, planned on site [Hooper, Feature pack] and recorded in Finds Index. All bones are considered to belong to Burial 28 except those marked 29.

Find No	On plan	context	Site ident [F Lee]	Lab Ident
2641	1	1096	L femur & patella; length=430mm Male?	
2625	2	1096	R femur; joins 4. Head in acetabulum of 3. Lower condyle arctic. with tibia 4	
2618	3	1096	R pelvis: acetabulum and part of iliac crest; sexing not possible	
2627	4	1096	R tibia; length=330mm	
2601	5	1096	R(?) Talus. End of 4	
2617	6	1096	L pelvis: acetabulum and iliac crest	
2644	7	1096	R ulna; proximal end only	
2644[a]	8	1096	R radius	
?2622	9 [29]	1089	<i>Femur</i>	<i>Femur ? side</i>
2624	10 [29]	1089	<i>Femur. Same bone as 9</i>	<i>unidentified</i>
2626	11 [29]	1089	<i>? tibia</i>	<i>? tibia</i>
2629	12	1096	sacrum; 1st S. vert. lowest level. Apod joints clean	
2631	13	1096	L vert. 4L or 5L = lesion on sup body surface. 3L = some disc degeneration	
2632	14	1096	vertebrae and frag of sternum. Lying over radius and ulna 17,18	
2633	15	1096	L calcaneum: arctic. with 16	
2634	16	1096	L talus; arctic. with 15	
2635	16A	1096	L navicular	
2636	16A	1096	L tarsals	
2637	17	1096	L ulna; arctic. with 20	
2638	18	1096	L radius; length = c 230mm (prox. end absent)	
2639	19	1096	L carpals	
2640	20	1096	L humerus; piece of ossified soft tissue found in region of 17-20 join. But could belong to knee at end of 21.	
2642	21	1096	L tibia; length=345mm	

2643	22	1096	L Fibula	
2645	23 [29]	1089	<i>L Femur; length=395mm. L condyles absent</i>	<i>L femur</i>
2646	24	? 1096	?	
2647	25	1096	[jaw]; no teeth	
2651	26	1096	?	
2652	27	1096	?	
2653	28	1096	? humerus. No bone surviving	
2654	29	1096	skull. No bone surviving	
2672	30	1096	? [from sieving]	

TABLE 14: List of Bones from grave F 166, planned on site [Feature pack] and recorded in finds index.

Find No	On plan	Context	Site ident	Lab ident
2719	1		skull	-
2718	2		area of L hand	-
2720	3		L humerus	-
2721	4		Area of L radius/ulna	-
2722	5		Area L scapula/rib cage	-
2724	6		Area L pelvis	-
2723	7		Area L foot	-
2725	8		Area R foot	-

7.1.14

BURIAL 30

Int 32 1985 P McCullough: F Lee

Grid: 217 150

GRAVE: F173 Fill: 2030, 2034, 2036, 2039 Orientation: W-E

High point: 32.72m AOD Max. length: 1.75m

Low point: 32.12m AOD Max. width: 0.47m

Min. depth: 0.60m Area: 0.82m²

The grave cuts prehistoric linear features F174, and more controversially F219.

BODY: [F264] 2038

Length: 1.72m

Posture: On back, with right hand over pelvis and resting on [N99/23] or over [N111/1] the central part of the left forearm. Left leg slightly raised at the knee, the head turned to face South.

Identified Bone:

2508	cervical vertebrae
2514	Thoracic vertebrae
2524	Sacrum
2508	R. clavicle
	R. scapula
2585	L. scapula
2519	R. ulna
2522	R. innominate
2523	L. innominate
2522	R. femur
2526	L. Femur
2527	R. tibia
2521	L. tibia
2527	R. fibula
2530	L. fibula
2529	L. calcaneum

C14 - Plenty present, avoid skull because coated with PVA. L. femur 2526?

Anatomy: Young male. The bone was in good to fair condition and produced the most complete anatomical records of the excavation. On-site observations were made by the specialist (F Lee) who (fortuitously) dug this grave. These are appended as "Field Report on Bone" by F Lee. These records (and those for Burial 28) show the value (even the necessity) of having a human-bone specialist to excavate the sand bodies.

Radio carbon date:

Excavation

The grave was defined by fill 2030. It was seen to be cutting F174, but the palisade F219 (extension of F213) had not been then defined, and their relationship was not observed.

A J Copp noticed a "surface discolouration" at the East end of the upper grave fill and supposed this to belong to the fill of the palisade trench F219 which had thus "quite possibly" cut across the backfilled grave (3.8.7.14).

In fact, the fill was heterogeneous, offering mottled patches at both East and West ends throughout Levels 1-4. None of these is suggestive of a cut or of post-impressions, and those with any shape are more likely to be due to rodent or other burrowing animals whose activities are recorded for all contexts, particularly at the East end. On 1 October 1985, P J Leach wrote in the Int 32 Site Book, "F213 ... visible until cut away by F173". And on 2 October 1985, "palisade F213/219 ... certainly cut by grave F173". The safe assumption is that F173 cut palisade F213/219, there being no good evidence to the contrary.

At Level 9, a strong brown stain (2034) [N96/16] was defined and suspected of being wood. It did not resemble the dark speckled character of wood as seen at Sutton Hoo in general, and neither did it differ materially from the backfill episodes of soil, to which it probably belonged. The backfill became more dominated by backfilled yellow subsoil (2036) as the levels descended.

The sand body (2038) was located, defined and recorded at Level 11 (the skull being seen at Levels 9 and 10) [N99/23].

At that point it had been intended to make a latex mould from it, but "in cleaning back the head, the top of the [bone] calva was exposed [N102/9] - unweathered with a dark brown soil over the top, illustrating that the [sand body] is body-[stain] and NOT bone-[stain]. [Excavators notes by F Lee].

An attempt was then made to retrieve the skeleton, which was largely successful [N111/1]. This proved possible only when the sand was [bone] dry and could be brushed off to the bone line.

The head and lower right leg were then consolidated by the BM so that they could investigate the difference between

body-stain and bone-decay product. The samples were lifted on 27 September 1985.

The remainder of the body was dismantled [N111/4] for examination by the specialist and C14 dating.

Beneath the body, a layer of clean sand (2039) was removed a primary fill.

Burial Rite: The body was laid on the back, feet to E, hands across the lap. There was no coffin or suggestion of sign of ritual trauma.

Field Report on Bone by F Lee:

F173 c 2038

Position: Supine, extended, with hands over pelvis. R. hand resting on mid shaft of lower arm.

Orientation: East-West with head to West. Head turned to face South

Comment: Feet tarsals, dist. end of tibiae disturbed by animal burrows.

Measurements:	L.		R.	
(Bone prior to lifting)	Tot. leg 163cm		(Head to point of disturbed feet) with legs bent	
	FELI	445mm	440	Head to Dist end indistinct Condyles Ref. W. Bass 1981
	T.L	Position of Dist. end disturbed by rabbit burrowing		
	HULI	370m (sand)	340m (sand)	Head distinct Dist. end estimated because merges with lower arm
	RALI	Imposs.		
	ULNI	Imposs	270±	

Cranial
Measurements: To be confirmed

Preservation: Poor. Rarely surface of the bone preserved

Comment: Sex: Male
1. Pelvis - Sciatic notch L & R well preserved. Narrow & deep
2. Cranium - Insufficient information in situ. Mastoid process absent. Supraorbital ridge not prominent

Age: Sutures - Coronal and sagittal still visible
Teeth - See p. excav. - attrition/ eruption
All epip fused - no evidence for recent fusion
Adult

Grave: Grave cut:

Total length: 176cm
 Max. width: 46cm
 No evidence for coffin

- Additions: 1. Vynamul - not used on any of the body
 2. Possibly to be used on skull for lifting it. Lower right limb to BM for analyses

Inventory:	<u>Bone</u>	<u>Stain</u>
	Skull: calva 1. Frontal bone very badly weathered. 2. R. sagital well preserved & with plate intact. L. sagital poorly preserved, mastoid process absent	
	Maxilla - teeth present	
	Mandible - L. RAMI well preserved, all teeth present - see measurements	
	Clavicle - Fragment of shaft of R. clavicle	Stain only
	Humerus - Fragment of shaft of R. humerus	Humerus - L & R
	Radius - L. fragment of mid shaft where protected by R. hand	R. stain only
	Ulna - L. fragment of mid shaft where protected by R. hand	R. stain only
	Carpals/?? & phalanges	General stain of hand on removing the area of shaft of L. arm well preserved
	Vertebrae	Cervical, thoracic & lumbar visible but as general areas <u>may</u> contain bone beneath if N. arches
	Sacrum - ALA & 1st vert. visible	Rest of vertebrae = stain
	Ribs	Some visible as stain
	Pelvis - L. pt of L. Ishial tuberosity preserved. Sciatic notch visible. Edge of acetabulum preserved. (?? articular surface)	
	Right - sciatic notch & surround area of ileac crest preserved. ?? acetabulum	
	Femur - L. preserved as bone. Measurement from acetabulum to lower condyles	Right - distal end only preserved as bone. Rest equals dark brown stain
	Tibia - L. tibia preserved as bone. Upper condyles visible, unweathered. Distal end disturbed by animal burrowing	R. tibia - unexcavated. Left for BM
	Tarsals/M.tarsals, phalanges - Fragment of anterior articular surface of L. calcaneum	Disturbed. Stain only & fragment of bone

R. humerus - stain only, no bone.

L. tibia - Well preserved - ie bone

L. fibula - Lifted as bone

L. femur - Entire bone lifted - remains of head arctic surface = clean (so is acetabulum) ie no pathol visible

L. innominate (pelvis) - half iliac crest, half acetabulum, ischium and sciatic notch survive.

Sacrum - Apophyseal facets - clean

Head - Consolidated & lower R. leg for BM

Vertebrae - Lower lumbar N. arch preserved: 5th & 4th? No evidence for degeneration of ??? joints.

Upper T. - well preserved N. arches - ?? C. vert but kept with and consolidated with skull

The bone well preserved on lifting. No black stain was noted beneath, but sitting in yellow-orange sand.

Yellow sand and black stain (similar in appearance to root marks). ??? manganese.

BURIAL 31

Int 32

1986

P Leach: C Williams

Grid: 218 159

GRAVE: F231

Fill: 1103

Orientation: NE-SW

High point: 32.35m AOD

Max. length:

2.20m

Low point: 32.04m AOD

Max. width

0.56m

Min. depth: 0.31m

Area:

 1.23m^2

The grave cuts layer 2028, and probably 1028, silted up but still visible, F130. Contemporary or earlier than F167.

BODY: F237, 1107

Length: 1.73m, head to instep as lying in the ground.

Posture: On the back, hands converging on abdomen area.

Identified

Bones: None

Anatomy: No bones survive.

Excavation

Discovered in (or within) layer 2028 in ditch F130 [N96/25]. The highest point of F231 is recorded as 32.35m AOD. The section through F130 at northing 157 [D369], although it does not cut F231, is immediately south of it. This section has the surface of 2028 at 32.46m AOD, which means that F231 was cut from a point two-thirds of the way down 2028.

The excavator assumed that the grave must have been cut through the upper levels of the backfill of F130, but that the upper cut had not been observed (ie through 1028, 2014). This assumption is endorsed by AJC [387.15: "initial cut for grave unrecorded due to unexpected nature of discovery. Possibly cut visible on surface of ditch F1/130".]

The records for F231 and F130 do not offer any support for this interpretation, but there are some reasons for believing that, in contrast, F231 was cut into a visible ditch at F130, when that ditch had contained about a third of its extant fill.

Ditch F130 has primary fills of 2072 and 2073 which are mainly sand and contain no charcoal. 2028 lies on top of these primary fills. It is silty sand (5 YR 4/4) without charcoal, and achieves a thickness of up to 200mm. Above it lay the layer 1028, a silty sand with traces of charcoal (7.5 YR 4/4). Above this lay the distinctive 2014, annotated "black charcoal patch", and "noticeable along the entire length of F130".

The backfill of grave F231 (1103) is described as mixed fill of buff-brown (7.5 YR 4/4) and yellow-brown (10 YR 5/6) sand silt. A trace (less than 1%) of charcoal was recorded. There is little doubt that F231 cannot have been dug through 2014 (towards the top of the ditch) since in the first place the excavators would have easily seen it, and in the second, the backfill (1103) would have been well marked by charcoal.

The gravediggers of F231, therefore, dug their grave into the ditch of a visible earthwork, a conclusion endorsed by the alignment of the grave itself, which sits symmetrically within the ditch [N147/25].

The question of how far the ditch had refilled by the time F231 was cut is not to be clearly answered. It was certainly cut through part, at least, of layer 2028 as is shown by the relative heights of the bottom of this layer (32.28m AOD) and the first sighting of F231 (32.35m AOD). The lowest point of the grave is recorded as 32.04m AOD [D494]. This suggests that the grave (to conform with Group 1 practice) should certainly have been cut from higher up than its extant measured depth of 0.31m. An extant/real depth of 0.60 to 0.90m would be normal for a grave of this size. This points to a cut within layer 1028, when the ditch would have been about 0.5m deep from OGS. This obtains some confirmation from the description of the backfill 1103, which conforms most nearly to a mixture of 1028 and subsoil.

The upper fills of ditch F130 were removed in 1985, and the "lower fills left in sectors 3B and 4B" for the following year. Burial 31 is in Sector 4B, but was not seen in 1985 [site book 25 September 1985].

The sand-body (F237) was excavated and recorded [N138/8] and a latex mould taken [N141/28: N145/5: N145/11] leaving the (damaged) sand body for lifting [N145/12]. The grave was then thoroughly bottomed [N147/25].

Burial Rite:

The grave for Burial 31 was cut into the ditch of a still-visible prehistoric earthwork. The body was lain on the back with the hands across the lap. There was no evidence for a coffin and no sign of ritual trauma.

7.1.16

BURIAL 32

Int 32	1986	P Bethell
Grid:	225 157	
GRAVE:	F227	Fill: 2088
		Orientation: W-E
High point:	32.48m AOD	Max. length:
Low point:	31.87m AOD	Max. width:
	["wood" in F238]	
Min. depth:	0.61m	Area:
		1.53m ²

F227 is a double grave, in which a single grave pit was used to bury two bodies, F238 (Burial 32) and F239 (Burial 33). F227 was cut by the wartime anti-glider ditch F220 and also a lozenge-shaped feature F226 immediately to the South [D388]. F226 was an unidentified feature at first thought to be a grave.

BODY: F238 (1112)

Length: c. 1.70m as measured on the ground

Posture: Face down, extended

Identified Bones:

3379 Skull
3377 L. femur
3378 L? humerus

C14 - probably sufficient if use most of the body

Anatomy: Young adult (robust)

Excavation

Context 2088 was seen in the bottom of the anti-glider ditch F220 and defined as the fill of a grave running E-W [D388].

Due to this truncation, patches of body stain were visible immediately after the definition [D536: N136/1] and by Level 4, the higher of the two bodies, F238, was beginning to emerge [D540: N140/2].

A linear "wooden" object was drawn on the Level 4 plan [D540] touching and parallel to the lower left leg of Body F238. It is presumably the series of samples recovered as 3359-3364. The plan has the added comment "seems in fact to be bone" adjacent to the legend announcing the "wooden object".

F239 (1113) was lower and beneath F238 [N143/5].

The recording of this grave was very peremptory: uninformative or (in the case of written records) largely omitted altogether. No levels were taken of the completed grave. The "lowest point" given is the lowest sample taken. The double burial was moulded using latex.

Interpretation

Two young adults of unknown gender were placed face down one after another, Burial 33 first, side by side, but slightly overlapping in a grave specially dug for the purpose.

7.1.17

BURIAL 33

Int 32 1986 P Bethell

Grid: 225 157

GRAVE: F227 Fill: 2088 Orientation: W-E

High point: 32.48m AOD Max. length: 2.04m

Low point: 31.87m AOD Max. width: 0.75m
["wood" in F238]

Min. depth: 0.61m Area: 1.53m²

BODY: F239 (1113)

Length: 1.79m as measured on the ground

Posture: Recorded as "in extended position, face down (?)". This is likely, given the relative position of the right (?) scapula over the ribcage [D482: N143/5].

Anatomy: Adult

Excavation and Interpretation

See Burial 32

7.1.18

BURIAL 34

Int 32 1986 K Spandl: P Leach

Grid: 224 161

GRAVE: F235 Fill: 2095 Orientation: W-E

High point:	32.60m AOD	Max. length:	1.46m
Low point:	31.89m AOD	Max. width:	1.05m
Min. depth:	0.91m	Area:	1.53m ²

The grave cuts through natural subsoil (1005-1007).

BODY: F240 (1114)

Length: c. 1.67m

Posture: Laid on right side, knees bent, right hand on right knee, left elbow on left thigh.

COFFIN: (Or wooden pieces) F236

High point: 32.07m AOD
Low point: 31.89m AOD

Four planks were securely identified: two set on edge (or nearly on edge) at each end (East and West) and two laid over the top. Less certainly, the locus of curved side planks was seen on the North and South sides.

Identified Bones: None

Anatomy: Stain only

Excavation

The fill of grave F235 (2095) was first seen in 1985, on the boundary between Int 32 and Int 38. The mottled appearance and the presence of orange-brown iron-pan fragments must have led to the suspicion that it was a grave, even had the policy of excavating all the features not been in operation.

The backfill was identified by the excavator as "distinctly mixed and streaked with sand, soil, gravel and ?turf, iron-pan fragments, etc. [N136/29]. The sides of the pit F235 were vertical or undercut and backfilling was supposed to have been rapid after initial excavation.

At level 5, the anomalies are still amorphous [N140/10] but at level 6 [32.02m AOD: D471] timber traces appeared at both the West and East ends [N140/30]. At the East end, the line (plank 1) is that of a thin curving vertical band 10mm thick. At the West end (plank 2) the board or boards run North to South but are uncertainly angled.

At level 7, another plank appears (plank 3), this time lying flat, running East-West slight North of centre. It was 220mm wide [145/15].

A fourth plank (plank 4) was also defined at level 7. It was up to 350mm wide and lay over the southerly part of the grave; it is described as obscuring "the head and upper body of the burial" (some of which lie beneath plank 3 actually). "Feet are also much obscured". D475, which records plank 4, shows that the feet were expected to lie where the hip

emerged, under plank 3, in the centre of the grave, but they were correctly positioned by the time of this remark, since it is plank 4 and not 3 which obscured the feet in reality.

Plank 4 showed as a curving surface "sloping down from its southern edge and to a lesser extent from its West end".

The body could be previewed through planks 3 and 4 [N148/1-2] which were removed to show the body tableau [N151/6].

At this point, linear traces could be observed running down part of the North (plank 5) and South (plank 6) sides also. The shape in plan bulges and suggests a barrel, but the planks are the wrong width and number. The excavation of the sand-body also offered very faint traces of a wooden plank base (plank 7) [N151/6, N154/35a, N154/36a]. However, P J Leach noted [Int 32 site book 11 September 1986] that there was "no sign of bottom planking despite careful cleaning of grave bottom, particularly adjacent to coffin ends".

Interpretation

The excavator supposes that a box without a base had been placed over a body which had been laid out in a flexed position on its side.

The "box" is unsatisfactory, owing to the absence of clear base and North and South sides. Four planks, placed as headboard, footboard, and cover, were securely observed, and the sides and base rely on very slight traces. The container could have been a flimsy and ad hoc construction of planks - or something more serious, such as a box or barrel. It had a lid over the body and was therefore not a bed.

The excavator felt that the large planks (3 and 4) may have been the collapsed sides of a coffin. However, if all 7 wood-locus observations are taken into account, we have a conventional wooden box with plank sides, base and lid. The whole shape is structurally unconventional, being very squat and occupying the edges of an unusually squat grave (ie the width is large in proportion to its length). The disposition of the body also suggests it was laid out in a generous area. For these reasons, the timber traces might be read better as a chamber.

Against that interpretation, is the detailed locus of planks 3 and 4 and plank 2. Planks 3 and 4 should represent the whole width of the timber construction, since there are no further traces of horizontal planks to North or South, but no good reason why they should not have been seen had they been there. The total width is a maximum of 630mm. The shape of plank 2 offers a return at both ends, 580mm apart. Plank 1 has a line 650mm long. The body in its final resting place requires a width of 700mm. The grave has a width of 980mm at the base.

A preferred interpretation is that the original box was a chest or lidded drawer, about 0.65 x 1.32m (c. 18ins x 3ft), probably about 6 ins. (150mm) deep, into which was placed a person c. 1.67m tall, flexed to fit. A coffin subsequently burst under the first loading of soil onto the lid, forcing the side planks outwards (planks 5 and 6).

7.2 Burials in Int. 52 [Group 1]

Burials 35 - 39 belong, strictly speaking, to Vol. 8i (where they also appear). They have been left in this catalogue for the sake of completeness of the group 1 cemetery.

7.2.1

BURIAL 35

Int 52	1991	A J Copp
Grid:	200 144	
GRAVE:	F4	Fill: 1005
		Orientation: W-E
High point:	32.72m AOD	Max. length:
Low point:	32.19m AOD	Max. width:
Min. depth:	0.53m	Area:
BODY:	F34 (1039)	

Length: 1.87m, restoring head. 1.62m without head

Posture: Extended, lying on back, decapitated, head placed on right arm.

Identified Bones:

87	L. temporal bone
88	Fragment of mandible
70	L. humerus
71	R. innominate
96	R. Femur
97	R. tibia
72	L. tibia
83	L. tibia
73	R. cuboid
75	R. calcaneum
74	R. talus
81	L. talus
82	L. calcaneum

C 14 - Doubtful if there is sufficient material [650-955 AD]

Anatomy: Young adult (robust) 18-21 years old.

Excavation

The grave shape was reasonably well defined after the preparation of Horizon 2 [N568/14], although the eastern end was not clear at spit 1 or spit 2 [N560/22a]. A standard cumulative section was used [N560/23a]. Although traces of body were contacted at spit 3, the definition of the body (F4) began at spit 4 [N574/2].

The posture of the body was very clear [N573/12]. It was lying on its back; the patella was still in place over the left knee. Backfill 1005 was completely removed by the excavator, leaving a near perfect account of the body remains as 1039 (F34). However, there was no surface bone encountered, and little more was encountered in the samples into which the sand body was broken (described by F Lee as "poor; fragment of left side of skull and fragments of upper and lower limbs"). Since preservation of skulls is always better for the lowest side, this confirms the excavator's opinion that the head was placed on its left side, teeth facing North.

Two uncertainties in the body-tableau were noted. The stain beneath the skull was thought too robust and prominent to be due to the right ribcage. (This does not however present an anomaly in retrospect). The stain between the legs was unassigned. It was thought perhaps to belong to the right hand (feature card).

However, as the plan [D13] and photograph [N53/12] make plain, the right arm is all accounted for in its position beside the right pelvis, and at 740mm is the same length as the left arm. The stain beneath the legs must remain unassigned: it might be observed, however, that it is a darker colour and may have been wood rather than body matter. The excavator noted that rootlets were more plentiful at the West end (where body matter is also more concentrated) than at the East end.

This fine excavation [N574/12] was used for publicity [N576/1].

Interpretation

This young adult was decapitated at or after death. The length of the grave was sufficient to accommodate the body without its head, but the whole corpse could easily have been placed within it, with a little flexing. This is therefore more probably the burial of a decapitated person, rather than decapitation for burial.

BURIAL 36

A J Copp

Orientation: SE-NW

1.25m

0.65m

 0.81m^2

BURIAL 37

Excavation

A fourth organic patch on the South side of the grave did not belong to the body and remains unassigned (F73, 1088). There is no report of animal disturbance which might have displaced part of the body F72. It is therefore unlikely that it is a human fragment; it may have been a meat offering or an intrusive rodent (1041).

Interpretation:

The excavator reported a "cracked skull" in the sand form and suggested that both the hands and feet were tied, although the indications are equivocal. The head faced upwards [N587/14].

BURIAL 38

Int 52 1991 A J Copp

Grid: 206 160

GRAVE: F35 Fill: 1040 Orientation: ESE/WNW

High point:	32.75m AOD	Max. length:	1.20m
Low point:	32.11m AOD	Max. width:	0.55m
Min. depth:	0.64m	Area:	0.66m ²

BODY: F75 (1090)

Length: c. 1.80m, measuring components on the ground

?Stain of wooden object [no number]

Posture: The body (F75) lay on its back on a slope at the West end of the grave (F35). The head is facing upwards, slightly turned towards the South. Both legs are drawn up, so that the knees rest on the shoulders and the legs hang outwards, displaying the abdominal area. The right foot is turned outwards, the left foot points upwards. The right arm lies beneath the right leg. The left arm lies across the chest.

Identified Bones: None

Anatomy: No evidence

Excavation

F35 was defined at Horizon 2 as a roughly oval feature in difficult terrain [N576/13; D58].

Backfill 1040 was a mixed sand silt with no strongly marked subsoil patches [N590/3a]. At spit 3, there appeared two patches of body and a linear feature seemingly of wood [N590/5a; D62]. The linear feature, which is 420mm long and 10mm wide, receives no mention in the written records. It is taken to be a stick backfilled very soon after the body.

At spit 4, the first recognisable parts of the body to appear are the left and right feet [N590/7a]. The right foot being higher than the left [N590/8a].

The body (F75) appeared in its entirety at the West end of the grave [N590/10a, N588/14]. In the final tableau as photographed, the left tibia and foot are missing following the collapse of the sand tableau. Its position can be seen in N590/7a and 8a.

The body contained no bone and was a fragile stain.

The grave was not exceptionally small, so that the body position was not caused by the grave being too small. [N587/18].

Interpretation on Burial Rite:

The deceased appears to have been buried in a position which resembles squatting, but the body is placed on its back. Such a position is difficult to maintain, leaving the possibility that it had been tied (trussed) or had attained *rigor mortis* to a sufficient degree to maintain the posture during backfilling.

In either case, the body position, exceptionally certain, peculiar and disturbing, must represent a posture adopted just before death.

7.2.5

BURIAL 39

Int 52 1991 A J Copp

GRAVE: F36 Fill: 1041 Orientation: NW-SE

High point:	32.83m AOD	Max. length:	1.58m
Low point:	32.31m AOD	Max. width:	0.70m
Min. depth:	0.52m	Area:	1.11m ²

BODY: F74 (1089)

Length: c. 1.60m

Posture: Kneeling, face to floor, knees apart, toes dug in, left arm over back, with hand on base of spine, right arm over right thigh and under trunk.

Identified Bone:

209	R. humerus
210	L. humerus
211	R. radius
207	L. radius
208	L. phalanges (hand)
184	R. femur
183	L. femur
	L. tibia
	L. fibula
206	L. calcaneum & talus

C14 - R. tibia & femur would provide sufficient material

Anatomy: Adult mature (male?) with healed right leg

The excavator suggests that the body would attain the position it was found in if it had been sitting (kneeling?) at the edge of the grave, been hit from behind and pushed in. However, the specialist reported no trauma to the well-preserved skull.

Excavation

Identified at Horizon 2 as a possible grave [N577/1], F36 contained a mixed, very stony backfill (1041). At spit 3 [N587/17], two lengths of body F74 appeared, corresponding to the left and right arms [D43].

The body position was recognised at spit 4, kneeling at the West end of the grave. The East end was blank. In order to confirm the vertebrae, the right arm and left femur and part of the right chest area was removed by excavation [N587/21]. The femurs proved to be exceptionally well preserved.

The excavator's case for the face-down posture [N587/24] was (1) the high position of the pelvis in the grave, with the legs tightly flexed; (2) the stain of the right thigh above the pelvis; (3) the discovery of the ribcage and spine at an early stage (ie high up); (4) the shape of the head, small; and round, suggesting the back of the head. There were no traces of teeth.

Both arms were higher (at 32.62, 32.59) than the backbone (32.40) or skull (32.51), suggesting they were behind the back. The head proved to have been in good condition, with a good set of teeth, confirming the excavator's opinion. Furthermore, the jaws were seen during the removal of the body samples, and the mouth recorded as facing the floor of the grave.

Interpretation:

The body was buried kneeling, with the face against the grave floor, and the hands behind the back. This position must have been taken up by a live body, or supported by trussing or *rigor mortis*.

7.3 Other Early Medieval Features

7.3.1 Timber Foundation in Int. 52

Note that 7.3.1 belongs to Vol. 8i (where it also appears) but it has been left in the present expose, for the sake of completeness of possible timber structures in and around Int. 32.

Int 52

1991

A J Copp

Grid: 202 159

F27/76

Fill: 1030, 1091

High point:	32.82m AOD	Max. length of the arc:	3.00m
Low point:	32.50m AOD	Min. width:	0.85m
Min. depth:	0.32m		

Linear slot (F27/76/77/78) had five postholes (F79-83) along its base.

Excavation

F27 was a feature defined at Horizon 2, and initially identified as a grave [N590/12a].

It was excavated in spits in the normal manner [N590/14a], 5 postholes being counted at spit 3 [N590/17a, 18a]. The whole feature at this point was redefined as F78 [D74].

One small lump of organic stain was located at spit 2 inside F78, F77/1092, recovered as find 157. It was a disc, 50mm in diameter and 20mm thick. "There is no doubt this was a piece of body stain - the colour and texture were typical, but no actual bone survived. The identity of such a small piece must be problematic, but my superficial impression is that it could be a kneecap (patella)". This was the only stain discovered within the fill.

The postholes defined at the base of F78 [N593/10] were:

F79:	diameter 0.55m NW: Lowest point - 32.28m AOD: diameter 0.80m EW: no post pipe: rounded base: no traces of wood
F80:	diameter 0.44m: lowest point - 32.39m AOD: no post pipe
F81:	diameter 0.60m: lowest point - 32.29m AOD: no post pipe: fill included lumps of [N593/4] bedded subsoil
F82:	diameter 0.45m: lowest point - 32.33m AOD: no post pipe
F83:	diameter 0.40m: lowest point - 32.32m AOD: no post pipe: very loose fill

Together these are thought to have formed a fragment of palisade [N593/12].

AJC writes: "There is little doubt that the excavated graves belong to a larger group of Early Medieval burials contacted in Int. 32 and suspected within Int. 38. The Burials mark the western edge of this cemetery and echo the eccentric character of the Burials from the earlier interventions. The palisade slot cannot be assigned to this period with similar confidence. After excavation it was only 3.00m long and 0.85m wide and ran in a continuous slight arc northwest-southeast. It is certainly different in character from the earlier prehistoric linear features which run out across the landscape and which, at best, only contain the most ephemeral and ambiguous traces of posts against the shallow floors.

It is possible that the position of the slot is crucial, lying on the extreme western edge of the Group 1 cemetery, here it is at least 2.00m away from the nearest burial (Burial 38, F35) and equidistant from Burial 37 (F25) and Burial 39 (F36) respectively. The clear evidence of relatively large post pits within the body of the slot suggest the vertical timbers were substantial. A tentative pattern appears if we consider the size and location of each posthole. From the west side the two larger post holes are the first and third pit, F79 and F81 respectively. Behind both lie smaller posts F80 and F82 respectively; F82 was later replaced by another post F83 cut even further back along the slot.. It should be noted that there is no stratigraphic evidence for such a succession of post holes but the series of pits does imply this site was an important position to mark and if we accept an Early Medieval date for this structure it is not too fanciful to suggest this was a totem marking the cemetery or even the site of a gibbet"

The excavator observed that the most westerly post (F79) and the next but one (F81) are the largest. He supposed that F79 and its smaller companion F80 formed a pair, which were replaced by the pair F81 and F82. F83 was a final replacement for the small F82. (He notes, however, that there was no stratigraphic indication for this sequence). Thus, the feature can be seen as one large post, a "support", which was replaced at least once.

He further supposes that this feature should not be prehistoric, owing to its different, sharper character, from the

prehistoric norm. He therefore suggests it to be Early Medieval and, in that context, supposes it to be a "gibbet". "Gibbet" seems too strong: the deepest post here would have been less than half a metre deep, and would have received very little support from a post immediately behind it. A raking shore would have been needed to support a vertical post, which must act as a gibbet. None of the post-impressions, however, showed any signs of an angled position or force.

Nevertheless, the location of this group of posts is suggestive, as the excavator remarks, and they have been studied with others in Interventions 32 and 39 which are possibly Early Medieval.

Interpretation

The identification of this feature is controversial. It was excavated by AJC, but not seen by MOHC. The shape of the final feature is convincing, and given the shape at Horizon 2 which pre-echoes it exactly, it is hard to see why it was dug as a grave. It might, however, have suggested an animal run. Although the general configuration (dished impressions in a slot) suggests a fragment of palisade, the shape and fill are unsatisfactory.

The "banana" shape would be more acceptable if the "palisade" had companion slots. As an isolated slot, its use would be more imaginable if it had been straight.

None of the impressions, individually, offered evidence for a post setting. Their fill was the subsoil that had been excavated from them.

There is also no evidence for dating this feature to the Early Medieval period, apart from a fragment of supposed body stain, the presence of which would be hard to explain.

Such other posts as have been recognised at Sutton Hoo as candidates for Early Medieval structures have contained post-pipes (see below, 7.3.2).

The evidence is not in favour of F27 being an Early Medieval structure. If it is Early6 Medieval, it is more likely (in view of the absence of post-pipes) to represent a single post, removed and replaced several times, than an array of posts.

Its position, relative to the graves, is not particularly suggestive, unless it can be contrived to represent some symbol or advertisement appropriate to the point at which a trackway entered, or passed near to, an execution area.

7.3.2 Features at the Focus of the Graves

Int 32	1985	Various Excavators
--------	------	--------------------

Grid: 213 156

Description

This is a group of features without diagnostic Early Medieval characteristics, but studied because they lay in the centre of the vacant space defined by the graves in Int 32. They comprise a pit, which may have resulted from a tree, and a group of postholes.

The pit, F243, is at the centre of the space. If this is Early Medieval, or later, then so are the features which cut it, F138, F198 and F242. F138 also cuts F183.

F198 was identified as a posthole:

High point:	32.77m AOD	Diameter:	0.40m
Low point:	32.45m AOD	Min. depth:	0.32m

The fill comprised 2071, 2074 and 2075, charcoal-bearing patches within 2058, a charcoal-free silt-sand.

F241 resembled a post-pit and post-setting in plan and section, but the excavator had little confidence in it, suggesting it could be (1) natural subsoil, or (2) part of F243, or (3) the staining from a World War II explosion (1109, 1110). [Int 32 site book 6 September 1986]:

High point:	32.73m AOD		
Low point:	32.60m AOD	Min. depth:	0.13m

F138 was identified as a double or single posthole:

High point:	33.03m AOD	Diameter	0.20m
Low point:	32.53m AOD	Min. depth:	0.50m

Fill: 1025, 1078. Charcoal sample recovered

F183 was declared a non-feature - natural subsoil.

F242 was thought to be a posthole; very shallow:

High point:	32.69m AOD	Diameter:	0.30m
Low point:	32.66m AOD	Min. depth:	0.03m

Its fill (1111) included some charcoal.

F243 was thought to be a geological feature, but it may have been a tree-pit:

High point:	32.81m AOD		
Low point:	32.22m AOD	Min. depth:	0.59m

Only two quadrants were excavated, and the section interpreted as "a Devonian frost-kettle reactivated in the older Dryas it occurs on the junction between heavy gravel (East) and sharp medium sands (?glacial outwash - West)."

However, the full description of the fill 1109 is not inconsistent with its having been a tree-pit. First defined as an elongated area of mottled dark and orange-brown soil. Relatively stone-free and retaining its shape as a damp area during drying of surroundings. Outer margins, particularly to the North and East, defined and lined by a concentration of pitched pebbles and cobbles, many angular. Main central fill with few stones and well -sorted sand - wind-blown?

F178, which was identified as a tree-pit on the surface; it had a tipped stone fill, although much less stony. It had iron-panning along its base; while the iron staining in F243 was confined to the West end and to F241.

However, as both features were naturally formed, some randomness in the sections is inevitable , inhibiting direct equations.

The excavator concluded that "evidently a natural feature of ? periglacial origin". [Int 32 site book 10 Sept. 1986; P J Leach].

F139 was a posthole at grid 2086 1542 and therefore outside the F243 group. It is included as the only posthole outside that group to have had a post-pipe:

High point:	32.80m AOD	Diameter:	0.19m (socket)
Low point:	32.45m AOD	Min. depth:	0.35m

F165 was a posthole at grid 214 159:

High point:	32.84m AOD		
Low point:	32.23m AOD	Min. depth:	0.61m

The post (2063) is square: 150 x 150mm and slopes at c. 30° from the vertical in an easterly direction.

Charcoal was kept from fill 2063, and 1097. Other fills were 1037 and 1098.

F167 (2061, 2062, 1091) was a posthole at grid 2164 1577.

High point:	32.94m AOD	Circular, diameter:	210mm
Low point:	32.35m AOD	Min. depth:	0.59m

F167 cuts the upper fill of ditch F130; the posthole had to be excavated before the upper ditch fill of F130 could be excavated across lane 4. This makes the posthole contemporary with or later than Burial 31. [Site book 18 September 1985].

The post was set vertically and possibly removed eastwards.

F191 (2027, 2050) was a posthole at grid 2130 1534.

High point:	32.76m AOD	Subcircular, diameter:	c. 300mm
Low point:	32.31m AOD	Min. depth:	0.45m

Interpretation

The assignment of the F243 group to the Early Middle Ages and to function is likely to be, and remains, extremely insecure.

A positive interpretation would note the following:

1. F243 is suggestively placed in the near centre of a circle of unexplained graves.
2. It could be a tree-pit, such as are known elsewhere on the site.
3. F198, 138 and possibly F241 are postholes which cut F243. F242, which also cuts F243 is a very shallow post-impression.
4. This array of posts could certainly have held a shored tripod or bipod or a single post, such as would be required for a gibbet.
5. The posts F139, 191, 165, 167 are distinguished by being the only posts with post-pipes (and therefore the only posts?) in Int 32 (with F189 and 198) [3.6.3.2].
6. The posts F139/189, 165, 167, , 191 make a four-post rectangular structure with F243 at its centre.

A negative interpretation would challenge the identification of F243 as a tree-pit and prefer the postholes as prehistoric, with the possible exception of F165.

7.4 Empty, Failed or Unexcavated Graves

7.4.1

Int 20	1984	P J Leach
--------	------	-----------

F38 (Int 20)

F131 (Int 32) Fill: 1060

Grid: 211 154

High point:	32.85m AOD	Max. length:	no info
Low point:	32.35m AOD	Max. width:	no info
Min. depth:	0.50m	Area:	no info

Vertically-sided, flat-bottomed rectangular trench, although oval at bottom on complete excavation.

Fill, 1060, described as "soft clean sand with few stones" "difficult to distinguish from ?natural sand". "Its regularity

as dug may be more apparent than real". There are no plans or sections of the feature. The feature was interpreted as an empty grave cut or natural disturbance of natural origin.

7.4.2

Int 32	1985	S Foster
F180 Suspected grave	Fill: 1077	Orientation: E-W

A rectangular cut with rounded corners, c. 1.7m long. It cuts palisade ditch F135.

Posthole F185 is set into the centre of F180.

High point:	32.80m AOD	Max. length:	1.43m
Low point:	32.33m AOD	Max. width:	0.50m
Min. depth:	0.47m	Area:	0.71m ²

Thought by the excavator to have been "undoubtedly" the grave of a child. The irregular shape of the dug feature and the complete absence of body material do not support this interpretation. The fill (1077) is not a typical grave filling and the feature remains undated and unexplained.

7.4.3

Int 32	1985	J Cane
F215 Possible grave	Fill: 2046	Orientation: NE-SW
Grid:	220 152	

A grave-shaped anomaly parallel to palisade F213. The fill (1046) is not described, but it is recorded as becoming increasingly natural in the East side. The natural edges came in so that the eventual fill was a wedge shape with a maximum depth of about 300mm. There was no trace of body material. Probably a natural feature.

High point:	32.70m AOD	Max. length:	2.10m
Low point:	32.48m AOD	Max. width:	0.85m
Min. depth:	0.22m	Area:	

7.4.4

Int 32	1986	P Bethell
F226 Possible grave	Fill: 2087	Orientation: E-W
Grid:	223 156	

High point:	32.51m AOD	Max. length:	2.2m
Low point:	32.24m AOD	Max. width:	0.40m
Min. depth:	0.27m	Area:	0.88m ²

Possibly cutting F227 (Burial 32/33). The feature was enhanced by spraying with a chemical mixture as part of the Leverhulme research project experiment LTPX1. The feature turned greeny-blue, which enable the edges to be clearly seen.

Posthole F225 stood adjacent halfway along the South side of F226. Part of F226 had been cut away by anti-glider ditch

F228. On excavation, the feature quickly bottomed. The fill showed some tipping from West downwards to East. There was said to be a fragment of body stain 50 x 150mm in size near the NE corner of the feature in a "stratigraphically uncertain" position. It is not impossible that this had been carried over from Grave F227, where the body was already exposed on the floor of F220. F226, a putative grave adjacent proved to be caused by the depression of our own JCB tractor tyre.

No other contact was made and, given its shape, the status of this feature as a grave must be uncertain.

7.4.5

Int 32	1986	P Bethell
F228. Possible grave	Fill: 2087	Orientation: E-W
Grid:	227 156	
High point:	32.51m AOD	Max. length: 1.64m
Low point:	32.40m AOD	Max. width: 0.46m
Min. depth:	0.11m	

A grave-like shape noticed on the surface on re-opening the site of Int 32 in 1986.

On excavation, proved to be a depression from the large wheel of our own JCB mechanical excavator.

7.4.6

Int 32/38	1986	C J D *** [Colm]
F233 possible grave	Fill: 1105	
Grid:	208 160	
High point:	32.86m AOD	Max. diameter: 0.95m
Low point:	32.59m AOD	Min. depth: 0.27m

A shallow, circular pit, thought to contain fragments of body stain at its North and West perimeters. To the North-west of the feature lay the possible grave F234, which F233 is said to have cut. A J Copp [site book Int 38, 17 August 1986] thought the episode might have been a body or part of a body dumped into an open pit. More probably, F233 is a recent pit cutting F234, the identity of which, as a grave, is rendered more probable.

7.4.7

Int 32/38	1986	P J Leach
F234 possible grave	Fill: 1106 (not removed)	Orientation: NW-SE
Grid:	208 161	
High point:	32.90m AOD	

A rectangular shape largely in Int 38 which was not excavated. It may have been a grave.

8. SELECTED STUDIES: MEDIEVAL AND LATER

8.1 *The Anti-glider ditch F220*

Int. 52, 38, 32 and 39 are bisected from NW to SE by a ditch, 2 m wide, known as F220, cut in 1942 as part of a network

of defences against German airborne landings. Stretches of this ditch were excavated in 1985-6, to "decontaminate" the northern part of Int. 32, where it cut ditch F1/130. Only after the removal of the fill of the anti-glider ditch could Burials 32 - 33 be investigated.

END