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SUMMARY

Between the 14th of February and the 1st of March 1999 the Archaeological Field Unit of Cambridgeshire County Council undertook the excavation of two areas to the south of the High Street, Fowlmere. Area 1 covered c.500 sq m and Area 2 measured roughly 3m sq. The work was commissioned by Mr P Thwaites of the Ashwell Group Ltd. in advance of the proposed development of the site for domestic housing. The excavation was undertaken by M Hinman in accordance with an AFU specification dated 14th January 1999 and approved by S Kaner of the County Council Archaeology Section.

Excavation has demonstrated the presence of at least three phases of activity within the development area, ranging in date from the early Saxon to post Medieval periods. Evidence of domestic occupation included the discovery of a sunken featured building, the first in Fowlmere, dateable to c.500 AD, possibly contemporary with the remains of a small pony buried in an adjacent pit. Evidence for a second phase of building activity took the form of a later but undated post built structure. During the Medieval period the site appears to have occupied a peripheral location in relation to the settlement core evidenced by a number of boundary/enclosure ditches.
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Between the 14th of February and the 1st of March 1999 the Archaeological Field Unit of Cambridgeshire County Council undertook the excavation of two areas to the south of the High Street, Fowlmere. Area 1 covered c 500 sq m. and Area 2 measured roughly 3m sq (Fig 1). The work was commissioned by Mr P Thwaites of the Ashwell Group Ltd. in advance of the proposed development of the site for domestic housing. The excavation was undertaken by M Hinman in accordance with an AFU specification dated 14th January 1999 and approved by S Kaner of the County Council Archaeology Section.

The site is situated between the High Street and the Round Moat (SAM 8) and covers an area of approximately 0.22 hectares of which a maximum of 800sq m was earmarked for investigation. The area under investigation was determined by the condition placed on one particular planning application within the development area as a whole. The original scheme, as outlined within the specification was further modified immediately prior to excavation due to the presence of a number of trees currently protected through conservation area registration. The underlying geology of the area is predominantly lower chalk.

Previous evaluation within the development area (Spoerry 1993, AFU Report Series No. 102) highlighted the presence of Medieval and Post Medieval remains adjacent to the High Street frontage and a ditch of possible prehistoric origin within the area of the current investigation.

Excavation has demonstrated the presence of at least three phases of activity within the development area, ranging in date from the early Saxon to post Medieval periods.

2 TOPOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY

The site lies within the historic core of the village of Fowlmere, on the west bank of the Fowlmere Brook, lying at about 23m. The site is situated between the High Street and the Round Moat (SAM 8) and covers an area of approximately 0.22 hectares of which a maximum of 800sq m was earmarked.
for investigation. The underlying geology of the area is Lower Chalk, although there may be some valley gravel and/or alluvium associated with the Brook line to the east of the site.

3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

3.1 Background

3.1.1 The Village

The village of Fowlmere appears to have been a relatively prosperous medieval centre, growing from 36 'households' in Domesday Book to about 100 by 1279 (Hitch, 1993). This growth, although not meteoric, was enough to warrant a Market Charter by 1207 (Keeling 1982, 160). Population declined in the fourteenth century, following the general pattern of economic hardship and disease in that century. Recovery, however, was good in Fowlmere, there being more than 70 households in several mid-late fifteenth century sources (Keeling 1982, 155)

3.1.2 Further Documentary Evidence

In addition to the rent roll of 1447, mentioned above, most other documentary sources that have been consulted are of fairly recent date. Maps and local documentary evidence have identified that both the frontage properties were occupied by buildings from at least the mid-nineteenth century onwards. The easterly property possessed a pair of cottages that constituted the western member of a group of two similar structures. This building was demolished in the middle part of this century, however, a wood cut, probably dating to the early part of this century (Fig. 2, Spoerry, 1993), of a view of the whole High Street frontage of the site illustrates the building excellently. It shows a pair of narrow thatched cottages, side-on to the road, with two doorways and windows at the front. The dwellings must have had a maximum frontage of about twenty feet each and, on the basis of the wood cut, a depth of perhaps fifteen feet at most. These cottages lie immediately adjacent to a more westerly property, which is the building that still stands. This is shown with a tiled roof, (now corrugated iron), the pitch of which is less steep than that of the adjacent thatched property. This latter is known through local contacts to have been used as the stabling for the Manse during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and appears to have had a more general storage use (for the tennis equipment in the inter-war years) in more recent times (JISON pers. comm.). It is currently in a poor state of repair. The most likely construction date for the two structures discussed is sometime in the eighteenth century, although a more precise date is not presently possible. Prior usage of the frontages is likewise not apparent from sources that were accessed.
Early cartographic evidence for the presence, and use, of a possible fishpond to the east of the Round Moat has not been identified. In the absence of any land-use information for this area, excavation remains the best tool to explain its morphology.

3.2 The Round Moat; Previous Archaeological Work

Although the Round Moat is believed to have been utilised during the Medieval period, its origins are possibly in the pre-Conquest Saxon period. Round moats usually prove to be earlier than the peak moat-building phase of the late twelfth to early fourteenth centuries when 'moat' form was almost always rectilinear. Curvilinear property boundaries and enclosures are a feature of the more organic village development of the pre-Conquest period. The settlement layout at Fowlmere seems to suggest that the village focus was originally centred on the Round Moat and Church, but that the location of the Manor at the west end of the High Street from the early fourteenth century (Keeling 1982, 157), and the increasing importance of the commercial activities along this road, resulted in a shift of focus to the north west, away from the Round Moat.

Yorke (1909) suggested that the entrance to the Round Moat was on the north west side, based on observation of existing earthworks at the turn of the century. If this were correct, the original access to this point from the east may have been more direct prior to the full establishment of the High Street, and therefore an earlier routeway may have traversed part of the development site. Alternatively an eastern entrance to the Round Moat may have existed, for which a trackway might also be sought.

The large bank and ditch of the Round Moat undoubtedly provided effective protection during times of stress and conflict, although for whom is not certain. It is also likely that the Round Moat performed functions other than the defensive. It was possibly originally an administrative centre, perhaps an earlier location for the Manor, and could have acted as a domestic site and agricultural store as well. If this were so then activity areas may well have been located quite close to the exterior of the bank and ditch, something that would be unlikely in a purely defensive/military site.

An early record of previous investigation of the Round Moat is the work of the Rev. A.C. Yorke, reported in the Proceedings of the Cambridgeshire Antiquarian Society for 1909 (Yorke 1909). In general terms, Yorke's paper informs us that the Round Moat is recorded on the Parish Enclosure Map (1845) as "White's Close", and that a Robert White had earlier appeared on the rent roll of AD 1447 (Addit. Charters 27, 338). He also writes that in 1887, when the then owner of the moat, Mr Edward Wedd, planted a number of trees on the platform of the site, a surface paved with cobblestones and a well containing a large amount of "broken drain pipes" were unearthed. It would also seem that around the turn of the century, the moat was cleaned out on its north side so that it could be used as a fishpond.
In the course of his own work, Yorke records that a hole was excavated across the entrance to the east side of the moat. It produced animal bones and horseshoes, whilst the nature of the moat silts is not recorded except that their thickness measured 6 feet. At this depth, the excavators reached the bottom of the moat, and also struck water. Although he also reports that Professor T McKenny Hughes indicated that the sherds of pottery recovered during these excavations may be early medieval in date, Yorke's work tells us little else with regards to the age and nature of the site.

Brendan P J Murphy undertook a small excavation in 1975 in the area adjacent to the moat, between its NW side and the parish church, where houses now stand. This produced a large quantity of medieval pottery dating from between the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries, with the majority of the sherds belonging to the 13th century. Some Roman buff and grey ware bases, along with some sherds of Samian ware, were also recovered, although these are regarded as residual (Murphy 1975, 71).

In February, 1992, G Haley of the Contracts Section of Cambridgeshire County Council's Archaeology Office conducted a limited investigation to establish the depth and state of preservation of the silts within the north-east sector of the round moat. A substantial amount of the moat's original silts were found to have been removed by the cutting of drainage ditches within the moat during the late 19th century although earlier silts were found in the SW end of the trench section, along the inner bank of the moat.

The area in which the work was conducted was heavily wooded, both with young saplings and mature trees. This had caused considerable disturbance to the moat silts, as well as making the location of a trench difficult. As a result the inner (south-west) side of the moat could not be excavated.

During August and September 1993, Paul Spoerry of the AFU carried out the evaluation of the whole of the proposed development area. The total area evaluated included a section (originally two properties) of street frontage onto the south side of the High Street, plus the area between this frontage and the Round Moat. The extent of the current investigations was determined by the planning condition placed on the permission for this portion of the development area.

4 METHODOLOGY

Between the 14th of February and the 1st of March 1999 the Archaeological Field Unit of Cambridgeshire County Council undertook the excavation of two
areas to the south of the High Street, Fowlmere. Area 1 covered c 500 sq. m (Fig. 2) and Area 2 measured roughly 3m sq. The excavation was undertaken by Mark Hinman in accordance with an AFU specification dated 14th January 1999 and approved by S Kaner of the County Council Archaeology Section.

The location and extent of the two areas was determined by the condition placed on one particular planning application within the development area as a whole.

After scrub removal the two areas were opened using a JCB with a 2m toothless ditching bucket. The depth of soil cover across the site varied from c 0.60m adjacent to the western limit of area 1 to c 1.00m adjacent to the eastern limit of area 1 and the limits of area 2. Archaeological features were cleaned by hand and a base plan at a scale of 1:50 was hand drawn. All deposits and cut features were recorded using the AFU’s single context system, supplemented by additional plans drawn at 1:10 or 1:20 as required. Frequent root disturbance combined with the relatively shallow depth of most archaeological deposits rendered the site unsuitable for environmental sampling.

5 RESULTS

Excavation has demonstrated the presence of at least three phases of activity, ranging in date from the early Saxon to post Medieval periods within area 1 and the Medieval and post Medieval periods within area 2.

5.1 The early Saxon Period: circa 500AD

Area 1

5.1.i A Sunken Featured Building: Contexts 100, (101), 102 to 131 inclusive.

A sunken featured building (SFB) was located adjacent to, and partially extending into, the south-western limit of excavation. The building cut, 100, was aligned east-west, sub-rectangular in plan, measuring 4.50m east-west by 3.65m north-south.

A number of post and slot impressions of varying depth and definition were present within the limits of the building as defined by cut 100. These internal structural features fall into four broad morphological groups or categories.

A series of rectangular postholes, 103, 107, 111 (see Fig 3) together with circular posthole 113, are the most substantial (max depth 0.66m) surviving
Figure 3  i) SFB 100  ii) Rectangular posts  iii) Circular post holes  iv) Shallow post holes
structural elements within the SFB and are presumed to have provided the main means of support for the building. Postholes 107 and 111 still contained a compacted clay silt and flint packing retaining the impressions of circular posts 105 (0.36m dia.) and 109 (0.32m dia.).

Circular postholes, 113, 115, 117, 119 (see Fig 3) are the second most substantial (max depth 0.24m) group of surviving structural elements within the SFB and are presumed to have complemented the main means of support for the building.

Rectangular slots 121 and 123, positioned respectively, parallel the western edge and cutting the northern edge of SFB 100, are the only evidence for the use of planking within the structure.

Irregular, shallow postholes 124 to 131 inclusive contained fills that were completely indistinguishable (and therefore not individually numbered) from (101), the infilling of the SFB. These features probably represent the impressions left from secondary wall and roof supports.

The SFB was filled by a single uniform dark grey brown sandy clay silt fill containing a wide variety of early Saxon pottery dateable to c 500 AD (see Blinkhorn, Appendix 1) and three fragments of residual Romano-British pottery including a single sherd of (previously curated?) Roman Samian Ware. In addition to a varied ceramic assemblage the infilling of the SFB contained a moderate amount of animal bone. The faunal assemblage appears to consist primarily of sheep/goat (both lamb and mutton) with occasional cattle bones, again from both young and mature animals, and one pig metatarsal. In addition to domestic food waste, two sawn rams horn cores and a fragment of worked and burnt red deer antler were recovered, which provide clear evidence for craft working. All of the artefacts recovered were seen to be evenly and randomly dispersed within the fill of the SFB and no in-situ deposits associated with the habitation or primary usage of this building were present.

The early Saxon ceramic assemblage is derived almost exclusively from the SFB, with the exception of a single sherd from (216) the fill of ditch 215 in area 2. Although this sherd represents the only dating evidence from the ditch, the general alignment of this feature suggests that it probably relates to the Saxo-Norman usage of the site and that the pottery is probably residual in this instance.

5.1.ii Roman Coin / Saxon Amulet

A single Roman coin was recovered from the spoil heap created by machine clearance. The coin, a denarius dateable to the third century AD had been pierced, creating a hole of c 1mm diameter. Roman coins altered in this manner are occasionally recovered from Saxon contexts and are thought to have been worn as amulets, which was probably the fate of the Fowlmere coin.
5.1.iii  Pony Burial: Contexts 173, (172), (174)

Pit 173, sub-circular in plan, length 1.60m x width 1.25m x depth 0.40m was located towards the south-western corner of area 1, east of SFB 100 and west of slot and posthole structure 197 to 200.

The pit was filled with a light brown clay silt (174) containing occasional chalk fragments and sub angular flint nodules.

The skeleton of a small female pony (172) aged seven years and standing under 12 hands high at the withers was found buried in Pit 173. The pony was lying on its right side with the head to the south and legs bent. No pathologies or signs of injury were noted on any of the bones examined.

Although no dating evidence was found in this pit the skeleton was less well preserved than the assemblage recovered from SFB 100 which may indicate that burial occurred during or prior to the Saxon period.

5.2  The Early Medieval Period: 900 - 1100 AD

The artefact density from features across the rest of the site ranges from rare to non existent and stratigraphic relationships (where one feature can clearly seen to be truncating the fills of earlier features) are also virtually non existent.

This presents problems in the resolution of the final phasing of this site. Those features containing no readily dateable artefactual assemblages, and those containing what is assumed to be exclusively residual material, which are included within this phase of activity are present due to similarities in terms of fill, or alignment with other securely dated features. Only further excavation can resolve the current level of uncertainty regarding the origins of these features.

5.2.i  Ditches: Enclosure and Drainage

Contexts 132 to 153 inclusive and 169, (170), 171.

Ditch 132

Aligned north-south, ditch 132, length 21.50m x width 1.75m (max), was truncated to the north by post medieval quarry pit 220 and extended into the southern limit of excavation. Three segments, (133), 134, (135) 136, (137), 138, were excavated at intervals along the ditch. A single sherd of St Neots type ware dateable to between 900-1100AD was recovered from fill (135) along with an undiagnostic fragment of early medieval sandy coarseware.

In addition to the two sherds of pottery ditch 136 contained the remains of two very young piglets, possibly natural fatalities, and two toads. These toads may have been a breeding pair locked in amplexus (a mating embrace) when the
ditch was infilled in the early spring, but this is a very tentative suggestion (I Baxter *pers. com.*).

**Ditch 140**

Aligned roughly east-west, ditch 140, width 0.50m extended approximately 6m from the western limit of excavation before seeming to terminate. Upon excavation this ditch was found to be only 0.15m deep. Fill (139) a dark grey brown sandy clay silt was artefactually sterile although similar in terms of colour and consistency with the fill of ditch 141 to the east.

**Ditch 141**

Aligned roughly east-west, ditch 141, width 0.50m extended approximately 14m from the eastern limit of excavation before seeming to terminate. Two segments, (142), 143, (144) 145, were excavated at intervals along the ditch. A single sherd of St Neots type ware from a jar dateable to between 1000-1200AD was recovered from fill (142). A similar sherd, probably from the same vessel (P Blinkhorn *pers. com.*) was recovered from ditch 146.

Given the similarity in both fill and alignment it is probable that ditches 140 and 141 are contemporary. That both ditches seem to terminate within the excavation area cannot necessarily be taken as evidence for an entranceway. Both ditches were clearly heavily truncated in antiquity and it is quite possible that when freshly cut these features were contiguous, forming a single unbroken boundary.

**Ditch 146**

Aligned roughly east-west, curving gently northwards at its eastern end, ditch 146, length 11.50m x width 0.55m was truncated to the west by modern quarry pit 220 and appeared to terminate to the east at pit 162. Two segments, (147), 148, (149) 150, were excavated at intervals along the ditch. A single sherd of St Neots type ware from a jar dateable to between 1000-1200AD was recovered from fill (147). A similar sherd, probably from the same vessel (P Blinkhorn *pers. com.*) was recovered from ditch 141. Two sherds of early medieval sandy coarseware were also recovered from fill (147).

The stratigraphic relationship between ditch 146 and pit 162 remains unknown. The similarity between the fills at the intersection of both of these features is almost certainly a result of root action in this case. Although the base of 146 sloped gently downwards from west to east the ditch was less than 20mm in depth at the point of intersection with 162 due to the rather more rapid fall off of the local topography, towards the line of the brook, a further 10 - 20m further east. It is quite possible therefore that 146 originally continued further eastwards, possibly even exiting into the line of the brook.
A section through this ditch had been previously excavated during the evaluation stage of this project (Spoerry, 1993). At this time ditch fill (302) 303 produced two sherds of pottery of indeterminate date but which, in the light of recent excavations are probably a single sherd of Romano-British date and a single sherd of probable Saxon origin.

**Ditch 151**

Aligned roughly east-west, ditch 151, length 10.50m x width 1.00m extended into both the western and the eastern limit of excavation adjacent to the northern edge of the site. One segment, (152), 153, across the ditch was excavated which failed to produce any artefactual material. Ditch 151 is similar both in terms of fill and alignment with ditch 215, within area 2, and consequently these ditches are thought to be contemporary.

**Ditch 169**

Aligned roughly north-south, ditch 169, length 10.50m x width 1.00m extended into both the northern and the southern limits of excavation adjacent to the far eastern edge of the site. One segment, (170), 171, across the ditch was excavated which failed to produce any artefactual material.

**Area 2**

**Ditch 215**

Aligned roughly east-west, ditch 215, length 3.90m x width 0.75m extended into both the western and the eastern limit of excavation adjacent to the southern edge of area 2. The ditch contained a single fill (216) which, when excavated produced a single sherd of early medieval sandy ware. Ditch 215 is similar both in terms of fill and alignment with ditch 151, within area 1, and consequently these ditches are thought to be contemporary. No other features were present within area 2, possibly as a result of truncation which had clearly occurred during the early 20th century.

5.2.ii **Pits, contexts 154 to 168 inclusive.**

**Area 1**

**Pit 155,**

Sub-circular in plan, pit 155, diameter 1.15m x depth 0.39m had steeply sloping sides and a concave base. The cut contained a single artefactually sterile mid to dark grey brown clay silt fill (154). It is possible that this was a tree root hole rather than a deliberately cut feature although the general level of root disturbance in the area and the underlying geology made a definitive interpretation impossible in this case.
Pit 157

Sub-circular in plan, pit 157, length 1.00m x width 0.70m x depth 0.20m had steeply sloping sides and a concave base. The cut contained a single artefactually sterile mid to dark grey brown clay silt fill (156). As with pit 155 it is possible that this was a tree root hole rather than a deliberately cut feature.

Pit 159

Sub-rectangular in plan, pit 159, width 2.00m x depth 0.37m, extended into the southern limit of excavation. The cut had steeply sloping sides and a flat base and contained a single artefactually sterile mid to dark grey brown clay silt fill (158), similar in every respect to the fills of 155 and 157. The size and shape of this pit is reminiscent of small scale quarrying activity, probably for flint nodules and chalk, both of which are occasionally utilised as building materials in the local area.

Pit 161

Sub-rectangular in plan, pit 161, length 6.40m x width 2.20m x depth 0.26m, extended into the eastern limit of excavation. The cut had steeply sloping sides and an irregular base and contained a single artefactually sterile mid to dark grey brown clay silt fill (160), similar in every respect to the fills of 155, 157 and 159. The size and shape of this pit is again reminiscent of small scale quarrying activity.

Pit 162

Sub-rectangular in plan with rounded corners, pit 162, length 3.75m x width 1.80m x depth 0.40m, had steeply sloping sides and a flat base. Two sections across the pit were excavated (163), 164 and (165) 166. Fill (163) contained a single, undiagnostic sherd of Romano-British pottery, a heavily abraded lava quern fragment and occasional fragments of cattle and sheep bones all of which appear to be residual materials by virtue of their size and state of preservation. Fill (165) was artefactually sterile. The size and shape of this pit may suggest that it was cut for a specific purpose other than quarrying, although no direct evidence for such a function was recovered through excavation.

Pit 168

Sub-circular in plan, pit 168, diameter 1.65m x depth 0.24m had steeply sloping sides and a concave base. The cut, of unknown function, contained a single artefactually sterile light grey chalky clay silt fill (167) which was truncated to the north by later pit 162.
5.2.iii A post built structure: Contexts 175 to 211, inclusive.

All of the above mentioned contexts are considered here as elements comprising part of a single structure which is presumed to extend beyond the southern and western limits of excavation. The lack of any dateable materials, lack of stratigraphic relationships and degree of root disturbance are problematic, as is the apparent lack of a clearly definable ground plan for this building. It is worth noting at this point that no postholes were observed to be cutting through the fill (101) of SFB 100, which is present within the same portion of the site, and as such it is quite possible that this building could predate the SFB. This building is only included with (occasionally) dateable medieval features due to a slight similarity in feature fills, including a notable absence of artefactual materials. For individual feature descriptions see Appendix III, and for the position of individual features see figure 4.

Figure 4 A Post-Built Structure
The main elements of this building are slots 175 and 197. Slot 175 aligned east-west contained postholes 176 to 181, inclusive and all elements of this wall fragment were filled by a uniform mid to dark grey clay silt (182). Slot 197, aligned north-south appeared to be aligned with medieval ditch 132 and contained postholes 198 to 200 inclusive with a single uniform fill (201) which appeared identical to the fill (182) of slot 175. Although no evidence for a likely function for this building was recovered as a result of excavation these slots are clear evidence for earthfast construction.

5.2.iv Abandonment / change of use: Layer 213

All features within area 1 described above and attributed to either the Saxon or Medieval periods were sealed by a uniform layer of very dark grey clay silt, 0.35m deep, containing moderate to frequent inclusions of small, sub-angular, flint nodules. The means by which this layer accumulated are uncertain, although the relatively high degree of root disturbance across the site may suggest that the flint nodules present within the subsoil have been carried downwards over time by the action of plant and tree roots. Sample areas of layer 213 were hand excavated within the south-western quarter of the site and were found to be devoid of artefactual materials in all cases.

5.2.v Topsoil: Layer 216

Directly overlying 213 was layer 216, a dark grey brown clay silt, 0.40m in depth across area 1. This topsoil layer presumably had accumulated naturally since the medieval period, indicating constant use of the area as open ground until the present. No direct evidence for agriculture / cultivation was observed. This layer had been truncated in the north-western corner of area 1 by modern quarrying (218 and 220) and no equivalent layer was present within area 2, again due to modern disturbance.

5.3 The Post Medieval Period: Ground disturbance and quarrying in the late 19th to early 20th century

5.3.i Quarry pitting and trenching: Contexts 217 to 220 inclusive.

Area 1

Quarry pit 220, irregular in plan, was present within the north-western corner of area 1 and had been cut from directly below the modern turf line (c 0.15m below the present ground surface). Fill (219), a light yellowish brown sandy chalky silt contained frequent inclusions of fine gravel and occasional fragments of modern pottery and roofing tile. Extraction of the lower chalk had effectively removed all traces of earlier activity within this corner of the site and directly truncated ditches 132 and 146. Quarry pit 220 had in turn been truncated to the east by later chalk filled feature 218.
Cut 218, irregular in plan, with near vertical sides was c 2.30m wide, aligned roughly north-south, and extended into the northern limit of excavation. Fill (217), as revealed and partially excavated during machine clearance, consisted of loosely compacted chalk fragments with occasional red ceramic roofing tile fragments.

Area 2

All traces of archaeological deposits above the chalk (c 22.00 mOD) had been completely truncated at some time during the 20th century. The degree of ground disturbance was rather excessive to be attributable simply to the demolition of what was latterly the dwelling of the owner of Cambridge's first bicycle shop. This cottage is known to have been demolished in the mid-twentieth century. During the evaluation stage of this project local sources indicated that the extreme eastern edge of the frontage was said to contain a part-demolished Second World War air raid shelter. It is possible that truncation occurred as a result of preparation for the construction of such a shelter although no direct evidence for the shelter itself was revealed.

6 SUMMARY

6.1 Early Saxon Remains

A sunken featured building (SFB) containing a wide variety of early Saxon pottery (circa 500 AD) was located adjacent to, and partially extending into, the south-western limit of excavation. The building was sub rectangular in plan, measuring roughly 4.50m east-west by 3.65m north-south. In addition to a varied ceramic assemblage the infilling of the SFB contained a moderate amount of animal bone. The faunal assemblage consisted primarily of sheep/goat with occasional cattle bones. All of the artefact recovered were seen to be evenly and randomly dispersed within the fill of the SFB and no deposits associated with the habitation or primary usage of this building were present.

A large pit immediately to the east of this building contained the complete articulated skeleton of either a small pony, buried on its right hand side with the head pointing towards the south. No readily dateable artefactual material was recovered from the burial although the position of the pit in relation to the SFB may suggest that the two features were in fact contemporary.

The early Saxon ceramic assemblage is derived almost exclusively from the SFB, the artefact density for the rest of the site ranges from rare to non existent.
6.2 Medieval Remains

Elements of a second structure were also present which appeared to surround the SFB. This post built structure appears to have been roughly rectangular in plan, although the layout of the building is far from coherent, due to the high degree of root disturbance affecting this part of the site. No dating evidence was retrieved from any of the structural elements excavated, although the apparent alignment of this structure with the ditch immediately to the east may imply a medieval date.

Four separate ditches, aligned roughly east-west were identified within the two areas of excavation. An additional two ditches, aligned roughly north-south, were also present within Area 1. Occasional small fragments of pottery recovered from these features during excavation suggest that they were infilled during the early medieval period. The most likely interpretation of these features is either field / strip boundaries or drainage ditches exiting into the brook immediately to the east of the subject site.

With the exception of the easternmost of the north-south ditches none of these features correspond, in terms of alignment, with the present pattern of development along Fowlmere High Street. Both the alignment of these features and the low artefact densities within their fills, suggests that during the period in question the site was either at, or beyond, the limits of core settlement.

A series of irregularly shaped pits within the eastern half of area 1 are thought to represent small scale ad hoc quarrying activity for flint chalk and gravel. These pits were artefactually sterile.

6.3 Post Medieval Remains

Quarrying in the post medieval period has effectively destroyed all earlier deposits within the north-western corner of area 1 and modern disturbance within area 2 has removed all traces of any stratigraphy associated with the development of the street frontage during the medieval and early post medieval periods as suggested by the results of evaluation (Spoerry, 1993).

7 CONCLUSIONS

The recent excavation adjacent to the High Street, Fowlmere has produced the first direct and highly significant evidence for the early Saxon origins of the village. The SFB is the first to be identified and others are undoubtedly present within the immediate vicinity. The range and density of artefacts present within the fill of this building is direct evidence of domestic occupation. Occasional finds of residual Romano-British pottery recall the findings of previous excavators (Murphy 1975, Spoerry 1993), and may hint at the presence of
some form of occupation during the period within Fowlmere, although the location of any settlement remains at present unknown. The contrast with the infrequent or often non-existent finds densities within features from later periods may be taken as evidence for a shift in the core of this settlement during the medieval period. Once again the origins of the Round Moat are open to discussion. Although the recent excavation was clearly limited in scope it is tempting to suggest the presence of a settlement of early Saxon origin located between the Round Moat and the precursor to the present church. During the evaluation the extreme western limit of a post built structure 529 et al was identified within sondage 2, trench 5 (Spoerry, 1993, p13). This building was in turn sealed by context 522, a ‘sandy silt layer with frequent flint pebbles’. At this time the layer was thought to represent a possible yard surface although open area excavation now allows us to suggest that this is in fact the southerly continuation of ‘abandonment layer’ 213. Unfortunately the extent of sondage 2, trench 5 was extremely limited although available evidence allows us to indicate the presence of an additional building adjacent to the northern edge of the round moat. Current dating evidence (from features sealed by 213) suggests that this building must have gone out of use by the 12th century at the very latest. Later moat clearance deposits (contexts 518-521, Spoerry, 1993, p13) indicate the continued usage and maintenance of the round moat into the later medieval period.

Excavation and dating of the structure identified within trench 5 during evaluation and its immediate environs should be seen as a key research priority which offers significant potential for resolving the question mark that still hangs over the origin of the round moat. At present a 6th to 7th century date for the construction of the moat still cannot be ruled out although the continued absence of Iron Age or earlier materials may allow us to suggest that this enclosure is unlikely to be a prehistoric construction. The area in question is currently under no threat from development as it lies within the conservation area surrounding the moat (SAM 8).

The recent excavation has revealed the presence of a previously unknown early Saxon settlement. The extent and nature of this settlement must be addressed through further excavation within the village of Fowlmere. The lower artefact densities within later ditches suggests a shift in the settlement core during the medieval period so that by the 12th century the area investigated had reverted to open ground.

The establishment of a manor upon higher ground to the north of the church in the early fourteenth century may have been a factor in the shifting of the settlement core and the crystallisation of the present village layout.
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APPENDIX I

Report on the animal bone from High Street, Fowlmere, Cambridgeshire

Ian L. Baxter

Introduction

The total assemblage for the site amounts to 2 boxes of bone with a weight of 10 kg, representing 347 fragments. Of this total, 246 fragments or 71% could be identified at least in general terms. The bone is in good condition although the pony skeleton from pit 173 is more friable than the other remains and etched by roots. A relatively large number of very small fragments, representing 32% of the total, recovered from sunken featured building 100 could not be identified.

The Number of Identifiable fragments of bones of each Species (NISP) are presented in Table 1. The ages of the domestic animals are given in Table 2. Bone measurements and withers heights are presented in Table 3. In view of the small size of the assemblage, bone is discussed in terms of Feature.

Sunken featured building (SFB) 100 is early Saxon c.500 AD, Ditch 136 is Saxo-Norman dating from the 11th century. Pit 162, segment 164, contained one residual sherd of Romano-British pottery but is probably later in date. No dating evidence was recovered from the pony burial located in front of the SFB. There is nothing to suggest that this is not broadly contemporary with the other features on the site but this could only be confirmed by radiocarbon dating.

Methodology

Bone was identified by comparison with published descriptions (in particular Schmid 1972; Boessneck 1969; Sisson and Grossman 1953; Amorosi 1989; Prummel 1987, 1989; Gasc 1966; Clutton-Brook et al 1990), and reference material in the collection of the author. Bone measurements and withers height estimates are based on von den Driesch 1976, Boessneck 1969, Kiesewalter 1888, and Teichert 1975.

SFB 100 (101)

A total of 216 fragments of animal bone were recovered from context (101), the fill of the early Saxon sunken featured building. Of the identified fragments 35% belong to cattle and large mammal, also almost certainly cattle, and 64% to sheep/goat and medium mammal. The medium mammal fragments, consisting mostly of long bone shaft splinters, more closely resemble sheep/goat than any other taxon. Cranium and mandible fragments from at
least three different young cattle were recovered. One mandible was from a calf of 6-7 months and another from a beast of 8-13 months (Grigson 1982). Most of the other cattle bones are from young animals. An exception is a proximal tibia fragment from a mature beast aged over 3½ to 4 years (Silver 1969). Left and right horn core fragments from a ram seem to have been chopped up. At least one was apparently sawn from the cranium. None of the sheep/goat remains is identifiable as goat. Mandibles include two young individuals of under 8 months and about 10 months, and an older animal of over two years (Grant 1982; Silver 1969). A sheep radius came from an animal approximately 54.8 cm high at the shoulder (Table 3). Only one pig bone was found in (101), a proximal third metatarsal fragment. A worked and burnt red deer (Cervus elaphus) antler fragment represents craft waste. The ram horn cores are probably derived from similar activities. Canid activity was slight with relatively few gnawed bones and the high degree of sheep long bone fragmentation may be related to human activity, such as retrieval of marrow.

**Pony burial in Pit 173 (172)**

The skeleton of a pony was found buried in Pit 173 located east of SFB 100 and west of a slot and posthole structure formed by cuts 197 to 200. The pony was lying on its right side with the head to the south and legs bent. The lower incisors suggest an age at death of seven years (Barone 1980), which is largely confirmed by the crown heights of the loose grinding teeth (Levine 1982)(Table 2). Withers height calculations using the multiplication factors of Kiesewalter (1888) and based on the seven suitable long bones recovered (Table 3) indicate that the pony stood approximately 114.6 cm high at the shoulder or under 12 hands. The mandible possess vestigial canines but none were recovered from the fragmented cranium. This suggests that the pony was a mare, 20-30% of mares have canines in the lower jaw (Sisson and Grossman 1953: 399). No pathologies or signs of injury were noted on any of the bones examined.

**Ditch 136 (135)**

The partial skeletons of two piglets were recovered from the fill of Ditch 136. One of these, represented by a mandible fragment and both femorae and tibiae, was under two weeks old and the other, represented both humeri and ulnae and the right tibia, was a neonate. These ages are based on the state of eruption of the deciduous dentition (Sisson and Grossman 1953: 488) and formulae for estimating the time elapsed since conception based on long bone diaphysis lengths (Prummel 1989). Pelvic and hind leg elements belonging to a large and smaller toad (Bufo bufo) were also recovered from the same context. These toads may have been a male and female locked in a mating embrace when the ditch was filled in. If so, the ditch was probably infilled in the early spring (Burton 1960: 169-70).
Only four fragments of animal bone were recovered from Pit 164, a burnt cattle upper M1 from a mature beast, two sheep/goat tibia fragments and medium mammal long bone shaft fragment.

Summary and Conclusions

The fill of Early Saxon sunken featured building 100 produced evidence for the working of red deer antler and rams horn. Domestic food species included young cattle and sheep, indicating the consumption of lamb and veal as well as mutton and beef. Sheep long bones may have been split for marrow. A single pig bone suggests that pork was also eaten. Saxo-Norman ditch 136 contained the remains of two very young piglets, possibly natural fatalities. The two toads from the same fill may, possibly, have been a breeding pair locked in amplexus when the ditch was infilled in the early spring, but this is a very tentative suggestion. A female pony aged seven years and standing under 12 hands high at the withers was buried in pit 173 to the east of sunken featured building 100. No dating evidence was found in this pit, although there seems no reason to suppose that it is not contemporaneous with the other features on the site. Only a radiocarbon date could prove the matter either way.
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APPENDIX II

Fowlmere: The Pottery

Paul Blinkhorn

Introduction

The pottery assemblage comprised 79 sherds with a total weight of 1,137 g. Four sherds (26g) were Romano-British, the rest Early Saxon or later. The minimum number of vessels (MNV) by summation of the surviving rimsherd circumference was 1.22. The majority of the assemblage (67 sherds, 1,009g, MNV = 4.19) was from the SFB (context (101)), which produced several decorated vessels which suggest a date of c. AD500. The late material comprised six sherds of Saxo-Norman or early medieval wares (71g, MNV = 0.03).

Early Anglo-Saxon

Fabrics

The range of chaff- and mineral-tempered pottery fabrics at this site is typical of the handmade Anglo-Saxon ceramics of the period, and can be paralleled at numerous sites in East Anglia and the south midlands, such as West Stow (West 1985).

The pottery occurrence by number and weight of sherds per context by fabric type is shown in Table 1.

F1: Sparse chaff and quartz. Sparse chaff voids up to 5mm, sparse sub-rounded white and clear quartz up to 0.5mm, very rare sandstone, ironstone and red quartz up to 1mm, very rare angular chalk up to 3mm. 13 sherds, 173g, MNV = 0.17.

F2: Dense quartz. Dense subangular white and clear quartz up to 1mm, most 0.5mm or less. Some larger polycrystalline grains, rare rounded chalk up to 1mm. 18 sherds, 214g, MNV = 0.

F3: Dense quartz and chaff. As F2, with the larger quartz grains predominating, and dense chaff voids up to 5mm. 1 sherd, 70g, MNV = 0.

F4: Sparse coarse quartz. Sparse sub-rounded white and grey quartz up to 2mm. Very rare ferruginous and/or calcite-cemented sandstone, ironstone and red quartz up to 1mm, very rare angular chalk up to 3mm. Very rare gold mica platelets up to 1mm. Rare rounded quartz pebbles c. 5mm. 26 sherds, 379g, MNV = 0.58.
F5: *Micaceous quartz*. As F2, with sparse to moderate quartz grains, and rare silver mica platelets up to 0.5mm. 1 sherd, 30g, MNV = 0.

F6: *Sandstone*: Crushed sandstone grains up to 2mm, some calcite-cemented, rare ferruginous grains. Moderate, sub-angular free quartz grains c. 0.5mm. 5 sherds, 118g, MNV = 0.24.

F7: *Chalk and chaff*: Moderate, subangular chalk fragments up to 0.5mm, moderate to dense chaff voids up to 10mm. 4 sherds, 44g, MNV = 0.20.

F8: *Sparse quartz and ironstone*. Sparse sub-round quartz and rounded red ironstone up to 1mm. 1 sherd, 12g, MNV = 0.

It is worthy of note that two of the decorated vessels (Figs FAS1 and FAS4) are in fabric 6, and comprise most of the small group of sherds in that fabric type. This may indicate that such clays were not local, and the pots were the work of a ‘specialist’ potter from outside the immediate area of the site, although it may be that the fineness of clay made it particularly suitable for the manufacture of such vessels, and it was utilised by local potters mainly for that task.

Table 1: Pottery occurrence by number and weight (in g) of sherds per context by fabric type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTEXT</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
<th>F6</th>
<th>F7</th>
<th>F8</th>
<th>T1(1)</th>
<th>T1(2)</th>
<th>Sandy</th>
<th>Med</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chronotypological Analysis**

Decorated sherds from at least three vessels were present. The most remarkable is that with the long-bosses and incised lines (Fig. 5.1, 5.1a). Such vessels are said to be typical of East Anglia, and examples different variants of the style are known from many areas of eastern England, including Yorkshire, the north and east Midlands and East Anglia (Myres 1977, figs 218-288). Because of this, they are considered to be typical of the areas seen as settled by people of Anglian origin (Myres 1986, 64 and fig.3), but they also occur outside these areas, such as a vessel from Eynsham Abbey, Oxfordshire (Blinkhorn in print), and can be paralleled outside the ‘Anglian’ areas of the continent (see below).
The form of the vessel is very distinctive, with sharply carinated shoulders. Such vessels are said to have close affinities with contemporary Norwegian pottery (Myres 1977, 43b). Myres stated that bossed vessels with long necks are particularly well-represented in Cambridgeshire and West Suffolk (ibid., 10b), although this vessel does not possess this distinctive feature. It is, however, very close in style to other vessels from Cambridgeshire, such as those from Little Wilbraham and, in particular, Linton Heath (Myres 1977, fig. 260). The latter vessel (corpus no. 2619) was found in association with a spear-head which was dated to c. AD500 (ibid. 44a), and Myres dates long-boss vessels generally to the first half of the sixth century (ibid.).

It is difficult to ascribe anything other than a general date to the stamped sherd (Fig. 5.4), although vessels with such decoration can be given a date that falls within the range suggested by the bossed vessel. Stamped vessels are known from the fifth century, but most date to the sixth century (ibid., 19-22). This sherd has four complete and two partial stamp impressions of Briscoe type 5g iv, and a fragment of an incised line, which suggests that the original vessel may have been decorated with stamp pendant triangles, a common East Anglian decorative scheme of the sixth century (ibid. 53a).

Three small sherds were noted with fragments of combed linear decoration. Due to the small sherd size, the overall decorative schemes could not be identified, and thus it is only possible to give the sherds a general fifth or sixth century date.

Two sherds were noted with scored surfaces (e.g. Fig. 5.5). Vessels with such surface enhancement are rare but widespread finds on early Anglo-Saxon sites, and occur at places as wide apart as Mucking, Essex (Hamerow 1994) and Eynsham Abbey, Oxfordshire (Blinkhorn in print). Such vessels cannot be dated other to within the early Anglo-Saxon period, although the technique was used on both British and continental pottery of the pre-Roman Iron Age (Hamerow 1994, 31).

**Vessel Forms**

All the form-diagnostic pottery occurred in the SFB, and all such sherds were from jars or bowls. A total of 14 rimsherds were noted, of which 8 were from jars (MNV = 0.70) and 6 were from small bowls (MNV = 0.49). All the vessels are typical of those from settlement sites, and the jars, decorated vessels aside, were all baggy forms with no remarkable features (e.g. Fig. 5.2). The bowls are similarly undistinctive, with the exception of that illustrated in Fig. 5.3. The vessel is exceptionally well-made, with thin walls and a well-smoothed and burnished outer surface.
Figure 5  Early Saxon pottery. 1a shows the suggested positions of pushed-out bosses. Scale 1:2 (except 1a approx 1:4)
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Saxo-Norman

Six sherds (71g) of Saxo-Norman or early Medieval pottery types were noted, as follows:

TI(1) St. Neots type ware. AD900-1100. Smooth to soapy, purplish-black, black or grey shelly limestone tempered ware. (Denham 1985, 54). 1 sherd, 2g, MNV = 0.

TI(2) St. Neots type ware. AD1000-1200. Weak to strong red and reddish-brown shelly limestone ware. (ibid.). 2 sherds, 50g, MNV = 0.03. The two sherds were from different contexts, 142 and 147, but are probably from the same vessel, a medium to large jar.

Early medieval sandy coarseware. Unglazed sandy ware of undistinctive type. Sparse to moderate, sub-rounded pink, clear and grey quartz up to 0.5mm. Rare calcareous material and ironstone of the same size and shape. 3 sherds, 19g, MNV = 0.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cntx</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>dwelling</td>
<td>Sub rectangular, L 4.50m x W 3.6m x D 0.22m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dk grey brown sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-light grey sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rectangular, L 0.40m x W 0.32m x D 0.20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Postpipe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt with frequent flint nodules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Postpipe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.36m x D 0.03m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole packing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-light grey sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Square, L 0.40m x W 0.40m x D 0.06m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Postpipe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-light grey sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Postpipe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.32m x D 0.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole packing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt with frequent flint nodules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Square, L 0.40m x W 0.40m x D 0.05m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dk grey brown sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.52m x D 0.24m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dk grey brown sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.22m x D 0.20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dk grey brown sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.18m x D 0.12m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dk grey brown sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub rectangular, L 0.20m x W 0.21m x D 0.17m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Slot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dk grey brown sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Slot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rectangular, L 0.32m x W 0.18m x D 0.12m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Slot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey silty sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Slot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rectangular, L 0.21m x W 0.15m x D 0.18m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.24m x D 0.23m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub rectangular, L 0.24m x W 0.19m x D 0.13m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.20m x D 0.08m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.20m x D 0.07m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub rectangular, L 0.20m x W 0.14m x D 0.07m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rectangular, L 0.42m x W 0.23m x D 0.13m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rectangular, L 0.25m x W 0.14m x D 0.13m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.20m x D 0.08m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>Linear, N-S, L 21.50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dark brown clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear, N-S, L 1.50m x W 1.50m x D 0.43m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dark brown clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear, N-S, L 1.50m x W 1.75m x D 0.50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid brown clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear, N-S, L 1.50m x W 0.93m x D 0.24m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>Dark brown sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear, E-W, L 6.60m x W 8.50m x D 0.15m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>Linear, E-W, L 14.00m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dark grey brown sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cntxt</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Linear, E-W, L 1.10m x W 1.10m x D 0.22m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dark grey brown sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear, E-W, L 0.75m x W 1.45m x D 0.04m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>Gravel, E-W, L 1.15m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dark grey brown sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear, E-W, L 1.25m x W 0.55m x D 0.20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dark grey brown sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>Linear, E-W, L 1.00m x W 1.00m x D 0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear, E-W, L 1.00m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dark grey brown sandy clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear, E-W, L 1.20m x W 1.07m x D 0.39m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey brown clay silt with frequent flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 1.15m x D 0.39m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey brown clay silt with frequent flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-circular, L 1.00m x W 0.70m x D 0.20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey brown clay silt with frequent flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-rectangular, W 2.00m x D 0.37m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey brown clay silt with frequent flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-rectangular, L 6.40m x W 2.20m x D 0.20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-rectangular, L 3.75m x W 1.80m x D 0.40m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-rectangular, L 1.10m x W 1.80m x D 0.41m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-rectangular, L 0.80m x W 1.20m x D 0.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Light grey chalky clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 1.60m x D 0.24m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear, N-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extends into N, S, W LodEst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Burial</td>
<td>Pony (elderly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Burial</td>
<td>Sub-circular, L 1.60m x W 1.25m x D 0.40m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Burial</td>
<td>Lt brown chalky clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Slot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear, E-W cont 176-181 /archaeic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.53m x D 0.28m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.52m x D 0.24m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-rectangular, L 0.25m x W 0.13m x D 0.11m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.60m x D 0.32m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.59m x D 0.31m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.20m x D 0.17m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.22m x D 0.08m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.20m x D 0.10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cntxt</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub rectangular, L 0.36m x W 0.22m x D 0.16m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.23m x D 0.12m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.35m x D 0.19m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.44m x D 0.09m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.43m x D 0.15m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Slot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub rectangular, L 0.70m x W 0.30m x D 0.06m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.30m x D 0.12m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.30m x D 0.27m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circular, Dia. 0.48m x D 0.10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub rectangular, L0.83m x W 0.50m x D 0.15m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub rectangular, L0.82m x W 0.42m x D 0.24m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Slot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Slot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub rectangular, L0.72m x W 0.25m x D 0.13m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LG grey sandy chalky clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Root disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Square, L 0.40m x W 0.40m X D 0.40m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Colluvium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DK Grey clay silt (F of 213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Ips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V DK Grey clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DK Grey brown clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear, E-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LG grey brown clay silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>