

Dryleaze Farm, Siddington, Gloucestershire Extraction Phases 1 and 2

for Hills UK Ltd

by Danielle Milbank, Sean Wallis and
Steve Ford
Thames Valley Archaeological
Services Ltd

Site Code DFG 07/101

List of Figures

- Figure 1 Location of site in the Upper Thames Valley showing other selected excavated sites
- Figure 2 Detailed location of site at Siddington
- Figure 3 Plan of excavation areas showing prior evaluation trenches
- Figure 4 Plan showing medieval ridge and furrow and post-medieval features
- Figure 5 Plan showing all excavated features and natural features
- Figure 6 Plan of excavated features in extraction phase 1 north
- Figure 7 Plan of excavated features in extraction phase 1 south
- Figure 8 Plan of excavated features in extraction phase 2 north
- Figure 9 Plan of excavated features in extraction phase 2 south
- Figure 10 Detailed plan and sections of roundhouse 912
- Figure 11 Detailed plan of Burnt mound A
- Figure 12 Sections of Burnt mound A
- Figure 13 Detailed plan of Burnt mound complex B,C, D
- Figure 14 Sections of Burnt mound complex B, C, D
- Figure 15 Plan and section of Burnt mound E
- Figure 16 Plan and section of Burnt mound F
- Figure 17 Plan of ring gully complex 905
- Figure 18 Sections of ring gully complex 905
- Figure 19 Plan of oval enclosure 10004/5/6
- Figure 20 Sections of oval enclosure 1004/5/6
- Figure 21 Detailed plan and sections of roundhouse 10057
- Figure 22 Detailed plan of rectilinear enclosure
- Figure 23 Detailed plan of rectilinear enclosure showing distribution of artefacts
- Figure 24 Sections of rectilinear enclosure
- Figure 25 Sections of northern complex
- Figure 26 Sections of Roman features
- Figure 27 Sections across palaeochannel
- Figures 28 and 29 Pottery and fired clay

Dryleaze Farm, Extraction Phases 1 and 2, Siddington, Gloucestershire 2011

Archaeological excavation

by Danielle Milbank, Sean Wallis and Steve Ford

With contributions by Steve Crabb, Ceri Falys, Steve Ford, Chris Green, Matilda Holmes, Rosalind McKenna, Jane Timby and Dan Young

Report 07/101

Summary

An open area excavation took place prior to mineral extraction and revealed multi-period use of the site over a long span. Neolithic activity consisted of a few pits and stray finds of struck flint, with one pit containing Grooved Ware. Early Bronze Age activity comprised pits containing Beaker pottery and stray finds of the same and an unusually early post-built roundhouse. Certain and probable middle Bronze Age activity comprised a number of burnt mounds located on the margins of a palaeochannel. Iron Age activity commenced on the site with a ring gully complex followed by a rectilinear enclosure and a funnel-shaped enclosure, all of which are thought to be related to animal husbandry. Two small areas of unenclosed Iron Age occupation were also noted. A trackway complex which extends for several hundred metres on aerial photographs has Iron Age origins and was a dominant landscape feature into Roman times; it also seems to have influenced the layout of medieval cultivation. Roman activity was slight but comprised the digging of an elongated enclosure ditch which utilized the long established Iron Age trackway and enclosure ditch. Prior to late post-medieval enclosure and farming, the higher land was occupied by medieval ridge and furrow.

Introduction

This report documents the results of an archaeological excavation carried out at Dryleaze Farm, Siddington, Gloucestershire (SU0290 9760) (Fig. 1). The work was commissioned by Mr Andrew Liddle, of Hills Quarry Products Ltd, Ailesbury Court, High Street, Marlborough, Wiltshire, SN8 1AA.

Planning permission (CT/2150/F) has been gained from Gloucestershire County Council to extract gravel from a c. 55ha parcel of land at Dryleaze Farm. The consent has been gained with a condition (38) which required a programme of archaeological works to excavate and record archaeological deposits prior to extraction or other damage. This report relates to the phase 1 and 2 extraction areas, comprising 4.2ha and 2.5ha respectively. The excavation was carried out to a specification approved by Mr Charles Parry, Senior Archaeological Officer with Gloucestershire County Council was carried out between the 20th November

2007 and 20th September 2009. Phase 1 was supervised by Sean Wallis and Phase 2 by Danielle Milbank. The site code is DFG 07/101. The archive is currently held by Thames Valley Archaeological Services, 47-49 De Beauvoir Road, Reading, RG1 5NR and will be deposited with Corinium Museum in due course.

Topography and geology

The site lies close to the boundary between Wiltshire and Gloucestershire in the Upper Thames Valley. It is located c.1km north-west of the village of South Cerney, and c.2.5km to the south of Cirencester in Gloucestershire (Fig. 1). It lies to the west of the A419 which follows the path of the Ermin Street (the Roman road from Silchester to Gloucester). The site consists of a rectangular parcel of arable land (Fig. 2), which lies on the First Gravel Terrace (BGS 1974). The gravels of the Upper Thames Valley are the result of the deposition of largely calcareous material, derived from the northern limestone outcrops washed down by post-glacial rivers. The gravel was observed throughout the excavation area and the site lies at a height of approximately 95m above Ordnance Datum.

Although referred to in the quarry operation and for planning purposes as Phases of extraction, these phases are really areas and will be referred to in this report as Areas to avoid confusion with archaeological phases.

Archaeological background

Evaluation (OAU 2002) comprising geophysical survey and machine trenching was carried out in the area following an earlier desk-based assessment (OAU 2001). This demonstrated the presence of concentrations of archaeological deposits in the six fields that make up the extraction area. These included at least three prehistoric ring ditches, Iron Age settlement sites, a long sinuous Roman track way, a probable medieval enclosure together with areas of undated features, palaeochannels and areas of small-scale quarrying. A watching brief was carried out in 2007 during enabling works, which consisted of small areas of topsoil stripping in advance of insertion of a road tunnel for a conveyor belt link, but did not reveal any deposits of archaeological interest (no report).

Area 1 (Fig. 3) encompasses several areas of archaeological deposits identified by the preliminary geophysical survey and subsequent trial trenching, as summarized in the evaluation report (OAU 2002, fig. 13). To the east, centred on evaluation trench 105, an Iron Age occupation complex was identified and elsewhere, in trenches 86 and 90 to the north, further Iron Age deposits were recorded. Other trenches (86, 87, 89, 95, 97, 98, 102, 110–112, 116 and 117) revealed undated features and some medieval ridge and furrow. Evaluation features discussed below are distinguished by trench number so: 105/5.

A trackway, aligned north-south within the eastern side of Area 1 and visible on aerial photographs was examined by these trenches but did not produce dating evidence. However, the evaluation elsewhere indicated it was of Roman date. Three areas of extensive disturbance in trenches 103, 109 and parts of 111 may indicate previous quarrying of uncertain but probably post-medieval date.

Recent work at Shorncote Quarry (Cotswold Community) has indicated a wide range of sites and finds in this area (Powell *et al.* 2010; Oram and Ford 2010; Weale and Preston 2010). The scale of the proposal and the presence of deposits with palaeoenvironmental potential seemed to offer the promise of a landscape perspective of the whole ecosystem at various times in the past.

Sites nearby, in both Wiltshire and Gloucestershire, have seen significant archaeological research in recent years (e.g., Ashton Keynes, Somerford Keynes, Fairford, Kempsford, Latton, Cricklade). Extensive mineral extraction programmes have offered unprecedented access to large tracts of past landscapes, which, while offering few particularly notable or remarkable individual ‘sites’ in the conventional sense, have provided substantive advances in our understanding of the spatial organization of past societies over long chronological spans. This has long been an aspect of the archaeological record in need of addressing, and these are important opportunities to answer the types of questions archaeologists have long wanted, and been unable, to ask.

National research agendas have recently been defined for a number of periods, and regional research agendas have been produced or are in production, for a number of regions. For the Iron Age (Haselgrove *et al.* 2001), the Upper Thames Valley is highlighted as one of the few areas with an already well-established basic framework on which to hang more progressive research. ‘With their abundant data sets, these are often the areas best suited to the evaluation of new theoretical interpretations through fieldwork or analysis of existing material’ (Haselgrove *et al.* 2001, 24). For the Roman period, several authors have urged a more holistic approach to sites, landscapes, geographies and economies (James and Millett 2001, *passim*)

Recent long-awaited publication of a number of related sites in the Upper Thames Valley has highlighted the need for a broad landscape perspective, focusing attention on issues of human/landscape interaction and perceptions, regionality and once again underlined the importance of developing more reliable locally-based chronologies (Miles *et al.* 2007).

The fieldwork described below was preceded by a small watching brief during construction of a conveyor belt tunnel to the south of the site. Nothing of archaeological interest was revealed in this phase of work.

The Excavation

Summary

The excavation areas were stripped of topsoil and subsoil using 360° type machines fitted with toothless grading buckets under constant archaeological supervision. There was significant survival of ridge and furrow across Area 1, while Area 2 had extensive areas of alluvium- and peat-filled palaeochannel (Fig. 4). Linear features, including ditches and gullies, were encountered, in addition to numerous discrete features (pits and postholes, and significant numbers of tree boles) (Fig. 5). The archaeological features were excavated by hand and represent four main phases of activity, in the earlier Prehistoric (Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age), the Middle Iron Age, Roman activity of broadly 2nd century date, and Medieval ridge and furrow ploughing. In addition, numerous undated features were recorded. The ridge and furrow and tree boles have been omitted from the detail plans for clarity.

Phase 1 Prehistoric

Phase 1a Early Neolithic?

A single feature is tentatively dated to this period. Pit 326 (Fig. 7) was oval in plan, 1.09m long and 0.7m wide and was 0.52m deep. It had steeply sloping sides and a concave base and contained five fills (665–9). It contained 12 struck flints, an unusually high density for this location, seven of which were narrow flakes. It also contained 122 sherds (354g) of pottery though 107 of these (90g) were undiagnostic crumbs. The pottery is in a fabric consistent with the Iron Age fabrics present on the site, yet the association with the struck flint is taken to be more compelling evidence of date in this instance. Sieving for charred plant remains produced hazel nutcase fragments and a few wheat and weed seeds.

Phase 1b Late Neolithic/ Early Bronze Age

Features of this period were widely scattered across the area excavated.

Roundhouse 912

A single round house is attributed to this phase, located towards the north west portion of Area 2 (Fig. 8). The roundhouse comprises eight postholes (1328–34, 1338–9) in an imperfect circle with a diameter of 4m (Fig. 10). The postholes were 0.23–0.6m across and 0.12–0.2m deep. There is no obvious location in the plan for an entrance although the south-east facing gap between 3338 and 3339 is the widest. There were two internal

postholes (1336–7) and a pit or possibly a tree hole (1334) and posthole (1345) outside but nearby. Two sherds of grog-tempered pottery, a few scraps of fired clay and some burnt stone were the only artefacts recovered from these features. Sieving for charred plant remains produced a little charcoal. A radiocarbon date of 2203–2018 cal BC (KIA43682) was obtained on charcoal from posthole 1333. The radiocarbon date places the structure in the Early Bronze Age, a period when relatively few house remains are recorded (Darvill and Thomas 1996) despite numerous landscape scale archaeological investigations in subsequent years. For this structure, there is a little corroborative artefactual association in the form of a few sherds of grog-tempered pottery of probable Early Bronze Age date and whilst there is always the need for a degree of reasonable doubt as to whether the dating evidence is residual, there is no over-riding reason to distrust the chronology of this structure.

Pits

Pit 112 was shallow (0.23m deep), 1.20m long and 1.10m wide, with gently sloping sides and a concave base. It produced 26 sherds of Beaker-type pottery, with six of the sherds showing traces of decoration. It was infilled with 181, which was a grey brown silt clay deposit with gravel inclusions. This feature was fairly isolated, with a further undated small pit (113) nearby but no other associated features (Fig. 7).

Pit 400 was oval in plan (0.38m long and 0.20m wide) and 0.17m deep, with a v-shaped profile. It was infilled with deposit 765 (dark red brown clay silt with occasional gravel inclusions), from which 45 sherds of Grooved ware pottery, typical of the later Neolithic period, were recovered. Although this small feature could conceivably be a posthole, its isolated position (Fig. 6) suggests it is a small pit. A sample of fill 765 was floated and processed through 0.5mm mesh for finds and environmental evidence, however nothing was recovered which might indicate the function of the pit (for example, grain storage).

Pit 222 (Fig. 7) was oval in plan, 0.9m long and 0.5m wide and was 0.4m deep. It had a deep bowl-shaped profile and contained two fills (461–2). The only artefacts it contained were a burnt flint scraper and 6 unidentifiable fragments (27g) of bone and sieving for charred plant remains produced only burnt hazel nutcase fragments. Apart from pit 326 (above) only one other fragment of hazelnut was recovered from elsewhere on the site. The association of hazelnut exploitation with early prehistoric occupation is well demonstrated and whilst this observation in itself is not conclusive dating, it may be indicative that this feature is of earlier prehistoric date.

Cremation burial 727(Pl 9)

This feature comprised an oval pit up to 0.78m across and 0.11m deep, again isolated from other features (Fig. 6). It contained 604g of cremated bone representing an un-sexed adult but also included several fragments of burnt antler or horn. Seven crumbs of pottery (4g) recovered were unidentifiable and thus the date of the feature is not known. Charcoal recovered by sieving was of oak.

Cremation deposit 1319

This feature comprised an oval pit up to 0.7m across and 0.1m deep, again isolated from other features (Fig. 8). It contained only 207g of cremated bone representing an un-sexed adult. Six crumbs of pottery (2g) recovered were unidentifiable and thus the date of the feature is not known but considered to be prehistoric. Charcoal recovered by sieving was of hazel and salix.

Fence 913 (Pl. 12)

A straight double-fence aligned north-south, lies to the north west of Area 2 broadly parallel to the palaeochannel (Fig. 8). In plan the fence consists of two lines of postholes but which only form a double fence line for a part of the total length. The spacing of the posts is regular at c. 1.7m. The eastern fence comprises 12 postholes (1410, 1412, 1414, 1415, 1418–19, 1421–4, 1426–7) and is 21m long. The western fence comprises 9 posts (1409, 1411, 1413, 1416–17, and 1420) and is 16m long, excluding an outlying post (1425) paired up with 1424.

The posts are typically 0.29–0.55m across and 0.18–0.24m deep. No artefactual dating evidence was recovered from any of the postholes. Sieving for charred plant remains recovered only a little oak, willow and hazel charcoal from three postholes (1421, 1407, 1422).

Phase 1c Middle Bronze Age

Four burnt mounds were located on the northern part of this Area 2, all within 50m of one another (Fig. 8). These features were all immediately adjacent to the palaeochannel deposits and three were stratified within the peat and/or alluvium (Fig. 5). Initially, the higher parts of the structures were revealed when overburden was removed by machine but it became clear that the dumps of stone extended beneath adjacent areas of alluvium. This latter material was removed by hand to reveal the full extent of the stone spreads.

Mound A (Pls 10 and 11)

Mound A is noteworthy in that it has the layout of a classic burnt mound (Raymond 1987; Barber 1990) with a crescentic mound form and trough at the centre (Fig. 11). Both east and west profiles (Fig. 12) suggest that the mound material lay within a slight hollow with the trough on a raised platform. Presumably the trough site was located for its slight pre-eminence in this generally low-lying setting. The mound was 12m across (east-west) with the mound material up to 5m wide. It had a height of 0.2m. Although the mound was broadly composed of burnt stone and charcoal in a dark grey silty clay matrix, it was possible to discern several layers, with element 1512, for example showing three overlapping layers (2377–8, 2386) (Fig 12). Whilst there is little to suggest significant breaks in the formation of the mound (as might be evidenced by the formation of soil or alluvium differentiating these layers), the layer presumably reflect episodic use of the site and the mound formation. A radiocarbon date was obtained on *Salix* (Poplar) charcoal from the within mound matrix (1505, layer 2292) of 1520–1408 cal BC (KIA43683). Only a single find came from the mound, a serrated flint flake from segment 1512 (2386).

Sieving for charred plant remains of the mound matrix was surprising productive for material other than wood charcoal. Wheat and other (unidentified) cereal were abundant as were cereal processing by-products. Barley and oats were also present. Smaller amounts of hazelnut (shell) and peas occurred along with a variety of weed seeds.

Beneath the mound material and extending beyond its limits beneath adjacent areas of alluvium was a buried soil (2387, 2296). This contained relatively little burnt stone, no artefacts and a modest amount of wood charcoal, a few cereal seeds and nut shell fragments.

The eastern limb of the mound was partially buried by grey alluvium (2375) whereas the western limb cut an area of brown alluvium.

At the focus of the crescent was a sub-rectangular pit (1341). The pit was 1.3m wide and 2.5m long with a bowl-shaped profile but which was much steeper at the southern end. The pit was 0.3m deep with five fills (2150, 2088–90, 2099) which was predominantly burnt stone with a charcoal-rich silty clay matrix. There was no trace of either a wooden or stone trough lining. A single flint flake was recovered from the fill (2089). Sieving for charred plant remains revealed a little hazel and willow wood charcoal only.

Inside the area defined by the crescent and gully 914 (see below) were 16 small pits and postholes (1402–5, 1432–40, 1444–6), ten of which occurred in apparent pairs. Another posthole (1515) cut the northern end of

the mound. Features 1402–5 1432, 1437–8, 1440 and 1444, are certainly or probably postholes, with 1432, 1437 and 1438 including a quantity of burnt stone gravel presumably as packing material. Features 1434–6, 1439 and 1445–6 are much wider relative to their depth and are likely to be small pits, not containing burnt stone. The features do not obviously form a ground plan indicative of a structure though they are all to be found within the zone defined by the crescent but not beneath the mound material (and one cut into the very edge of this). No finds were recovered from this group of features but a little hawthorn charcoal, wheat and hazel nut shell came from pit 1445 (2272) and *Salix*/Poplar charcoal from 1444 (2271).

Gully 914

A 9m length of curvilinear gully lay about 3m north of mound A (Figs 11 and 12). It was orientated approximately east-west with a curvature focussed on the trough (1341) at the centre of the mound complex and is considered to be a related component. The gully was 0.42m across and 0.37m deep with two fills but contained no artefacts. Sieving produced a little wood charcoal only.

Mounds B-C-D (Figs 13, 14)

This set of burnt stone deposits comprised an irregular oval 7m x 9m across which lies on the western margin of a gravel island. It was buried by peaty alluvium (2486). It comprises a complex of deposits representing re-use on several occasions with pits lying beneath some stone deposits, and others cut through. It is possible that these pits served as troughs.

Mound B

The earliest deposit is represented by a layer of burnt stone (2482) forming mound B. This material infills the markedly irregular (almost pock-marked) surface of the natural gravel geology (in such a marked hollow it has been given cut number 1533, although it is almost certainly natural). It is possible that this deposit relates to pit 1540 to the north which is also early in the stratigraphic sequence, or the possible pit 1547 to the north east. Layer 2482 was up to 0.2m thick. It contained a small clearly intrusive piece of Roman pottery. Sieving for charred plant remains recovered only a single cereal seed (2482).

Pit 1540 was 1.55m x 1.9m across and 0.5m deep. It revealed a complex infill with both burnt-stone rich and stone-free layers present. It appears to have been recut on at least one occasion (as 1603) and possibly more

than once. Sieving for charred plant remains recovered only charcoal of hazel and *Salix* (from layer 2495). A radiocarbon date of 1776–1625 cal BC (KIA43684) was obtained on *Salix*/Poplar charcoal from layer 2495.

Mound C

Mound C was a slightly crescentic shape forming the south-east quadrant of the deposit complex, perhaps with pit 1534 at its focus to the north-west as, stratigraphically, mound B was cut by pit 1534. Pit 1534 was 0.8m across and 0.1m deep with a silty clay containing much burnt stone. Mound C was 4.5m by 2.5m across and just 0.07m thick. It was overlain by a thin skim of peaty alluvium (2486) and occupied a slight hollow in the gravel which was infilled with a brown silty clay buried soil (2484).

Mound D

This irregular lobate- shaped deposit formed the northern portion of this complex of deposits. It was 7m x 6m across but again only 0.03m deep at thickest. Stratigraphically, it overlies Mound B and pit 1534 and it partly infilled pit 1540 before the latter was re-cut by pit 1640. It is possible that Mound D relates to possible pit 1547. Pit 1547 was oval shaped, 0.6m across and 0.2m deep infilled with a grey silty clay (2557). It was overlain by peaty alluvium but contained no burnt stones and might not even be of archaeological origin, as the surface of the natural gravel here was so uneven.

Assuming that there is a direct correlation between the mound formations and the pit/troughs on the complex, it is unclear which dump deposit the use of recut 1603 would relate to, though any dumping of stone on top of mounds D or C may not have been recognisable. Pit 1441 to the north west of Mound D revealed a complex fill of alternating bands of gravel and peaty silt, but contained no artefacts nor burnt stone.

Mound E

This small mound formed the southernmost of this type of feature on the site, some 25m south of the B-C-D complex (Fig. 8). It was exposed when the overlying subsoil was removed and did not appear to have been buried by any alluvium. It lay on the margins of a gravel 'island' surrounded by peat and alluvium. It comprised a kidney-shaped feature, 4.4m across and 1.5m wide with a maximum thickness of 0.1m (Fig. 15). The structure

seems to largely be homogenous in its formation with no evidence of discrete dump components. The mound lay on top of a deposit of grey alluvium (2453). Two shallow pits (1524,1525) up to 0.1m deep were substantially infilled with burnt stone, lay to the north. The only finds recovered were a single struck flint from segment 1514 (2391) Sieving for charred plant remains only recovered small amounts of highly fragmented wood charcoal.

Mound F

This sub-circular ‘mound’ of burnt stone lay 30m to the east of Mound A on the edge of a gravel island but within the palaeochannel. It was partly overlain by grey alluvium. It was 5m across and occupied a shallow hollow (Fig. 16). It had a height of 0.2m though the lower fill of the hollow (2461) had little stone. Use of the word ‘mound’ is a misnomer, as the material here had a near level surface. The only finds recovered were a flint flake and core from 1530 and 10 sherds of Roman pottery from the overlying alluvium (2469) in slot 1529. Sieving for charred plant remains only recovered small amounts of hazel charcoal.

Immediately to the south was an oval pit (1431) which was 1.2m by 0.9m across but only 0.18m deep with a bowl-shaped profile. It contained three fills most of which contained burnt stone, but with fire reddened clay in parts. It is possible that this feature was a trough though it is perhaps too shallow and small and may be better interpreted as a hearth where the stone was heated.

The mound and alluvium was traversed by ditch 916 which had been substantially recut (1516). No dating evidence was recovered from ditch 916.

The palaeochannel

Three bespoke sections, 1428,1430 and the southern baulk (Figs 9 and 27) were dug by machine across the deepest parts of the palaeochannel to record the full stratigraphic profile and take environmental samples. The descriptions are presented in Appendix 8 and results of the analysis presented below.

Phase 2 Iron Age

There appears to be a hiatus in the use of the site, at least in terms of the cutting of subsoil features, for the best part of a millennium. No features are recorded of later Bronze Age date (though many are undated) and no pottery or other material culture recovered can be attributed to this period. A small (16%) part of the calibrated

radiocarbon date for ring gully structure 905 lies within the late Bronze Age, though the main part of the date lies within the Early Iron Age. In the interim, it is assumed that the open grassland environment, indicated by analysis of the environmental sequence provided by the palaeochannel deposits, is maintained by grazing. The majority of the remaining features to be described on the site are assigned to this period though a significant proportion are undated. There is clearly some time depth to the Iron Age activity on the site, with both stratigraphic relationships indicative of development, and a progressive series of radiocarbon dates. However, the main dating evidence, pottery, does little to assist in fine tuning the chronological development of the Iron Age deposits.

The narrative that follows divides the Iron Age deposits into three units; an earlier phase (2a), a later phase with subdivisions (2b) and a broad Iron Age phase which incorporates the majority of the deposits which cannot be placed into the sub-divisions.

Phase 2a (Early Iron Age)

To the east of the main Iron Age complex (in Area 1) and on the edge of the palaeochannel in Area 2 was a complex of features, the most distinctive of which were a penannular ring gully (905) and a short length of trackway (903/904). On the basis of a radiocarbon date this complex of features is considered to be one of the earliest Iron Age components on the site.

Ring gully 905 (Pl. 13)

This ring gully formed about 50% of the circumference of a circle which was 10m across, but with its western margins lost beneath the baulk (Figs 17 and 18). It is possible that the gully was not circular and a return was formed by gully 1135/1137. The ring gully is approached by a trackway whose sides are marked by gullies 903 and 904 with ring gully terminal (1206) respecting the position of trackway ditch 904 and terminating 1m short of the latter. It is considered that the trackway and ring gully form one structural complex. The ring gully has evidence of only a single phase of infilling and was typically 0.4m wide and 0.2m deep. Some 51 sherds of pottery were recovered, all of which came from the eastern portions of the feature. A few fragments of animal bone came from terminal 1206 only. Sieving for charred plant remains produced only a little wood charcoal from terminal 1206 with similar material from later gully 1240/1224.

Gully 1135/1137

This straight section of gully was of similar dimensions to the ring gully being 0.3m wide and 0.1m deep. It is possible that it is a continuation of the ring gully circuit, though if correct the ground plan would now be less circular.

Roundhouse 909

Within the ring gully circuit was a group of postholes and small pits, and it is possible that these formed a round house structure (909). The preferred circuit comprises 6 posts (1114–6, 1226, 1225, 1223) with a diameter of 5.7m. These postholes were all between 0.2–0.3m deep and 0.25–0.5m across. Posthole 1223 was the only feature to produce any finds which comprised 12 sherds of pottery. An alternative plan for a post-built structure would comprise 5 features (1203–4, 1114–6 and 1226) with a diameter of 6m. However, features 1203 and 1204 unlike the other nearby features contained quantities of burnt stone and may be small pits related to a cooking function rather than being structural. Sieving for charred plant remains was unsuccessful.

Trackway 903/904

This short trackway comprised two parallel lengths of gully 3m apart. The shorter element (903) was 5.8m long with well defined terminals, where as 904 was 10m but with the eastern terminal lost in an area of peat. The gullies were larger than the ring gully being 0.7–0.85m wide and 0.3–0.35m deep. A radiocarbon determination of (most likely) 566–402 cal BC (KIA43681) on wood charcoal was obtained from the terminal (1205) of gully 904, with a possibility of an earlier period being represented (see Appendix 10). Both terminals close to the ring gully produced sherds of pottery with 1148 producing a little animal bone. Sieving for charred plant remains produced only wood charcoal, some of which was from hazel and *Salix*/poplar.

Other features

To the south of the ring gully complex are a further series of linear and curvilinear gullies along with pits and postholes (Fig. 17). It is unclear how these relate to the ring gully complex in time or layout. Several features produced Iron Age pottery and a few produced a few bone fragments. Sieving for charred plant remains was again largely unproductive with just wood charcoal present in a few features but including hazel, ash, *Salix* and buckthorn represented in pit 1130.

Phase 2b (Middle Iron Age)

Oval Enclosure 10004–6 (Pl. 1)

Two ditches (10004 and 10005) in the eastern half of Area 1 were of segmented form and broadly aligned north-south though sinuous in plan (Figs 19 and 20). It is considered that they produced an elongated oval enclosure which was 100m long perhaps incorporating a funnel arrangement at the southern end, suggesting a livestock management function. The ditches were 16m apart at the northern end, with the gap between them varying up to 30m, then curving back together to create a narrow neck between the two gullies, approximately 9m wide, at the south. An additional short length of ditch at the southern end (10006) perpendicular to 10005 appears to have formed an entrance 9m wide opening on the south-western side.

Ditch 10004 was examined by 16 slots (21, 23, 25, 143, 145, 200, 203, 207, 208, 209, 210, 213, 218, 219, 225 and 308) and was 107m long. The width of the ditch varied from 1.15m to 3.25m and the depth varied from 0.25m to 0.73m deep. The profile of the ditch varied too, from steep sided to slightly irregular sided with a concave to flattish base. It contained in total 39 sherds of pottery of Iron Age date. Slot 21 (deposit 78) also contained a fragment of copper alloy pin. Ditch 10005 examined by 19 slots (8, 20, 24, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, 41, 125, 133, 134, 138, 139, 141, 144, 206, 226 and 237) was 102m long, between 0.33m and 1.9m wide and 0.20m to 0.38m deep. The base of the ditch was flat to slightly concave, and the sides were steeply to moderately sloping. It contained in total 346 sherds of Iron Age pottery, most of which (262 sherds) came from the northern terminal 206.

Ditch 10006 was 7m long with 2 slots investigated (22, 26). It was 2.2m wide and 0.34m deep. No finds were recovered.

It is noteworthy that the majority of the pottery and bone recovered from the enclosure came from the eastern ditch, 10005 and that it also came from the terminals of the various segments, and most particularly the northern terminal. Apart from wood charcoal and a few weed seeds, cereal remains were conspicuously absent from sieved samples. The interior of the enclosure contained three clusters of smaller features.

Pit groups

A tight cluster of 6 pits (221–4, 229–30) with 5 postholes nearby (234, 241–2, 246–7) lay towards the north end of the interior of the enclosure. There was no dating evidence and the only artefacts recovered were 6 fragments of animal bone from pit 222.

A second loose group of 6 pits (329–31, 334–6) and a post hole (332) lay just beyond the northern entrance to the enclosure. There was no dating evidence recovered.

Gully pair A

Where the main enclosure narrows at the south and on the west (interior) side of ditch 10005 was a pair of short gullies (10007 and 10008), aligned east-west *c.*4m apart (Fig. 19). Their eastern ends cut into the infilled enclosure ditch but it seems likely they were at least partly contemporary with it. These gullies were both 3m long, 0.50m wide and 0.34m deep and infilled with single deposits. Six small sherds of Iron Age pottery were recovered from slot 34 with 3 fragments of animal bone and 25g of cremated human bone from slot 29. Their position abutting the boundary of the main enclosure is to form a three-sided structure, such as might be used as an animal pen.

Gully pair B

To the north of these, again on the western side of 10005 was a further pair of parallel gullies (10009 and 10010) aligned NW–SE which were *c.*3m apart, and 7.5m long. These were excavated in slots 214 and 236, and 220 and 227. Gully 10009 was 0.35–0.58m wide, and 0.21–0.33m deep, while gully 10010 was 0.50–0.55m wide and 0.18–0.22m deep, and both gullies were steep sided, with concave bases. Gully 1009 was partially recut at its west end (215) (Fig. 20). Both gullies contained quantities of Middle Iron Age pottery. Stratigraphically, the relationship between these two gullies and ditch 10005 was unclear though for 10010 there was an indication that 227 cut 226. Nevertheless their spatial position again is such that they must be using the boundary of the enclosure to form a three sided structure, such as an animal pen. Post holes 232-3 and 244-5 may have supported this function, perhaps holding gates. Post-hole 232 contained twelve sherds of Iron Age pottery.

Gully pair C

Towards the centre of the enclosure were two short lengths of gully (243, 231) approximately parallel to each other and 5m apart. Gully 243 was slightly curvilinear, 6m long, 0.51m across and 0.3m deep and produced 6 sherds of Iron Age pottery and a fragment of animal bone. Gully 231 just was 3m long, 0.52m across and 0.25m deep (Fig. 20) but produced 106 (very small) sherds of Iron Age pottery. It is possible that these gullies formed part of an occupied structure with a diameter of *c.* 5m. However, they are similar to gully pairs A and B and, with the use of temporary hurdling, may also have been a form of animal pen.

Potentially also related to enclosure 10005 were short stretches of ditch 238, 239 which only just appeared on the east edge of the excavated area and appeared to respect the line of 10005. Ditch 239 contained two small sherds of Iron Age pottery.

Gully 10014

A length of gully was aligned east- west and was 10m long. It was 1.1m wide and 0.6m deep with two fills and was truncated by Roman ditch 10011 but presumably its western terminal respected the presence of the main north-south hollow way. It contained 1 sherd of Iron Age pottery but sieving revealed no charred plant remains. It is unclear how this gully related to enclosure 10004 if at all.

Southern posthole cluster and roundhouse 10057

A cluster of small pits and postholes lay just beyond the southern end of the oval enclosure 10004/5 (Figs 19, 21). Three of these features (101, 104 and 6) produced 4 sherds of Iron Age pottery, but the remainder were undated.

It is possible to discern a near-circular pattern amongst the posthole cluster with a diameter of 11.5m and which may indicate the presence of a roundhouse. If this interpretation is accepted, it can be seen that the structure lies at the centre of the cluster with other features in a broad arc around it, though this pattern may be exaggerated due to the presence of the limit of excavation just to the east. The circuit comprised 9 postholes (6, 102-3, 106, 108-9, 127-8 and 132). The postholes were typically 0.29-0.5m across (feature 102 being up to 0.95m across was the exception) and 0.07-0.4m deep (Fig. 21). Of these features, 6 and 102, being wide but shallow are the least convincing as postholes. Several of these features contained burnt stone. There is no indication of where the entrance lay. Four postholes (45, 104-5, 107) lay within the circuit, but formed no particular pattern.

As an alternative interpretation, it is also possible to identify a near square configuration of four postholes (105, 106, 107 and 109) though with a spacing between the posts of c. 3.4m, this seems an unlikely candidate for a four-post structure. As so often with clusters of undated post-holes, other structural arrangements are possible but none especially convincing.

A second cluster of postholes, with small pits and a linear feature are present 20m further to the south of the main cluster (Fig. 7). These are located immediately adjacent to the south-eastern corner of the excavated phase 1 area and are presumably a part of a larger group of features, the significance of which cannot be established at present. Ditch terminal 7 produced 45 sherds of Iron Age pottery.

Enclosure 10015

The most dense area of Middle Iron Age deposits on the site is contained within a roughly rectilinear enclosure ditch (10015, 10017, 10018) in the centre of Area 1 (Figs 5 and 7). Three sides of an enclosure were recorded (Fig. 22) with a likely fourth side located beyond the eastern limit of excavation, or perhaps formed by a stream. An entrance lay on the northern side. The enclosure was at least 53m east–west wide and 44m north–south. In plan the enclosure had an unorthodox layout with an original ditch (10015) being extended by an L-shaped addition (10017) to complete the circuit. There are several stratigraphic relationships present within the enclosure and a broad sequence of development can be determined

Phase 2bi Pre-enclosure features

It is entirely possible that many, even the majority of features within the circuit of the enclosure could pre-date the digging of the main ditches and neither stratigraphy nor artefactual remains can assist in elucidating this further. However, the exception to this is presented by two lengths of gully truncated by ditch 10017. Gully 10019 which was 0.7m wide and 9.25m deep seemingly extends the line of ditch 10015 for a further 8m. It is possible that this was an initial extension to the main enclosure or possibly was an earlier version of the main enclosure which was mostly removed when the latter was dug. Gully 10020 is truncated by both 10017 and 10021. It was 0.30–0.78m wide and 0.10–0.17m deep. No dating evidence was recovered. An alternative interpretation is that 10019 and 10020 are later than 10015 forming the northern side of the enclosure, subsequently replaced by 10017/10018.

Phase 2bii

Ditch 10015 (Pls 4 and 7)

This ditch was excavated in 10 slots (240, 301, 306, 346, 432, 502, 608, 618, 639 and 643). In plan the southern and western elements formed a reversed J-shape with the northern element terminating (502) after a distance of 11m from an eastward return. The ditch was 2–2.9m wide and 0.63–1.06m deep with a U-shaped profile. Several fills were sometimes present (Fig. 24). A radiocarbon determination of 404–231 cal BC (KIA43679) on a tooth was obtained from the middle fill (566) of slot 301. The ditch was not recut as an entity, though its western element was later followed by Roman ditches 10011/10048 and 10013 (Figs 22, 24). A total of 30 fragments of Iron Age pottery were recovered from 10015.

Ditches 10017 and 10018

The northern terminal of 10015 was subsequently joined by an L-shaped ditch of similar proportions but aligned at right-angles (10017). It was excavated in five slots (105/2, 430, 504, 516 and 540). It measured between 1.8–2.21m wide and 0.62–0.94m deep, with steep sides and a concave base, matching the profile of 10015. It contained 34 sherds of pottery. The line of 10017 continued to the east as ditch 10018 with the two termini forming an entrance 4.2m wide. Ditch 10018 was 1.7m wide and 0.45m deep and terminus 523 contained 5 sherds of pottery.

Ditch 10023

Ditch 10023 (slots 541 and 548) was a short length of ditch mostly truncated by 10021. Its position close to the enclosure entrance gap between 10017 and 10018 may relate to control of the entrance and it may have been replaced and enhanced by ditch 10021. It was 0.78m wide and 0.27–0.33m deep. It contained 203 sherds of Middle Iron Age pottery.

Ditch 10021

A segment of L-shaped ditch had been dug 2m to the south of, and almost blocking the entrance formed by 10017 and 10018. If contemporary with the main enclosure, it would have served to divert incoming traffic either to the left through a 2.2m gap, or right through a 1.45m gap. Ditch 10021 was examined by 4 slots (520, 530, 547 and 549) and was 1.04–1.1m wide and 0.44–0.79m deep, with steep sides and a concave to flattish base. It contained 59 sherds of Iron Age pottery.

Ditch complex 10022, 10025, 10026, 10027

There were several further short lengths of gully ditch in the environs of the entrance which form a rectilinear arrangement and respect the positions of each other. For example, 10027 and 10025 form a rectilinear plan that butts the eastern terminal of ditch 10021. Another element, 10022, lies parallel to 10027 butts 10021 but also terminates just as it cuts into 10026. Gully 10027 was 0.7m wide but only 0.07m deep, ditch 10025 was 1m wide and 0.57m deep and ditch 537 was 1.1m wide and 0.75m deep. Seventeen sherds of pottery were recovered from gully 10027 and 10026 contained 14 more.

Another curved length of gully, 10028, lay immediately north of the entrance and could also be related to controlling traffic flow in this area, although the reason for its positioning is not clear; it was of similar dimensions and profile to 10021 but contained no pottery and is phased here only speculatively.

Phase 2biii

Ditch 10033

Ditch 10033 was aligned east–west and formed a major subdivision of enclosure 10015. It was at least 51m long terminating (647) in the west where it stopped just short of enclosure ditch 10015 but extending out of Area 1 to the east. There was no indication that it extended as far as Area 2. It was excavated in 10 slots (338, 341, 414, 420, 426, 437, 508, 524, 532 and 647). and ranged from 1.30–1.74m wide and from 0.20–0.61m deep, though typically *c.*0.45m deep. The sides were steep and the base was flattish to concave. It contained just 6 small sherds of Iron Age pottery.

Enclosure 10024, 10030, 10031, 10033

This enclosure was formed by a series of segmented linear and curvilinear gullies (10030-1, 10024) which abut ditch 10033 and must include the latter for the enclosure to work as an entity. Any eastern side of the enclosure is lost beneath the baulk to the east. The two gaps in the circuit are about 1m wide. Ditch 10024 appears to be a re-cut and extension of 10026. Ditch 10030-1 was 0.4–0.7m wide and 0.15m–0.23m deep and contained 3 sherds of pottery. Ditch 10024 was 1.15–1.3m wide and 0.51–0.6m deep. It contained 39 sherds of pottery. Ditch 10024 was cut by pit 534 in the entrance gap; the pit also contained five sherds of Iron Age pottery.

Phase 2biv

A series of gullies, several with a rectilinear arrangement, cut across ditch 10033 and features associated with the latter, indicating that this internal subdivision of the larger enclosure was relatively short-lived.

Enclosure 349, 409, 10032, 10035, 10036

Gullies 349, 409, 10032, 10035, 10036 and possibly 10042 along with L-shaped ditch 10029 appear to form a rectilinear enclosure. At the north-east corner, the configuration forms a short in-turned entrance 2m wide. At the north-west corner, is a simple gap or entrance 1.8m wide. To the south-west the boundary is segmented. It is possible that the suggested enclosure is open to the south though the proximity of the terminal of 10042 to the main enclosure ditch 10015 with a gap of only 1.8m suggests that it utilizes the latter, and implies that this main enclosure has remained in use through several re-modellings of its interior.

Ditch 10029 was up to 0.96m wide and 0.68m deep with several fills. A tooth fragment from the upper fill (782) of the southern terminal (411) provided a radiocarbon determination of 356–110 Cal BC (KIA43680). This ditch contained 168 sherds of pottery.

Ditch 10032 was 10m long and was 0.75–0.90m wide, and 0.35m deep overall. It contained 20 fragments of pottery. Pit 505 which it cut contained numerous crumbs of what is probably also Iron Age pottery, and a dispersed cremated bone (1210g). Ditch 10035 was only c.2m long, 0.56m wide and was between 0.30m and 0.35m deep. It contained 17 sherds of pottery. Gully 10036 was 13.4m long, 0.30m to 0.70m wide and 0.20m to 0.24m deep. It contained 37 sherds. Ditch 10042 was 12m long, 1.75m wide and 0.54m deep. It contained 10 sherds and three fragments of animal bone. Ditch 409 was 3m long, 0.9m wide and 0.35m deep with 13 sherds. Ditch 10030 was 2.6m long 0.6m wide but only 0.12m deep.

Within this putative sub-enclosure were three further lengths of linear feature (606, 607 and 10037, the latter recut as 10041) all about 5m long. Two of these cut across 10033. The relationship of 10037/10041 and 10036 is unclear. They are considered as possible further sub divisions of the enclosure into smaller units. Gully 606 was 2.3m long, 0.4m wide and only 0.06m deep. Gully 607 was 1.7m long, 0.55m wide and 0.21m deep. It contained 7 sherds. Gully 10037 was a length of gully 4m long recut by 10041. It was a variable 0.25m to 0.74m wide and 0.17m to 0.52m deep. Ditch 10037 contained 14 sherds and was re-cut as 10041 which contained 6 sherds.

Gully 10043 was 3.5m long and lay at right angles to ditch 10042, though the relationship between the two was unclear; they are probably contemporary. It was 0.29m wide and 0.13m deep at the eastern end. It possibly recut and replaced a shorter length of ditch represented by segments 404 and 407. It contained 13 sherds. ^{1?}

Beyond this inner enclosure, several small features are phased on the basis that they cut across ditch 10033 though in all cases their function is not known, other than 10038 lying parallel to 10036 suggests it belongs with the latter. Gully 10038 was 6.7m long, 0.40m to 0.75m wide and 0.34m to 0.38m deep. It appears to cut 10039. It contained 26 sherds of Iron Age pottery. Gully 10039 was aligned approximately east-west and was gently curved. At the east end it was truncated by 10038 but cut into the western end of 10033. It measured 9m long and was up to 0.45m wide, and 0.24m deep, with a concave base and produced no finds. Gully 10034 was just 2m long with a slight curve which truncated ditch 10033. It was 0.48m wide and 0.21m deep. It contained 60 crumbs of pottery. The function of this small spur is unclear, as it was not visible to the south of the enclosure ditch and is too small to be considered a subdivision.

Gully 10040 was similar to 10034. It was initially thought to relate to 10039, however its alignment suggests it was not part of the same gully. It was 2m long and up to 0.70m wide, and 0.48m deep. Although it did not contain any dating evidence, it truncated 10033.

One other feature truncated ditch 10033. Pit 421 was shallow, 0.61m wide, oval in plan with sloping sides, and was 0.14m deep. It did not contain any finds or dating evidence.

Elsewhere within the main enclosure

Gullies

Two curved gully segments, though only broadly dated to the Middle Iron Age, are likely to form a further subdivision, part of the complex within the enclosure, but it has not been possible to assign these to a phase; possibly 10045 linked with 10019 and belonged to an early layout but this is speculative. Gully 10045 was a semicircular gully excavated in slots 536, 635 and 636. It was 8.9m long, between 0.25m and 0.68m wide, and 0.17m to 0.28m deep, with a concave base. It contained 2 pieces of animal bone (6g), and was truncated by 10046 at its north end. Ditch 10046 was a short ditch aligned NW–SE, dug in 3 slots (623, 633 and 634) and was 9m long, 0.53m to 1.2m wide and 0.29m to 0.63m deep. The terminals produced 220 sherds of pottery.

Several further short lengths of gully of uncertain function and date were recorded (521, 443–4, 632).

Pits and postholes

Thirteen pits were recorded within the enclosure (343-5, 422, 439–422, 510, 513, 518, 534 and 611) with another eight beyond but close by to the north (627–31, 637,638 and 701). Not all of these produced artefactual dating evidence but they all appear to be Iron Age. One pit and one posthole (329, 332) lay just beyond the main enclosure ditch (10015) to the south (Fig. 7). Noticeably, there are no Iron Age pits nor post holes immediately beyond the western enclosure ditch. The pits tend to occur in groups of twos or threes mostly towards the northern end of the enclosure. No pits (nor postholes) were found in the south-western quadrant. One pit-sized feature (629) is located immediately adjacent to the enclosure entrance and may have functioned as a gate post.

The pits were 0.12–0.68m deep and 0.55–1.92m across, with a mixture of single or multiple fills. The distribution and character of pottery finds from the pits was not obviously different from the assemblages recovered from the ditches and gullies with no deposition of exceptional volumes of material nor placement of specific objects or burials (Fig. 23). None of the sample of pits sieved for charred plant remains produced any usable material.

Posthole-sized features were surprising few. Some 16 were recorded though, inevitably, there is some overlap in shape and size with small pits. (425, 526–8, 533, 105/17, 105/19, 105/23, 105/25, 105/27, 105/29, 612–15, 624). They are distributed singly or in pairs and are similar in distribution to the pits. None of the postholes appear to form structures any more elaborate than two -post frames.

Clay lined pit

Pit 442 was 0.21m deep and 1.03m across, with steep sides and a flat base. The feature was noteworthy as the lower fill (887) comprised a 0.04m layer of grey orange clay. The upper fill (886) was predominantly infilled with burnt stone. Sieving of a sample of the upper fill (886) produced only unidentified charcoal.

Hearth 307

Hearth 307 was notable for the presence of burning of the top of the pits sides with the lower infill containing large (0.2m across) lumps of limestone and 3 sherds of pottery; It was 0.91m across and 0.23m deep and was cut into the infilled top of ditch 10015. Sieving produced charred plant remains with *Salix* and buckthorn wood charcoal present along with hazel brassicas and prunus (cherry) represented.

Cremation burial and pyre deposits

Cremation burial 505

This feature comprised an oval pit up to 1.15m across and 0.5m deep and was cut by ditch 10032. (Fig. 22). It contained 1210g of cremated bone dispersed within the fill representing an adult probably male burial but also included several fragments of unburnt sheep/goat bone. It contained 60 crumbs (21g) of broadly Iron Age pottery. Charcoal recovered by sieving was of oak and hazel.

Cremation deposit 621

This feature comprised an oval pit up to 0.75m across but only 0.08m deep (Fig. 22). It contained 253g of cremated bone in a dense cluster which was excavated in spits. It contained 4 crumbs (1g) of probable pottery and an unidentifiable fragment of iron. Charcoal recovered by sieving was of oak.

Phase 2 Middle Iron Age- Other features

Four-post structure (Pl. 5)

Some 50m to the west of the main cluster of Iron Age deposits in splendid isolation was a four- post structure (116-119) (Fig. 7). It was 1.6m square with postholes 0.25–0.3m across and 0.1–0.15m deep. No artefacts were recovered.

Northern cluster

Towards the north-west of Area 1 lay a cluster of postholes, small pits and one sinuous and one curvilinear gully (Fig. 6). Several of these features contained Iron Age pottery and the curvilinear gully was cut by a probable Roman gully.

Gully 10054

This curved segment of gully was 0.55–0.9m wide and 0.26–0.38m deep and was possibly re-cut (818) in one section (Fig. 25). It was cut by linear gully 10053. It contained 55 sherds of Iron Age pottery.

Ditch 10055, 10056, 10053, 10047 and trackway/hollow way (Pl. 8)

Ditches 10055/46 were lengths of ditch which were interrupted by a narrow (0.5m wide) causeway with the northern end terminating as an oval pit (823). It has a sinuous plan, 43m long typical of Iron Age features, both on the site and elsewhere. It was 1.19 – 2.51m wide and 0.47 – 0.65m deep. Some 51 sherds of pottery were recovered. The northern component (828) was possibly recut (829). The function of the ditch is unclear, but it may relate to the north-south trackway. It is also noted that the southern end terminates in the same general location as gully 10053 perhaps to form a gateway 3m wide.

Gully 10053 was notably straight and was initially considered to be of Roman date. However, the dating evidence recovered from 10053 was 9 sherds of Iron Age pottery. Gully 10053 was typically 0.9m wide and 0.3m deep. The line of 10053 continued to the south as a series of undated ditch segments (10047) .

Pits/post hole clusters

An elongated spread of 24 pits and postholes lay over a distance of 75m to the east of ditch 10053 with the curvilinear gully 10054 near the centre. None of the small groups of postholes formed a coherent structural ground plan, with only postholes 739–45 perhaps representing a building in part. and only three of the pits (813-4, 839) produced dating evidence of Iron Age pottery, though pit 839 also produced a sherd of probably Roman pottery. Pit 814 was notable for a bell-shaped profile typical of Iron Age storage pits (Fig. 25). It contained one of the better assemblages of material culture with pottery (107 sherds) bone and a little iron slag present along with a small amount of charred cereal grain.

Hearth

A small isolated pit (1229) west of the fence line in Area 2 was distinctive in that it contained a fire-reddened clay and burnt limestone matrix and is considered to be a hearth (Fig. 8).

Phase 3 Roman

In marked contrast to the Iron Age activity, the Roman phase is most notable for its scarcity of features or finds. Roman pottery is limited to just 81 sherds. The principal features of Roman date are landscape features representing enclosure and land division, though the chronology of several elements assigned to the Roman period is uncertain. As for the Iron Age deposits, elements of the Roman pattern appear to lie beneath the unexcavated baulk between Areas 1 and 2, which corresponds with the edge of the palaeochannel. Again this might be a natural topographic feature for boundaries to follow.

Enclosure Ditch 10011 (Fig. 7, Pl. 4)

This ditch was stratigraphically later than both the Iron Age oval enclosure and the Iron Age rectilinear enclosure, with the latter being 'captured' by 10011 and its subsequent recuts. Ditch 10011 formed an L-shaped plan and its north-south element was continuous for 240m. North from this it became intermittent and segmented in places but the line continued for an additional 190m up to the northern edge of the excavation. The ditch ranged from 0.65m to 3m in width (typically at the upper end of this range) and was between 0.33m and 0.59m deep, with steeply sloping sides and a flattish to concave base. A part of the ditch in the northern area was difficult to define adjacent to the hollow way/channel deposits. It contained 56 sherds, though 43 of these were minute fragments.

Ditch 10013/10048

This ditch appeared to redefine ditch 10011 and followed much of the course of the latter. In the south the course varied to produce a more rectangular corner (between slots 302 and 211). It also formed a marked terminal 100m to the north (310). There is no trace of a recut for the next 55m until a new stretch of ditch (10048) cuts both 10011 and 10015 (Fig. 24). Ditch 10048 continues northwards for 40m parallel to 10011 before terminating (649). There is no corresponding continuation further to the north. This ditch produced just a single sherd of Roman pottery.

Ditch 10012

This ditch represents a further partial recut of the enclosure. It was clearly observable for about 40m in excavated slots towards the south of the north-south element and on most of the slots on the east-west element. The ditch appears in its turn to have been recut twice locally in the vicinity of Slot 312 as 327 and 328 (Fig. 26). The only pottery from ditch 10012 appears to be earlier prehistoric and must be residual.

Trackway/Hollow way

On the western side of both the rectilinear Iron Age enclosure and Roman ditch 10011 and its recuts, lies a zone 10-15m wide occupied by irregular, ill defined linear hollows. These are present for the whole excavated area, a distance of 415m, continuing beyond to both north and south. The hollows, where examined (e.g. slot 728) were wide (2.8m) and shallow (0.24m). It is considered that they represent the wear and erosion effects of passing traffic or stock.

A proportion of the route of the hollow way is undefined by boundaries which have been preserved below ground and presumably hedges were used for this purpose, although droeways need not be marked at all, especially if they do form hollow ways. For much of the route, it has only been defined on its eastern side but there is a segment where a second ditch has been dug. Fifteen metres to the west of ditch 10011 and parallel to it was an intermittent linear feature (ditch 10047/10053). It was 110m long. However, the dating evidence comprised 75 sherds of Iron Age pottery and it seems unlikely that it and 10011 functioned together (though clearly a long lived hedge may well have done. At the southern end of the Roman enclosure the ditches (10012 and 10013) cut the infilled hollow way suggesting that the trackway may have early Roman or even pre-Roman origins (Fig. 26).

Other field elements

A ditch (10003) aligned parallel to the southern side of enclosure ditch 10011 could not be reliably dated through pottery, but its stratigraphic relationships suggest it is likely to be contemporary with, or earlier than, the Roman enclosures. This ditch (excavated in slots 1, 2, 11, 12, 140 and 203) was observed from the eastern limit of excavation, aligned NE-SW, and was at least 58m long. At the south-western end, it appeared to merge with the hollow way. It was 0.75m to 1.26m wide and 0.30m to 0.38m deep. The sides were sloping and the base concave, and it was infilled with a lower and an upper fill. It truncated the oval Iron Age enclosure ditches 10004 and 10005.

A series of straight gullies with a rectilinear plan are present towards the northern portion of the site (across both areas 1 and 2) and are on a similar alignment to the trackway and to ditch 10011. Though they did not necessarily function together.

The north-south element (10049) was 24m to 27m east of ditch 10011 for 138m before it bent sharply eastwards through a near right angle. Parallel to the east-west element of 10049 was gully 702. Both of these seem to continue eastwards in Area 2 where they merge as 910 though one of these ditches (probably the southern one, 702) seems to have substantially recut and obliterated 10049. Gully 10049 was 0.4–0.7m across and 0.18–0.25m deep with gully 910 being 0.6m–1.1m across and up to 0.17m deep. A single sherd of Roman pottery came from gully 10049

Two gullies lay east–west at right angles to ditch 10049 and were both cut by the latter. Gully 10051 terminated at its intersection with 10049 but continued eastwards into the baulk. It was 0.71m across and 0.22m deep. Gully 10050 continued for another 10m to the west of 10049 before petering out. It was 0.60m across and 0.11m deep. To the east, in the Area 2, it seems to have continued as gully 911. The latter contained two sherds of Roman pottery and a tiny fleck of brick or tile.

Undated pre-medieval linear feature

Two gullies (10000, 10001) are present in the south west portion of the site and both terminate within the trench (Fig. 7). They contained no dating evidence. They were up to 0.7m across and 0.31m deep with single fills. It is unclear if they relate to each other.

A large ditch (10052) was located in the north-eastern portion of Area 1 aligned NW–SE and appeared to be unrelated to any other features on the site (Fig. 6). It was typically 1.8m across and 0.58m deep and had been partially recut. It remains undated.

Undated features

A variety of features, technically undated, were recorded across the site, though a number of these can be dated with some confidence due to their spatial association with better dated ones. There are, however, a number of features of small pit and posthole size in area 2 on the eastern side of the palaeochannel which contained no dating evidence and which cannot be assigned to any phase .

Phase 4 Medieval/Post-medieval

Medieval ridge and furrow was evident only in the Area 1 (Fig. 4). It was uniform, with the furrows typically 1m wide and 8m apart, aligned east-west in the north and north-south in the south. In the northern area, the irregular hollow, utilized and defined by the Roman ditches (above) appears to define the eastern boundary of this ploughing activity with a wide gap between it and the edge of the furrows representing a headland.

A slot (111) was excavated through a shallow ditch which appeared to divide the area of ridge and furrow at the south from that at the northwest side, which were differently aligned. A sherd of post-medieval china was recovered from the surface of the ditch, which, if it is not an intrusive find, may indicate that this field division existed into the later post-medieval period.

Finds

Pottery by Jane Timby

The archaeological work resulted in the recovery of 2910 sherds of pottery, weighing *c* 16 kg, accompanied by 145 fragments of fired clay and a single fragment of ceramic building material. The assemblage largely dates to the middle Iron Age period with a smaller amounts of earlier prehistoric, Roman and post-medieval pieces present. The latter, comprising some 10 sherds, is not discussed further other than for dating purposes. Although essentially one site, the archaeological work was divided into two areas with some 2812 pieces (97%) coming from Area 1 and just 3% from Area 2.

The prehistoric assemblage was sorted into fabrics following the PCRG (1997) guidelines. Roman sherds were coded using the National Roman reference fabric codes (Tomber and Dore 1998), or where not classified, codes based on these. The assemblage was quantified by sherd count and weight and the full details are in the site archive. The resulting information is summarized in Table 1. Very small crumbs were counted and weighed but not sorted into fabrics. Effectively these make up 20.2% by count (but only 2% by weight) of the Iron Age and Roman assemblage emphasising the fairly fragmented condition of much of the pottery. This is in part due to the nature of the fabrics, most of which are heavily tempered and low fired, making sherds very friable. The overall average sherd weight of the prehistoric material is only 5.4g and the number of diagnostic sherds very limited. Despite a generally more robust nature the Roman pottery is equally fragmented with an average weight of just 5.3g. Pottery was recovered from 164 cut features with just 17 sherds from surfaces or layers; thus the incidence of sherds per feature was generally very low.

Grooved Ware

Some 48 sherds of a grog- and limestone-tempered ware were recorded, 45 of which came from pit 400 (765). Of the remaining three, one came from ditch 842 and two from ditch group 10017. The soft, slightly friable, fine textured clay contains sparse fragments of limestone/ fossil shell 2–3mm in size and rare fragments of sub-angular to rounded grog. Amongst the pieces from pit 400 was a small rim fragment of a simple rim open bowl with finger pinched rusticated decoration (Fig. 28.1) and a bodysherd with an applied raised rib (Fig. 28. 2). Such features would be characteristic of a Grooved Ware assemblage dating to the later Neolithic period.

Grooved Ware settlement sites have been identified in and around Lechlade at The Loders (Darvill *et al.* 1986), Roughground Farm, (Allen *et al.* 1993) and Butler's Field (Darvill 1998) and later Neolithic pottery has been documented at a number of sites across the Cotswold Water Park.

Beaker

Pit 112 produced 26 very fragmentary sherds probably from a single vessel. Apart from one tiny rim fragment the sherds are from the body of the vessel. The sherds have a black to brown patchy coloration and are made in fine textured clay with a sparse frequency of sub-angular grog. Six of the sherds show traces of decoration in the form of horizontal lines of cord impressions.

?Early prehistoric

Two tiny fragments of grog-tempered ware from gully 1119 and ditch 147 may be Beaker or early Bronze Age in date. The pieces appear to be redeposited. Similarly a single sherd of flint-tempered ware in a fabric with an orange exterior and black interior from ditch 729, again a residual sherd, may be of similar date. A further two small grog tempered sherds came from postholes 1333 and 1337 belonging to roundhouse 912.

Iron Age

Most of the assemblage, 97%, belongs to this phase of activity, much of the material coming from the various linear features crossing the site. The assemblage can be divided into five basic ware groups: calcareous (shell, fossiliferous detritus, limestone); sandy; flint; organic; and grog, which have been sub-divided into twenty fabrics on the basis of the frequency, grade and type of inclusions.

The calcareous fabrics dominate the assemblage, in particular the sandy limestone and shelly wares (SALI) that make up 69% by count, 87% by weight of the later prehistoric assemblage. In the Thames Valley the sandy wares and sandy-limestone fabrics tend to replace the coarse shelly and limestone dominated fabrics progressing from the early to middle Iron Age (Allen 1990, 42). Whilst most of the assemblage appears to be fairly local

there are a few obvious imports to the site; in particular Palaeozoic limestone-tempered wares from the Woolhope Hills, sandstone-tempered wares from the Malvernian / Forest of Dean region and a single flint-tempered vessel.

The large wide-mouthed barrel-shaped jars, smaller jars and bowls present in this group are typical of the middle Iron Age period. Most of the vessels are plain with no surface finish; the assemblage overall containing just two decorated sherds (Fig. 28: 4 and 6), both characterized by linear incised designs. One of these (Fig. 28: 4) is a regional import; the other is made from locally available materials. The date of the decorated sherds is slightly uncertain as they are so fragmentary. Decorated vessels are not generally a feature of the middle Iron Age but incised decoration, sometimes dividing the surface into panels, first appears in the later Bronze Age/early Iron Age. Such sherds, for example, featured in the Late Bronze Age assemblages at Reading Business Park (Hall 1992, fig. 47.127) in a flint and grog-tempered ware and Knights Farm (Bradley *et al.* 1980, fig. 35). These sherds may thus be stray residual pieces or they may be contemporary with the rest of the assemblage. The middle Iron Age assemblage from Watkins Farm had a small number (less than 3%) of decorated sherds (Allen 1990) although the motifs used are quite different from the designs here. A small number of vessels, such as Fig. 28: 14 have a burnished finish.

Several vessels show evidence of use in the form of sooting on the exterior surfaces, burnt residue on the interior or the leaching of inclusions on the interior vessel surfaces. Most of these featured in the SALI group with at least five vessels with internal residues and four with external sooting. A further two vessels in fabric SH3 had internal burnt deposits. None of the sherds examined showed evidence of modification in the form of perforations.

Description of fabrics and associated forms

Calcareous

- L1:** Sandy fabric with coarse, sparse rounded fragments of limestone. Represented by three sherds.
- L2:** Contains predominantly discrete fine (1mm and less) limestone oolites with some accompanying fossiliferous debris. Represented by two very small sherds.
- L3:** Sandy textured fabric with sparse discrete limestone oolites. Two sherds only.
- L4:** Quite dense, fine oolitic-limestone-tempered ware with fossil shell fragments. This fabric accounts for 2.2% by count of the assemblage. The group includes three jar rims and a bodysherd decorated with infilled panels (Fig. 28: 6).
- SH1:** coarse fossil shell-tempered ware. Featured sherds suggest mainly simple rim slack-sided jars (Fig. 28: 16).
- SH2:** Sparser fragments of generally finer fossiliferous matter including shell, coral and bryozoa. The density of inclusions varies between sherds. No featured sherds.
- SH3:** mixed fossil shell and fragments of limestone.
- SH4:** sparse inclusions of medium-fine (2mm and less) fossil shell and limestone. A single sherd from gully 506.

SALI1: A mainly oxidized orange, occasionally red-brown or brown ware with a moderate to common frequency of fairly well-sorted limestone, fossil shell and other fossiliferous detritus including coral and bryozoa. This is the commonest ware in the assemblage accounting for 34.7% by count. Vessels are mainly wide-mouthed, barrel-shaped neckless jars (Fig. 28: 7, 9, 11) with diameters ranging from 100mm up to 320mm. One smaller vessel has a grooved upper rim surface (Fig. 28: 5) and another an uneven line defining the rim (Fig. 28: 12). Several of the sherds are sooted indicating the use of these vessels on hearths for cooking.

SALI2: A dark brown to black ware, occasionally lighter brown or orange, with a sandy texture and a sparse scatter of ill-sorted shell and other calcareous matter. This was one of the commonest fabrics accounting for 32% by count of the prehistoric assemblage. All the featured vessels are wide-mouthed, barrel-shaped neckless jars ranging in diameter from 110mm up to 240mm with a single larger example of 320mm from gully terminal 7 (Fig. 28: 8). Some vessels have slightly beaded rims (Fig. 28: 10, 13)

SALI3: This is a variant of the above but with much finer inclusions of limestone and shell in the fabric. A small group with just 62 sherds and only one rim.

Flint-tempered

FL1: A black ware with a smooth exterior and few visible inclusions on the surface. These are more apparent on the interior, which shows a sparse to moderate frequency of sub-angular fine flint 1mm and less in size. Two joining sherds from pit 1105 decorated with incised panel decoration probably comprising infilled triangles (Fig. 28: 4).

Sandy

SA1: a mainly black medium-fine textured sandy fabric with a sparse to moderate frequency of visible quartz (x20 magnification) and some fine white mica. Vessels include slack-shoulder wide-mouthed jars (Fig. 28: 15).

SA2: similar to SA1 but with occasional grains of limestone up to 2mm in size. Smoothed exterior. There are two rims, one from a wide-mouthed jar or bowl with a slight ridge at the shoulder and a burnished finish (Fig. 28: 14).

Mixed temper

SALIGR: very sandy textured lumpy ware, blackish exterior with a yellow-brown interior and core. Some interior voids. The paste contains rare grog and limestone 3–4mm in size. Limited to a single slack-sided jar with a wiped surface from pit 326 (Fig. 28: 3).

Organic

SAOR: A brown ware with a black core and interior. A fairly poorly consolidated clay containing a moderate to common frequency of linear organic voids and a sparse scatter of fine, rounded quartz sand. A single thick-walled bodysherd (10 mm) from ditch 10015 (slot 346).

Malvernian

MAL REB: Palaeozoic limestone-tempered ware probably originating from the Woolhope Hills (Morris 2005). A small group of 15 sherds, mainly bodysherds with one base.

MAL SST: Malvernian/ Forest of Dean sandstone-tempered ware. A black ware with a brownish exterior and quite a compact, gritty textured fabric. The paste contains a rare scatter of fine quartz sandstone inclusions 1–2 mm in size and sparse sub-angular quartz. Four sherds, one from ditch 10015 (slot 346) and three from ditch 10029 (slot 419).

Roman

A total of 81 sherds of Roman date are present, most of which are local products from the North Wiltshire industries. Imports are limited to three sherds of samian, a few pieces of Dorset black burnished ware and a Severn Valley ware jar. The assemblage indicates activity in the 2nd century but there is no evidence of any mid-later Roman material suggesting a fairly limited episode of activity followed by abandonment.

Central Gaulish samian (LEZ SA2) (Tomber and Dore 1998, 32). Three sherds were recovered, two from pit 1400 and including a cup Drag 33; and one sherd of a decorated bowl (Drag 37) from surface collection. The latter has fine (?knife) cut lines on the interior.

Dorset black burnished ware (DOR BB1) (Tomber and Dore 1998, 127). Eight sherds from three contexts including three sherds from an everted rim jar of 2nd-century date.

Early Severn Valley ware. A single storage jar in an early Severn Valley ware, marked by the presence of organic matter (charcoal) in the fabric, was recovered from the surface. Such vessels are typical of the 1st to 2nd centuries AD.

Wiltshire wares. A range of North Wiltshire wares are present including sandy oxidized ware, reduced wares, black sandy burnished ware and a single base sherd with a foot-ring from a red colour-coated vessel.

Area 1

The bulk of the assemblage came from Area 1, some 2715 sherds weighing *c* 15kg. It indicates sporadic activity at the site in the later Neolithic – Beaker period, the middle Iron Age and Roman periods (2nd century). The single Grooved Ware pit (400) and Beaker pit (112) lie in this part of the site. Ditch 10012 contains just two very small pieces, one grog-tempered, the other a sandy ware but is clearly stratigraphically Roman.

The later prehistoric assemblage is quite homogeneous with nearly every assemblage of 30 or more sherds being dominated by sherds of fabric SALI. Features with in excess of 100 sherds include ditch/gully groups 10005, 10010, 10023, 10029, 10046 and pit 326. Collectively these account for 42.6% of the later prehistoric pottery from this area of the site. The Palaeozoic limestone-tempered wares imported from the west are distributed across a number of different features including ditch groups 10017, 10024, 10026 and 10054 with sandstone tempered sherds from 10029 and 10015. These are also typical of middle Iron Age assemblages although the Cotswold Water Park is probably towards the periphery of their distribution.

Nearly three-quarters of the Roman pottery, 74%, came from this part of the site. Much of this, 54 sherds, came from ditch group 50048 which included a much fragmented Wiltshire black sandy ware vessel, sherds of a DOR BB1 jar and other local North Wiltshire sherds all indicative of a date in the first half of the 2nd century. Other much smaller assemblages came from ditch groups 10011 and 10013 and a single probably intrusive sherd came from the terminal (516) of middle Iron Age ditch 10017.

Later Roman, Saxon and medieval wares were absent from the assemblage, the latest feature on the site being ditch 337 which produced nine post-medieval sherds suggesting a 17-18th century date.

Area 2

This area produced a much smaller assemblage of 204 sherds weighing 816g. The material was exceptionally fragmented with an average sherd weight of 4g. Although there may be odd sherds of earlier prehistoric date present most of the defined features appear to date to the middle Iron Age although the individual assemblages

are considerably smaller than those in Area 1. The largest group was from gully 905 with 48 fragments but 33 of these comprised just crumbs. Pit 1105 produced 22 sherds amongst which was the decorated flint-tempered sherd found with several sherds of SALI.

A few Roman sherds were recovered from the surface and from gully 911 (slot 1318), pit 1410, and the alluvium overlying burnt mound F (2469) and intrusive into burnt mound B (2482). A fragmented piece of Roman ceramic building material, the only one from the site, was also present in gully 911 (1318). The overall date range of the Roman sherds seems similar to that in Area 1.

Catalogue of illustrated sherds

1. Small rim fragment from an open bowl. Slight groove on the top of the rim. Finger-pinched rusticated decoration. Fabric: GRLI. Pit 400 (765).
2. Small bodysherd with an applied ridge. Orientation uncertain. Dark brown, Fabric: GRLI. Pit 400 (765).
3. Cup or small bowl. Black exterior with a brown interior, Grass-wiped exterior. Fabric: SALIGR. Pit 326 (667).
4. Two joining bodysherds decorated with incised lines. Fabric: FL1. Pit 1105 (1696).
5. Small jar with a groove on the upper rim surface. Sooted rim. Fabric: SASH1. Ditch 10026, 538 (1064).
6. Bodysherd with very faintly incised panel decoration. Fabric: L4. Ditch 10026, 538 (1064).
7. Wide-mouthed jar. Oxidized orange. Fabric SALI1. Ditch 10021, terminal 547 (1078).
8. Wide-mouthed large jar. Oxidized surfaces with a brown core. Fabric: SALI2. Gully 7 (60).
9. Slightly beaded rim jar with a barrel-shaped body. Mid brown with a grey inner core. Fabric: SALI1. Ditch 10023, 541 (1071).
10. Beaded rim ovoid jar. Patchy orange-red to red-brown. Fabric: SALI2. Gully 10035, 413 (789).
11. Wide-mouthed barrel-shaped jar with a simple incurving undifferentiated rim. Orange to red-brown with a grey interior. Sooted on the upper body. Fabric SALI1. Pit 631 (1353).
12. Rim from a ?bowl or jar with an uneven groove below the rim. Black in colour. Fabric: SALI1. Pit 631 (1353).
13. Beaded rim jar. Oxidized. Fabric: SALI2. Gully 10010, 220, (457).
14. Round-bodied jar/bowl with a slight ridge below the rounded rim. Black in colour with a burnished finish. Fabric: SA2. Pit 814 (1374).
15. Jar with a simple slightly pinched rim. Black. Fabric SA1. Ditch 10022, 529 (994).
16. Simple rim jar with an incurving, undifferentiated rim. Black. Fabric: SH1. Ditch 10024 terminal 602 (1002).
17. Simple rim jar with an incurving rim slightly beaded on the interior. Black. Fabric: SALI2. Hearth 307 (585).
18. Simple rim ovoid bodied jar. Black exterior with a brown core and interior. Slightly vesicular interior from leached inclusions. Fabric: SALI1 Gully G904 1205 (1799).
19. Simple rim, ovoid-bodied jar. Brown with a sooted exterior. Fabric: SALI2. Ditch 10029, 411 (782).
20. Fragment of fired clay with one curved and one flat face. The break shows two round stick (?wattle) impressions which appear to be off-centre. Pale brown to orange clay containing a sparse limestone and fossil shell temper. Ditch 10013, 609, (1094).

Fired clay by Jane Timby

Some 145 fragments of fired clay weighing 800g were recovered, all from the later prehistoric features. Most of the pieces came from Area 1, with just 38 fragments, 312g from Area 2. Generally of the pieces are scattered across several features with no particular focus but two concentrations should be noted; one from ditch 10013 with 21 fragments, 159g; the other from feature 1431 with 36 fragments, 310g. The former includes a curved

piece with ?wattle impressions (Fig. 28: 20); the latter also includes an irregular-shaped piece with wattle impressions indicating structural fragments.

Struck Flint by Steve Ford

A small collection of 38 struck flints was recovered during the course of the excavations, 19 from each area. Thirty-four were recovered from excavated features, usually in ones or two but with one feature (pit 326) producing a small assemblage of twelve items. Several pieces from gullies or ditches are clearly residual. The collection is summarized in Appendix 3.1 and catalogued in full in Appendix 3.1.

The pieces are variously fresh or patinated a creamy white but some with a bluish grey tinge. Two pieces are heavily iron stained. Apart from three burnt pieces, the flints are generally in very good condition with little post-depositional damage (there is one slightly rolled piece). The remaining cortex on some pieces is quite thick with no evidence of frost flaws and perhaps indicates suggests a source direct from the chalk.

The flake component of the collection is dominated by blades or narrow flakes, most of which were recovered from pit 326 and which indicates a Mesolithic and/or earlier Neolithic contribution (Ford 1987). One large broken blade was heavily iron stained with the remains of blade scars on its dorsal surface and is the only item most likely to be of Mesolithic date. The collection of twelve pieces from pit 326 appear to indicate an earlier Neolithic date for this feature. A single broken segment of a serrated flake is probably of Neolithic or earlier Bronze Age date. The smaller numbers of flints from other features are less chronologically diagnostic and could be of Neolithic or Bronze Age date.

Slag by Steve Crabb

Just three fragments of slag weighing a total of 11g were recovered by sieving from ditch 10005 (terminal 206 (381)), and pits 820 (1380) and 814 (1465), all of Iron Age date. The pieces all have an external appearance characteristic of iron corrosion, suggesting iron slag. However, they are all undiagnostic iron slags and therefore it is not possible to determine the process by which they have been produced.

Metalwork by Steven Crabb

A total of fifteen metal finds were recovered from this site, the majority of which are ferrous (Appendix 4). Only eight finds were recovered from stratified locations, of these five were nails or fragments of nails. The nails are all square in section and where the head is present it is also square.

Of the stratified finds one is a copper alloy pin (Cat. No. 1). It is 55mm long, circular in section and tapers from 3mm to a point. It has a green surface patina, with some areas of blue green. It was recovered from Iron Age oval enclosure ditch 10004 slot 21 (78). All the other stratified metal finds were from Roman features

A small iron knife blade (Cat. no. 5) was recovered from Roman ditch 10011, slot 300 (564). It measures 80mm long, 20mm of the tang still remains, at a width of 8mm whilst the blade is 14mm across, triangular in cross section from 4mm thick at the back of the blade. The back of the blade is flat and the front of the blade shows some evidence for wear caused by repeated sharpening events.

The assemblage of metal finds is too small and widely spread across the site to permit any conclusions about the site's status or function.

Burnt human bone by Ceri Falys

Burnt human bone was recovered from five contexts (Appendix 5). All of the remains were whole-earth recovered, although as the nature of the deposits was unknown, three of the four contexts (94, 956, 1279) were excavated as single events, while two deposit (1157, 2059) were each excavated in a series of four 0.02m spits. During the post-excavation processing, the samples were floated and wet-sieved to a 2mm mesh size, with all burnt bone and other associated residues separated for further analysis. The burnt bone from each context was sorted using a sieve stack of 10mm, 5mm, and 2mm mesh sizes. For ease of sorting, the remains were considered in terms of those over the sizes of 10mm and 5mm, and those under 5mm.

The bone recovered from each sieve (10mm, 5mm and 2mm) was weighed. The weights of the fractions were recorded, along with the maximum fragment size, and colour of the burnt bone for each deposit (Appendix 5.1). The degree of bone fragmentation can be inferred by the weight of bone in each category when compared to the fragment size in Appendix 5.2. Overall, much of the bone was 5mm or smaller, decreasing the amount of retrievable demographic and pathological data from the remains. The reliability of skeletal demographic techniques (i.e. age at death estimation and sex determination methods) is greatly affected by both the quantity and quality of observable traits: both the preservation of the remains and the degree of fragmentation were detrimental to this reliability.

Osteological Analysis

All bone was subjected to osteological analysis following the procedures suggested by Brickley and McKinley (2004) and Buikstra and Ubelaker (1994). The purpose of osteological analysis is to determine the demographic profile of skeletal assemblages based on the assessment of age, sex, pathological conditions and non-metric

traits that can be extracted (primarily through morphological examination) from skeletal remains. In addition, the minimum number of individuals (MNI) represented within each context was determined through the duplication of the same skeletal element, or by differing age-dependent development of teeth and/or skeletal element. The most frequently preserved/identified fragments were found to be portions of the cranial vault, tooth roots, and phalanges of the fingers. Non-descript fragments of long bone shafts were also exceptionally common. All deposits suggest the presence of one individual per deposit.

The condition of bone was generally very poor, with a worn and chalky appearance. The vast majority of deposits contained completely oxidized bone (i.e. buff-white or white in colour), indicating an efficient cremation process (i.e. the skeleton was subjected to adequate time, temperature and oxygen supply for the organic components of the bone to be oxidized).

All deposits of burnt human bone were found to contain a minimum of one individual. All identified elements demonstrated fully fused long bone epiphyses, as well as the presence of premolars and molars (including wisdom teeth), strongly suggesting all individuals present were adult at the time of death. More precise age ranges were not possible to estimate, due to the lack of observable traits (i.e. degenerative changes to the pubic symphysis, auricular surface, and degree of dental attrition).

The sex of the individuals was not determined, as necessary aspects of the skull and pelvis were not sufficiently preserved, with the exception of that from 505 (956), which was a possible male individual based on cranial characteristics. Pathological and non-metric traits were not observed in any context. No further information could be retrieved from these contexts of burnt human bone.

Non-human burnt bone by Ceri Falys

A small assemblage of burnt non-human remains was recovered from six contexts across the excavated areas. A total of 97 fragments were present for analysis, weighing 40g (Table 5.3). The preservation of the remains was generally poor, with most contexts containing chalky and brittle bone.

The colour of burnt bone varied both within and between contexts. Variations in colour reflect the efficiency of the burning process (i.e. the time, temperature and amount of oxygen supplied to the bone), and reflects the degree of oxidation of the organic compounds within bone. For example colours range from brown/orange (unburnt), to black (charred; c. 300°C), through hues of blue and grey (incompletely oxidised, up to c. 600 °C) to the fully oxidised white >600 °C). Evidence of all the degrees of oxidation was observed in this assemblage, although it is noted that the majority of bone was fully-oxidized buff-white and white in colour.

The majority of pieces were small, measuring 5mm or smaller. Very few fragments were found to be greater than 10mm. This small size was detrimental to the amount of information that could be derived from these remains, as it rendered many of the remains non-descript and lacking diagnostic characteristics. Identification of skeletal element identification and ultimately species of origin was not possible for all contexts. No further information could be retrieved from these burnt remains.

Animal bone by Matilda Holmes

The vast majority of the animal bone recovered came from Phase 2 features (Appendix 6, Table 6.1). Sample sizes are too small from the sub-phases to be analysed individually, so the assemblage will be considered as generically middle Iron Age in date. The majority of bones came from ditches, but also from a few pits and gullies. Preservation was extremely poor, and there is little ageing or metrical data available, so analysis will be minimal.

Methodology

Bones were identified using the author's reference collection. Due to anatomical similarities between sheep and goat, bones of this type were assigned to the category 'sheep/goat', unless a definite identification (Prummel and Frisch 1986; Payne 1985) could be made. Bones that could not be identified to species were, where possible, categorized according to the relative size of the animal represented (small – rodent /rabbit sized; medium – sheep / pig / dog size; or large – cattle / horse size). All fragments were recorded, although ribs were not identified to species, and only the zygomatic arch and occipital areas of the skull were identified from skull fragments.

Tooth wear and eruption were recorded using guidelines from Grant (1982) and Silver (1969), as were bone fusion (Amorosi 1989; Silver 1969), metrical data (von den Driesch 1976), anatomy, side, zone (Serjeantson 1996) and any evidence of pathological changes, butchery (Lauwerier 1988) and working. The condition of bones was recorded on a scale of 1–5, where 1 is perfectly preserved and 5, the bone is so badly degraded to be unrecognizable (Lyman 1994). Other taphonomic factors were also recorded, including the incidence of burning, gnawing, recent breakage and refitted fragments.

A number of sieved samples were collected but because of the highly fragmentary nature of the bone in such samples a selective process was undertaken, whereby fragments were recorded only if they could be identified to species and / or element, or showed signs of taphonomic processing.

Taphonomy and Condition

The bones were in extremely poor condition (Table 2) because of a high incidence of surface erosion, indicating that many fragments were exposed to the elements prior to burial, or were subject to chemical erosion in the soil. Due to the poor preservation, butchery marks were rarely identified and it is likely that a higher proportion had been gnawed, but the marks were indistinguishable from the erosion. Bones were also friable, nearly 40% showed signs of fresh breakage when lifted, and 149 fragments could be refitted to make just 14. The ratio of loose teeth to mandibles was also considerable, again indicative of burial some time after defleshing.

The Assemblage

Due to the poor condition and highly fragmentary nature of the assemblage, few bones were identified to species and/ or anatomy (Table 3). Of those that were, cattle were the most commonly occurring species, then horse and sheep/ goat (of which only sheep were positively identified); very few pigs were recorded. Few wild species were present, including two pieces of red deer antler, another antler fragment of indeterminate species, and one rabbit humerus which, judging from its condition, was most likely intrusive. Species from the sieved material were also limited to the main domestic mammals (Table 4).

Bones were recovered from all parts of the body. Sample sizes were too small to interpret the presence of carcass parts in terms of relative proportions (Table 5), although they were not indicative of specific butchery or craft-working waste.

Nearly all bones were fused, the only exceptions a sheep/ goat distal tibia from an animal less than two years old and a pig lateral metapodial from an animal younger than 27 months. Tooth wear data were also from older animals – two examples were recorded of cattle at stages F, G and I, one pig was at stage D, and a sheep stage F (after Hambleton 1999), representing adult cattle and sheep, and a juvenile pig.

Summary

This small assemblage fits within the trends noted from other sites in the region (Hambleton 1999, 46), where cattle were more abundant than sheep, and pigs rarely recorded. Sample sizes and poor preservation prevent further analysis or comparison with contemporary sites.

Charred and waterlogged plant remains by Rosalind McKenna

A programme of soil sampling was implemented during the excavation, which included the collection of soil samples from sealed contexts, ranging from 5L to 40L in size (Appendix 7). The sub samples were processed by staff at TVAS using their standard water flotation methods. The flot (the sum of the material from each sample

that floats) was sieved to 0.5mm and air dried. The heavy residue (the material which does not float) was not examined, and therefore the results presented here are based entirely on the material from the flot. The flot was examined under a low-power binocular microscope at magnifications between x12 and x40. A four point semi quantitative scale was used, from '1' – one or a few specimens (less than an estimated six per kg of raw sediment) to '4' – abundant remains (many specimens per kg or a major component of the matrix).

The flot was then sieved into convenient fractions (4, 2, 1 and 0.3mm) for sorting and identification of charcoal fragments. Identifiable material was only present within the 4 and 2mm fractions. A random selection of ideally 100 fragments of charcoal of varying sizes was made, which were then identified. Where samples did not contain 100 identifiable fragments, all fragments were studied and recorded. This information is recorded with the results of the assessment in Table 2 below. Identification was made using the wood identification guides of Schweingruber (1978) and Hather (2000). Taxa identified only to genus cannot be identified more closely due to a lack of defining characteristics in charcoal material.

Results

Two hundred and twenty samples are the basis of this investigation, 44 from Area 1 and 176 from Area 2. Plant macrofossils were present in 26 of the samples and identifiable charcoal in 56 samples. Where charred remains were present they were generally very poorly preserved, and were lacking in most identifying morphological characteristics. The results of this analysis can be seen in Appendix 7. The most commonly recorded charred macrofossil was indeterminate cereal, which lacked identifying morphological characteristics, and was present in generally in very small amounts. Where it was possible to ascertain identifications, wheat, barley and oat were represented, although mainly as single occurrences. There were also chaff fragments in two samples from Area 2, although they were again poorly preserved and unidentifiable.

Another, more indirect, indicator of cereals being used on site is the large proportion of remains of arable weeds that were found in two samples from Area 1 and three from Area 2. However they were preserved via waterlogging, and so probably represent different depositional events to the charred grains. These weeds are generally only found in arable fields, and are doubtless incorporated into domestic occupation samples with crop remains. The remains of *Chenopodium/ Atriplex* and *Rumex*, may also fall in this group.

Garden pea (*Pisum sativum*) in two samples may show the use of peas as a crop. Other species present which may have been harvested by the inhabitants of the site were cherries (*Prunus*) and hawthorns (*Crataegus monogyna*). The latter can be harvested and used as an edible dietary component, but both may also merely represent the presence of hedges / scrubland on or near to the site.

Plant macrofossils that were modern contaminants were also present in twenty-three of the samples, and were represented by the species of elder, goosefoot/orache, cinquefoils and buttercup.

Charcoal fragments were present in almost all samples: 37 from Area 1 and 127 from Area 2, though mainly scoring a '1' on the semi-quantitative scale. The preservation of the charcoal fragments was relatively variable even within the samples. Some of the charcoal was firm and crisp and allowed for clean breaks to the material permitting clean surfaces where identifiable characteristics were visible. However, most of the fragments were very brittle, and the material tended to crumble or break in uneven patterns making the identifying characteristics harder to distinguish and interpret. The majority of the charcoal present was too poor to enable identification: 24 samples from Area 1 and 31 from Area 2 produced identifiable material (Appendix 7)

The total range of charcoal taxa comprises oak (*Quercus*), alder (*Alnus*), hazel (*Corylus*) ash (*Fraxinus*), salix/poplar (*Salix/Populus*) and common buckthorn (*Rhamnus catharticus*). A local environment with a relatively wide range of trees and shrubs is indicated. Oak is by far the most numerous of the identified charcoal in Area 1, with hazel, salix/poplar, alder and common buckthorn also being identified in varying levels. All the same species were present in Area 2, however here Salix/poplar was the most numerous. It is possible that these were the preferred fuel woods obtained from a local environment containing a broader choice of species. With ash present in the environment, it is perhaps worth noting that oak is considerably more represented in the samples. Oak is probably the first choice structural timber, and with a local abundance it may have been used instead of ash, thereby providing more by-product fire fuel. Bark was also present on some of the charcoal fragments, and this indicates that the material is more likely to have been firewood, or the result of a natural fire.

Generally, there are various, largely unquantifiable, factors that effect the representation of species in charcoal samples including bias in contemporary collection, inclusive of social and economic factors, and various factors of taphonomy and conservation (Thery-Parisot 2002). On account of these considerations, the identified taxa are not considered to be proportionately representative of the availability of wood resources in the environment in a definitive sense, and are possibly reflective of particular choice of fire making fuel from these resources.

Summary

The samples produced environmental material with very little evidence of 'economic' species such as cereals for consumption or other plant for industrial use, other than wood charcoal. Charcoal was identified in 55 samples, and plant macrofossils from 26 samples. The general absence of cereal remains is noteworthy for the

interpretation of the site. The archaeobotanical evidence found in the samples was all very similar in the various features and periods studied.

The charcoal remains showed the prevalence of oak and salix/poplar being selected and used as fire wood. Oak has good burning properties and would have made a fire suitable for most purposes (Edlin 1949). Oak is a particularly useful fire fuel as well as being a commonly used structural/artefactual wood that may have had subsequent use as a fire fuel (Rossen and Olsen 1985). The compositions of the samples are all very similar, even though the types of deposits differ from gully slots to furnace hearths to cremations. There may be a shift in the chosen fuel between Areas 1 and 2 from oak to salix/poplar, which may reflect a change in the vegetation available, or merely a difference in the collection of firewood practices.

The remains here are similar to those found at other sites in the region that have activity from similar periods. Recent excavations carried out by TVAS at Eysey Manor and Roundhouse Farm show very similar results, although these sites also produced material that was preserved via anoxic waterlogging and enabled more information relating to the surrounding environment to be analysed. Thornhill Farm (Jennings *et al.* 2004) shows a similar composition of assemblages and draws the conclusion that the site may be associated with pastoral farming due to the environmental evidence reflecting an area of grassland that has been disturbed. Similar results were found at Claydon Pike (Miles *et al.* 2007).

Palaeoenvironmental assessment of palaeochannel deposits by Dan Young and Chris Green

Four column samples (CS 1 to 4; Figs 9, 11, 12, 27) were recovered from sediments within a palaeochannel. The aim of this investigation was to assess the potential of these samples for reconstructing the vegetation history of the site and its environs, and to quantify evidence of human activities. The site is on the northern edge of an extensive area of low river terrace/floodplain lying immediately to the north of the upper Thames between Ashton Keynes and South Cerney. This is an area of generally level terrain drained by the River Churn (a north bank tributary of the Thames) and by various minor tributaries. The ground surface is between 91.0m and 92.5m aOD. The area to the south of the site has been extensively disturbed by sand and gravel extraction that reaches to within a kilometre of the site. The terrace deposits have been described in detail from sites near Latton, about 5km ESE of the Dryleaze Farm site (Lewis *et al.* 2006).

Lithostratigraphic descriptions

Column samples 1 to 4; (locations shown on Figs 9, 11, 12 and 27) were described in the laboratory using standard procedures for recording unconsolidated sediment and organic sediments, noting the physical

properties (colour), composition (gravel, sand, clay, silt and organic matter) and inclusions (e.g. artefacts). The procedure involved: cleaning the samples with a spatula or scalpel blade and distilled water to remove surface contaminants; recording the physical properties, most notably colour using a Munsell Soil Colour Chart; recording the composition; (e.g. gravel, fine sand, silt, clay, organic material); recording the degree of peat humification and recording the unit boundaries e.g. sharp or diffuse. The results are presented in Appendix 8

The deposits recorded in the column samples are regarded on the basis of the field evidence as the infill of a palaeochannel. The evidence from the column samples shows that the fine-grained and organic elements of this infill are thin. In column sample 3, in which the full thickness of the palaeochannel infill was preserved, it was only 0.5m thick, including the surface horizons affected by present-day soil forming processes and agricultural activity. In column samples 1, 2 and 3, closely similar sediment sequences are recorded, with a thin (0.1– 0.15m), very blocky, silty clay overlying a thin (0.14–0.16m) horizon of peat containing substantial amounts of mineral material both as scattered sand grains and as silty inclusions. In column sample 2 the peat was seen to rest on a deposit of calcareous sand and gravel and in column samples 1 and 3, the peaty horizon was mineral-rich at the base, suggesting close proximity to underlying mineral sediment. From the evidence in the column samples it is not possible to determine whether the sand and gravel at the base of the observed sequences forms part of the palaeochannel infill or represents the upper surface of older terrace deposits into which the palaeochannel has been cut.

In column sample 4 a thin bed of very blocky silty clay, closely similar to units recorded in column samples 1 Unit 2, 2 Unit 4 and 3 Unit 3, was present overlying a bed of ash, burnt stone and charcoal which rested directly on calcareous sand and gravel closely similar to Unit 1 of column sample 2. No peaty horizon was present in column sample 4.

Pollen assessment

Twelve pollen samples (three from each column sample) were extracted as follows: (1) sampling a standard volume of air-dried sediment (4g dry weight); (2) addition of four *Lycopodium clavatum* (clubmoss) tablets to enable calculation of pollen concentrations; (3) deflocculation of the sample in 1% sodium pyrophosphate; (4) sieving of the sample to remove coarse mineral and organic fractions (>125µm); (5) removal of finer minerogenic fraction using sodium polytungstate (specific gravity of 2.0g/cm³); (6) acetolysis; (7) mounting of the sample in glycerol jelly stained with safranin. Each stage of the procedure was preceded and followed by thorough sample cleaning in filtered distilled water. Quality control is maintained by periodic checking of residues, and assembling sample batches from various depths to test for systematic laboratory effects. Pollen

grains and spores were identified using the University of Reading pollen type collection and the following sources of keys and photographs: Moore *et al.* (1991); Reille (1992). Plant nomenclature follows Stace (1997). The assessment procedure consisted of scanning the prepared slides, and recording the concentration and preservation of pollen grains and spores, and the principle taxa on four transects (10% of the slide).

The results of the assessment are displayed in Appendix 9. Pollen was preserved in low to moderate quantities in all four column samples, with the exception of the sample from column 4 (context 2387, calcareous sand and gravel) at 92.15 to 92.16m OD, in which no pollen was found.

In the samples from the organic horizons found in column samples 1 to 3 (contexts 1571, 1678 and 1676) pollen was preserved in low to moderate quantities and was dominated by herbaceous taxa including Poaceae (grass family), Lactuceae (dandelion family), Cyperaceae (sedge family), Caryophyllaceae (pink family), *Plantago cf. coronopus* (cf. buckshorn plantain) and *Plantago lanceolata* (ribwort plantain). The assemblage in this organic horizon is indicative of a wet, open environment dominated by herbaceous taxa.

In the organic silty clay/silty clay units overlying the organic horizon (context 1572) pollen was found in low to moderate quantities and was dominated by herbaceous taxa including Cyperaceae, Lactuceae and Poaceae. Tree taxa were represented by *Pinus* (pine) in column sample 1 (92.09 to 92.10m OD). This assemblage is indicative of a wet, open environment dominated by herbaceous taxa.

Context 2378 (burnt material) in column sample 4 contained very low quantities of pollen, with just one grain of Lactuceae (92.23 to 92.24m OD). The overlying unit (context 2375) contained low quantities of pollen and was dominated by herbaceous taxa including Cyperaceae and Poaceae. Tree and shrub taxa were present including *Corylus* type (e.g. hazel) and *Alnus* (alder). This assemblage is indicative of a wet open woodland environment.

Micro-charcoal was present in low concentrations in the majority of the samples, with two samples from column 4 containing moderate to high quantities of microscopic charcoal (contexts 2378 and 2375).

Discussion and conclusions

The results of the lithostratigraphic description indicate that the sediments represented in the column samples are likely to be the deposits of a minor stream draining across the surface of the low terrace of the Thames that forms the principal element of the relief in the immediate locality of Dryleaze Farm. In column sample 4, ash and charcoal are present and the peaty horizon forming part of the natural sequence recorded in the other column samples is missing.

The results of the pollen assessment indicate that pollen assemblages are largely dominated by herbaceous taxa, and are indicative of wet open or wet open woodland environments. The open nature of the environment may be indicative of a Roman or later date for the sequences since arboreal taxa are poorly represented or absent; forthcoming radiocarbon dates will prove or disprove this hypothesis.

Radiocarbon dating

Six samples of material for carbon dating (a cattle tooth and five charcoal samples) were submitted to the Leibnizlabor at the University of Kiel for radiocarbon dating. Details of methodology and assessment of the reliability of the results are held in archive. In summary, four produced results which are considered to be reliable. It was feared that the tooth sample (KIA43680) failed to provide enough collagen for a reliable result first time around and was re-processed; the replacement results are considered reliable. The results are presented in Appendix 10. All results have been calibrated using OxCal4.1.7 (Bronk Ramsey 2010 with data from Reimer *et al.* 2009). Calibrated dates are given at 2-sigma range (95.4% probability).

Conclusion

The excavations carried out for these phases of extraction at Drylease Farm have revealed both discrete deposits, intensive zones of activity, and eventually landscape-scale features. Unusually, natural deposits also encountered have provided data relating to the palaeoenvironmental setting of these phases of activity.

The earliest deposits here are represented by isolated pits, probably of Neolithic date. Here just one pit (326) was tentatively identified as being of earlier Neolithic date, despite containing undecorated pottery ordinarily considered to be of Iron Age date were it not for the presence of an assemblage of struck flint and charred plant remains largely or wholly of collected wild foods. The later Neolithic is represented by a single Grooved Ware pit (400), and one pit (222) is not closely datable at all. It is regrettable that archaeologically visible activity in this period, both within the region and beyond usually consists of little more than seemingly isolated pits and, due to conservative use of struck flint away from flint bearing strata, is also not well represented by durable artefact scatters. Darvill (2006, 25) recently summarized that the Upper Thames Valley was rather poor in such remains, and drew attention to the particular paucity for the lower gravel terraces (on which our site lies), despite extensive area excavations. More recent fieldwork has partially redressed this imbalance, but not markedly so. Isolated or small groups of Neolithic pits, along with stray finds of struck flint have been recorded at Cotswold Community, Shorncote (Powell *et al.* 2010), Latton Quarry (Pine 2009) and

Roundhouse Farm (Lewis and Cass 2010). By way of contrast other extensive excavations such as at Eysay Manor (Pine 2008; 2010; 2011a; 2011b) and Kempsford (Hammond *et al.* 2005) revealed no Neolithic material. It is considered that the limited below-ground evidence for Neolithic activity here is representative of a mobile settlement pattern, but it remains to be seen whether this is representative of the region as a whole, or whether more durable and extensive Neolithic remains are to be found in the zones centred upon the distinctive Neolithic ceremonial monuments, such as causewayed enclosures (Ford and Taylor 2004, 103) as at Down Ampney in this region (Oswald *et al.* 2001).

Bronze Age activity on the site comprises several components. The earliest activity seems to be represented by a post-built round house of early Bronze Age date. Round house 912 is dated by two sherds of probable early Bronze Age pottery and a radiocarbon date of 2203–2018 cal BC (KIA43682). This date for such a structure is earlier than anticipated, as house remains of this period are rarely recorded (Darvill and Thomas 1996). Elsewhere a single pit (112) contained Beaker pottery with no other material. Nearby was a second undated pit (113) but otherwise these features were isolated. Two other residual sherds may be of similar date.

The most unexpected discovery for the project was the presence of four burnt mounds (with others now recorded in a new extraction phase to the north). Burnt mounds are a monument type infrequently recorded in the archaeological literature for southern England, with a markedly uneven distribution across the zone (Ehrenberg 1991). They are predominantly a Bronze Age phenomenon but with some Neolithic and Iron Age examples recorded. Just three certain and possible examples are recorded for Gloucestershire (Darvill 2006, 47–8) but are not mentioned in a recent summary of the Thames Valley (Lambrick *et al.* 2009). They are often compared to their more numerous and well-studied counterparts in Ireland and highland zones of Britain (Buckley 1990), yet frequently the comparison is only general with many distinctive defining features being absent (Raymond 1987). In brief, whereas in some locations, notably the monuments in the New Forest and Avon Valley of Hampshire (Pasmore and Pallister 1967; Shennan 1999), they have comparable features such as a crescentic mound of burnt stone focused on a trough, other recently excavated sites lack these features. For example, sites at Greywell Road, Hatch (Basingstoke) and Green Park (Reading) simply comprise large plough-levelled mounds of burnt flint (Oram 2006; Brossler *et al.* 2004, 39–41). The chronology of these monuments is slowly being refined by radiocarbon dating if only because there is usually a lack of datable artefacts. This is typified by the carbon-dated example in Gloucestershire at The Buckles, Frocester with a determination of 1750–1439 cal BC (GU2230) though, unusually, that site was artefact-rich and an alternative description is that it was midden debris from an occupation site rather than a burnt mound proper (Darvill in Price, 2000). In

summary, whilst there is still an emphasis on the later Bronze Age, more middle Bronze Age dates have become available (Oram 2006).

The sites at Dryleaze Farm fall into two categories. Mound A has a classic form of monument with a crescentic mound with an oval pit at its focus. It has a middle Bronze age date of 1520–1408 cal BC (KIA43683). Mound complex B/C/D, at a casual inspection appears to represent a simple dump of burnt stone, but detailed examination reflects the presence of several smaller, successive mounds, each with its own trough. One trough had been recut at least three times with the first recut producing a radiocarbon date at the transition from Early to Middle Bronze Age of 1776–1625 cal BC (KIA43684).

Mounds E and F provide a contrasting pattern, being much smaller in area and comprising simple dumps, with nearby pits, that are considered to have been better used to heat the stone, rather than to act as troughs.

Despite the presence of a middle Bronze Age burnt mound, there is no other definite middle Bronze Age activity on the site. It is speculated that fence 913 which lies between roundhouse 912 and the burnt mounds in an area without other Iron Age activity, might well belong to the earlier part of the Bronze Age. However, no artefactual dating evidence has been recorded to support or refute this suggestion. Despite the large area opened, and the quantity of burnt stone available, no finds of votively placed heated stone were present to support a recent argument (Seager Thomas 2010) that this is what Bronze Age pots containing burnt stone are.

The former stream channel which forms much of the Area 2 seems to have been open and flowing with water during the Neolithic and probably earlier, only becoming inundated with silt and peat during the Bronze Age. These alluvial deposits are stratified with the burnt mounds of which one is certainly of middle Bronze Age date and it is clear that alluviation continued after use of the mounds had ceased. It is hoped that this broad sequence of events can be further elucidated by radiocarbon dating.

The provisional analysis of the environmental sequence initially indicates an open, damp herbaceous environment, with few trees present. No cereal pollen was recorded and whilst cereal pollen is often under-represented in most pollen spectra, in the context of other evidence from the site, it may well be that little cereal agriculture was practiced in the vicinity. The later environmental sequence, derived from the alluvium overlying the abandoned burnt mounds, not only failed to record any cereal production but suggested the emergence of damp woodland. This accords well with the lack of any archaeological evidence corresponding to the later Bronze Age on the site.

This broadly correlates with a similar sequence of channel deposits recorded at Eysey Manor to the south east (Pine 2008). At Eysey the environmental sequence commenced from 1781–1636 cal BC (KIA 35306) with

cleared woodland followed by the presence of disturbed grasslands from this period onwards. The water table rose subsequently, with flooding episodes occurring in the middle Iron Age with more widespread alluviation from the late Iron Age. This also broadly conforms with the notion of a rise in the water table for this part of the Thames valley starting between the mid/late Bronze Age and middle Iron Age (Robinson and Lambrick 1984).

The most intensive activity on the site appears to commence early in the Iron Age. The radiocarbon chronology has established that ring gully complex 905 was established by 566–402 cal BC (KIA43681) although the calibration curve allows for a small but not negligible probability of pushing this back to as early as 749 cal BC. Yet the associated pottery, non-descript as it is, is not obviously of later Bronze Age date. Similarly on morphological grounds, a ring gully structure such as this has greater affinities with buildings of Iron Age date (Lambrick *et al.* 2009) despite evidence, on occasion, for earlier origins (cf. Mudd 1995).

This Iron Age use has several separate components, and with some time depth present. Three of the elements are enclosures albeit of radically different layouts: one takes the form of large irregular elongated oval with a funnel entrance, which is not well paralleled in the literature; the others are of more familiar form: one is as a small ring gully with internal post-built building approached by a short trackway and the third, a medium-sized rectilinear enclosure which contained further linear features with much evidence of internal sub-division and reorganization. The other areas of activity attributed to this phase are the unenclosed southern posthole complex with a post-built roundhouse (10057), and the collection of a small group of pits with linear and curvilinear gullies of uncertain function to the north.

These enclosure complexes appear to indicate a function predominantly associated with the handling of stock and this notion is supported by a lack of other evidence from the site with regards to any arable component to the economy. For comparison, this is suggested at sites such as Watkins Farm, Northmoor and Minges Ditch, Hardwick (Allen 1990, 78; Lambrick *et al.* 2009, 43) where good supporting environmental evidence was obtained. At Dryleaze, for example, there are few deep pits suitable for below ground grain storage anywhere on the extraction area. Pit 814 which is not associated with the enclosures is a notable exception. Neither are there above ground facilities such as 4-post structures (apart from one isolated example) and artefactually, there are no quernstones for cereal processing. Curiously, within the rectilinear enclosure, there are no candidates for houses, despite the evidence of domesticity in the form of pottery and animal bone discard. Postholes are few and widely dispersed and the few curvilinear gullies present are less than convincing evidence as structures. Allen (1990) in his discussion of Watkins Farm and Minges Ditch points out that the stake wall-built houses preserved at the latter site would be easily removed by the plough on sites with less overburden. At Watkins Farm though, he has

also considered that an unambiguous ring gully structure at the centre of the enclosure is surrounded by possibly five further structures (Allen 1990, fig. 34). These latter structures are defined by gullies which are u-shaped in plan or comprising only a short segment of curvilinear gully. On this basis, at Dryleaze Farm within the rectilinear enclosure (Fig. 22), gullies 10045 or 10031 would be possible house sites.

The extensive sampling programme for charred plant remains adds further, but negative evidence. Despite sieving of 230 contexts (220 analysed), which recovered charcoal from wood and weed seeds routinely, no cereal remains were recovered from the three enclosure groups (nor the posthole group to the south). The only Iron Age context where cereal was recovered (but only a modest volume) came from pit 814 in the northern complex. By way of contrast, it was the middle Bronze burnt mound A which produced most cereal grains from the site and even Grooved Ware pit 326 produced more cereal than the multitude of Iron Age contexts in its vicinity. Faunal remains from the site were of poorly preserved and of modest volume, insufficient for detailed economic study. The usual domesticated species of cattle and sheep/goat being dominant but with horse better represented than pig.

The form of Iron Age settlement in the Upper Thames Valley has recently been reviewed (Lambrick *et al.* 2009) to place the seemingly bewildering array of settlement forms into some sense of order. In the Iron Age there are clearly marked differences in settlement form even without considering the chronological progression. These indicate clear differences in the organization and function of Iron Age sites and settlement. At one extreme are pit cluster sites, such as Gravelly Guy, Stanton Harcourt or Coxwell Road, Faringdon, which it can be argued indicate large scale grain storage, even if the use of the term 'centralized' is not yet justified (Lambrick *et al.* 2009, 74). At the other extreme are perhaps unenclosed house, pen and paddock sites. When these are found on low-lying land, they may well represent seasonally used sites as at Farmoor (Lambrick and Robinson 1979) though the same argument cannot be advanced for sites with the same morphology on higher ground such as at Cotswold Community, Shorncliffe (Powell *et al.* 2010, fig 2.51). It might be considered that such sites represent a 'typical' middle Iron Age farmstead. Such a site might be represented at Dryleaze by ring gully complex 905 (Fig. 17) and both the southern and northern complexes (Figs 6 and 21).

Finally, a larger, but difficult to define class of settlement type is that of the enclosures. As Lambrick *et al.* (2009) and others before have pointed out, there is a wide range of enclosure types with markedly different dominant functions evident from their morphology alone, but the common thread is that they represent a communal endeavour rather than the infrastructure of an individual farmstead. The main Iron Age deposits at Dryleaze Farm belong to this class of enclosure.

Intensive Iron Age use of the site appears to have ceased several centuries prior to Roman times. Whilst there is a possibility of the continuity of Middle Iron Age pottery forms and fabrics up to the Roman period (and thus the date of the deposits they contain), the two radiocarbon dates obtained support the hypothesis as proposed. Yet the Iron Age 'structure' to the landscape, namely the rectilinear enclosure and the north-south trackway were sufficiently impressive to be incorporated into the large elongated Roman enclosure. Other Roman use of the site is indicated by a very modest spread of pottery, including from the uppermost levels of the palaeochannel deposits, and speculation that undated ditches to the west are of this date. It appears that use of the site at this time is largely for agriculture, but perhaps on a scale of land division larger than that seen in the Iron Age. A similar pattern has been observed at Eysey Manor (Pine 2008) and Marston Meysey (Lewis and Cass 2010; Lewis and Wallis 2010) where Iron Age settlement was replaced by Roman land division on a larger scale.

Following Roman use of the site, which has left only a minimal physical trace and a small scatter of artefacts, there was no recorded activity until medieval times, when the western portion of the site (Area 1) was occupied by ridge and furrow field system. No artefacts or other cut features of medieval date were recorded. The one notable observation is the position of the ridge and furrow which respects the main north-south boundary that was certainly present in Roman times and certainly, in part was present in Iron age times. It is anticipated that for this boundary to have survived for re-use (or continuous use) as a recognizable boundary, implies that the landscape was open and maintained by either grazing or ploughing in the intervening period.

Acknowledgements

The excavation was generously funded by Hills Group Limited. The authors wish to thank all who participated on site and behind the scenes. The excavation team consisted of Natasha Bennett, Dan Bray, Oliver Brown, Vanja Blomqvist, Kyle Beaverstock, Marta Buczek, Aidan Colyer, Simon Cass, Steve Crabb, Dave Cranham, Tim Dawson, James Earley, Ceri Falys, Steve Ford, Matt Gittins, Arak Gnas, Katie Harris, Henrietta Longden, Alison Meakes, James McNicoll-Norbury, Julian Newman, Stewart Patterson, Jo Pine, David Platt, Ilya Santos, Rob Skinner, and Sean Wallis.

References

- Allen, T G, 1990, *An Iron Age and Romano-British enclosed settlement at Watkins Farm, Northmoor, Oxon*, Thames Valley landscapes: the Windrush Valley Vol 1, Oxford
- Allen T G, Darvill T C, Green L S and Jones M U, 1993, *Excavations at Roughground Farm, Lechlade, Gloucestershire: a prehistoric and Roman landscape*, Oxford Archaeology Thames Valley Landscapes: the Cotswold Water Park 1, Oxford
- Amorosi, T, 1989, *A postcranial guide to domestic neo-natal and juvenile mammals* BAR Int Ser 533, Oxford
- Barber, J, 1990, 'Scottish burnt mounds: variations on a theme', in V Buckley (ed), *Burnt offerings International contributions to burnt mound archaeology*, Dublin, 98–104

- BGS, 1974, *British Geological Survey*, 1:50 000, Sheet 252, Solid and Drift Edition, Keyworth.
- Brickley, M and McKinley, J (eds), 2004, *Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains*, IFA Pap 7
- Buikstra, J E and Ubelaker, D H, 1994, *Standards for data collection from human skeletal remains* Arkansas Archaeological Survey Research Series, **44**, Fayetteville, Ark.
- Bradley, R J, Lobb, S, Richards, J and Robinson, M, 1980, 'Two late Bronze Age settlements on the Kennet gravels: excavations at Aldermaston Wharf and Knight's Farm, Burghfield, Berkshire', *Proc Prehist Soc* **46**, 217–95
- Bronk Ramsey, C, 2010, *OxCal version 4.1.7, web interface build no. 61*, Oxford
- Brossler, A, Early, R and Allen, C, 2004, *Green Park (Reading Business Park), Phase 2 excavations 1995 – Neolithic and Bronze Age sites*, Oxford Archaeology, Thames Valley Landscapes Monogr **19**, Oxford
- Darvill, T, 1998, 'Neolithic pottery', in A Boyle, D Jennings, D Miles and S Palmer, *The Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Butler's Field, Lechlade, Gloucestershire. Vol 1: prehistoric and Roman activity and Anglo-Saxon grave catalogue*, Oxford Archaeology Thames Valley Landscapes monogr **10**, Oxford, 275–6
- Darvill, T, 2000, 'Early prehistoric settlement', in F Price, *Frocester: a Romano-British settlement, its antecedents and successors. Volume 1, The sites*, Gloucester and District Archaeol Research Group, Stonehouse, 193-186
- Darvill, T, 2006, 'Early Prehistory', in N Holbrook and J Jurica (eds), *Twenty-Five Years of Archaeology in Gloucestershire*, Bristol Gloucestershire Archaeol Soc Rep **3**, 5–60
- Darvill, T, Hingley, R, Jones, M and Timby, J, 1986, 'A Neolithic and Iron Age site at the Loders, Lechlade, Gloucestershire', *Trans Bristol Gloucestershire Archaeol Soc* **104**, 27–48
- Darvill, T and Thomas, J, 1996, *Neolithic Houses in Northwest Europe and Beyond*, Oxbow Monogr **57**, Oxford
- Driesch, A von den, 1976, *A guide to the measurement of animal bones from archaeological sites* Cambridge, Mass.
- Edlin, H L, 1949. *Woodland crafts in Britain: an account of the traditional uses of trees and timbers in the British countryside*, London
- Ehrenberg, M, 1991, 'Some aspects of the distribution of burnt mounds', in M A Hodder and L H Barfield (eds), *Burnt mounds and hot stone technology*, Sandwell, 41–58
- Ford, S, 1987, 'Chronological and functional aspects of flint assemblages', in A G Brown and M R Edmonds (eds), *Lithic analysis and later British prehistory; some problems and approaches*, BAR Brit Ser **162**, 67–85 Oxford
- Ford, S and Taylor, K, 2004, 'Neolithic occupation at Cippenham, Slough, Berkshire', in J Cotton and D Field (eds), *Towards a new Stone Age, aspects of the Neolithic in south-east England*, CBA Res Rep **137**, York, 99–104
- Grant, A, 1982, 'The use of tooth wear as a guide to the age of domestic ungulates', in B Wilson, C Grigson and S Payne (eds), *Ageing and Sexing Animal Bones from Archaeological Sites*, BAR Brit Ser **109**, Oxford 91–108
- Hall, M, 1992, 'The Prehistoric Pottery', in J Moore and D Jennings, *Reading Business Park: a Bronze Age landscape*, Thames Valley Landscapes: the Kennet Valley **1**, 63–70
- Hambleton, E, 1999, *Animal Husbandry Regimes in Iron Age Britain*. BAR Brit Ser **282**, Oxford.
- Hammond, S Havard, T, Hindmarch, E, Preston, S and Taylor, A 2005, 'Roman landscape features at Manor Farm, Kempsford, Gloucestershire', Thames Valley Archaeol Services, Draft publication rep 02/93c, Reading
- Haselgrove, C, Armit, I, Champion, T C, Creighton, J, Gwilt, A, Hill, J D, Hunter, F and Woodward, A, 2001, *Understanding the British Iron Age: an Agenda for Action*, Salisbury
- Hather, J G, 2000, *The identification of Northern European woods; a guide for archaeologists and conservators*, London
- James, S and Millett, M, (eds), 2001, *Britons and Romans: advancing an archaeological agenda*, CBA Res Rep **125**, York
- Jennings, D, Muir, J, Palmer, S and Smith, A, 2004, *Thornhill Farm, Fairford, Gloucestershire; an Iron Age and Roman pastoral site in the Upper Thames Valley*, Oxford Archaeology Thames Valley Landscapes Monogr **23**, Oxford
- Lambrick, G and Robinson, M, 1979, *Iron Age and Roman riverside settlements at Farmoor, Oxfordshire*, Oxfordshire Archaeol Unit Rep 2/CBA Res Rep **32**, Oxford
- Lambrick, G, Robinson, M and Allen, T, 2009, *The Thames Through Time: The Archaeology of the Gravel Terraces of the Upper and Middle Thames: The Thames Valley in Later Prehistory: 1500BC–AD50*, Oxford Archaeol Thames Valley Landscapes Monogr **29**, Oxford
- Lauwerier, R, 1988, *Animals in Roman Times in the Dutch Eastern River Area*, ROB Nederlandse Oudheden **12**, Amersfoort

- Lewis, J and Wallis, S, 2010, 'Roundhouse Farm, Marston Meysey, Wiltshire, Processing Area and Extraction Phases 1 and 2: Post-Excavation Assessment', Thames Valley Archaeological Services rep 05/49, Reading
- Lewis, J and Cass, S, 2010, 'Roundhouse Farm, Marston Meysey, Wiltshire, Phases 3 and 4: Post-Excavation Assessment', Thames Valley Archaeological Services rep 05/49b, Reading
- Lewis, S G, Maddy, D, Buckingham, C, Coope, G R, Field, M H, Keen, D H, Pike, A W G, Roe, D A, Scaife, R G and Scott, K, 2006, 'Pleistocene fluvial sediments, palaeontology and archaeology of the upper River Thames at Latton, Wiltshire, England', *J Quaternary Sci* **21**, 181–205
- Lyman, R L, 1994, *Vertebrate Taphonomy*, Cambridge
- Miles, D, Palmer, S, Smith A and Perpetua Jones, G, 2007, *Iron Age and Roman settlement in the Upper Thames Valley: excavations at Claydon Pike and other sites within the Cotswold Water Park*, Thames Valley Landscapes Monogr **26**, Oxford
- Moore, P D, Webb, J A and Collinson, M E, 1991, *Pollen Analysis* (2nd edn), Oxford
- Morris, E L, 2005, 'Pottery and briquetage', in N Thomas, *Conderton Camp, Worcestershire: a small middle Iron Age hillfort on Bredon Hill*, CBA Res Rep **143**, London, 117–47, Appendix 3
- Mudd, A, 1995, 'The excavation of a late Bronze Age/early Iron Age site at Eight Acre Field, Radley', *Oxoniensia*, **55**, 21–66
- OAU 2001, 'Dryleaze Farm, Siddington, Gloucestershire, Archaeological Desk Based Assessment', Oxford Archaeol rep, Oxford
- OAU 2002, 'Dryleaze Farm, Siddington, Gloucestershire, Archaeological Evaluation, Oxford Archaeol rep, Oxford
- Oram, R, 2006, 'A Middle Bronze Age burnt mound at Greywell Road, Hatch, Basingstoke', *Hampshire Stud* **61**, 1–15
- Oram R and Ford, S, 2010, 'Middle Iron Age occupation at Shorncombe Quarry Phase 3, Cotswold Community, Ashton Keynes, Wiltshire', in Powell, K, Smith, A and Laws, G, *Evolution of a farming community in the Upper Thames Valley: excavation of a prehistoric, Roman and post-Roman landscape at Cotswold Community, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire; vol. 1: Site Narrative and Overview*, Oxford Archaeol, Thames Valley Landscapes Monogr **31**, Oxford (integrated contribution)
- Oswald, A, Dyer, C and Barber, M, 2001, *The creation of monuments: Neolithic causewayed enclosures in the British Isles*, Swindon
- Pasmore, A H and Pallister, J, 1967, 'Boiling mounds in the New Forest', *Proc Hampshire Fld Club Archaeol Soc* **24**, 14–19
- Payne, S, 1985, 'Morphological distinctions between the mandibular teeth of young sheep, *Ovis*, and goats, *Capra*', *J Archaeol Sci* **12**, 139–47
- PCRG, 1997, *The study of later prehistoric pottery: general policies and guidelines for publication*, Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group, Occas paps **1** and **2** (revised)
- Pine, J, 2008, 'Eysey Manor, Cricklade, Wiltshire, Phase 1/2A, Post Excavation Assessment', Thames Valley Archaeol Services rep 04/87, Reading
- Pine, J, 2009, Latton Quarry, Latton, Wiltshire, Post-Excavation Assessment, Thames Valley Archaeological Services project 04/22, Reading
- Pine, J, 2010, 'Eysey Manor, Cricklade, Wiltshire, Post Excavation Assessment Phase 2B', Thames Valley Archaeol Services, rep 06/32, Reading
- Pine, J, 2011a, 'Eysey Manor, Cricklade, Wiltshire, Post Excavation Assessment Phase 3', Thames Valley Archaeol Services, rep 06/96, Reading
- Pine, J, 2011b, 'Eysey Manor, Cricklade, Wiltshire, Post Excavation Assessment Phase 4', Thames Valley Archaeol Services, rep 08/84, Reading
- Powell, K, Smith, A and Laws, G, 2010, *Evolution of a farming community in the Upper Thames Valley: excavation of a prehistoric, Roman and post-Roman landscape at Cotswold Community, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire; vol. 1: Site Narrative and Overview*, Oxford Archaeol, Thames Valley Landscapes Monogr **31**, Oxford
- Prummel, W and Frisch, H, 1986, 'A guide for the distinction of species, sex and body side in bones of sheep and goat', *J Archaeol Sci* **13**, 567–77
- Raymond, F, 1987, *Monument Protection Programme, Single Monument Class Description: Burnt Mounds*, English Heritage, London
- Reille, M, 1992, *Pollen et Spores d'Europe et d'Afrique du Nord*, Marseille
- Reimer, P J, Baillie, M G L, Bard, E, Bayliss, A, Beck, J W, Blackwell, P G, Bronk Ramsey, C, Buck, C E, Burr, G S, Edwards, R L, Friedrich, M, Grootes, P M, Guilderson, T P, Hajdas, I, Heaton, T J, Hogg, A G, Hughen, K A, Kaiser, K F, Kromer, B, McCormac, F G, Manning, S W, Reimer, R W, Richards, D A, Southon, J R, Talamo, S, Turney, C S M, van der Plicht, J, and Weyhenmeyer, C E, 2009, 'IntCal09 and Marine09 radiocarbon age calibration curves, 0–50,000 years cal BP', *Radiocarbon*, **51(4)**, 1111–50

- Rossen, J and Olson, J, 1985 *The controlled carbonisation and archaeological analysis of SE US wood charcoals*, *J Field Archaeol* **12**, 445–56
- Schweingruber, F H, 1978, *Microscopic wood anatomy*, Birmensdorf
- Seager Thomas, M, 2010, 'Potboilers reheated', *Proc Prehist Soc* **76**, 357–66
- Serjeantson, D, 1996, 'The animal bones'; in (eds) S Needham and T Spence, *Refuse and disposal at area 16 East Runnymede*, Runnymede bridge research excavations **2**, London, 194–223
- Shennan, S J, 1999, 'The excavation of a burnt mound at Harbridge, Hampshire,' *Hampshire Stud (Proc Hampshire Fld Club Archaeol Soc)* **54**, 172–9
- Silver, I A, 1969, 'The ageing of domestic animals', in eds D R Brothwell and E S Higgs, *Science and Archaeology*, London
- Stace, C, 1997, *New Flora of the British Isles*, 2nd edn, Cambridge
- Théry-Parisot, I, 2002, 'Gathering of firewood during the Palaeolithic' in S Thiébault (ed), *Charcoal Analysis, Methodological Approaches, Palaeoecological Results and Wood Uses*, BAR Int Ser **1063**, Oxford
- Tomber, R and Dore, J, 1998, *The National Roman Fabric Reference Collection: a handbook*, MoLAS Monogr 2/ Engl Heritage/ Brit Mus, London
- Weale, A and Preston S, 2010 Excavation of Roman field boundaries at Cotswold Community Phase 4, Ashton Keynes, in Powell, K, Smith, A and Laws, G, *Evolution of a farming community in the Upper Thames Valley: excavation of a prehistoric, Roman and post-Roman landscape at Cotswold Community, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire; vol. 1: Site Narrative and Overview*, Oxford Archaeol, Thames Valley Landscapes Monogr **31**, Oxford (integrated contribution)

APPENDIX 1: Feature list

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Fills</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Dating evidence</i>
1	50-1	Ditch	10003	1	3	By association
2	52-3	Ditch	10003	1	3	By association
6	59	Posthole	10057	1	2	pot
7	60-1	Gully terminus		1	2	pot
8	62	Ditch terminus	10005	1	2	pot
9	63	Posthole		1	2	By association
10	64	Posthole		1	2	By association
11	65-6	Gully	10003	1	3	By association
12	68-9	Gully	10003	1	3	By association
13	67	Posthole		1	2	By association
14	70	Posthole		1	2	By association
15	71	Posthole		1	2	By association
16	72	Posthole		1	2	By association
17	73	Posthole		1	2	By association
18	74	Posthole		1	2	By association
19	75	Posthole		1	2	By association
20	76-7, 80	Ditch	10005	1	2	By association
21	78-9	Ditch	10004	1	2b	By association
22	81	Ditch	10006	1	2b	By association
23	86-7	Ditch	10004	1	2b	By association
24	82-85	Ditch	10005	1	2b	By association
25	88-90	Ditch	10004	1	2b	By association
26	91	Ditch	10006	1	2b	By association
28	93	Gully terminus	10007	1	2b	By association
29	94	Gully terminus	10008	1	2b	Pot
31	98-9, 150	Ditch	10005	1	2b	Pot
32	151-3	Ditch	10005	1	2b	Pot
33	96	Ditch	10005	1	2b	By association
34	97	Gully	10008	1	2b	Pot
35	154	Ditch	10005	1	2b	By association
36	155	Gully	10007	1	2b	By association
37	156-7	Ditch	10005	1	2b	Pot
38	196	Posthole		1		
39	197	Posthole		1		
40	166-8	Posthole		1		
41	158-60	Ditch	10005	1	2b	Pot
42	161	Gully	10000	1	3	By association
43	163	Gully	10000	1	3	By association
44	165	Gully	10000	1	3	By association
45	169	Posthole	10057	1	2b	
46	170	Posthole		1		
47	171	Posthole		1		
48	162	Gully terminus	10001	1	3	By association
49	164	Gully	10001	1	3	By association
100	172	Gully	10001	1	3	By association
101	173-5	Pit		1	2	Pot
102	176, 178	Pit	10057	1	2b	By association
103	177	Posthole	10057	1	2b	By association
104	190	Pit	10057	1	2b	Pot
105	191	Posthole	10057	1	2b	By association
106	192	Posthole	10057	1	2b	By association
107	193	Posthole	10057	1	2b	By association
108	194	Posthole	10057	1	2b	By association
109	195	Posthole	10057	1	2b	By association
110		pit/tree bole		1		
111	180	Furrow		1	4	
112	181	Pit		1	1b	Pot
113	182	Pit		1	1	
114	179	Gully	10000	1	3	By association
115	183-4	Gully	10000	1	3	By association
116	185	Posthole		1	2	By form
117	186	Posthole		1	2	By form
118	187	Posthole		1	2	By form
119	188	Posthole		1	2	By form

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Fills</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Dating evidence</i>
120	198	Posthole		1		
121	199	Posthole	10057	1	2	By association
122	250	Posthole		1	2	By association
123	251	Posthole		1	2	By association
124	252	Posthole		1	2	By association
125	253, 284-5	Ditch terminus	10005	1	2	Pot
126	254	Posthole		1	2	By association
127	255	Posthole	10057	1	2	By association
128	256	Posthole	10057	1	2	By association
129	257	Posthole		1	2	By association
130	258	Pit		1	2	By association
131	259	Posthole		1	2	By association
132	260	Posthole	10057	1	2b	By association
133	261-3	Ditch	10005	1	2b	Pot
134	264-6	Ditch	10005	1	2b	By association
135	267-8	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
136	269-74	Ditch	10012	1	3	By association
137	275-6	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
138	277-9	Ditch	10005	1	2b	Pot
139	280-1	Ditch	10005	1	2b	By association
140	282-3	Gully	10003	1	3	By association
141	286-8	Ditch	10005	1	2b	By association
142	289-90	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
143	291-5	Ditch	10004	1	2b	By association
144	296-8	Ditch	10005	1	2b	Pot
145	299,350-52	Ditch	10004	1	2b	Pot
146	353	Ditch	10011	1	3	Pot
147	354-5	Ditch	10012	1	3	Pot
148	356-8	Ditch	10003	1	3	By association
149	359-60	Ditch	10012	1	3	By association
200	361-2	Ditch	10004	1	2b	Pot
201	363	Ditch terminus	10011	1	3	By association
202	364,366	Ditch	10003	1	3	By association
203	367-8	Gully	10004	1	3	By association
204	369	Gully	10013	1	3	By association
205	365, 370	Ditch terminal	10011	1	3	Pot
206	380-2	Ditch terminus	10005	1	2	Pot
207	371-2	Ditch terminus	10004	1	2b	By association
208	373-4	Ditch terminus	10004	1	2b	By association
209	375-9	Ditch	10004	1	2b	By association
210	383-5	Ditch	10004	1	2b	By association
211	386-7	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
212	388-9	Ditch	10012	1	3	By association
213	390-3	Ditch terminus	10004	1	2b	Pot
214	394	Ditch terminus	10009	1	2b	By association
215	395	Ditch terminus	10009	1	2b	Pot
216	450-1	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
217	452-3	Ditch	10012	1	3	By association
218	396-9	Ditch terminus	10004	1	2b	By association
219	454-6	Ditch	10004	1	2b	By association
220	457	Gully terminus	10010	1	2b	Pot
221	458-60	posthole		1		
222	461-2	posthole		1	1b	
223	463-4	posthole		1		
224	465	posthole		1		
225	466-8	Ditch terminus	10004	1	2b	Pot
226	469-70	Ditch	10005	1	2b	By association
227	471	Gully	10010	1	2b	Pot
228	472-5	Ditch	10013	1	3	Pot
229	476, 480	posthole		1		
230	477-9	posthole		1		
231	481-2	Gully terminus		1	2b	Pot
232	483	posthole		1	2	Pot
233	484-5	posthole		1		
234	486	posthole		1		
235	487	Pit		1		
236	488-9	ditch	10009	1	2	By association

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Fills</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Dating evidence</i>
237	490-1	ditch	10005	1	2b	By association
238	492-4	Ditch terminus		1		
239	495	Gully		1	2	Pot
240	496-8	Ditch	10015	1	2b	By association
241	499	posthole		1		
242	550	posthole		1		
243	551	Gully		1	2n	Pot
244	552-3	posthole		1		
245	554	posthole		1		
246	555	posthole		1		
247	556	posthole		1		
248	557-8	Ditch terminus	10014	1	2	Pot
249	559-61	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association
300	562-4	Ditch	10011	1	3	Pot
301	565-8	Ditch	10015	1	2b	Pot; C14
302	579-81	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association
303	582-3	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
304	574-5	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association
305	576-8	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
306	569-73	Ditch	10015	1	2b	Pot
307	584-6	Hearth	0	1	2	Pot
308	587-928	Ditch terminus	10004	1	2b	
309	589-92	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
310	593-4	Ditch terminus	10013	1	3	By association
311	595-7	Ditch terminus	10014	1	2	By association
312	598-9, 650	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
313	670-1	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association
314	672-3	Ditch	10012	1	3	By association
315	674-5	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
316	678-9	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association
317	680	Ditch	10012	1	3	By association
318	681-2	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
319	651-2	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association
320	653-4	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
321	655-6	Ditch	10012	1	3	By association
322	657-8	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association
323	659-60	Ditch	10012	1	3	By association
324	661-2	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
325	663-4	Ditch	10013	1	3	Pot
326	665-9	Pit		1	1a	Pot
327	676	Ditch	10012	1	3	
328	677	Ditch	10012	1	3	
329	683-4	Pit		1		
330	685	Pit		1		
331	686	Pit		1		
332	687	posthole		1		
333	688-9	Ditch	10011	1	3	By association
334	690	Pit		1		
335	691	Pit		1		
336	692	Pit		1		
337	693	Ditch		1	4	Pot
338	695-7	Ditch	10033	1	2biii	
339	698	Gully terminus	10034	1	2	Pot
340	699	Gully	10034	1	2?	
341	750-2	Ditch	10033	1	2biii	
342	694	Ditch	10042	1	2biv	
343	753-5	Pit		1	2	Pot
344	756	posthole		1		
345	757	posthole		1		
346	758-61	Ditch	10015	1	2b	Pot
347	762	Ditch	10042	1	2biv	Pot
348	763	Ditch	10035	1	2biv	Pot
349	764	Ditch		1	2biv	Pot
400	765	Pit		1	1b	Pot
401	766	Pit		1		
402	767	Gully	10043	1	2	By association
403	768	Gully	10043	1	2	Pot

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Fills</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Dating evidence</i>
404	769	Gully terminus	10043	1	2	By association
405	770	Gully	10043	1	2	Pot
406	771-2	Ditch	10043	1	2	Pot
407	773-4	Ditch	10043	1	2	By association
408	775	Ditch	10042	1	2biv	Pot
409	776-7	Ditch		1	2biv	Pot
410	778-80	Ditch terminus	10047	1	2	Pot
411	781-2	Ditch terminus	10029	1	2biv	Pot
412	783-4	Ditch	10036	1	2biv	Pot
413	789-90	Gully	10035	1	2biv	Pot
414	791	Ditch	10033	1	2	By association
415	792-3	Ditch terminus	10047	1	2	Pot
416	794-5	Ditch terminus	10047	1	2	Pot
417	796	Ditch terminus	10047	1	2	Pot
418	785-6	Ditch terminus	10036	1	2	Pot
419	787-8	Ditch terminus	10029	1	2	Pot
420	850-3	Ditch	10033	1	2biii	Pot
421	854	Pit		1		
422	855	Pit		1		
423	797-9	Ditch terminus	10038	1	2	Pit
424	856-7	Ditch terminus	10038	1	2	Pit
425	888-9	Pit		1	2	Pit
426	886-7	Ditch	10033	1	2	By association
427	858	posthole		1		
428	859	Ditch	10039	1	2	By association
429	860-1	Ditch	10038	1	2	By association
430	862-5	Ditch	10017	1	2b	Pit
431	866	Ditch	10039	1	2	By association
432	868-70	Ditch	10015	1	2b	By association
433	871-2	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association
434	873	Pit		1		
435	874	Pit		1		
436	867	Ditch terminus	10040	1	2biii	By association
437	875	Ditch	10033	1	2	By association
438	876	Ditch	10039	1	2	By association
439	879-80	Pit		1	2	Pot
440	881-3	Pit		1		
441	884-5	Pit		1	2	Pot
442	886-7	Clay-lined pit		1		
443	877	Gully terminus		1	2	Pot
444	878	Gully terminus		1	2	By association
445	895-6	Gully	10037	1	2	Pot
446	897-9	Ditch	10041	1	2	Pot
447	950	Gully	10037	1	2	By association
448	951	Ditch	10041	1	2	By association
449	952-3	Ditch	10036	1	2biv	Pot
500	954	Ditch	10036	1	2biv	By association
501	955	Gully	10037	1	2	Pot
502	890-1	Ditch terminus	10015	1	2b	By association
503	892	Gully	10019	1	2bi	By association
504	893-4	Ditch terminus	10017	1	2b	By association
505	956	Cremation burial		1	2	Pot
506	982	Gully	10032	1	2biv	Pot
507	983	Gully	10032	1	2biv	By association
508	957-9	Ditch	10033	1	2biii	By association
509	963	posthole		1		
510	960, 965	posthole		1	2	Pot
511	961	Gully	10027	1	2biii	Pot
512	964	Gully terminus	10027	1	2biii	By association
513	962	Pit		1	2	Pot
514	971-3	Ditch	10029	1	2	Pot
515	966, 1051	Gully	10020	1	2bi	By association
516	967-9	Ditch terminus	10017	1	2b	By association
517	970	Gully terminus	10019	1	2bi	By association
518	974-6	Pit		1	2	Pot
520	977, 979-80	Gully terminus	10021	1	2bii	Pot
521	978	Gully terminus	10019	1		

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Fills</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Dating evidence</i>
522	981	Gully terminus	10024	1	2biii	Pot
523	984-7	Ditch terminus	10018	1	2	Pot
524	988-9	Ditch	10033	1	2biii	By association
525	990	Gully	10032	1	2biv	By association
526	991	posthole		1		
527	992	posthole		1		
528	993	posthole		1		
529	994-6	Ditch	10022	1	2biii	Pot
530	1056-7	Ditch	10021	1	2bii	By association
531	997-8	Pit		1		
532	999, 1050	Ditch	10033	1	2	By association
533	1058-9	posthole		1		
534	1060-2	Pit		1	2	Pot
536	1052	Gully terminus	10045	1	2	By association
537	1053-5	Ditch	10022	1	2bii	By association
538	1063-4	Ditch	10026	1	2biii	Pot
539	1065	Ditch	10024	1	2biii	Pot
540	1066-8	Ditch	10017	1	2b	Pot
541	1069-71	Ditch terminus	10023	1	2bii	Pot
542	1072	Ditch	10026	1	2biii	Pot
543	1073	Ditch terminus	10022	1	2biii	Pot
544	1074	Gully terminus	10030	1	2biii	Pot
545	1075	Ditch	10029	1	2	Pot
546	1076	Gully	10030	1	2biii	By association
547	1077-8	Ditch terminus	10021	1	2bii	Pot
548	1079-81	Ditch	10023	1	2bii	By association
549	1082-3	Ditch	10021	1	2bii	By association
600	1090	Ditch terminus	10026	1	2biii	Pot
601	1091	Ditch	10024	1	2biii	By association
602	1092-3	Ditch terminus	10024	1	2biii	Pot
603	1084	Gully	10031	1	2biii	By association
604	1085-6	Gully	10031	1	2biii	By association
605	1087	Gully terminus	10031	1	2biii	By association
606	1088	Gully terminus	0	1	2	By association
607	1089	Gully terminus	0	1	2	Pot
608	1158-60	Ditch	10015	1	2b	Pot
609	1094	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association
610	1095-7	Ditch terminus	10025	1	2	By association
611	1098	Pit		1		
612	1099	posthole		1		
613	1150	posthole		1		
615	1153	posthole		1		
617	1152	posthole		1		
618	1154	Ditch	10015	1	2b	By association
619	1155	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association
620	1156	Ditch	10016	1	2b	By association
621	1157	Cremation burial		1		Pot
622	1161	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association
623	1165-7	Ditch terminus	10046	1	2	Pot
624	1162	Ditch	10028	1	2	By association
625	1163	Ditch terminus	10028	1	2	By association
626	1164	Ditch	10028	1	2	By association
627	1168	posthole		1		
628	1169	Pit		1		
629	1170-1	posthole		1		
630	1172	Pit		1	2	
631	1352-3	Pit		1	2	
632	1173-4	Ditch terminus		1		
633	1175-6	Ditch terminus	10046	1	2	Pot
634	1177	Ditch	10046	1	2	By association
635	1178	Gully terminus	10045	1	2	By association
636	1179	Gully	10045	1	2	By association
637	1180	Pit		1	0	
638	1181-2	Pit	0	1	0	
639	1183-4	Ditch	10015	1	2b	By association
640	1185	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association
641	1186-7	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Fills</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Dating evidence</i>
642	1188	Ditch	10013	1	3	Pot
643	1189-91	Ditch	10015	1	2b	Pot
644	1192	Hollow way		1	2	
645	1193	Pit		1		
646	1194	Gully	10049	1	3	By association
647	1195	Gully terminus	10033	1	2	By association
648	1196	Ditch	10013	1	3	By association
649	1197	Ditch terminus	10013	1	3	By association
700	1198-9	Gully	10049	1	3	By association
701	1250	posthole		1		
702	1251	Gully		1		
703	1252	Gully	10049	1	3	Pot
704	1253-4	Pit		1	2	Pot
705	1255	Ditch	10048	1	3	Pot
706	1256	Gully	10049	1	3	By association
707	1257	Ditch	10048	1	3	By association
708	1258	Gully	10051	1	3	By association
709	1259	Gully	10049	1	3	By association
710	1260	Gully	10051	1	3	By association
711	1261	Ditch terminus	10048	1	3	By association
712	1263-4	Gully terminus	10049	1	3	By association
713	1265-6	Pit		1		
714	1262	Ditch terminus	10048	1	3	By association
715	1267	Gully	10050	1	3	By association
716	1268	Gully	10049	1	3	By association
717	1269	Ditch terminus	10048	1	3	By association
718	1270	Gully	10048	1	3	By association
719	1271	Gully	10048	1	3	By association
720	1272	Gully	10048	1	3	By association
721	1273	Gully	10050	1	3	By association
722	1274	Gully	10048	1	3	Pot
723	1275	Gully	10048	1	3	Pot
724	1276	Ditch	10048	1	3	By association
725	1277	Ditch	10048	1	3	By association
726	1278	Gully	10048	1	3	By association
727	1279	Cremation burial		1	2	Pot
728	1280	Hollow way		1	2	
729	1281	Ditch	10048	1	3	Pot
730	1282	Pit		1		
731	1283	Ditch	10053	1	3	By association
732	1284	Gully terminus		1		
733	1285	Ditch	10053	1	3	By association
734	1286	Ditch	10053	1	3	By association
735	1287	posthole		1		
736	1288	posthole		1		
737	1289	posthole		1		
738	1290	Gully terminus	10053	1	3	By association
739	1291	posthole		1		
740	1292	posthole		1		
741	1293	posthole		1		
742	1294	posthole		1		
743	1295	posthole		1		
744	1296	posthole		1		
745	1297	Pit		1		
746	1298	posthole		1		
747	1299, 1350	posthole		1		
748	1351	posthole		1		
749	1354	posthole		1		
800	1355	posthole		1		
801	1356-7	Ditch	10053	1	3	Pot
802	1358	posthole		1	2	Pot
803	1359	posthole		1		
804	1360	Ditch terminus	10053	1	3	By association
805	1361	posthole		1		
806	1362	posthole		1		
807	1363	Gully	10053	1	3	By association
808	1364	posthole		1		

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Fills</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Dating evidence</i>
809	1365	posthole		1		
810	1366-7	posthole		1		
811	1368	posthole		1		
812	1369	Ditch	10053	1	2	
813	1370-2	Pit		1	2	Pot
814	1373-4, 1465, 1469-72	Pit		1	2	Pot
815	1375	Gully	10054	1	2	Pot
816	1376	Gully	10053	1	2	By association
817	1377	Gully	10054	1	2	Pot
818	1378	Gully	10054	1	2	Pot
819	1379	Gully	10054	1	2	By association
820	1380-1	Pit		1	2	Pot
821	1382-4	Ditch terminus	10056	1	2	By association
822	1385-7	Ditch terminus	10055	1	2	Pot
823	1388-9	Pit		1	2	Pot
824	1390-1	Gully	10049	1	3	By association
825	1392-3	Ditch terminus	10055	1	2	Pot
826	1394	Pit		1		
827	1395	Gully	10049	1	3	By association
828	1396, 1486	Ditch	10056	1	2	Pot
829	1397, 1487	Ditch terminus	10056	1	2	Pot
830	1398	Gully	10049	1	3	By association
831	1399	Ditch	10049	1	3	By association
832	1450	Gully	10049	1	3	By association
833	1451	Ditch	10049	1	3	By association
834	1452	Gully	10048	1	3	By association
835	1453	Gully	10048	1	3	Pot
836	1454	Pit		1		
837	1455-6	Pit		1		
838	1457-64	Ditch	10052	1		
839	1466-7	Pit		1		
840	1468	Pit		1		
841	1473-5	Ditch	10055	1	2	By association
842	1476-8	Ditch	10055	1	2	By association
843	1479-81	Ditch		1		
844	1482-5	Ditch	10052	1		
1000	1550	posthole		2		
1001	1551-2	Pit		2		
1002	1553-5	Pit		2		
1003	1556-8	Pit		2		
1004	1559	Gully terminus	900	2		
1005	1560	Gully	900	2		
1006	1561	Gully	900	2		
1008	1563	posthole		2		
1009	1564	Pit		2		
1010	1565-6	Pit		2		
1011	1567-9	Pit		2		
1012	1573-7	Pit		2		
1014	1579	posthole		2		
1015	1580-1	Pit		2		
1016	1582-3	Pit		2		
1017	1584	Pit		2		
1018	1585	posthole		2		
1037	1591	posthole		2		
1038	1592	posthole		2		
1039	1593	posthole		2		
1040	1594	posthole		2		
1041	1662	posthole		2		
1042	1663	Pit		2		
1043	1664-6	Pit		2		
1044	1669	Gully	901	2	2	By association
1049	1672-3	Pit		2		
1100	1674-5	Pit		2		
1101	1679	Gully	901	2	2	By association

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Fills</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Dating evidence</i>
1103	1682	posthole		2		
1104	1683	Gully	901	2	2	By association
1105	1690-6	Pit		2	2	Pot
1106	1684	Gully terminus	901	2	2	By association
1111	1697,1758	posthole		2		
1112	1698	posthole		2		
1113	1699	posthole		2		
1114	1750	posthole	909	2	2a	By association
1115	1751	posthole	909	2	2a	By association
1116	1752	posthole	909	2	2a	By association
1118	1754	Gully	901	2	2	By association
1119	1755	Gully	901	2	2	Pot
1120	1756	Gully terminus	901	2	2	Pot
1121	1757	posthole		2		
1122	1760, 1950	posthole		2		
1123	1761	posthole		2		
1124	1762	posthole		2		
1125	1763	posthole		2		
1126	1764-5	Gully terminus	902	2	2	Pot
1127	1759	Gully terminus	901	2	2	Pot
1128	1771, 1855	Gully terminus	907	2	2	Pot
1129	1766-7	Gully terminus	902	2	2	By association
1130	1872-8	Pit		2		
1131	1768-70	Gully	907	2	2	Pot
1132	1772-6	Pit same as 1207		2		
1133	1777	Gully	901	2	2	Pot
1134	1778	Pit		2		
1135	1779	Gully terminus	905	2	2a	By association
1136	1850	posthole		2		
1137	1780	Gully	905	2	2a	By association
1138	1851-4	Pit		2		
1139	1790-1	Pit		2		
1141	1781-2	Pit		2		
1142	1783	posthole		2		
1143	1784	posthole		2		
1144	1785	posthole		2		
1145	1786	posthole		2		
1146	1787	posthole		2		
1147	1788	posthole		2		
1148	1789	Gully terminus	903	2	2a	Pot
1200	1795	Gully	904	2	2a	By association
1201	1796	Gully	904	2	2a	By association
1202	1794	Gully terminus	903	2	2a	By association
1203	1793	Pit	909	2	2a	By association
1204	1797	Pit	909	2	2a	Pot
1205	1798-9	Gully terminus	904	2	2a	Pot
1206	1856	Gully terminus	905	2	2a	Pot
1207	1858-68	Pit same as 1132		2		
1208	1866	posthole	905	2	2a	By association
1209	1869	Gully	905	2	2a	By association
1210	1870-1	Gully	905	2	2a	Pot
1211	1895	Gully	905	2	2a	By association
1212	1896	Gully	906	2	2	By association
1213	1879-83	Pit		2	2	By association
1214	1884-5	Gully	905	2	2a	Pot
1215	1886	Pit		2	2	Pot
1216	1887-8	Pit		2		
1217	1889-90	Pit		2		
1218	1891	posthole		2		
1219	1892-4, 1897	Pit		2		
1220	1898	posthole		2		
1221	1899	posthole		2		
1223	1951, 1956	posthole	909	2	2a	Pot
1224	1957, 1962	Gully terminus	906	2	2a	By association
1225	1958	posthole	909	2	2a	By association
1226	1952, 1959	posthole	909	2	2a	By association
1227	1953	Gully terminus	905	2	2a	By association

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Fills</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Dating evidence</i>
1228	1954	Gully terminus	905	2	2a	By association
1229	1960-1	Burnt pit/hearth		2		
1230	1963	Ditch	910	2	3	By association
1231	1964	Gully	10049	2	3	By association
1232	1965	Gully	908	2		
1233	1966	Gully	908	2		
1234	1967	Gully	908	2		
1235	1968	Gully	908	2		
1236	1969	Gully	908	2		
1237	1970	posthole		2		
1240	1971	Gully terminus	906	2	2	By association
1245	1977-8	posthole		2		
1246	1979	posthole		2		
1247	1980	posthole		2		
1249	1981	posthole		2		
1300	1983	posthole		2		
1301	1984-5	Pit		2		
1302	1986	posthole		2		
1303	1987	posthole		2		
1304	1988	posthole		2		
1305	1989	posthole		2		
1306	1990	posthole		2		
1307	1991	Pit		2		
1308	1992	gully	10049	2	3	By association
1310	2051	Gully	910	2	3	By association
1311	1996	Gully	911	2	3	By association
1312	1997	Gully	911	2	3	By association
1313	1998	Gully	911	2	3	By association
1314	1999	Gully	911	2	3	By association
1315	2050	posthole		2		
1316	2052, 2058	Pit		2		
1317	2053-4	Gully	911	2	3	By association
1318	2055-7	Gully	911	2	3	pot
1319	2059	Cremation burial		2	1/2	pot
1320	2060	posthole		2		
1321	2061-4	Pit		2		
1322	2065	posthole		2		
1323	2066	posthole		2		
1326	2069	Pit		2		
1327	2070-1	posthole		2		
1328	2073-4	posthole	912	2	1b	By association
1329	2075	posthole	912	2	1b	By association
1330	2076-7	posthole	912	2	1b	By association
1331	2078	posthole	912	2	1b	By association
1332	2079-80	posthole	912	2	1b	By association
1333	2081-2	posthole	912	2	1b	C14; pot
1334	2094-5	Posthole?		2		
1336	2084	posthole	912	2	1b	By association
1337	2085	Posthole	912	2	1b	Pot
1338	2086	posthole	912	2	1b	By association
1339	2087	posthole	912	2	1b	By association
1341	2088-90, 2099, 2150	Trough	915	2	1	By association
1342	2091-2	Pit		2		
1343	2093	posthole		2		
1345	2097	posthole		2		
1346	2098	Gully	914	2	1c	By association
1401	2151-2	Gully terminus	914	2	1c	By association
1402	2153-4	posthole	915	2	1	By association
1403	2155-6	posthole	915	2	1	By association
1404	2157-8	posthole	915	2	1	By association
1405	2159-60	posthole	915	2	1	By association
1406	2161	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1407	2162-3	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1408	2164-5	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1409	2166	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1410	2167-8	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1411	2169-70	posthole	913	2	1b	By form

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Fills</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Dating evidence</i>
1412	2171-2	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1413	2173-4	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1414	2175	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1415	2176-7	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1416	2178-9	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1417	2180-1	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1418	2182-3	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1419	2187-8	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1420	2189-90	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1421	2191-2	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1422	2193	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1423	2194-5	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1424	2196-7	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1425	2198-9	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1426	2250-1	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1427	2252-3	posthole	913	2	1b	By form
1428	2359-68	Palaeochannel		2		
1429	2374-5, 2388	Palaeochannel		2		
1431	2256-8	Pit		2	1	By association
1432	2259-60	posthole	915	2	1c	By association
1433	2261	posthole	915	2	1c	By association
1434	2262	posthole	915	2	1c	By association
1435	2263	posthole	915	2	1c	By association
1436	2264	posthole	915	2	1c	By association
1437	2265	posthole	915	2	1c	By association
1438	2266	posthole	915	2	1c	By association
1439	2267	posthole	915	2	1c	By association
1440	2268	posthole	915	2	1c	By association
1441	2274-8	Pit	B-C-D	2	1	By association
1444	2271	posthole	915	2	1c	By association
1445	2272	posthole	915	2	1c	By association
1446	2273	posthole	915	2	1c	By association
1447	2279-80	Pit		2		
1448	2281	posthole		2		
1449	2282	posthole		2		
1500	2283	posthole		2		
1501	2284	posthole		2		
1502	2285	posthole		2		
1503	2286-7	Pit		2		
1504	2288-90	Pit		2		
1505	2291-2, 2295-6	burnt mound A	A	2	1c	By association
1506	2293	Pit		2		
1507	2294, 2297, 2376	burnt mound A	A	2	1c	By association
1508	2299, 2350, 2356-7	burnt mound A	A	2	1c	By association
1509	2351-2, 2354, 2358	burnt mound A	A	2	1c	By association
1510	2355	Ditch	916	2		
1512	2377-8, 2386-7	burnt mound A	A	2	1c	C14
1513	2385	burnt mound A	A	2	1c	By association
1514	2389, 2391-2	burnt mound E	E	2	1	By association
1515	2390	Post hole	915	2	1c	By association
1516	2393	Gully		2		
1517	2394	Gully	914	2	1	By association
1521	2453, 2467	burnt mound E	E	2	1c	By association
1523	2456-8	burnt mound E	E	2	1c	By association
1524	2459	Pit	E	2	1c	By association
1525	2460	Pit	E	2	1c	By association
1526	2461-2, 2468	burnt mound F	F	2	1c	By association
1527	2463	Gully	916	2		
1528	2464-5, 2477	burnt mound F	F	2	1c	By association
1529	2469-72	burnt mound F	F	2	1c	Pot (intrusive)
1530	2473, 2478	burnt mound F	F	2	1c	By association
1531	2474-5	burnt mound F	F	2	1c	By association
1532	2476	Ditch	916	2		
1533	2479-80, 2482, 2491	burnt mound B	B	2	1c	Pot (intrusive)
1534	2481, 2485	Pit	B	2	1	By association
1535	2483-4	burnt mound C	C	2	1c	By association

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Fills</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Dating evidence</i>
1536	2487-8	burnt mound C	C	2	1c	By association
1537	2489-90	burnt mound C	C	2	1c	By association
1538	2492, 2558	burnt mound D	D	2	1c	By association
1540	2495, 2582	Pit	B	2	1	C14
1541	2497-9	burnt mound B	B	2	1c	By association
1545	2496, 2554-6	burnt mound D	D	2	1c	By association
1547	2557	Pit	D	2	1	By association
1548	2559-60	burnt mound D	D	2	1c	By association
1601	2564-6	burnt mound D	D	2	1c	By association
1602	2567	Pit		2	1	By form
1603	2493-4	Pit	D?	2	1	Recut of 1504
	1570	brown clay subsoil		2		
	1571	bluish clay		2		
	1572	black peat		2		
	1676	brown peat		2		
	1677	dark blue grey clay		2		
	1678	dark brown peat		2		
	1857	blue grey clay		2		
	2072	peat layer		2		
	2184	grey clay layer		2		
	2185	peat layer		2		
	2186	Wood in peat		2		
	2254	layer		2		
	2255	layer		2		
	2298	layer		2		
	2375	Alluvial layer (over burnt mound A)		2		Stratigraphy
	2486	Alluvial layer (burnt mounds B, C, D)		2		

APPENDIX 2: Summary of pottery by fabric

	<i>Fabric</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No%</i>	<i>Wt (g)</i>	<i>Wt%</i>
Early Prehistoric	GRL1	grog and limestone	48	1.7	114	0.8
	GR	grog-tempered	2	*	3	*
	BKR	Beaker	26	0.9	25	*
	FL2	sparse flint-tempered	1	*	5	*
IRON AGE	L1	sandy with sparse limestone	3	*	15	*
	L2	oolitic limestone, some fossil	2	*	3	*
	L3	sandy with sparse oolites	2	*	15	*
	L4	dense fine oolitic limestone	61	2.2	321	2.1
Shelly	SH1	coarse shelly	42	1.5	301	2.0
	SH2	sparser shell and fossil detritus	26	0.9	99	0.7
	SH3	mixed shell and limetstone	21	0.7	289	1.9
	SH4	sparse fine shell/ limestone	1	*	36	*
Sandy/calcareous	SALI1	sandy with limestone/shell/fossil	975	34.6	5264	34.8
	SALI2	sandy with sparse limestone/ shell	903	32.1	7798	51.5
	SALI3	very fine limestone/shell	62	2.2	157	1.0
Mixed	SALIGR	sandy with limestone and grog	1	*	22	*
Flint	FL1	flint-tempered	2	*	8	*
Sandy	SA1	medium-fine sandy	5	*	65	*
	SA2	medium-fine sandy with limestone	23	0.8	142	0.9
	SA	miscellaneous sandy	4	*	14	*
Organic	SAOR	sandy with organic matter	1	*	7	*
Malvernian	MAL REB	Palaeozoic limestone-tempered	15	*	59	*
	MAL SST	sandstone-tempered	4	*	22	*
unclassified	OO	undiagnostic small crumbs	587	20.8	349	2.3
sub-total			2817	100.0	15133	100.0
ROMAN	LEZ SA	Central Gaulish samian	3	3.7	30	6.9
	DOR BB1	Dorset black burnished ware	8	9.9	86	20.0
	OXIDF	fine oxidised ware	2	2.5	3	0.7
	SVW OX	early Severn Valley ware	1	1.2	96	22.3
	WIL BB	Wiltshire black burnished ware	43	53.1	51	11.8
	WIL OX	Wiltshire oxidised ware	6	7.4	20	4.6
	WIL RE	Wiltshire reduced sandy ware	17	21.0	122	28.3
	WIL CC	Wiltshire colour-coated ware	1	1.2	23	5.3
TOTAL			81	100.0	431	100.0

* = under 0.5%

APPENDIX 4: Metalwork catalogue

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Deposit</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Phase</i>	<i>Cat No</i>	<i>Material</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Wt (g)</i>	<i>Comment</i>
21	78	Ditch	10004	2b	1	cu	pin	1	3	
211	386	Ditch	10011	3	2	fe	nail	1	6	
228	474	Ditch	10013	3	3, 4	fe	nail	2	22	
300	564	Ditch	10011	3	5	fe	blade	1	26	
319	652	Ditch	10013	3	6	fe	nail	1	16	
440	882	Pit			7	fe	nail	1	11	
621	1157	Cremation			11	fe	object	1	1	
		unstrat				fe	nail	3	105	
		unstrat				fe	ring	3	19	
		unstrat				brass	button	1	4	

APPENDIX 5: Burnt bone

Table 5.1 – Inventory of burnt human bone

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Deposit</i>	<i>Colour</i>	<i>Wt (g)</i>	<i>Max Frag size (mm)</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Sex</i>	<i>Non-human bone in context</i>
29	94	buff	25	35	adult?	?	-
505	956	mix- grey, blue, white	1210	58	adult	?M	unburnt sheep/goat tooth
621	1157	white	253	37	adult	?	-
727	1279	white	604	43	adult	?	antler/horn core fragments
1319	2059	mix- grey, blue, white	207	34	adult	?	-

Table 5.2 – Summary of burnt human remains fragmentation

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Deposit</i>	<i>Sample</i>	<i>10mm</i>		<i>5mm</i>		<i><5mm</i>		<i>Total (g)</i>
			<i>(g)</i>	<i>(%)</i>	<i>(g)</i>	<i>(%)</i>	<i>(g)</i>	<i>(%)</i>	
29	94	4	10	40	5	20	10	40	25
505	956	26	669	55	279	23	267	22	1210
621	1157	34	65	26	69	27	119	47	253
727	1279	37	172	28	197	33	235	39	604
1319	2059	175	68	33	59	28	80	39	207

Table 5.3 – Inventory of burnt non-human bone

<i>Cut</i>	<i>Deposit</i>	<i>Colour</i>	<i>Wt (g)</i>	<i>No. frags</i>	<i>Max Frag size (mm)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
104	190	Charred-white	3	2	22	
326	666	mix	6	76	15	Animal tooth fragments
346	761	Black-grey	5	1	25	
411	782	charred	19	8	29	
631	1353	mix	3	2	23	
814	1374	mix	3	7	25	
1328	2073	white	1	1	15	
Total		-	40	97	-	-

APPENDIX6: Animal Bone

Table 6.1: Fragment representation by feature and phase. Identified fragments only

Features	2	2A	2B	2C	?2	All
Ditch	180	1	19	15	2	217
Gully	16		6	7	1	30
Pit	59					59
Total	255	1	25	22	3	306

Table 6.2: Condition and taphonomic factors affecting the assemblage

Condition		%	Taphonomic Factors	
Excellent	1		Butchery	3
Good	2	9	Gnawing	12
Fair	3	33	Burning	13
Poor	4	25	Fresh break	39
Very Bad	5	33	Refit	149=14
			loose: mand	16:7

Table 6.3: Species representation (hand collection)

Species	n	%
Cattle	109	46
Sheep/ Goat	48	21
Sheep	3	
Pig	12	5
Horse	59	25
Red Deer	2	1
Deer	1	-
Rabbit	1	-
Total Identified	235	
Unidentified Mammal	183	
Large Mammal	341	
Medium Mammal	66	
Large Bird	1	
Total	826	

Table 6.4: Species representation (from samples)

Species	n
Cattle	3
Sheep/ Goat	6
Pig	1

Table 6.5: Fragment representation (epiphysis count)

Anatomy	Cattle	Sheep	Pig	Horse
Mandible*	7	1	2	1
Horn core		1		
1st Cervical Vertebrae		1	1	
Cervical Vertebrae	1			
Scapula	3		1	
Humerus	2	3		
Radius	7			1
Pelvis	2			2
Tibia	6	1		
Metacarpal	4			
Metatarsal	3			1
Metapodial	2			4
Lateral Metapodial			1	
1st phalange**	1			1
Ulna	1			
Total	39	7	5	10

* mandibles with molars; ** figures adjusted for frequency bias

APPENDIX 7: Charred plant remains

A Charcoal (number of fragments identified) *Taxonomy and nomenclature follow Schweingruber (1978).*

	<i>Sample</i>	91	86	4	27	30	29	12	18
	<i>Cut</i>	1205	1148	29	520	541	522	339	307
	<i>Deposit</i>	1798	1789	94	977	1071	981	698	585
	<i>no frags</i>	100+	50	100+	100+	100+	100+	27	500+
	<i>max. size (mm)</i>	17	4	17	6	28	14	7	24
	<i>Area</i>	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
	<i>Feature type</i>	Gully	Gully	Gully	Gully	Gully	Gully	Gully	Hearth
	<i>Phase</i>	2a	2a	2b	2bii	2bii	2biii	3	2
Name	Vernacular								
<i>Corylus avellana</i>	Hazel		2		3		15		
<i>Quercus</i>	Oak	65	4	26	51	100	9	27	
<i>Salix / Populus</i>	Salix / Poplar	35	44	60	12		38		17
<i>Rhamnus tharticus</i>	Common buckthorn								83
	Indet.			14	34		46		

	<i>Sample</i>	125	34	34	34	34	34	34	37
	<i>Spit</i>		1	2	3	4	surface	surface	
	<i>Cut</i>	1319	621	621	621	621	621	621	727
	<i>Deposit</i>	2059	1157	1157	1157	1157	1157	1157	1279
	<i>no frags</i>	50+	58	53	100+	53	50	52	100+
	<i>max. size (mm)</i>	11	9	9	3	4	9	11	17
	<i>Area</i>	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	<i>Feature type</i>	Cremation	Cremation	Cremation	Cremation	Cremation	Cremation	Cremation	Cremation
	<i>Phase</i>	2							2
Name	Vernacular								
<i>Corylus avellana</i>	Hazel	1							
<i>Quercus</i>	Oak	23	44	48	24	38	35	30	79
<i>Salix / Populus</i>	Salix / Poplar	26							
	Indet.		14	5	76	62	15	22	21

	<i>Sample</i>	14	148	183	193	194	153	158	174	175	1
	<i>Cut</i>	222	1338	1434	1444	1445	1402	1407	1421	1422	6
	<i>Deposit</i>	462	2086	2262	2271	2272	2153	2162	2191	2193	59
	<i>no frags</i>	62	6	100+	100+	100+	13	11	1	7	48
	<i>max. size (mm)</i>	11	11	7	12	7	8	8	9	3	19
	<i>Area</i>	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	<i>Feature type</i>	Posthole	Post hole	Post hole	Post hole	Post hole	Post hole	Post hole	Post hole	Post hole	Posthole
	<i>Phase</i>	1b	1b	1	1	1	1	1b	1b	1b	2
Name	Vernacular										
<i>Corylus avellana</i>	Hazel			1			2			1	
<i>Quercus</i>	Oak	16	2	8	67	82			1		37
<i>Salix / Populus</i>	Salix / Poplar	21		37	33	18	5	11			
	Indet.	22	4	54			6			6	11

	<i>Sample</i>	20	234	236	26	38	39	40	41	8	57	60	95
	<i>Cut</i>	326	1540	1540	505	631	813	814	820	110	1009	1012	1130
	<i>Deposit</i>	666	2493	2495	956	1353	1371	1374	1380	189	1564	1575	1874
	<i>no frags</i>	1000+	3	100+	1000+	4	41	300+	26	500+	7	100+	100+
	<i>max. size (mm)</i>	17	4	18	18	31	9	29	14	20	6	11	14
	<i>Aera</i>	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
	<i>Feature type</i>	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit
	<i>Phase</i>	1a	1c	1c	2	2	2	2	2	-	-	-	-
Name	Vernacular												
<i>Corylus avellana</i>	Hazel		1	4	71								6
<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	Ash												9
<i>Quercus</i>	Oak	5			29		3		18	100	2	25	
<i>Salix / Populus</i>	Salix / Poplar	23		96		4	30	100				75	25
<i>Rhamnus tharticus</i>	Common buckthorn												31
	Indet.	72	2				8		8		5		29

	<i>Sample</i>	11	13	19	23	24	32	35
	<i>Cut</i>	206	215	308	410	411	602	623
	<i>Deposit</i>	381	395	588	778	782	1092	1165
	<i>no frags</i>	19	23	19	100+	72	31	32
	<i>max. size (mm)</i>	8	7	8	15	13	13	8
	<i>Area</i>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	<i>Feature type</i>	Ditch	Ditch	Ditch	Ditch	Ditch	Ditch	Ditch
	<i>Phase</i>	2	2b	2b	2	2biv	2	2
Name	Vernacular							
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	Alder					4		
<i>Quercus</i>	Oak		10		75	33	6	18
<i>Salix / Populus</i>	Salix / Poplar	3		12	16	6	19	
	Indet.	16	13	7	9	29	6	14

	<i>Sample</i>	214	197	198	199	200	201	204	205	208	210	211	212	150	226	222	224
	<i>Cut</i>	1513	1505	1505	1507	1505	1505	1508	1508	1508	1508	1508	1509	1341	1533	1525	1528
	<i>Deposit</i>	2385	2291	2292	2294	2295	2296	2299	2350	2353	2356	2357	2358	2089	2479	2464	2465
	<i>no frags</i>	19	500+	1000+	100+	100+	100+	100+	300+	100+	200+	50+	100+	15	100+	5	4
	<i>max. size (mm)</i>	8	23	26	15	10	15	15	22	17	16	5	21	12	12	12	4
	<i>Area</i>	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	<i>Feature type</i>	Burnt mound A											Trough	Burnt Mound B	Burnt Mound E	Burnt Mound F	
	<i>Phase</i>	1c											1c	1c	1c	1c	
Name	Vernacular																
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	Alder							4									
<i>Corylus avellana</i>	Hazel							12						1		3	1
<i>Quercus</i>	Oak	13															
<i>Salix / Populus</i>	Salix / Poplar	6	100	100	100	11	100	33	100	100	100	3	100	3	100		
	Indet.					62						47		11		2	

<i>Sample</i>	14	20	18	23	40	35	36	56	86	121	194	
<i>Cut</i>	222	326	307	410	814	623	647	1004	1140	1306	1445	
<i>Deposit</i>	462	666	585	778	1374	1165	1195	1559	1792	1990	2272	
<i>Area</i>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	
<i>Feature type</i>	Posthole	Pit	Hearth	Ditch	Pit	Ditch	Gully	Gully	Pit	posthole	posthole	
<i>Phase</i>	1b	1a	2	2	2	2	2	2	-	-	1	
LATIN BINOMIAL												COMMON NAME
<i>Corylus avellana</i> L.	135	119				1						Hazel
<i>Chenopodium</i> spp./ <i>Atriplex</i> spp.				4	2							Goosefoot / Orache
BRASSICACEAE		1		1	1							Cabbage family
<i>Potentilla</i> spp.									1000+			Cinquefoils
<i>Prunus</i> spp.			1							6		Cherries
<i>Crataegus monogyna</i> Jacq											3	Hawthorn
<i>Avena</i> spp.				1								Oat
<i>Hordeum</i> spp. (ch.)				3	4							Barley
<i>Triticum</i> spp. (ch.)		2		14	1							Wheat
Indeterminate cereal				25	9		1					
Cereal culm nodes												
Indeterminate nutshell						1						
Unidentified							1	1				

1140 is not in the feature table

APPENDIX 8: Lithostratigraphy

Table 8.1: Lithostratigraphic description of column sample <1>

<i>Depth (m OD)</i>	<i>Context</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Description</i>
91.91 to 92.07	1571 and 1676	1	10YR2/2 very dark brown; patchy mixture of peat and silty clay passing down to mixture of peat, silty clay with calcareous sand increasingly common downward; massive; detrital plant remains; sub-vertical root penetration; localised strong acid reaction.
92.07 to 92.23	1572	2	2.5Y3/3 dark olive brown; silty clay with sand-fine gravel size particles of white limestone; very blocky; sub-vertical root penetration; no acid reaction; sharp contact with:

Table 8.2: Lithostratigraphic description of column sample <2>

<i>Depth (m OD)</i>	<i>Context</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Description</i>
91.68 to 91.89	N/A	1	2.5Y8/6 yellow to white; sandy and stony calcareous debris.
91.89 to 91.95	1678	2	10YR2/2 very dark brown; peat with scattered mineral grains increasing substantially in lowest 10mm; sub-vertical root penetration; sharp contact with:
91.95 to 92.05	1571	3	10YR2/2 very dark brown; patchy mixture of peat (mainly) and silty clay; weakly defined uneven sub-horizontal bedding; sub-vertical root penetration; no acid reaction; well-marked transition to:
92.05 to 92.13	1572	4	2.5Y3/3 dark olive brown; silty clay; very blocky; common root remains; no acid reaction; gradual transition to:

Table 8.3: Lithostratigraphic description of column sample <3>

<i>Depth (m OD)</i>	<i>Context</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Description</i>
92.01 to 92.07	1676	1	10YR3/3 dark brown; mixture of silty clay and peat with calcareous sand; massive; scattered root remains; detrital plant remains; strong acid reaction.
92.07 to 92.15	1676	2	10YR2/2 very dark brown; sandy and gravelly peaty silt/silty peat; massive; <i>in situ</i> root network; detrital plant remains; gradual transition to:
92.15 to 92.33	Subsoil	3	10YR4/2 dark greyish brown; silty clay with 5YR6/8 reddish yellow staining around root channels; very blocky; <i>in situ</i> root network; detrital plant remains; no acid reaction; sharp contact with:
92.33 to 92.51	Topsoil	4	10YR3/3 dark brown; slightly sandy silty clay with clasts of limestone (up to 10mm); massive; root remains; detrital plant remains; weak acid reaction; gradual transition to:

Table 8.4: Lithostratigraphic description of column sample <4>, Dryleaze Farm

<i>Depth (m OD)</i>	<i>Context</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Description</i>
92.14 to 92.20	2387	1	2.5Y8/6 yellow to white; sandy and stony calcareous debris.
92.20 to 92.30	2378	2	Mixture of ash, charcoal and clasts of burnt calcareous sandstone; sharp contact with:
92.30 to 92.50	2375	3	2.5Y3/1 very dark grey; silty clay; very blocky; massive; scattered iron-stained root channels and root remains; weak acid reaction; very sharp contact with:

APPENDIX 9: Pollen

Sample	Depth (m OD)	Context	Main pollen taxa			Concentration 0-5	Preservation 0- 5	Charcoal 0-5
			Latin name	Common name	No.			
<1>	92.01 to 92.02	N/A	Poaceae Lactuceae Cyperaceae <i>Plantago cf. coronopus</i> <i>Plantago lanceolata</i> <i>Lycopodium clavatum</i>	grass family dandelion family sedge family buckshorn plantain ribwort plantain clubmoss spike	4 4 2 1 1 23	2	4	1
<1>	92.10 to 92.09	1572	Cyperaceae Lactuceae Poaceae <i>Pinus</i> <i>Lycopodium clavatum</i>	sedge family dandelion family grass family pine clubmoss spike	13 12 1 1 40	2	4	1
<1>	92.18 to 92.17	1572	Cyperaceae Lactuceae <i>Pinus</i> <i>Lycopodium clavatum</i>	sedge family dandelion family pine clubmoss spike	6 3 1 32	1/2	4	1
<2>	91.87 to 91.86	1678	Lactuceae <i>Lycopodium clavatum</i>	dandelion family clubmoss spike	2 5	1	3	1
<2>	91.95 to 91.94	1678	Lactuceae Cyperaceae <i>Lycopodium clavatum</i>	dandelion family sedge family clubmoss spike	2 1 24	1	3	1
<2>	92.03 to 92.02	1572	Cyperaceae Lactuceae Poaceae Caryophyllaceae <i>Lycopodium clavatum</i>	sedge family dandelion family grass family pink family clubmoss spike	14 2 1 1 17	2	4	0
<3>	92.10 to 92.09	N/A	Lactuceae Cyperaceae <i>Lycopodium clavatum</i>	dandelion family sedge family clubmoss spike	3 2 13	1	3	1
<3>	92.26 to 92.25	N/A	Lactuceae <i>Lycopodium clavatum</i>	dandelion family clubmoss spike	2 17	1	3	0
<3>	92.42 to 92.41	N/A	Cyperaceae Lactuceae <i>Pinus</i> <i>Lycopodium clavatum</i>	sedge family dandelion family pine clubmoss spike	5 3 1 25	1	3	1
<4>	92.16 to 92.15	2387	<i>Lycopodium clavatum</i>	clubmoss spike	4	0	-	1
<4>	92.24 to 92.23	2378	Lactuceae <i>Lycopodium clavatum</i>	dandelion clubmoss spike	1 8	1	3	4
<4>	92.33 to 92.32	2375	Cyperaceae Poaceae <i>Corylus</i> type <i>Alnus</i> <i>Lycopodium clavatum</i>	sedge family grass family e.g. hazel alder clubmoss spike	2 2 2 1 28	1	3	2/3

Key: Concentration: 0 = 0 grains; 1 = 1-75 grains; 2 = 76-150 grains; 3 = 151-225 grains; 4 = 226-300, 5 = 300+ grains per slide

Preservation: 0 = none, 1 = very poor, 2 = poor, 3 = moderate, 4 = good, 5 = excellent

Charcoal: 0 = none, 1 = negligible, 2 = occasional, 3 = moderate, 4 = frequent, 5 = abundant

APPENDIX 10: Radiocarbon dating

KIA43679 ditch 10015, slot 301 fill 566, cattle tooth

Fraction	Corrected pMC	Conventional Age	$\delta^{13}\text{C}(\text{‰})\ddagger$
Bone, Collagen, 4.4 mg C	75.19 ± 0.28	2290 ± 30 BP	-22.61 ± 0.17
Radiocarbon Age:	BP290 ± 30	calibrated age	Probability
Two Sigma Range:		cal BC 404–354	69.1%
(Probability 95.4%)		cal BC 291–231	26.3%

KIA43681 gully 904 slot 1205 fill 1798, charcoal,

Fraction	Corrected pMC	Conventional Age	$\delta^{13}\text{C}(\text{‰})\ddagger$
Charcoal, Alkali residue, 3.7 mg C	73.97 ± 0.28	2425 ± 30 BP	-24.80 ± 0.23
Radiocarbon Age	BP2423 ± 30	calibrated age	Probability
Two Sigma Range		cal BC 747–687	16.5%
(Probability 95.4%)		cal BC 666–643	4.4%
		cal BC 591–578	1.3%
		cal BC 566–402	73.2%

KIA43682 roundhouse 912 post hole 1333 fill 2082, charcoal

Fraction	Corrected pMC	Conventional Age	$\delta^{13}\text{C}(\text{‰})\ddagger$
Charcoal, Alkali residue, 3.6 mg C	63.03 ± 0.28	3710 ± 35 BP	-30.71 ± 0.18
Radiocarbon Age	BP 3708 ± 35	calibrated age	Probability
Two Sigma Range		cal BC 2203–2018	93.2%
(Probability 95.4%)		cal BC 1995–19801	2.2%

KIA43683 burnt mound A slot 1505 layer 2292; Salix/Poplar charcoal

Fraction	Corrected pMC	Conventional Age	$\delta^{13}\text{C}(\text{‰})\ddagger$
Charcoal, Alkali residue, 1.7 mg C	67.26 ± 0.28	3185 ± 35 BP	-27.23 ± 0.21
Radiocarbon Age	BP3186 ± 34	calibrated age	Probability
Two Sigma Range		cal BC 1520–1408	95.4%
(Probability 95.4%)			

KIA43684 Pit 1540 fill 2495; Salix/Poplar charcoal

Fraction	Corrected pMC	Conventional Age	$\delta^{13}\text{C}(\text{‰})\ddagger$
Charcoal, Alkali residue, 3.8 mg C	65.37 ± 0.26	3415 ± 30 BP	-26.53 ± 0.32
Radiocarbon Age	BP3414 ± 32	calibrated age	Probability
Two Sigma Range		cal BC 1871–1845	5.0%
(Probability 95.4%)		cal BC 1812–1804	1.0%
		cal BC 1776–1625	89.4%

KIA43680 ditch 10029, slot 411 fill 782, cattle tooth original reading (rejected by lab)

Fraction	Corrected pMC	Conventional Age	$\delta^{13}\text{C}(\text{‰})\ddagger$
Bone, Collagen, 3.5 mg C	76.23 ± 0.28	2180 ± 30 BP	-22.91 ± 0.24
Radiocarbon Age	BP2180 ± 29	calibrated age	Probability
Two Sigma Range		cal BC 362–169	95.4%
(Probability 95.4%)			

KIA43680 ditch 10029, slot 411 fill 782, cattle tooth revised reading (preferred)

bone tooth, Dryleaze Farm, Siddington, Gloucestershire Phase 1, sample depth: 0.5 m

Fraction	Corrected pMC	Conventional Age	$\delta^{13}\text{C}(\text{‰})\ddagger$
Bone, Collagen, 3.7 mg C	76.45 ± 0.23	2155 ± 25 BP	-22.03 ± 0.18
Radiocarbon Age	BP2157 ± 24	calibrated age	Probability
Two Sigma Range		cal BC 356–287	38.9%
(Probability 95.4%)		cal BC 234–110	56.5%