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Summary

An archaeological excavation was carried out at Moulton Paddocks, Newmarket between the 2nd and 6th of December 2013. The development entailed the construction of a practice start track with stalls and turning circle, with an access track from the road to the south. The proposed track will be 250m long x 5m wide and the access road 40m long x 4m wide; there will be a turning ring 20m in diameter at the northern end of the practice track.

The works revealed a series of tree throws with no associated finds along with a small area of colluvial soil which contained prehistoric struck flint. The colluvium was found within a large natural hollow at a low point in the central area of the field, and was overlain by recent made ground.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 An archaeological excavation was conducted at Moulton Paddocks, Newmarket, Suffolk.

1.1.2 This archaeological excavation was undertaken in accordance with a Brief issued by Jess Tipper of SCC (Suffolk County Council) Archaeological Service, supplemented by a Specification prepared by OA East.

1.1.3 The work was designed to assist in defining the character and extent of any archaeological remains within the proposed redevelopment area, in accordance with the guidelines set out in National Planning Policy Framework (Department for Communities and Local Government March 2012). The results will enable decisions to be made by SCC, on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, with regard to the treatment of any archaeological remains found.

1.1.4 The site archive is currently held by OA East and will be deposited with the appropriate county stores in due course.

1.2 Geology and topography

1.2.1 The underlying geology across the site is from the Holywell Nodular Chalk Formation and New Pit Chalk Formation with a band of Sand And Gravel River Terrace Deposits overlying them at the south (BGS 2010). The Development area lies at around 50m OD at its most northern extent, falling to c. 46m at the centre before rising again to c. 48m at it’s southern extent.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

Prehistoric

1.3.1 Previous fieldwork to the west, south and east of the site shows that the site is located in an area containing sporadic evidence related to prehistoric funerary and domestic activities. Archaeological features broadly categorised as prehistoric have been identified to the east and south and comprise a series of pits (Suffolk HER MUN022) and an inhumation burial (MUN035) respectively (Williams 2010). Immediately to the west of the site the excavations at Moulton Paddocks (MUN 038) produced features and finds assemblages from the Late Neolithic, Early Bronze Age and Early Iron Age. An excavation on a new gallop to the east (MUN039) uncovered part of a Late Neolithic monument and further Early Iron Age features.

Palaeolithic to Neolithic

1.3.2 Evidence for early prehistoric activity is present all across the landscape, and is predominantly represented in the Suffolk and Cambridgeshire HERs as find spots. Flint scatters have been identified at Kennett Hall Farm to the north of the site (Suffolk HER MCB18220), at Little Bradley to the south (Suffolk HER BRL007) and along the route of the Fordham bypass to the north-west (Cambridgeshire HER01228, HER08165, HER7530 and HER7737) (Mortimer forthcoming). The Little Bradley scatter is a large assemblage of Mesolithic and Neolithic/Bronze Age flints recovered adjacent to the
River Stour and that found at Kennet Hall Farm, combined with the results of the fieldwalking, indicates transient activity with a possible working area or habitation site.

1.3.3  Neolithic find spots in the form of flint axes have also been found in fields to the east of the development area (Suffolk HER MSF14541, MUN006 and MSF07487).

1.3.4  On the outskirts of Kedington village (c.12 miles south of the development area) prehistoric archaeological features have been identified as cropmarks, indicating a possible interrupted ditch system (or causewayed enclosure) forming an approximate semi-circle to the west of Hall Farm. This is likely to represent a high-status site and is a scheduled monument (Suffolk HER KDG006). Over 2000 Mesolithic and Neolithic struck flints and flint tools have also been found in this location. A linear cropmark identified as a possible cursus feature has also been identified to the east of the scheduled area (Finch 2010).

1.3.5  At the Moulton Paddocks excavation immediately to the west (MUN038) a single large sub-circular pit of Later Neolithic date was recorded, adjacent to a dense contemporary struck flint mound deposit. The west of this a second large, contemporary flint deposit was excavated within an infilled natural hollow.

1.3.6  At the Moulton Gallop excavation further to the east, on the north-facing slope of Folly Hill, at a height of c.74m and overlooking the Paddock site, was a pit-cut ring ditch monument. It consisted, in the trench, of two curvilinear (pit-dug) ditches which, if joined, would have formed a circle c.20m in diameter.

**Bronze Age**

1.3.7  The majority of the recorded sites in the area are thought to represent the Bronze Age are seen as ring ditches, burial mounds and through cropmarks. A long linear barrow cemetery covering c.3km occupies the high ground to the north-east of Newmarket. It consists of at least sixteen ring ditches and barrows and extends south-west towards Royston.

1.3.8  To the east of the development area, on the west side of the River Kennett, is a group of four ring ditches (Suffolk HER MUN001, 002, 009 and 019). Some 3km east of site are a further two groups of Bronze Age monuments. The first consisting of four ring ditches, (Suffolk HER KTD001, 002, 003 and 004) and the second of three round barrows (Suffolk HER GAZ002, 003 and 008) and a ring ditch (Suffolk HER GAZ005). These three round barrows are Scheduled Monuments (Rolfe 2007).

1.3.9  A further burial mound has been recorded at Pin Farm, Gazeley, immediately north of A14 and north-east of site. These excavations unearthed a barrow with a central burial, seven Bronze Age cremations and sixteen associated inhumations, along with amber beads, and sherds of Early Bronze Age collared urn finds (Suffolk HER GAZ001).

1.3.10 Enclosures and ring ditches, possibly representing the ploughed out remains of Bronze Age burial mounds, are visible as cropmarks to the south of Fordham (Cambridgeshire HER07433 and 09025). An unprovenanced Beaker burial was found near or at Fordham in about 1905 – it was an inhumation accompanied by a handled vessel (Fox 1923). Excavations undertaken to the south-west of the new Biggen Stud roundabout at Landwade Road (Connor 1996), immediately north of Newmarket, showed evidence for activity in the Middle to Late Bronze Age and included enclosures, a post-built structure and cremation burials.
1.3.11 Archaeological works carried out to the immediate south of the Moulton Paddock site (Suffolk HER MUN038) in 2009 revealed a grave which contained a poorly preserved beaker burial and a pit holding a cremation vessel and copper-alloy awl (Grassman and Stone 2009).

1.3.12 On the location of the Moulton Gallop site (Suffolk HER MUN039), three prehistoric find spots have been recorded: a group of prehistoric flint implements (Suffolk HER MUN003), beaker pottery (Suffolk HER MUN005) and a prehistoric flint adze (Suffolk HER MUN007).

1.3.13 At the Moulton Paddocks excavation immediately to the west (MUN038) a single small cremation pit containing a complete Collared Urn holding cremated bone was found in the western area. In the eastern area a group of six pits created two arcs on the western and eastern sides of an earlier (Late Neolithic) pit and struck flint mound. Although these pits were significantly later in date than the pit/mound, it is clear that they respected it. Those to the east contained small, complete, refired urns; of those to the west one contained a cremation deposit and one a few sherds of pottery.

Iron Age

1.3.14 Sites dating to Iron Age period are not terribly prolific with the immediate area. The most notable example however is from Exning (on the north-west periphery of Newmarket), where an evaluation in 2006 (Suffolk HER EXG082) revealed a substantial Iron Age ditch containing a large assemblage of Early Iron Age pottery, which has now been identified as part of a potential hill-top enclosure (Caruth 2006).

1.3.15 A 45 hectare evaluation undertaken immediately next to Moulton Gallop (Suffolk HER MUN039) in 2008 (Suffolk HER MUN022) found limited archaeology, but three late prehistoric pits containing struck flint were uncovered in the northern end of the development area (Duffy 2008).

1.3.16 Further into Cambridgeshire, Iron Age sites and finds become numerous. Snailwell has a number of Iron Age sites located along the River Snail and the Landwade Road excavation (Connor 1996) also revealed Iron Age activity and provided a large pottery assemblage dating to the Early Iron Age.

1.3.17 On the Moulton Paddocks site (MUN038), the Early Iron Age activity was confined to the westernmost area. A total of twenty-nine features were recognised as belonging to the Early Iron Age, consisting of nine storage pits and twenty smaller pits. At the Gallop excavation (MUN039) three further Early Iron Age pits were recorded.

Roman

1.3.18 There is very little evidence for Roman activity in the area surrounding site. The B1506 Well Bottom Road (adjacent to the northern edge of site) is believed to run along the line of the Ickneild Way, a major prehistoric route. Its age is debatable, mostly being attributed to the Roman period, implying a potential for material from this period to be found in the area.

1.3.19 An area of apparent iron working was excavated in Moulton (to the south-east) during the early 1960s and is recorded as evidence of Romano-British occupation (MUN Misc). Unfortunately the records no longer exist for this site and the location is unknown. A Roman glass vessel has been dug up from a garden in Moulton village (Suffolk HER
MUN012). A Roman copper alloy disc brooch has also been found during archaeological works adjacent to Moulton Gallop (Suffolk HER MUN022).

1.3.20 A number of Roman sites are known to exist some distance away from the development area to the south, the most notable being a Roman villa on the Kedington/Wixoe parish boundary (Suffolk HER KDG011) and the Roman settlement recently excavated by OA East in Wixoe.

**Anglo-Saxon**

1.3.21 Evidence for Anglo-Saxon occupation is predominantly seen to the west of site, around Newmarket and Exning. Nonetheless, an Anglo-Saxon cremation urn (Suffolk HER MUN011) is documented as having been found in 1965, next to the location of Moulton Gallop.

1.3.22 Other Early Saxon remains including an inhumation cemetery and a middle Saxon royal centre have been recorded at Exning. St Wendredas’ well to the north-west of Newmarket is traditionally associated with the daughter of the East Anglian King Anna. Also, to the west of Newmarket is the Devils Dyke earthwork built in the Saxon period as a territorial boundary.

**Medieval**

1.3.23 Established historical settlements around the development area are likely to be of a medieval origin and are recorded in the Domesday Book. The village of Moulton to the east pre-dates the Domesday book of 1086 and is older than Newmarket. On the south-east of the village of Moulton is Packhorse Bridge (Suffolk HER MUN008), a 15th century four arched flint bridge over the River Kennett. A second flint built bridge, Priddy Bridge (Suffolk Her MUN017) lies just to the south.

1.3.24 Newmarket, to the west of site, originated in the medieval period when the inhabitants to Exning founded a market on the Cambridge to Bury St Edmunds road and is recorded c.1200 as *Novum Forum* (Suffolk HER NKT 022).

**1.4 Acknowledgements**

1.4.1 The author would like to thank Derek McLean of Godolphin Management company Ltd for commissioning, and Godolphin Management company Ltd for funding the evaluation work. The author would also like to thank Dr Matthew Brudenell of Suffolk County Council for monitoring the works and Richard Mortimer of Oxford Archaeology East for managing the project.

1.4.2 Further thanks should go to Pat Moan for survey work, Stuart Ladd for graphics and special thanks to Peter Swan for his background knowledge of the previous work in the area.
2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The original aims of the project were set out in the Brief and Written Scheme of Investigation by Jess tipper (SCC) and further refined in the specification (Richard Mortimer).

2.1.2 The main aims of this excavation were

- To mitigate the impact of the development on the surviving archaeological remains. The development would have severely impacted upon these remains and as a result a full excavation was required, targeting the areas of archaeological interest.
- To preserve the archaeological evidence contained within the excavation area by record and to attempt a reconstruction of the history and use of the site.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 The methodology used followed that outlined in the Brief and detailed in the Written Scheme of Investigation.

2.2.2 Machine excavation was carried out by a 360 type excavator using a 1.8m wide flat bladed ditching bucket. under constant supervision of a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist.

2.2.3 Spoil, exposed surfaces and features were scanned with a metal detector. All metal-detected and hand-collected finds were retained for inspection, other than those which were obviously modern.

2.2.4 All archaeological features and deposits were recorded using OA East's *pro-forma* sheets. Trench locations, plans and sections were recorded at appropriate scales and colour and monochrome photographs were taken of all relevant features and deposits.

2.2.5 Work was carried out in generally good weather, with occasional heavy rain showers. The ground was dry and free draining.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 The proposed development area was excavated using a 360 excavator to 0.3-0.4m in depth to natural chalk and sand formations and an area of recent made ground. The topsoil was 0.3-0.37m in depth and a very thin subsoil of 0.05m was present only at the southern end of the site. Three areas of archaeological interest were identified and are presented below.

3.2 Tree boles
3.2.1 A number of tree boles were present throughout the excavated area. A fifty percent sample was excavated and three notable features were recorded.
3.2.2 Tree bole (6) was circular in plan with concave sides and base and measured 0.8m in diameter, 0.29m in depth and contained one fill (7). Fill (7) was a soft dark brown sandy silt with occasional charcoal flecks and contained no finds.
3.2.3 Tree bole (8) was irregular in plan with irregular sides and base and measured 1.96m in length, 0.68m in depth and 0.21m in depth and contained one fill (9). Fill (9) was a soft mid red brown sandy silt with moderate small flint inclusions and contained no finds.
3.2.4 Tree bole (10) was lozenge in plan with irregular sides and concave base and measured 4.34m in length, 0.91m in depth and 0.38m in depth and contained one fill (11). Fill (11) was a soft mid red brown sandy silt with moderate small flint inclusions and contained one piece of struck flint.

3.3 Colluvium and Made ground
3.3.1 The excavated area contained a natural depression (12) thought to be a dry valley which has subsequently become infilled with colluvial material and has been further infilled in recent years with dumped material. This feature ran approximately 50m on the south end of the development area. 
3.3.2 The made ground consisted of mixed dark brown sandy silt and light yellow clay and chalk. This was thought to be filled in as late as 2004 to level the field and overlays colluvial deposits within hollow (12).
3.3.3 Hollow (12) contained a colluvial layer on the northern edge. This was excavated in six 1x1m test pits (13)-(18) and contained a homogenous fill of soft light yellow silty sand with occasional small flint inclusions. All the test pits contained struck flint (see Table 1 for quantification) with a combined total of 39 pieces.
3.3.4 Test pit (13) was 0.18m in depth.
3.3.5 Test pit (14) was 0.20m in depth.
3.3.6 Test pit (15) was 0.22m in depth.
3.3.7 Test pit (16) was 0.17m in depth.
3.3.8 Test pit (17) was 0.24m in depth.
3.3.9 Test pit (18) was 0.13m in depth.
3.4 **Ditches**

3.4.1 Two small ditches were uncovered during excavation, both undated by finds material and running east to west at the southern end of the development area.

3.4.2 Ditch (2) was 0.84m wide, 0.40m deep and ran the full 5m of the excavation area on an east to west alignment. The feature had flat sides and a flat base with a moderate break of slope and contained one fill (3). Fill (3) was a soft light brown sandy silt with moderate chalk inclusions and contained no finds.

3.4.3 Ditch (4) was 0.58m wide, 0.12m deep and ran on a east to west alignment for the full 5m of the excavated area. The feature had a concave base and sides with a shallow break of slope and contained one fill (5). Fill (5) was a compact dark brown silt with occasional small flint and CBM inclusions and contained no finds.
4 Discussion and Conclusions

4.1 Prehistoric

4.1.1 The prehistoric evidence on this development was isolated to the area of colluvium within hollow (12) although one piece of struck flint was recovered from tree bole (10). The struck flint in the colluvium was excavated in six 1x1m test pits and was of a late neolithic to late bronze age date. The density was low and no knapping platforms could be identified. It is most likely the flint within the colluvium has been washed down slope rather than being knapped in situ due to the spread, density and size of the lithics.

4.1.2 Tree boles were seen throughout the excavation area but only one yielded any finds. The single lithic within (10) shows that some of the tree boles may be prehistoric but the lack of finds associated with them makes it hard to determine. A fifty percent sample of the tree boles were excavated and three were recorded with finds only present in (10).

4.2 Linear features

4.2.1 Two linear features were identified and excavated within the development area. These are both undated but are thought to be Post-Medieval in date as ditch (2) is visible on maps from 1850 and 1990. Ditch (4) is on the same alignment as ditch (2) and is close to the recent made ground area and has a similar fill and contained brick flecks.

4.3 Significance

4.3.1 The site is of interest in furthering our understanding of the use of the early prehistoric landscape and due to its proximity with other excavations had the potential for archaeological features.
## Appendix A. Context Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context no</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Ditch Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Ditch Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Ditch Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Ditch Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Tree Bole Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Tree bole Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Tree Bole Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Tree bole Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>Tree bole cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>Tree bole Fill</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Hollow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Test Pit Fill</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Test Pit Fill</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Test Pit Fill</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Test Pit Fill</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Test Pit Fill</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Test Pit Fill</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. FINDS REPORTS

B.1 Lithics

By Michael Green

Introduction and methodology

B.1.1 An excavation at moulton paddocks recovered a total of 40 worked flints. These were predominantly confined to a colluvial layer filling a natural hollow (12) which was excavated in a series of six 1x1m test pits. The material has been catalogued and presented in a table below (Table 1) and raw material and suggested dating has been discussed.

Struck Flint Raw Material

B.1.2 The raw materials used to manufacture the struck assemblage consist of translucent black and mottled translucent black/opaque fine-grained flint. Where retained, cortex is often smooth, thin and weathered and ancient thermal surfaces are frequently present. There is no convincing evidence that mined flint was used and flint is common in the area.

Condition

B.1.3 The condition of the assemblage is mostly good with many sharp pieces present. There is some edge damage and a few pieces also show evidence of heavier chipping and even rolling. The extent of the edge damage means that positively identifying deliberate light edge retouching or use-wear is difficult.

Technology and Dating

B.1.4 Both the typological composition of the struck flint and its technological attributes indicate that it was manufactured in the later prehistoric period with a few pieces of later neolithic flint working present. The overall assemblage cannot be chronologically separated by context and therefore all identifications have to rely on the intrinsic attributes of each piece. This means that in many cases only broad distinctions can be made.

Neolithic

B.1.5 A small proportion of the assemblage can be associated with the later neolithic. The pieces have been skilfully produced but are not the result of systematic reduction strategies. Although not easily defined or closely dateable, they are most characteristic of Later Neolithic or Early Bronze Age flintworking techniques. The most notable of these are two re-touched tools, the first being a bull nose scraper from (15) and a re-touched flake which has had bulb reduction and inverse working on two edges from (16).
Later Prehistoric

B.1.6 The majority of the assemblage can be placed in the later prehistoric. This later prehistoric collection is dominated by large but short and usually thick flakes. They characteristically have wide, unmodified and markedly obtuse striking platforms, being comparable to Martingell’s ‘squat flakes’ (Martingell 1990). This assemblage also includes a high proportion of cores and most of the conchoidally fractured chunks are also likely to represent later prehistoric cores that disintegrated due to internal thermal flaws during reduction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Flake</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Retouched</th>
<th>Blade</th>
<th>Chip</th>
<th>Scraper</th>
<th>Burnt</th>
<th>Decortation flake</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Quantification of Lithic Material by Context
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Figure 1: Site location showing excavation area (red) and previous excavations (blue)
Figure 2: Excavation area
Section 1

Section 10, Test Pit 17

Figure 3: Selected section drawings
Plate 1: Extent of site, looking south

Plate 2: Test pits in colluvium (hollow 12), looking south