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1 SUMMARY

As part of a joint Oxford University (OU)/Oxford Archaeology (OA) project to investigate Saxon settlement and society in the area around Sutton Courtenay, OA carried out a research evaluation at Drayton Road, Sutton Courtenay, Oxfordshire. This work was funded by English Heritage. The evaluation revealed features and finds covering a wide period span from the Mesolithic to the Anglo-Saxon period. Within the four trenches excavated, discoveries of particular significance included a gully and seven pits in the north-east of the site with an important assemblage of early Saxon pottery. A palisade burial was found adjacent to this trench in a test pit. A Saxon timber hall was also investigated and an early to mid Saxon waterhole, a group of Neolithic pits and several Roman ditches were examined. Saxon pottery was found in the upper fill of a Roman trackway ditch. Fieldwalking, metal detecting and test-pit sieving recovered a wide variety of material, mainly of Neolithic and early Bronze Age date, but also a human jaw fragment from the area where Anglo-Saxon cemetery finds had previously been recovered by metal detectorists.

2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

2.1 Location and scope of work

The project investigated an area of cropmarks on the Second (Summertown-Radley) Gravel Terrace of the River Thames, straddling the parish boundary between Sutton Courtenay and Drayton, Oxfordshire (SU 491 933), 2 km south of Abingdon (Fig. 1). The site is located in a wedge-shaped field immediately to the south of Drayton East Way and to the east of the Milton Road (Fig. 2), and lies adjacent to Scheduled Ancient Monument Oxon 248, believed to be the site of a Saxon Royal vill. The field had been ploughed (possibly deep ploughed) for some years and had also been actively metal-detected, at least since the early 1990s. Archaeological features were, therefore, significantly truncated in some cases. Cropmarks, metal-detector finds and magnetometer survey indicated multi-period occupation spanning the Neolithic to the early medieval period. The primary focus of the evaluation project was the investigation of a settlement, cemetery, and probable market complex dating to the Anglo-Saxon period.

2.2 Geology, topography and land use

The site lies on the Thames Valley Second Gravel Terrace at c. 57 m above OD, and is situated on land that falls gently to the north and west. It is currently under cereal cultivation.

2.3 Archaeological background

The archaeological background to the evaluation was presented in the Project Design (OU/OA 2002), a summary of which is presented below. The site itself
has produced significant archaeological evidence and there are several known sites with archaeological remains adjacent to the project area.

In the 1920s and 1930s, a total of 33 sunken-featured buildings (SFBs) were excavated some 300 m to the north of the Project Area by E T Leeds of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (Leeds 1923; 1927; 1947). In addition, the Drayton South Cursus and ring ditches located in a field immediately to the west of the study area were subject to archaeological investigation in advance of gravel extraction by the Oxford Archaeological Unit (now Oxford Archaeology) in 1994 (Barclay et al. 2003). Leeds’ archives are located in the Ashmolean Museum and have already been comprehensively examined by Helena Hamerow. The OAU archives are currently held by Oxford Archaeology.

A group of large rectangular buildings of presumed early medieval date lying immediately to the west of the project area were recognised from aerial photographs in the 1970s (Benson and Miles 1974). This site now has Scheduled Ancient Monument Status (Oxon no. 248), and the complex of cropmarks as a whole is included in the RCHME’s (now English Heritage’s) recent National Mapping Programme. One building of the complex, lying on the east side of Mill Lane at the west edge of the evaluation area, was occasionally visible from the air.

The field of the 2002 evaluation has been subjected to regular metal detecting for more than 10 years (Mr R Allen pers. comm.). A relatively large number of significant finds have been recovered during this period including thirteen silver coins (sceattas) of mid-Saxon date. The coins may indicate the presence of a market in the area by the late seventh century. Several examples of ornamental metalwork have also been recovered through metal detecting. This suggests the possible presence of an Anglo-Saxon cemetery of sixth- and seventh-century date in the area. The land has been, and continues to be ploughed, sometimes quite deeply. The effect of the ploughing and the metal detecting make it particularly vulnerable and its future uncertain.

In September 2001 and February 2002, English Heritage carried out a magnetometer survey over an area of some 10 ha within the project area (Fig. 2). This has recently been extended (English Heritage forthcoming). As expected over Thames valley gravels, the magnetic response over the site was clear and considerably enhanced the aerial photographic evidence. The preliminary plots clearly show, in the eastern part of the survey area (i.e. the area of the presumed Anglo-Saxon cemetery and possible market), a long, curving trackway running east-west across the southern part of the survey area and a number of field boundary ditches. Complex systems of enclosures, including possible hut circles and large pits indicate the presence of an Iron Age settlement. In the western part of the survey area, two ring ditches and a possible oval barrow of Neolithic date were revealed, as well as around a dozen small, well-defined rectangular anomalies, at least some of which are likely to be Anglo-Saxon sunken-featured buildings. In addition, a rectangular feature, almost certainly a large Anglo-Saxon timber building, was revealed just to the east of the Milton Road in the area of the cropmark referred to above.
Sutton Courtenay/Drayton is the only Anglo-Saxon settlement complex where large timber buildings ("Great Halls"), sunken-featured buildings, a cemetery (indicated by metal-detector finds of jewellery), and a probable market (indicated by metal-detector finds of coins) have been identified in direct association. On analogy with Yeavering in Northumberland (Hope-Taylor 1977), the site almost certainly represents an undocumented royal vill of mid-Saxon date and presents an unparalleled opportunity to investigate a high-status complex of this period.

It has been recognised for some time that the "Great Halls" excavated at Yeavering constitute only the core of a much more extensive complex which includes sunken-featured buildings (SFBs), pits and other features. The function of, and relationship between, these different components of the settlement complex have never been established. A similar pattern can be seen at the nearby royal vill at Milfield, another cropmark site (Harding and Scull 1990; Gates and O’Brien 1988). Here, an associated cemetery (though with very few grave goods) and one SFB have been excavated, but not the timber buildings or enclosures. At Sutton Courtenay/Drayton there is thus considerable potential to investigate the relationship between the different elements of such a site as an integrated whole.

The recently recognised cemetery at Sutton Courtenay (Hamerow 1999) was already established by the early sixth century, if not earlier, and is thus contemporary with the earliest SFBs excavated by Leeds; its foundation clearly preceded the construction of the Great Halls. The cemetery appears to have continued in use, however, into the seventh century, in the course of which it is likely that the Great Halls were built. The cemetery thus provides a vital context for the emergence of the high status settlement.

Archaeologists have speculated as to the presence of a market at Yeavering, and at royal/aristocratic centres generally. The discovery of 13 mid Saxon silver coins ("sceattas") at Sutton Courtenay/Drayton may indicate the presence of a market here by the late seventh century ¹, although this remains to be validated.

The site also has great local and regional importance. The Upper Thames valley lay at the heart of the early Kingdom of Wessex and the area around Abingdon has long been recognised as a main focus of settlement in the region during the early Anglo-Saxon period (Hawkes 1986; Blair 1994). Sutton was, furthermore, the 'south tun' (or farm) of Abingdon, where a double monastery was founded in the late seventh or eighth century, i.e. around the time the coins were lost. The proximity of the site to the two most richly-furnished Anglo-Saxon burials in the region, located roughly a kilometre to the south at Milton, highlights the importance of this micro-region.

### 2.4 Reasons for and circumstances of the project

As already noted, large timber buildings lying immediately to the west of the Project Area were identified in the 1970s from aerial photographs (SAM no Oxon. 248); these almost certainly represent an undocumented Anglo-Saxon

¹ The coins were examined and recorded by Prof. Michael Metcalf, who is confident that they represent casual losses and not a hoard.
royal vill, as recognised by Benson and Miles (1974). In the 1990s metal-detector finds of coins and ornamental metalwork from the Project Area (ie to the east of the SAM) were brought to the attention of Helena Hamerow. These suggest the presence here of an Anglo-Saxon cemetery of sixth- and seventh-century date and probably a market of late seventh- and eighth-century date.

The site has been, and continues to be, subjected to deep ploughing and has been heavily metal-detected for some ten years (many of the metal-detector finds from Sutton Courtenay/Drayton have been published by Helena Hamerow (1999)). These activities make it particularly vulnerable and its future uncertain. Nevertheless, the cropmarks, magnetometry results and archaeological investigation by OA indicate that there is sufficient good-quality archaeological data to allow the character of the site and the potential threat to this resource to be assessed.

The fields in question are owned by Mr Robert Allen (Uptown Farm, Sutton Courtenay). Access to the site was agreed with Mr Allen and the project was timed in consultation with him, so as to cause least disruption. The site was reinstated to its current appearance on completion of fieldwork.

3 RESEARCH AIMS

Many of the research aims presented in the Project Design (OA/OU 2002) remain valid.

3.1 Research aims of the project

1. Changes in settlement hierarchy, AD 450-700.

This is a period which saw the emergence, around the end of the sixth century, of the first obviously high-status centres in Anglo-Saxon England. The main research aim of the project is to investigate, with minimal intrusion, such a high-status complex, its extent, character, and relationship to earlier Anglo-Saxon buildings and burials, as it is one of very few known nationally which has all these elements within a small area. In particular, this work will seek to understand the chronological, spatial and functional relationships between the different elements of the early medieval settlement complex (ie SFBs, cemetery, timber buildings and market).

The presence of timber halls, SFBs, a cemetery and probable market at Sutton Courtenay/Drayton offers an opportunity to examine for the first time a high-status Anglo-Saxon complex as an integrated whole. Results from this investigation will be of national, indeed international, significance. Understanding the chronological development of the site, how the high-status centre relates to earlier settlement features and burials, and the relationship between the different elements of this settlement complex, is a key aim of the project.
2. **The relationship of early medieval settlement to the Romano-British and prehistoric landscapes.**

A secondary aim of the project is to explore the relationship of the early medieval (Saxon) complex to a series of prominent features in the preceding landscape. In common with a number of high-status centres (including Yeavering and Milfield), the settlement at Sutton Courtenay/Drayton was established on the site of an ancient monumental complex still visible as a series of barrows, and near to a Neolithic cursus monument. In addition, magnetometry has revealed with great clarity a settlement complex of presumed Iron Age date (comparable with Claydon Pike, Gloucestershire), including apparent hut circles and, presumably of later date, an east-west trackway and rectilinear enclosure system (Fig. 2). Of particular interest is the apparent longevity of the major ditches defining the road and main enclosures. The proximity of Drop Short Roman villa is significant and may offer potential for elucidating late fourth- and early fifth century activity in this area (excavations were carried out at Drop Short by the Berkshire Archaeological Society in the 1950s but never published; the archive has still to be located).

3. **Methodological Issues**

In view of the continued ploughing and metal-detecting over the site, a main aim of the project is to establish the origin of the finds that have been recovered, assess the present condition of archaeological features and the extent to which damage is currently taking place. This will enable the site’s future preservation to be more effectively managed.

4. **Sampling Archaeological Cropmarks**

The proposed project should yield valuable information regarding the date and function of these cropmarks, which have been mapped by RCHME.

3.2 **Specific Research Objectives**

Within these overall aims, the primary objective of the project was to clarify the relationship between three distinct elements of the Saxon landscape:

A) The SFBs, of which around a dozen have provisionally been identified by the EH magnetometer survey. It was proposed to examine two of these structures in Trench 3 in order to assess their contemporaneity with the Great Halls, and to search for evidence of craft activity, the economy and environment.

B) The ‘Great Halls’ to the west of (A). Most of these lie to the west of the Milton Road and are inaccessible due to uncooperative landowners. Immediately to the east of the road, however, lies another large building (approximately 20 m in length). The project proposed partly to excavate this building in Trench 4 in order to characterise its construction, retrieve dating material and establish whether adjacent structures are present.

C) The area of a sixth to seventh-century cemetery, including high-status burials (indicated by Style II ornamental metalwork; Hamerow 1999). Thirteen late seventh- and early eighth-century silver coins ( sceattas) were
also recovered from this field, suggesting that the cemetery later became the site of market activity. The project proposed to establish the presence and condition of the cemetery, and its likely extent.

D) The Roman trackway system and its possible use in the Saxon period.

*Inter alia,* the following objectives will also be pursued:

- To investigate potentially changing burial customs in relation to change in settlement type during the early and mid Saxon periods
- to establish whether other feature types are present which may not be visible in non-intrusive survey
- to test the hypothesis that there was a market on the site and establish the origin of the finds recovered
- to investigate the environment of this early settlement and any information that environmental data can shed on economy, trade and subsistence patterns
- to examine the relationship of the Saxon settlement to earlier, and potentially visible, ceremonial and settlement remains, specifically the east-west road and the possible Iron Age enclosures.
- to enhance knowledge of the local settlement pattern and establish the significance of the site within its regional and local context at a time of emerging settlement hierarchy
- to enable a review of the management of the site and the extent of the scheduled area.

4 **FIELDWORK METHODOLOGY**

4.1 **Scope of fieldwork**

English Heritage undertook magnetometer survey over c. 10 ha in 2001 and 2002 (Fig. 2); the evaluation built upon the results of this survey and the aerial photographic evidence that was available. Work in September 2002 involved evaluation trenching, test-pit sieving, fieldwalking and metal detecting. The area had been partially ploughed before the evaluation trenches were opened and examined and the test pitting was undertaken, but the entire field was reploughed following re-instatement of the trenches and the field was then walked and metal detected.
4.2 Evaluation trenching

4.2.1 Trench positions

Four 20 m x 10 m evaluation trenches were excavated within the field (Fig. 2).

_Trench 1_ was placed in the area where metal-detector finds indicated the presence of an Anglo-Saxon cemetery and a possible market. The geophysical survey suggested that it was an area of Iron Age settlement with large pits (Fig. 2).

_Trench 2_ was positioned in order to establish the date and longevity of the major ditched features, including an east-west road of presumed Roman date, and to determine the extent to which these remained significant features in the early medieval landscape.

_Trench 3_ was positioned in order to examine two possible SFBs.

_Trench 4_ covered the eastern half of a large timber building. The trench was positioned perpendicular to the building in order to identify any features which may be associated with the building, such as the fenced enclosures observed at Yeavering and Cowdery’s Down (Hope-Taylor 1977; Millett 1983).

It should be noted that only three trenches were suggested in the outline proposal. However, magnetometry undertaken by EH in February 2002 to the west of the original project area revealed a wealth of additional settlement evidence. As it was central to the research aims of the project to investigate large timber buildings and SFBs in this area, a fourth trench was added.

4.2.2 Excavation methods and recording

The overburden was removed under close archaeological supervision by a 360° mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless bucket. The trenches were cleared by hand, photographed and the features thus revealed were sampled to determine their extent and character, and to retrieve finds and environmental samples. All archaeological features were planned at 1:50 and, where excavated, their sections drawn at a scale of 1:20. All features were photographed using colour slide and black-and-white print film. Recording followed procedures laid down in the _OAU Fieldwork Manual_ (ed. Wilkinson 1992).

Features exposed in the trenches were sampled in order to:

- gain information on the extent, morphology and function of a range of settlement features in the area
- establish the chronological sequence of remains and gain dating evidence from them
- evaluate the economic basis of early and middle Saxon communities through the recovery of pottery, metal finds, faunal assemblages and macrobotanical remains
• recover suitable samples to establish changes in the environment of the area and its immediate hinterland through time and space.

Finds
Finds were recovered by hand during the course of the excavation and generally bagged by context. All finds were removed from the site at the end of each day and were removed to Oxford Archaeology premises where they were washed, marked, boxed by material and context and recorded on the OA finds database. Finds were also recovered during the flotation of soil samples, and these were added to hand-retrieved material for the purposes of assessment.

Human remains
Angela Boyle, OA human remains specialist, provided advice on the excavation of human skeletons, and personally excavated the burial found adjacent to Trench 1.

Environmental sampling
The criteria for selecting environmental samples are set out in the OA sampling guidelines (OA 2000). Following advice on site from Mark Robinson of Oxford University Museum, samples were recovered from a range of feature types and periods; some were also chosen to ensure that features with the greatest potential were examined, especially the early Saxon pits and the post-in-trench timber hall. Samples for charred plant remains and animal bones were 40 litres in size (or all of the deposit if less than 40 litres). A number of features were also sampled for snails.

Samples for flotation were recovered in sample buckets and removed to Oxford Archaeology premises where they were processed following OA guidelines (OA 2000).

Geoarchaeology
Matt Canti of English Heritage visited the site and provided advice on the character of the soils. He took micromorphological samples from a possible ground surface and an unusual soil deposit within one of the early Saxon pits.

4.3 Test-pit sieving
Two 1 m x 1 m test pits were excavated at opposing corners of each excavation trench, eight pits in all. This was undertaken in order to establish the vertical distribution and quantity of archaeological material contained within the ploughsoil in the immediate environs of the trenches. The soil was sieved through a 10 mm mesh. Finds from each test pit location were separated by 0.1 m spits and bagged by individual test pit number and spit. The bottoms of the pits were cleaned to search for archaeological features.
4.4 Fieldwalking

Fieldwalking was undertaken over the entire field approximately two weeks after it had been ploughed. Twenty-six north-south transects were set out and walked at 20 m intervals with finds collected in 20 m stints. It is estimated that each walker will scan approximately 1 m on each side of their line, representing 10% of the entire field. All material was collected, except scatters of clearly modern material (such as aluminium, cans, bottle tops and foil) which was noted but not collected. Fieldwalking records were maintained, which included details of surface geology, soil conditions (moisture, friability of soil etc), slope/topography, date and time of walking, weather, light conditions and name of individual fieldwalker per transect. Materials collected in the field were bagged in self-sealing bags with the origin of each collecting unit being recorded by an appropriate grid reference.

4.5 Metal detecting

Metal detecting was undertaken on all stripped surfaces and on the spoil heaps of evaluation trenches and test pits. Metal detectorists also attempted to walk the same transects as fieldwalkers. However, this was abandoned when it became clear that the site contained an unusually high proportion of modern metallic material such as bottle tops, tin foil and drinks cans. This may have been the result of deliberate ‘seeding’ of the site, possibly by regular detectorists to discourage others working on it.

5 QUANTIFICATION OF THE ARCHIVE

5.1 Stratigraphic information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Type</th>
<th>Quantification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context records</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrices A4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans A1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans A4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections A4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk finds record sheets</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small finds record sheets</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels record sheets</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental sample record sheets</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-and-white films</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour films</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Ecofactual and artefactual material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Evaluation trenching (no of pieces)</th>
<th>Test-pit sieving</th>
<th>Fieldwalking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building materials</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper alloy objects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron objects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead objects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver objects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt flint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay pipe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron objects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>624</td>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human bone</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal bone</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charred remains</td>
<td>6 grain frags; 3 weed frags plus wood charcoal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 THE STRATIGRAPHIC AND STRUCTURAL RESULTS AND THEIR POTENTIAL

6.1 Results of evaluation trenching

All archaeological remains had been truncated by the plough to some extent, and no surfaces, floors or hearths survived. Plough marks from recent cultivation were noted and ploughsoil (0.20 m - 0.38 m deep) overlay all features, except in Trench 4 where a thin layer of colluvium was present. Nevertheless, the definition of features was reasonably clear in all of the trenches, the building in Trench 4 being particularly well defined, and even shallow features such as postholes survived.

6.1.1 Trench 1

Trench 1 was positioned over the possible site of an early Saxon cemetery and market. The plan of features is shown in Figure 3. A narrow (c 1 m) and deep (0.82 m) east-west linear ditch (104/109) was revealed containing a large quantity of pottery and bone. It terminated 13.50 m into the trench. A slot (148) ran roughly parallel to the ditch at a distance of 0.70 m - 1 m. Seven large pits lay to the south of the ditch, four of which cut the slot and five postholes were found to the north in a rough east-west alignment. Four of the pits were excavated and these yielded a significant assemblage of pottery of early Saxon date and animal bone.
In the south-east corner of the trench, a curvilinear ditch (129) was exposed and a small slot which terminated within the trench (131); neither contained datable material.

A shallow ditch ran north-south across the trench. It contained some post-medieval material, and its alignment parallel to ploughmarks suggest that it may be a recent field boundary.

6.1.2 **Trench 2**

Trench 2 was positioned in order to establish the date and longevity of use of ditches revealed in the geophysical survey, one of which defines a presumed Roman trackway. The trench plan is shown in Figure 4. Three substantial ditches were revealed, one of which (206/229) crossed the trench from east to west and corresponds to the northern trackway ditch in the geophysical survey. It cut a large, flat-bottomed pit (212) on its north side (also visible on the survey) and seems to have been recut at least once. The upper fill yielded one sherd of Anglo-Saxon pottery.

A north-south ditch (238) was revealed on the west edge of the trench which turned through 90° just to the south of 206/209 to run parallel and to the south of it. The geophysical survey suggests that this may be the north-east corner of a small field or enclosure.

In the north-east corner of the trench a curving ditch (243) was revealed with a gully (225) running parallel to it. This corresponds to a trackway or boundary ditch running from the north and turning to run parallel with the main east-west trackway ditch (206/229). Unfortunately, no relationship was established between them.

A number of small pits and postholes were also revealed within the trench, none of which were dated, and tree disturbance was also present (Fig. 4).

6.1.3 **Trench 3**

Trench 3 was placed to examine two small rectangular anomalies on the geophysical survey, which were thought to be SFBs. These features (shown on Fig. 5) were found to be a large pit (329) which was not bottomed but was almost certainly a waterhole with waterlogged deposits in its lower fills. It was cut by several intercutting pits to the south, a few of which contained pottery of early to middle Saxon date, and animal bone in small quantities.

A small number of discrete pits and postholes were also exposed, of which ten were excavated. Two pits contained flint of Neolithic date, and the similarity of three other pits suggests that they are contemporary. The proximity of these features to the Neolithic oval barrow is of interest. Three postholes (365, 350 and an unexcavated example) lay on the edge of a north-south ditch (341/361) and may represent a parallel fenceline. The ditch is probably the very clear eastern boundary if a large enclosure or field seen on the geophysical survey. It cut a slight east-west feature, possibly the north side of the trackway ditch, but much truncated here.
6.1.4 Trench 4

Trench 4 was targeted on the Saxon timber building seen on air photographs and in the geophysical survey, although its precise position had to be moved slightly north of the desired location to avoid modern services. The eastern 7 m of a building, orientated east-west and 8 m wide, was revealed in the south of the trench, the walls of which had been constructed within a wall trench. The construction sequence was complex, but the initial evaluation suggests that there had been large upright posts spaced approximately every 1.5 m along the trench with smaller posts between. However, some of these posts had probably rotted, or failed in some way, and had been deliberately removed. A number of probable replacement posts were found which had rotted in situ. An entrance was present midway along the east wall, marked by a very shallow, flat-bottomed slot, 1.10 m wide and 0.08 m deep. A small number of postholes were revealed within the building, including a substantial posthole containing limestone packing. The stone and surrounding gravel had been burnt, suggesting that a large post had burnt in situ. The internal features were not stratigraphically related to the construction of the building but contained similar fills to those in the foundation trench, and their spatial arrangement suggests that they are all broadly contemporary. The wall trench appeared to cut a shallow east-west ditch (426), although the termination of the ditch here may suggest that it was part a contemporary layout.

A possible gully cut across the north-east corner of the trench (420), and a north-south ditch ran along the trench, cutting the Saxon hall. It is parallel to modern field boundaries and is probably a post-medieval feature. Very few finds were recovered from this trench.

6.2 Results of test pitting

Little material was retrieved from the test pits, but the finds that were recovered were all post-medieval in date or undatable (see table). However, in the bottom of Test pit 1A to the north-east of Trench 1, an inhumation burial was revealed of an individual who had been placed head first into a small gravel cut (see below, Section 7.5).

Finds recovered from test-pit sieving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Test pit no</th>
<th>Spit</th>
<th>Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench 1 (east)</td>
<td>TP1A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench 1 (west)</td>
<td>TP1B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 fragment tile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 fragment animal bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench 2 (north)</td>
<td>TP2A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench 2 (south)</td>
<td>TP2B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 sherd white china with blue decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench 3 (east)</td>
<td>TP3A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 fragment animal bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 fragment land drain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench 3 (west)</td>
<td>TP3B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 unworked flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench 4 (north)</td>
<td>TP4A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench 4 (south)</td>
<td>TP4B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Results of fieldwalking

A number of flints were recovered from across the field (Fig. 6). The small number of diagnostic pieces within the assemblage are of mixed date, spanning the Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age and post-medieval periods. However, although generally undiagnostic, the majority of the assemblage is consistent with a Neolithic or Bronze Age date. Flintwork was mostly located in two spreads, one to the west and one to the east of the field, and the majority of the material is in poor condition, suggesting that it has been in the ploughsoil for some time. The cluster to the west was larger than that to the east, covering around 7 ha, and contained much of the tools that were recovered, including the leaf-shaped arrowhead and most of the blades. This scatter overlies the Neolithic and Bronze Age barrows, and lies nearest to the Drayton Cursus.

No pottery of Iron Age date was recovered during the evaluation, but several sherds of this date were found towards the eastern end of the site during fieldwalking (Fig. 8). This material came from the area of pits and gullies revealed by the geophysical survey (Fig. 2). The recovery of friable Iron Age pottery is a rare occurrence, and suggests that ploughing has only recently brought this material to the surface.

A light scatter of Roman pottery was recovered from the field, mainly towards the eastern end of the site, over the settlement area and ditched enclosures and trackways detected in geophysical survey. This may indicate that occupation of this site extended into the Roman period, as pottery is likely to be rare in boundary ditches away from settlements. This was demonstrated by the excavations in Trench 2.

A solitary sherd of early to mid Saxon pottery was recovered from the centre south of the field (Fig. 8). There was more medieval pottery, presumably introduced with manure, but manuring seems to have increased in the post-medieval period, as sherds of this date are common especially in the west of the field.

The recovery of a human mandible from the north-east of the field, to the north of Field 1 (Fig. 8) is of considerable interest. Its presence may suggest that the Saxon cemetery lies to the north of evaluation Trench 1, and that the plough may be actively cutting into graves. Alternatively, metal detectorists may be digging into shallow graves beneath the ploughsoil.

6.4 Results of metal detecting

As already described, the metal detecting exercise was not very successful. The detectorists began by walking the transects over the areas where important metalwork had previously been found, but recovered nothing except modern debris. It is suspected that some or much of this material was deliberately placed there by detectorists who wanted to prevent others working the site. In
the end it only proved possible to walk 7 ha in this fashion, representing a little more than one third of the area and covering that part of the site where most was expected. Nevertheless, a small number of post-medieval metal finds of some interest were recovered in the process, especially to the south of the field (Fig. 9), including a silver half groat of Charles I (Section 7.4).

6.5 Results by period and statement of potential

6.5.1 Neolithic and Bronze Age
Prehistoric activity on the site was demonstrated by the Neolithic oval barrow and ring ditches seen on the geophysical survey plot lying to the west of the site (Fig. 2). A small group of bowl-shaped pits was uncovered in Trench 3, two of which contained Neolithic material. A relatively large flint assemblage was also recovered, which mainly concentrated in this west part of the field and included a leaf-shaped arrowhead. This material was in poor condition suggesting that it had been in the ploughsoil for some time.

These discoveries demonstrate the potential to elucidate a long period of activity on this site in an area adjacent to the Drayton cursus:

- understanding the antiquity of the landscape and its development through time, especially when the environmental evidence is included

- the opportunity to examine a Neolithic oval barrow and its context, a category of monument that is poorly understood and rarely well preserved

- the development of the ceremonial monuments through time and, particularly, the relationship with the cursus that has already been partly excavated (Barclay et al. 2003).

6.5.2 Iron Age
The magnetometer survey revealed what appears to be a densely-occupied Iron settlement site of the type examined nearby at Ashville, Abingdon. Nevertheless, even though Trench 1 was positioned in an area where pits were present, these were found to be Anglo-Saxon in date, and no Iron Age material was recovered in any evaluation trench. Iron Age pottery was, however, recovered in fieldwalking in the east of the field (Fig. 8) and this suggests that at least some of this activity is of that period. The extent to which the pit-like anomalies to the east are Iron Age must now be questioned; the Saxon activity may be more widespread and varied here than had been imagined.

There is considerable potential on this site to investigate Iron Age settlement features, their relationship to Bronze Age predecessors and the transition to the Roman period. Such sites are not, however, unusual in the Upper Thames valley and a number have been excavated in detail. There is little to suggest that this site is in any way extraordinary.
6.5.3 Roman

Some of the Roman pottery recovered in fieldwalking may come from occupation features in the east of the site. However, the most noticeable aspect of presumed Roman activity is the east-west trackway which crosses the site, and the boundary ditches of small fields or enclosures that can be seen on the magnetometer plot (Fig. 2). Some of these ditches were examined in Trench 2, although very few finds were recovered from them.

The Roman features have the potential to reveal information on the increasingly sub-divided and organised agricultural landscape of the early centuries AD. Its influence on Anglo-Saxon settlement is an issue of considerable importance for understanding the transition between these periods and the relationship between Saxon inhabitants and their Romano-British predecessors.

6.5.4 Early Saxon (5/6th century)

The main area of early Saxon activity was uncovered in Trench 1. Here a ditch, a parallel gully and seven large circular pits were exposed. The important assemblage of decorated, early Anglo-Saxon pottery from these features was a surprise, presenting the opportunity to examine a facet of early Saxon settlement not previously investigated. The complete horse skull in Pit 113, may indicate a ritual element in the deposition of these finds. This site is so unusual (see below) that any investigation of its character and date and elucidation of the type of activity represented will be of considerable significance.

These features are situated beneath the area where early Saxon cemetery finds were retrieved from the ploughsoil by metal detectorists (Hamerow 1999). It is possible that the human jaw fragment indicates the location of the early Saxon cemetery.

The Saxon use of Roman field systems also has the potential to shed light on continued use of earlier landscape features through this major period of transition in the mid first millennium BC.

6.5.5 Early/mid Saxon

The most prominent feature of the middle Saxon period of occupation was the timber hall building in Trench 4. The building is orientated east-west and has a well-defined construction trench. A small number of internal features were also revealed. These features, especially those forming the construction were extensively sampled but no material for dating was retrieved. A single sherd of pottery dating to the early/mid Saxon period was recovered from the fill. The clarity of preservation of the timber structure means that there is great potential to investigate methods of construction.

The small quantity of material recovered from a waterhole and intercutting pits to the south-east of the building in Trench 3 may also be assigned to this phase of activity. The source of a quernstone found in this area would be of great interest in the context of exchange mechanisms at this time, and examination of metal sheet fragments and metal spillage will shed light on craft activities.
A single sherd of early/mid Saxon pottery was retrieved from the recut of a presumed Roman trackway ditch in Trench 2.

The unusual inhumation of an individual head first within a pit is most likely to represent a punishment burial of the middle Saxon period (Reynolds 1997). Its discovery near to the presumed market site may be significant. Radiocarbon dating of this individual is needed to confirm its date but, if mid Saxon, its analysis will contribute to the growing number of such burials and an understanding of social practices at this time.

A single sherd of early/middle Saxon pottery was recovered from the centre south of the field but, unfortunately, no other pottery or metal finds of this period to match the spectacular metalwork recovered by metal detectorists in previous years (Hamerow 1999).

Thus, the features examined in this evaluation have the potential to shed some light on the form of middle Saxon activity in this area and the nature of features associated with a royal vill at this time. This includes examination of the structural detail of the timber hall and of the evidence for the mid Saxon market, a place near to which punishments may have been meted out and executions held.

6.5.6 Medieval and post-medieval

There is no indication of post-Saxon occupation on this site. Finds of pottery and metalwork are indicative of the manuring of fields, and a few ditches of this date are likely to be field boundaries.

6.5.7 Modern disturbance

All features exposed on the site had been plough truncated to some extent. The depth of modern ploughing is variable but there is no doubt that in the east of the field cultivation is actively eroding archaeological deposits. This was already suspected from the earlier metal-detector finds, and reinforced by the discovery of friable Iron Age sherds during the fieldwalking exercise; these would not survive very many ploughing events. The evaluation trenches revealed modern plough scoring, for example in Trench 1 where the ploughsoil was particularly shallow (c 0.20 m). Nevertheless, even here relatively insubstantial features such as small postholes survived and what appeared to be a surface into which finds had been trampled was uncovered.

To the west of the field the depth of modern ploughsoil was deeper, and a shallow colluvial deposit had built up in the area of Trench 4, perhaps explaining the relatively good preservation of the post-in-trench building.
7  THE ARTEFACTUAL RESULTS AND POTENTIAL

7.1  The pottery

by Paul Blinkhorn

7.1.1  Pottery from the evaluation

Quantification
The post-Roman pottery assemblage from the evaluation comprised 175 sherd s with a total weight of 1,958 g. The estimated vessel equivalent (EVE), by summation of surviving rimsherd circumference was 1.02. The majority of the assemblage comprised hand-built Anglo-Saxon material (167 sherds, 1922 g, EVE = 1.02), with the style of decorated wares suggesting that the majority of such material was of 5/6th-century date. The rest of the assemblage was post-medieval.

Fabrics
The following Anglo-Saxon fabrics were noted:

F1: Fine sand. Slightly sandy texture, few visible inclusions except for rare sub-rounded quartz and/or limestone up to 1mm. 131 sherds, 1,480 g, EVE = 0.90.

F2: Organic temper. Moderate to dense voids up to 5mm, few other visible inclusions. 12 sherds, 150 g, EVE = 0.12.

F3: Organic and limestone. Moderate to dense voids up to 5mm, sparse to moderate angular limestone up to 10mm, most 2mm or less. 19 sherds, 255 g, EVE = 0.

F4: Coarse quartz. Moderate to dense sub-rounded quartz up to 1mm. 2 sherds, 16 g, EVE = 0.

F5: Sandy chaff. Sandy texture, sparse chaff voids up to 3mm, few visible inclusions. 1 sherd, 10 g, EVE = 0.

F6: Oolitic limestone. Moderate to dense oolitic limestone up to 1mm. 1 sherd, 11 g, EVE = 0.

The post-medieval pottery was recorded utilising the coding system and chronology of the Oxfordshire County type-series (Mellor 1984; 1994), as follows:

OXFH: Border wares, 1550 - 1700. 1 sherd, 5 g, EVE = 0.
OXBEWSSL: Staffordshire-type slipwares, 1650-1800. 1 sherd, 4 g, EVE = 0.
OXST: Westerwald Stoneware, 1590-1800. 1 sherd, 4 g, EVE = 0.
CRM: Creamware, mid 18th - early 19th C. 1 sherd, 3 g, EVE = 0.
WHEW: Mass-produced white earthenwares, mid 19th - 20th C. 4 sherds, 20 g.

The pottery occurrence by number and weight of sherds per context by fabric type is shown in Table 7.1.1. Each date should be regarded as a terminus post quem.
**Table 7.1.1: Pottery occurrence by number and weight (in g) of sherds per context by fabric type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>F1 No</th>
<th>F1 Wt</th>
<th>F2 No</th>
<th>F2 Wt</th>
<th>F3 No</th>
<th>F3 Wt</th>
<th>F4 No</th>
<th>F4 Wt</th>
<th>F5 No</th>
<th>F5 Wt</th>
<th>F6 No</th>
<th>F6 Wt</th>
<th>PM No</th>
<th>PM Wt</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>U/S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6thC?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6thC?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6thC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6thC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6thC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6thC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6thC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E/MS?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U/S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E/MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E/MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E/MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E/MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U/S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E/MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worthy of note in the case of the Anglo-Saxon pottery that, while all the fabrics are typical of pottery of the period in the region, all the decorated pottery is in the fine sandy fabric, and organic tempered pottery only occurs in contexts which do not have decorated sherds. This may be highly significant; Hamerow (1994) showed that at Mucking in Essex, the later, 7th-century contexts at the site produced mainly chaff-tempered wares, whereas such fabrics were less common in earlier features. This may be the case here, but may be the result of other factors, not least the small assemblage size. The possible implications of this will be discussed at the report stage.

**Chronology**

The decorated Anglo-Saxon pottery from this site, in the main, appears to be of 5/6th-century date. Myres (1977, 2-59) defined a series of vessel forms and decorative traits which may be amongst the earliest Anglo-Saxon vessels known from England, in particular carinated bowls, biconical jars, vessels with incised curvilinear and/or fingertip decoration, and 'high-necked' vessels with incised decoration. This site has produced all these types. The potential presence of Iron Age pottery in Anglo-Saxon features is slightly problematic; carinated Iron Age vessels are known from this area of Oxfordshire, but in the main are in shelly fabrics (P Booth pers. comm.). Thus, it is likely that the carinated bowls from this site are all Anglo-Saxon. A total of 20 sherds from the carinations from biconical vessels were noted, including small bowls. One context in particular (114) produced sherds of two small carinated bowls which can, stylistically, be amongst the earliest Anglo-Saxon vessels known from England. One of the vessels has incised horizontal lines and a row of single finger-tip impressions above the carination, the other has facets cut into the carination.
The following contexts also produced diagnostic Anglo-Saxon sherds:

106: Single carinated sherd with incised lines above the angle.

110: Four carinated and three incised sherds. Further sherd with a possible fragment of curvilinear (‘stehende bogen’) decoration.

112: Sherds from three vessels with fingertip decoration, one of which also has incised lines. Five sherds from carinated vessels, including one with slashed decoration on the carination.

115: Sherds from two carinated vessels, one of which is a very large jar; rimsherd with horizontal incised decoration at the neck; incised sherd, possibly from a ‘high-necked’ vessel, single row of diagonal slashing flanked by multiple single horizontal lines.

116: A large sherd from a large carinated jar, and fragments of carinations from at least four smaller vessels, as well as two sherd with incised decoration.

132: Sherds from three carinated vessels, and another sherd with a ring-and-dot stamp flanked by incised lines.

With the exception of the stamped sherd, all these fragments could be of 5th-century date. It is true that some of the Anglo-Saxon styles which can be regarded as early continued to be used in the 6th century, but the fact that this small assemblage has produced almost the full range of ‘early’ types suggests that it is highly unlikely that most of the assemblages with diagnostic sherds date to later than the 5th century. A case can even be made for the stamped sherd being of 5th-century date; Myres (1977, 19) cites examples of stamped vessels with incised linear decoration which he believed to date to the 5th century.

Assessment of potential
The small group of Anglo-Saxon pottery, on the basis of the decorated sherds, appears to date largely to the 5th century and, considering the size of the assemblage, this group has one of the highest proportions of early-style sherds ever seen from one site. It has, therefore, considerable potential for further analysis and discussion, especially in the light of the significance of the Anglo-Saxon settlement in the vicinity of these excavations, including those excavated by E T Leeds in the 1920s.

7.1.2 Pottery from fieldwalking
Quantification
The pottery assemblage from the fieldwalking comprised 352 sherds with a total weight of 2,557 g.

Fabrics and wares
The database codes relate to the following ware types, with the medieval and later pottery recorded utilising the coding system and chronology of the Oxfordshire County type-series (Mellor 1984; 1994):

F1002: All Iron Age
F1001: All Romano-British
F1: Early/middle Anglo-Saxon wares
F352: OXAM: Brill/Boarstall ware, AD1200 - 1600
F404: OXCL: Cistercian ware, 1475-1700
F405: OXST: Frechen Stoneware, AD1550 - 1700
F416: Polychrome Slipwares, 17th century.
F425: OXDR, Red Earthenwares, 1550+
F448: OXBEWSSL: Staffordshire slip-trailed earthenwares, 1650-1800
F1000: Miscellaneous 19th- - 20th-C wares.

7.2 The flint

by Kate Cramp

7.2.1 Introduction
A total of 327 struck flints and 26 burnt unworked flints (221g) were recovered from the fieldwalking and evaluation. The majority of the assemblage was provided in the course of fieldwalking; smaller quantities were recovered from the evaluation trenches (Table 7.2.1). Most of the evaluation material was produced by the environmental sampling of pit 305, which contained an assemblage of 55 flints including 29 chips.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fieldwalking</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of struck flints:</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total:</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of burnt unworked flints:</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total:</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (g) of burnt unworked flints:</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total:</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2.1: Quantities of worked and burnt unworked flint from Sutton Courtenay.

7.2.2 Methodology
All the struck flints within the assemblage were individually examined and catalogued according to broad artefact/debitage type. Technological information was recorded throughout the analysis, particularly where such data contributed to the characterisation of the assemblage. Dating was attempted where possible. Further observations with regard to the condition, degree of cortication, and type of raw material were commented on where appropriate. Cores and core fragments were classified according to the type of removal and number of platforms, and were individually weighed. Burnt flint was described and quantified by piece and by weight. Additional information, such as the degree of calcination, was recorded where relevant. The data were entered directly on to an MS Access database.

7.2.3 Condition
With a very small number of exceptions, the material from the fieldwalking is in extremely poor condition. A total of 201 pieces (83.1% of the struck
component) are moderately or heavily damaged; a single flint (Transect 8 100-
120) is in fresh condition. Plough-damage on the edges of flints is common,
and numerous pieces are rolled and abraded. The degree of damage implies
that the flintwork has been considerably disturbed, largely by the repeated
ploughing of the site.

The majority of flints from fieldwalking are uncorticated. This component is
represented by a total of 187 pieces (77.3%). The remainder possesses a
cortication that varies in extent, consisting either of an incipient speckling (41
pieces) or of a dense white discoloration of the surface (14 pieces).

The assemblage from the evaluation is in reasonable condition, particularly the
material from pit 305. This feature contained a total of 53 flints in fresh
condition and a further two flints exhibiting slight modern damage. Four
pieces from context 314 (pit 312) and one piece from context 205 were also
recorded as fresh. The incidence of edge-damage amongst the remaining
evaluation assemblage suggests that a considerable proportion of it has been
redeposited. A total of 17 flints (20%) were recorded as minimally damaged.
A moderate or heavy degree of damage was noted on ten flints recovered from
contexts 100, 115, 116, 131, 332 and 366.

With the exception of the assemblage from pit 305, most of the evaluation
flints are uncorticated (24 pieces). Pit 305 contained 49 heavily corticated
flints and the remainder exhibit a light or moderate cortication. The
concentration of corticated pieces within this feature probably reflects
localised soil conditions.

7.2.4 Raw material
For the most part, the raw material employed for the production of the tools
and debitage appears to have been a gravel-derived flint, characterised by a
stained, abraded cortex and the occasional presence of thermal fractures. This
raw material was probably procured locally.

A small proportion of the raw material seems have been provided by non-local
flint supplies. The flake from a polished implement (evaluation context 205)
and a number of the flakes from pit 305 almost certainly derive from a non-
local chalk flint source. Several pieces possess a thick but slightly stained and
abraded cortex, suggesting the exploitation of superficial chalk flint deposits.
The use of bullhead flint, which occurs at the base of the Reading Beds
(Dewey and Bromehead 1915; Shepherd 1972, 114), is represented by three
pieces. These were recovered from evaluation contexts 100, 159 and 314.

7.2.5 Technology and dating
Fieldwalking
Fieldwalking produced an assemblage of 242 struck flints (Table 7.2.2). An
additional 25 fragments of burnt unworked flint were recovered from 22
squares, most of which contained a single piece. By weight, the largest
quantity of burnt material (53g) came from Transect 12, 80-100 m (Fig. 7).

Most of the assemblage is represented by unretouched debitage, of which
flakes are the most commonly occurring type. A total of 169 were recovered
(71% excluding chips). The majority are thick and squat in form; most have probably been struck using hard-hammer percussion. Platform edge abrasion occurs occasionally, but was not an important element of the knapping strategy. Blades and blade-like flakes are comparatively under-represented (seven pieces; 2.9%). The predominance of flake production, as opposed to blade production, implies that the assemblage is largely later Neolithic or Bronze Age in date (Pitts and Jacobi 1979; Ford 1987).

A proximal microburin, which represents a by-product of the microburin technique of microlith manufacture (Inizan et al. 1992, 69), was recovered from Transect 25, 60-80 m. The piece indicates a limited Mesolithic presence.

A total of 13 cores (5.5%) was recovered. Single platform and multi-platform flake cores are the most common sub-category, although two single platform blade cores (Tr. 5, 140-160 m and Tr. 11, 220-240 m) were also recorded and can be dated to the Mesolithic or early Neolithic period. Two cores on flakes (Tr. 8, 100-120 m and Tr. 19, 240-260 m), two unclassifiable flake core fragments (Tr. 20, 100-120 m and Tr. 80-100 m) and a partially-worked nodule (Tr. 4, 180-200 m) are also present. The average weight of all complete specimens is 37.3g. Transect 11, 0-20 m contained a hammerstone (47g) consisting of a reused multi-platform flake core.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade-like flake</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular waste</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro burin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single platform flake core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-platform flake core</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single platform blade core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core on a flake</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassifiable/fragmentary core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tested nodule</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retouched flake</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End scraper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-and-side scraper</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other scraper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf arrowhead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backed knife</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denticulate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun flint</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassifiable retouch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammerstone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>242</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7.2.2: Flint by type from fieldwalking.*

The retouched component comprises 24 tools (10.1%), of which edge-retouched flakes (13 pieces) are the dominant type. Scrapers are relatively
common, represented by five pieces (Tr. 9, 60-80 m; Tr. 13, 140-160 m; Tr. 13, 220-240 m; Tr. 16, 20-40 m; Tr. 24, 120-140 m). The majority of these are probably of Neolithic or Bronze Age date. The denticulated scraper (Tr. 22, 140-160 m) has been manufactured on a thermal fragment, and can tentatively be dated to the Bronze Age. A robust piercing tool (Tr. 10, 40-60 m), which has been crudely retouched on the proximal end of a thick preparatory flake, may also date to this period.

Transect 9, 160-180 m produced a small, leaf-shaped arrowhead with covering invasive retouch on both faces and a broken tip. Although incomplete, the arrowhead is typologically similar to Green’s type 1B (Green 1980) and can be dated to the early Neolithic.

A backed knife, consisting of a large tertiary flake with semi-abrupt edge retouch to the length of both lateral margins, was recovered from Transect 6, 100-120 m. The knife, which is in reasonable condition and has apparently been utilised, probably dates to the late Neolithic or early Bronze Age period.

Transect 3, 320-340 m produced a post-medieval gun flint.

Evaluation trenching
A total of 85 struck flints and a single fragment of burnt unworked flint (4 g) were recovered from three evaluation trenches (Table 7.2.3). The material was retrieved from 17 individual contexts, the majority of which produced one or two pieces. The largest assemblage of flints, a total of 55 pieces, was contained within pit 305 (contexts 303 and 304). A small group of five flints was recovered from pit 312 (context 314). The flintwork from these features will be discussed separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tr. 1</td>
<td>Tr. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>1 3 1 2 3 1</td>
<td>1 10 10 2 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade-like flake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flake from ground implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core face/edge rejuvenation flake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular waste</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
<td>1 13 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassifiable/fragmentary core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retouched flake</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End scraper</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End and side scraper</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt unworked flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>4 4 2 2 3 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1</td>
<td>24 31 5 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2.3: Flint by type from the evaluation trenches.
Pit 305 (contexts 303 and 304)
A total of 55 flints in a fresh, heavily corticated condition were recovered from pit 305 (Table 7.2.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Context:</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade-like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core face/edge rejuvenation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2.4: Flint by type from pit 305.

The assemblage is composed entirely of unretouched debitage types, including 20 flakes, two blade-like flakes, one blade and 29 chips. The flakes are of variable size but are generally regular in form. The chips form a fresh, homogeneous group and several possess a similar cortex, suggesting that they derive from the same core. A number of the flakes are also of a visually similar flint type and, as such, it seems likely that the deposit contains some knappingdebitage. The potential for finding refits may be high.

Platform edge abrasion, reflecting a concern with the controlled and predictable detachment of flakes, was recorded on four flakes and a small number of chips. The hammer-mode appears to have been mixed. Three platform edge rejuvenation flakes were also recovered, indicating a desire to maintain core productivity.

Although no retouched tools are present, macroscopically detectable use-wear was noted on eight pieces. This figure would undoubtedly increase given a microscopic analysis. A total of five flints, including one chip, have been burnt.

Technologically, the assemblage can be dated broadly to the Neolithic. Although no datable types were recovered, the flintwork would certainly be consistent with an early Neolithic date.

Pit 312 (context 314)
A small, fresh assemblage consisting of two flakes, one blade-like flake, one blade and a probable flake core fragment (30 g) was recovered from context 314. Dating the material from the pit is problematic given the limited number of flints involved and the absence of diagnostic types. Nonetheless, its proximity to pit 305 makes contemporaneity a possibility.

The remaining assemblage
The remaining evaluation assemblage (25 pieces) is dominated by debitage, including 15 flakes, one blade-like flake and two fragments of irregular waste. The majority of flakes have been hard-hammer struck, and very few exhibit
evidence of platform preparation. Given the paucity of blades and blade-like flakes within the assemblage, a broad Neolithic or Bronze Age date would be appropriate for the material (Pitts and Jacobi 1979; Ford 1987), although it would be difficult to verify in view of the limited assemblage size.

A flake that has been struck from a finely-ground implement of a light-grey chalk flint was recovered from context 205. An area of polishing is retained to the left-hand area of the dorsal surface; macroscopically detectable use-wear was noted on the proximal right-hand edge. The flake can be dated broadly to the Neolithic.

A possible flake core fragment (15 g) was recovered from context 200. The fragment exhibits a few multi-directional removals and no platform preparation; it may have shattered down a thermal fracture from a larger core during the knapping process.

The retouched component comprises two edge-retouched flakes, one end scraper and one end-and-side scraper. The broken retouched piece from context 159 consists of large distal-trimming blade of bullhead flint with edge retouch and use-wear to both lateral margins. The retouch is bifacial in places and slightly serrated in appearance. Context 112 contained a thick, irregular secondary flake with crude retouch to discontinuous areas of the left-hand edge. The flake may have been utilised as a scraping and/or piercing tool. An unusual end scraper, which has been inversely retouched on a plunging side-trimming flake, was recovered from context 100. The retouch is relatively neat and regular in form, suggesting a Neolithic or earlier Bronze Age date. Context 101 contained an end-and-side scraper, which has been made on disc-like side-trimming blank with a cortical striking platform. Abrupt retouch has been applied to the distal left-hand corner, truncating a slight distal break.

7.2.6 Discussion and potential

Much of the material from the fieldwalking and evaluation is technologically undiagnostic but would be consistent with a Neolithic or Bronze Age industry on morphological and technological grounds. The presence of a microburin confirms that at least a small proportion of the assemblage is Mesolithic in date; the blade cores from the fieldwalking may also belong to this period. Activity in the Neolithic is indicated by a leaf arrowhead and a flake from a polished implement. The assemblage from pit 305, and perhaps that from pit 312, can also be dated to this period. The backed knife and some of the scrapers within the assemblage are technologically consistent with a later Neolithic or earlier Bronze Age industry.

A technological analysis of the assemblages from pit 305 and pit 312, involving the recording of various attributes such as butt type, hammer-mode and dorsal extent, would provide a means of refining the date and would allow a more detailed discussion of the character of the material.

The remaining assemblage is thinly spread across the site; the generally poor condition implies that it has been in the ploughsoil for some time. The small number of diagnostic pieces within the assemblage reflect its mixed date, spanning the Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age and post-Medieval periods.
Given the condition and assorted character of the material, no further work is recommended on this component.

7.3 **The worked stone**

*by Ruth Shaffrey*

7.3.1 **Methodology**

All the stone was examined with the aid of a x10 magnification hand lens.

7.3.2 **The worked stone assemblage**

The worked stone from Drayton includes two small items of indeterminate function, a block of building stone and a rotary quern fragment. They were retrieved from an early/mid Saxon waterhole (329). The building stone and rotary quern are made from the same lithology, a coarse and shelly iron-rich sandstone. No other querns of this material have been identified and although the quern is of typical dimensions, its provenance needs to be determined. The other items of retained stone are unworked.

7.3.3 **Catalogue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ctx</th>
<th>SFNO</th>
<th>Descrip</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Lithology</th>
<th>L Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Probable rotary quern fragment</td>
<td>Weathered all over so original working unclear. Has flat roughly parallel faces and curved edges which lean in.</td>
<td>360mm diameter x 61mm max thickness</td>
<td>Possible Greensand</td>
<td>Coarse and shelly iron rich red sandstone. Granular in places with clear bedding and variable colouring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leight to provide building stone chunk</td>
<td>Large rectangular block, probably architectural.</td>
<td>260 x 140 x 80mm</td>
<td>As 308.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Possible building stone</td>
<td>One worked face but function unknown.</td>
<td>90 x 87 x 80mm</td>
<td>Pink shelly limestone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Worked fragment</td>
<td>Burnt and with one flat worked face. Small fragment of unknown function</td>
<td>28 x 27 x 20mm</td>
<td>Iron and quartz cemented sandstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.4 **Discussion and potential**

The lithology of the rotary quern and building stone chunk (331) merits further investigation in order to determine their source. This is not a common quern material and could therefore provide interesting information regarding supply in the early/mid Saxon period. No other work is recommended and no objects have been selected for illustration.
7.4 The small finds

by Leigh Allen

This assessment considers the metalwork recovered from the fieldwalking and evaluation phases of work at Drayton, Sutton Courtenay. The bulk of the metalwork assemblage came from fieldwalking and comprises 50 objects of copper alloy, iron, lead, and silver. A further three objects (two iron and one copper alloy) were recovered from the evaluation. In addition, one piece of glass came from the ploughsoil and a fragment of clay pipe was retrieved from context 106, the top of an east-west ditch in Trench 1.

7.4.1 Quantification and character of assemblage

Evaluation

A number of irregularly-shaped iron sheet fragments were recovered from the fills of pit 329. SF 317 from context 331 (early/mid Saxon waterhole 329) comprises two conjoined fragments but with no other distinguishing features. SF 301 from context 330 (also waterhole 329) comprises five fragments, only two of which appear to join; there is a possible rivet through one fragment. The fragments are in poor condition, they are heavily corroded and will require x-radiography to confirm that they are plain sheet. The copper alloy object, SF 321, from context 300 (also waterhole 329) is a solid misshapen fragment that resembles a waste fragment/spillage from metalworking.

Fieldwalking

The assemblage recovered from fieldwalking contains very few diagnostic objects; those that can be dated are all from the post-medieval period. These include a silver half groat of Charles I, a discoidal button, a knife tang with a bolster, and a straight-sided, machine produced thimble. The assemblage also includes a number of lead weights, probably from fishing nets, and a selection of nails of various sizes.

Table 7.4.1 Metal finds from fieldwalking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transect</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>material</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR 13</td>
<td>120-140 Buckle</td>
<td>buckle with a slender frame and a large solid pin</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32</td>
<td>180-200 Button</td>
<td>circular discoidal button the attachment loop is missing</td>
<td>copper alloy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 24</td>
<td>120-140 Coin</td>
<td>half groat of Charles I (Tower mint)</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 12</td>
<td>160-180</td>
<td></td>
<td>silver</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 01</td>
<td>000-020 Handle</td>
<td>modern spoon handle</td>
<td>copper alloy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 05</td>
<td>220-240 Knife</td>
<td>Knife tang with bolster, the blade is missing</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 12</td>
<td>020-040 Knife</td>
<td>knife tang, most of the blade is missing</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 12</td>
<td>080-100 Misc</td>
<td></td>
<td>lead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 12</td>
<td>000-020 Misc</td>
<td></td>
<td>lead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 12</td>
<td>060-080 Misc</td>
<td></td>
<td>lead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 12</td>
<td>180-200 Misc</td>
<td></td>
<td>lead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 18</td>
<td>040-060 Misc</td>
<td></td>
<td>lead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 12</td>
<td>140-160 Misc</td>
<td>part of a gun cartridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4.2 Potential
The bulk of the assemblage has little potential for further work but the iron sheet fragments recovered from pit 329 should be x-rayed and examined in detail. They were found in well-stratified contexts that contained early/middle Saxon pottery, and may be associated with the waste fragment/spillage from the same feature.

7.5 The human bone
by Annsofie Witkin

7.5.1 Introduction
A human skeleton (163) which was found during the excavation of a test pit immediately to the north-east of Trench 1 (TP 1A; Fig. 3). The skeleton was located in an oval cut (162), it was tightly flexed and lying on its back. The
feet were drawn up against the pelvis and both arms were flexed at the elbows with the right hand resting on the right knee. The head was located beneath the thigh bones. The overall impression is that the individual was curled up in a ball. It is therefore likely that the person was tightly bound into this position when buried.

In addition, a disarticulated mandible was found during fieldwalking approximately 50 m north of Trench 1 (Fig. 8).

The skeletal remains are assessed for the suitability of full analysis and the potential of the remains for furthering the knowledge of these types of burial deposits.

7.5.2 Methodology
Completeness was scored using four categories, namely poor (0 - 25%), fair (26-50%), good (51-75%) and excellent (76-100%). Skeletal preservation was scored using a scale ranging from poor (near complete destruction of the cortical surface) to excellent (cortical surfaces of the bones preserved).

The sex of the individual was established through visual observations of the sexually diagnostic criteria of the cranium and pelvis. A rough age estimate was made using the pubic symphysis (Suchey and Brooks 1990) and dental attrition (Miles 1962). Pathological lesions observed were noted.

7.5.3 The results
The articulated skeleton
Preservation and completeness
The preservation of this skeleton was good with little cortical degradation. Few post-mortem breaks were present on the long bones and the cranium was also complete. Most of the bones were present. The only bones missing were some of the carpals, tarsals and phalanges from the hands and feet. A few ribs were also absent.

Sex and age estimates
The cranial and pelvic morphology indicated that this was a female. This included small supraorbital ridges and a weak occipital protrubance on the skull. The pelvis displayed female traits such as a wide sciatic notch and sub-pubic angle as well as an present ventral arc. The sexually diagnostic post-cranial measurements were all within the female range. Age was estimated to be between 35 and 45 years.

Pathology
Dental pathology
This individual had lost two teeth ante-mortem and four post-mortem. Calculus deposits were also present on all teeth. Calculus is mineralised plaque which accumulates on the base of living plaque deposits (Hillson 1996, 225). Calculus is a common pathological condition and is generally related to poor oral hygiene. Six carious lesions were also present on five teeth. These were all small. Dental caries are cavities formed on the enamel surface of the tooth. It is the caused by the fermentation of food sugars by bacteria which naturally
occur on the teeth (Roberts and Manchester 1995, 46). One dental abscess was present distally to the maxillary right second premolar. An abscess may be formed by the formation of a periodontal pocket or periodontal disease allowing micro-organisms to accumulate in the pulp cavity. Alternatively, caries may also predispose the development of an abscess through the exposure of the pulp cavity (ibid, 50).

Skeletal pathology
Degenerative joint disease was present on the lateral end of the clavicles and the sternal end of the left clavicle. The spine exhibited slight porosity on the vertebral bodies of the lower thoracic and lumbar vertebrae.

The right and left sacroiliac joints were affected by an infectious disease. The articular surfaces showed a massive multifocal lytic process. The posterior surfaces of the iliac blades at the site of the joint surfaces were also covered in lamellar bone. Healed new bone deposits were also present on the anterior surfaces of the fourth and fifth lumbar vertebral bodies. The left sacral ala was also completely destroyed and new irregular bone deposits on the sacrum itself. An isolated lytic lesion was situated midshaft on the medial side of the left tibia. These lesions are likely to have been caused by Brucellosis. Brucellosis is an infection which is transmitted from animals including cows, goats and pigs via contaminated milk, dairy products and meat (Schwartz 1995, 234).

The disarticulated bones
The disarticulated remains consisted of a mandibular body only. The post-mortem damage present was old and is likely to have been caused by ploughing. All teeth apart from the first molars had been lost post-mortem. The mandible came from an individual aged around 18 years. The sex of the individual is unknown. No pathological lesions were present.

7.5.4 Historical background
The unusual inhumation burial is of particular interest. All the features in the adjacent trench were all early Anglo-Saxon, but there were no finds in the fill of the pit or associated with the skeleton which could date the burial. The skeleton could, therefore, be of early Anglo-Saxon date or, possibly, contemporary with the royal vill of mid-Saxon date.

The unusual position of the skeleton signifies that this is a deviant form of interment. As such, the normal social identity is not expressed. What is expressed is the circumstances of their death and the types of sanctions which the society in question imposed on the individual (Shay 1985, 226). A series of characteristics has been identified which can be used for the identification of execution burials. These include, random orientation, prone and decapitated corpses, instances of tied hands and location on, or adjacent to, principal boundaries (Reynolds 1997). It seems probable that this burial is an executed individual.

Other deviant burials are known from middle Saxon contexts. At Yarnton, Oxfordshire, a juvenile was buried prone with the legs bent backwards tightly at the knees, possibly tied, with the feet resting on the pelvis. Partial remains
of four subadults were also found beneath the skeleton (Boyle in press). At
Higham Ferrers, a mutilated skeleton of a prime adult female was found in
an isolated grave. The skeleton was prone and tightly flexed with the feet
directly beneath the pelvic area. The ankles were very close together which
may indicate that they had been bound together. The 4th lumbar vertebra was
also missing suggesting the body was deposited in two parts (Witkin 2002).
The context of the Sutton Courtenay burial is, therefore, unusual but not
unparalleled.

7.5.5 Potential
The articulated skeleton is in a good state of preservation and near complete. It
therefore offers a good opportunity for full osteological and palaeopathological
analysis which would enable an estimate of stature, metric and non-metric
analysis and full palaeopathological analysis to record the lesions present,
evertheless enable a differential diagnosis of the hip lesions.

Since this was an isolated burial, there is no comparative data available for a
local population study. However, the skeleton has good potential to be
compared with material from similar ritual contexts. As such, it may serve to
add, or even elucidate our understanding of these forms of burials.

The skeleton could be dated through radiocarbon analysis, in order to establish
whether it is contemporary with adjacent features or associated with the royal
vill. Dating will also enable a more useful contribution to be made to an
understanding of deviant burials in the early medieval period.

The disarticulated remains have no potential for further analysis. However,
catalogue entries will be compiled for inclusion in the final report.

7.6 The animal bone
by Bethan Charles

7.6.1 Introduction
A total of 783 fragments (10429g) of animal bone were recovered by hand
during the evaluation excavations and an additional 844 fragments (434g) of
bone was recovered from environmental samples sieved through meshes of
>10, 10 - 4 and 4 - 2 mm.

7.6.2 Methodology
Identification of the bone was done at Oxford Archaeology with access to the
reference collection and published guides. The calculation of the species
recovered was done through the use of the total fragment method. All
fragments of bone were counted including elements from the vertebral
centrum, ribs and long bone shafts. The separation of sheep and goat bones
was done using the criteria of Boessneck (1969), Prummel and Frisch (1986),
in addition to the use of the reference material housed at OA. However, since
no positive identification of goat was made all caprine bones are listed as sheep.
The ageing of the animals was based on tooth eruption and epiphyseal fusion. Silver's (1969) tables alone were used to give the timing of epiphyseal closure for cattle, sheep, pigs and horses. Sheep tooth eruption and wear was measured using a combination of Payne's (1973) and Grant's (1982) tables. Cattle tooth eruption and wear was measured using Hulst's (1985) and Grant's (1982) tables. Pig tooth eruption and wear was measured using Higham (1967), Bull and Payne (1982) and Grant (1982), defined by Hambleton (1990). Horse tooth eruption and wear was measured using Levine's (1982) tables.

The sex of the animals was ascertained depending on the preservation of indicative fragments of bone. The measurements taken were those defined by von den Driesch (1976), all measurements can be found in the archive.

7.6.3 Condition

The condition of the bone was assessed by grading it from 1 to 5, using the criteria stipulated by Lyman (1996), grade 1 being the best-preserved bone and grade 5 indicating that the bone had suffered such structural and attritional damage as to make it unrecognisable. The majority of bone from the site was in excellent condition (between grades 1 and 2). As a result, the surface of the bones were good allowing the recording of butchery marks and carnivore gnaw marks as shown in Table 7.6.1.

The majority of the burnt bone from the site came from the environmental samples and was mostly burnt white. The fragments tended to be small broken pieces from medium-sized animals, and none were identified to species. Much of the bone from the Saxon deposits had carnivore gnaw marks, particularly the material from pit 113, Trench 1 (Fig. 3). It is likely that scavengers may have affected the distribution of some of the animal bone across the site. A single sheep phalanx from early/mid Saxon context 135 (pit 137, also Trench 1) had evidence of rodent gnawing indicating that the bone would have been left in the open for a period of time before burial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.6.1. Condition of bone according to period and retrieval method.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6th Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/M Saxon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.6.4 Results

Neolithic

A small quantity of bone was recovered from contexts 303 and 304, found within Neolithic pit 305 (Trench 3, Fig. 5). The material consisted of 15 fragments collected by hand and an additional 171 fragments recovered from environmental samples. Only a small percentage of the material could be identified to species and included two poorly-preserved and fragmented red deer antler that may have belonged to the same element. The surface of one fragment showed faint evidence of cut marks along the tine.
Other bone identified from the pit included a few fragments of cattle mandible and some teeth. The pig bone consisted of a fragment of maxillae and a few loose teeth belonging to an animal of less than 2 years of age. Thirty-eight fragments of burnt bone were recovered from the feature all of which were small fragments of medium sized bone most of which were burnt white.

Table 7.6.2. Total number of animal bone recovered by hand according to species and phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Pig</th>
<th>Red Deer</th>
<th>D. Fowl</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Century</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6th Century</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/M Saxon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.6.3. Total number of animal bone recovered from sieving according to species and phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Neolithic</th>
<th>5th Century</th>
<th>Undated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Vole</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Mouse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrew</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frog</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Saxon**

Early Saxon (5th/6th century)

The majority of the material recovered from the early Saxon period came from a single ditch fill 106 (cut 104) and a series of pits (113, 117 and 134) in Trench 1, and consisted of cattle, sheep and pig bone. At least one sheep mandible from this group belonged to an individual of between 4 - 6 years. However, two mandibles were from younger animals between 2 - 6 months and a third one from a sheep between 6 - 12 months. At least four elements from young individuals were identified from amongst the rest of the assemblage indicating that the inhabitants were eating lamb as well as mutton.

The bone from cattle appeared to be from mature animals and at least one mandible was from an old adult.
A complete horse skull was identified from ditch fill 106. The horse was female and aged between 5 and 6 years of age at death. The back of the skull, particularly on the right hand side was very fragmented. However, the breaks were mostly fresh and there was no clear evidence of trauma to the bone. Archaeological and anthropological studies have suggested that the symbolic deposition of animal skulls is associated with warding off evil or as a good luck symbol (Wilson 1999). However, there is no evidence that this deposit held such significance. Other horse bone identified included a fragment of femur from context 110. There is no evidence that the inhabitants were eating horses at the site.

Apart from the main domestic species, a number of smaller mammals were identified from the sieved material including field voles and field mice. It is almost certain that these animals were natural fatalities. A small amount of frog bone and seven fragments of fish vertebrae were identified from context 106. The fish was not identified to species.

A single cattle proximal phalanx from context 106 showed evidence of pathological change. There was evidence of bone growth on the abaxial dorsal section of the articulation and some bone lipping on the axial side.

**Early/mid Saxon**

Almost all of the material attributed to the early to mid Saxon period was recovered from a waterhole (329) in Trench 3 (Fig. 5). As with the Trench 1 material, the majority of animals represented consisted of cattle, sheep and pig bone. A fragment of a horse radius and a single tooth were recovered from the waterhole, in addition to a domestic fowl left ulna and humerus.

One of the cattle mandibles was identified as belonging to an adult individual. A sheep mandible from the same context was from and individual between 3 - 4 years of age and a second between 1 - 2 years of age.

It can be seen in Table 4 that the majority of the elements recovered from the Saxon periods of occupation consisted of elements from around the head area (skull, mandible, loose teeth) and feet (metapodials, phalanges). Most of the long bone elements were fragmentary and had evidence of butchery cut marks along the shafts.

There is no evidence of a concentrated area at the site for butchering and the material recovered is likely to represent animals specifically butcheted for the consumption of the community living at the site.
### Table 7.6.4. Number of elements identified according to species and period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Pig</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>horn core</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skull</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maxilla/pra maxilla</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaw</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loose teeth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atlas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>axis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other vertebrae</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ribs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scapula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pelvis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humerus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ulna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>femur</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tibia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astragalus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calcaneum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carpal/tarsal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metacarpus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metatarsus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metapodial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phalanges</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.6.5 Significance and potential

The cattle and pig bone identified from the Neolithic pit is typical of material recovered from this period. The presence of red deer and calcined material is noteworthy, but its significance is uncertain. The small assemblage does not warrant further work.

The Anglo-Saxon assemblage is not particularly large, but it is clear that cattle and sheep appear to have been the major food animals on the site during the Saxon period of occupation. Most Anglo-Saxon assemblages show cattle and sheep to be the dominant species (Bourdillon and Coy 1980; Crabtree 1994). However, it has been suggested by Clutton-Brock (1979) that pigs were more common on small-holdings. The right of pannage would have allowed the farmers to graze the animals in surrounding woodland. Pork and bacon are likely to have been very popular during this period and it is possible that pigs provided a greater proportion of meat to the site than is suggested by the remains recovered.

The bone from both the Saxon periods of occupation does not appear to indicate a site of particularly high status. Cattle are likely to have been kept primarily for traction and milking and the sheep would have been kept for wool and for their milk with the dung from both animals used for cultivation of crops. Pigs would have been kept primarily for their meat since they
provided little in the way of secondary products. Other meats supplementing
the diet of the inhabitants would have been domestic fowl and fish. The
recovery of fish bone on Saxon rural sites is not particularly common,
however, and its species identification is of interest. Otherwise, no further
work is recommended.

7.7 The charred plant remains and wood charcoal

by Dana Challinor

7.7.1 Introduction
Seventeen samples from a selection of settlement features were taken during
the excavation for the recovery of charred plant remains and charcoal. The
majority of the samples are likely to be Saxon in date, although one pit, 305, is
probably Neolithic. Sample numbers 3, 23, 24, 26 and 27 were processed but
were devoid of any identifiable remains.

7.7.2 Methodology
The soil samples, ranging in size from 6 to 40 litres, were processed for
charred plant remains and charcoal by mechanical flotation in a modified
Siraf-type machine, with the sample held on a 500µm and the flot collected on
a 250µm mesh. The flots were then air-dried and scanned under a binocular
microscope at x10 and x20 magnification. Any seeds or chaff noted were
 provisionally identified and an estimate of abundance made. Charcoal caught
on the 2mm sieve was considered identifiable and quantified; fragments were
randomly extracted, fractured and examined in transverse section. While this
provides a reliable method of the identification for ring porous taxa (e.g.
Quercus sp.), identifications are tentative for the semi- to diffuse-porous taxa
(Maloideae, Prunus etc.).

7.7.3 Results
Modern contamination, in the form of roots, weed seeds and pupa cases, was
present in varying amounts in all seventeen flots. Twelve produced
identifiable charred remains of which wood charcoal was the most abundant
material (Table 1). Five taxa were provisionally identified: Quercus sp. (oak),
Maloideae (hawthorn, apple, pear etc), Prunus sp. (blackthorn, cherry),
Fraxinus excelsior (ash) and Alnus/Corylus (alder/hazel). Other charred plant
remains were not so well preserved or abundant; occasional grains of Triticum
sp. (wheat) and Hordeum sp. (barley) and a limited range of weed seeds,
including Bromus (brome grass), Galium (cleavers), Rumex (docks) and
Vicia/Lathyrus (small legumes). The two samples from Neolithic pit 305 were
distinguished by containing large amounts of Corylus avellana (hazel) nut
shell.
7.7.4 Implications

The charred material from Sutton Courtenay is consistent with settlement debris of the Saxon period. The abundance of wood charcoal suggests that the material represents the redeposited remains of fuelwood from domestic fires. There were not enough cereal remains to indicate specific crop processing activities but the occasional grain probably represents food residue. The weed seeds probably entered the archaeobotanical record as accidental inclusions from the crop fields or with the fuel.

The Neolithic pit deposits are also likely to represent the redeposited remains of fires. The fact that the hazelnut is represented by broken shell fragments rather than whole nuts suggests it to be derived from food residues, rather than entering the deposits attached to fuel wood. There was nothing in these samples to indicate cereal growing.

The samples from Sutton Courtenay show that charred remains are preserved at the site, although the material is neither abundant nor well preserved. However, a paucity of remains is typical of both the Neolithic and Saxon periods, and consequently these periods tend to be under-represented in the archaeobotanical record. The material from Sutton Courtenay would add to our understanding of Saxon fuel use and add to a growing corpus of information on Neolithic gathering practices. There is potential, therefore, assuming confirmation of dating is provided, to undertake further limited analysis. The quantity of modern contamination in many of the flots may limit the potential of some samples, but the range of charcoal identified in the assessment should be confirmed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature type</th>
<th>Feature number</th>
<th>Sample number</th>
<th>Context number</th>
<th>Volume of soil (l)</th>
<th>Charcoal</th>
<th>Grain</th>
<th>Weeds</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+++ Quercus, Maloideae, Alnus/Corylus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>++ Fraxinus, Quercus, Maloideae</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Fragments of grain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>229</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+ Maloideae</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glume base (Trit. spelta/ dicoccum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+++ Fraxinus, Quercus, Alnus/Corylus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+++ Fraxinus, Quercus, Alnus/Corylus, Prunus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+++ Quercus, Alnus/Corylus, Maloideae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+++ Quercus, Alnus/Corylus</td>
<td>Hazelnut shell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+++ Quercus, Alnus/Corylus, Maloideae</td>
<td>Hazelnut shell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>329</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>++ Alnus/Corylus, Prunus, Maloideae</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+ Quercus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+ Maloideae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>430</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+ Quercus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.7.1: Results of the charred remains assessment

7.8 The land snails

by Elizabeth Stafford

7.8.1 Method
No samples were retrieved from the excavations specifically for land snails. However, during the preliminary assessment of the bulk samples for charred plant remains, snails were noted in the flots in small quantities. It appears that the large volumes of sediment processed concentrated the shells in the flots that would otherwise not have been present in the smaller KG samples usually retrieved for land snails. As a result, notes were made on the species and an estimate made on the total number of individuals present.

7.8.2 Results
The majority of flots from features dated to the early Saxon period contained small assemblages of 1-20 individual identifiable fragments suggesting open
country, probably grassland conditions. The fauna generally consisted of *Vallonia excenstra*, *Vertigo pygmaea*, *Hellicella itala* and *Trichia hispida*. *Candidula intersecia* was present in the majority of the flots. This species, although consistent with open country conditions, is on the whole considered to be a medieval introduction (Kerney 1999). It is quite possible that these shells have been moved down-profile by bioturbation. This is supported by the fact that all of the flots contained large quantities of modern roots, seeds and the modern burrowing snail *Cecilloides acicula*. Occurrences of medieval-introduced species have been noted elsewhere in the Middle and Upper Thames Valley gravels, for example at Barrow Hills, Radley (Robinson 1999, 241), and more recently at Yarmont, Oxfordshire (Robinson pers comm.). These occurrences, where biological processes continue within the deposits after the feature has been sealed, tends to be more prevalent in shallower features and on gravel terraces where they are not sealed by a layer of alluvium and are thus less protected (Robinson pers comm.). In view of these issues, the integrity of the assemblages should be questioned.

An exception to this are the two samples retrieved from a possible Neolithic pit, <1> and <2>. In these samples, molluscs were abundant with estimates of >100. The fauna was distinctly different and more diverse. Although some open country species were present, they also consisted of a large percentage of species indicating woodland/shaded conditions. These included *Discus Rotundatus*, *Carychium tridentum*, *Acanthina aculeata*, *Oxychilus cellarius*, other Zonitidae and catholic terrestrial species. The assemblage is consistent with a deposit formed under wooded conditions, with woodland close by, or at least shells that derive from a woodland soil. It is noteworthy that no species of *Candidula* were noted in these two samples.

7.8.3 Potential

The samples dated to the early Saxon period have little potential for further work because of the low diversity, the very sparse assemblages, and questions over the extent of later contamination. Although samples <1> and <2> are from pit deposits, they do have the potential to add to data pertaining to the environment and forest clearance during the Neolithic in the locality. They may provide interesting comparanda with environmental information gleaned from the nearby Drayton cursus (Barclay et al. 2003). This is increasingly so if the contexts can be securely dated, for example if charred plants from them were radiocarbon dated.

7.9 Geoarchaeological sampling

*by M.G. Canti*

The site was visited in order to examine soils and features with unusual characteristics and to explore the potential for micromorphology and soil chemistry to understand the ways and circumstances in which they filled. Such sampling may reveal evidence of turf remains, ashed dung, cereal processing
waste or industrial debris. Soil chemistry includes techniques such as carbon
content, magnetic susceptibility and phosphates. Combined, these techniques
may be able to shed light on the nature and function of such structures such as
a dwelling or an animal enclosure.

Trench 1 had been stripped of about 0.15 - 0.20 m of ploughsoil to reveal a
series of pits and a ditch dug through a rather pale, possibly trampled layer of c
0.05 - 0.10 m thick, with a seemingly anomalous surface stone scatter
composed of 20 - 50 mm, rounded and subrounded chert/flint. Beneath that
was a dense reddish-brown clay layer about 0.10 - 0.15 m thick, overlying the
normal calcareous gravel. There did not seem to be enough flint/chert in the
gravel to provide the stone scatter on the surface. Perhaps the stone was
transported?

The pale layer may be pale due to calcium carbonate content, which prompted
the theory that it could have been the material dug out from the pits and spread
around on the surface. It could then have been trampled after spreading.

A micromorphological sample was taken through the pale layer and the top of
the reddish-brown clay in the exposed side of pit 113 to determine whether the
paleness was due to calcium carbonate content, and look for evidence for
trampling. A second, lower sample was taken through the base of the clay and
into the gravel below, to see if these were comparable materials.

In addition to the above, the fill of pit 113 was somewhat ashy in appearance,
being a slightly greyer colour than normal, and containing some charcoal. A
micromorphological sample was taken to determine whether there was a
significant ash content.

In the context of the uncertainty surrounding the character and wider context
of these features, whether they or not they are part of a rural domestic site,
geoarchaeological analysis of these unusual aspects of the burial record may
help in their interpretation.

8 STATEMENT OF POTENTIAL

A clear picture of the stratigraphic record has been recovered from the
excavation. There is good potential for further detailed analysis in order to
refine present understanding of dating and phasing. This will aid in providing
full characterisation of Saxon occupation in the area and provide additional
information to supplement the existing knowledge of Saxon activity in the
region. In particular, good information was derived from the timber hall to
suggest the method of construction.

There seems to be significant Saxon activity on the site in the early-middle
Saxon period, with initial settlement occurring in the 5th or early 6th century.
The pits and gullies in Trench 1 were particularly unexpected, as such
complexes of large pits are unusual at such an early date.
Examination of the building in Trench 4 will provide information with which comparisons with similar structures can be made. A study of comparable buildings may provide useful information on matters relating to status and function of the individual building and the group of buildings as a whole. Further study of the pits, postholes and ditches in Trenches 2 and 3 will also serve to refine the phasing and the dating of the developmental sequence of the site.

The fieldwork thus far has yielded material of considerable academic significance and several of the original objectives of the project have been fulfilled, namely objectives 2, 5, 6, 7:

- Excavation has established that Anglo-Saxon activity was spread over a much wider area than originally envisaged, not only to the south-east of the ‘Great Hall’ complex (Trench 3), but even extending to the easternmost edge of the Project area (Trench 1).

- Excavation has suggested that the Roman trackway remained in use, indeed was actively maintained, in the Anglo-Saxon period. This is a discovery of significance for establishing the relationship of the Anglo-Saxon settlement to the preceding landscape.

- The architectural detail yielded by excavating part of the Great Hall will make a valuable addition to the small body of data relating to such structures.

- Finally, if radiocarbon dates establish that the execution burial is indeed mid/late Anglo-Saxon in date, this would underscore the exceptional nature of the site still further, as recent work by Andrew Reynolds has shown that such burials tend to be associated with ‘special’ places (Reynolds 1997).

- As might be expected from a site of this size and complexity, however, unexpected discoveries, and the difficulties of precisely relating metal-detector and surface finds to below-ground features, leave certain questions unanswered and raise new ones. Of the original objectives, establishing the presence and extent of SFBs to the south-east of the ‘Great Halls’, suggested by the magnetometry survey, was not met. This could be most readily answered through further fieldwork.

- The most important new question raised by excavation, however, concerns the area of early Anglo-Saxon pits and ditches identified in Trench 1. This discovery is significant for two reasons: first, it demonstrates the existence of early Anglo-Saxon occupation over an even larger area than had originally been envisaged. Second, it is highly unusual (perhaps even unparalleled) to find extensive pit and ditch complexes in early Anglo-Saxon settlements. If this small area can be shown to be part of a more extensive zone of pits and ditches (ie if many/most of the pits and ditches clearly visible in the magnetometry survey in this area prove to be early Anglo-Saxon, rather than Iron Age in date), this would significantly alter current thinking about early Anglo-Saxon settlements, which are generally
believed to lack such zones. If evidence of the function of the pits could be retrieved, that would of course greatly enhance the value of these findings.

9 **REVISED AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

The assessment thus indicates the potential of this site to yield data of great academic significance. This can, in the first instance, be achieved by the further analysis of the evaluation results and its synthesis and publication, but further small-scale fieldwork would also make a considerable contribution to an understanding of this site and Anglo-Saxon settlement in the area. Future work will address the following aims and objectives:

1. **Changes in settlement hierarchy, AD 450-700**

This is a period that saw the emergence, around the end of the 6th century, of the first obviously high-status centres in Anglo-Saxon England. The main research aim of the project is to investigate, with minimal intrusion, such a high-status complex, its extent, character, and relationship to earlier Anglo-Saxon buildings and burials, as it is one of very few known nationally. In particular, this work will seek to understand the chronological, spatial and functional relationships between the different elements of the early medieval settlement complex (viz. SFBs, cemetery, timber buildings and market).

The presence of timber halls, SFBs, a cemetery and probable market at Sutton Courtenay/Drayton offers an opportunity to examine for the first time a high-status Anglo-Saxon complex as an integrated whole. Understanding the chronological development of the site, ie how the high-status centre relates to earlier settlement features and burials, and the relationship between the different elements of this settlement complex, is a key aim of the project.

This aim can be explored in the proposed post-exavcation programme by addressing the following questions and synthesising their results:

1. What is the structural history of the timber hall structure and what are its other contemporary elements? What can this tell us about the middle Saxon hall complex?

2. What was the nature of Anglo-Saxon activity to the south-east of the Great Hall complex, where excavation has revealed an early Anglo-Saxon waterhole and pits? Does this area contain buildings, in particular SFBs, as suggested by the magnetometry results?

3. What was the nature, extent and date-range of Anglo-Saxon activity in the easternmost part of the project area, where excavation has revealed a ditch and several pits of early Anglo-Saxon date? The magnetometry results suggest this could be part of a much larger complex.

4. Can the Anglo-Saxon cemetery which produced the metal-detector finds be located or pinpointed more precisely?
5. What is the character of the punishment burial and to which phase of activity does it belong? What light does it shed on social practices at the time?

6. What can the finds assemblage tell us about craft activities, and also about depositional practices, especially the discovery of highly decorated pottery and horse skull in the pits to the north-east of the site?

2. The relationship of early medieval settlement to the Romano-British and prehistoric landscapes

A secondary aim is to explore the relationship of the early medieval complex to a series of prominent features in the preceding landscape. In common with a number of high-status centres (including Yeavering and Milfield), the settlement at Sutton Courtenay/Drayton was established on the site of an ancient monumental complex still visible at that time as a series of ring ditches, and near to a Neolithic cursus monument. In addition, magnetometry indicates the presence of a settlement complex of presumed Iron Age date, with enclosures and round houses. Of particular interest is the longevity of the major ditches defining the road and main enclosures. The proximity of Drop Short Roman villa is significant and may offer potential for elucidating late 4th- and early 5th-century activity in this area (excavations were carried out here by the Berkshire Archaeological Society in the 1950s but never published; the archive has still to be located).

This aim can be explored in the proposed post-excavation programme by addressing the following questions and synthesising their results:

1. What was the character of Neolithic and early Bronze Age activity on the site, as represented by pit deposits on the one hand, and flint implements in the ploughsoil on the other? What is the relationship between the fieldwalking finds and the monuments which are visible from the air and in the geophysical survey?

2. What can the depositional sequences within the Roman ditches tell us about later use of the site?

3. What is the relationship between the Saxon features uncovered in the evaluation and the earlier landscape features, monuments and settlements?

3. Methodological issues

In view of the continued ploughing and metal-detection of the site, a main aim of the project will be to establish the origin of the finds that have been recovered, assess the present condition of archaeological features and the extent to which damage is currently taking place. This will enable the site’s future preservation to be more effectively managed. Finally, the proposed
project should yield valuable information regarding the date and function of
the cropmarks which have been mapped by RCHME.

1. What is the relationship between finds densities and ploughsoil depth?
   Can areas of greater vulnerability be identified?

2. What is the relationship between finds in the ploughsoil and features
   revealed by air photographs, geophysical survey and evaluation trenching?

3. Can the Anglo-Saxon cemetery which produced the metal-detector finds be
   more precisely located?

10 METHODOLOGY

10.1 Project set-up

10.1.1 Information on site and context data will be provided for specialists at the
beginning of the post-excavation project and a seminar will be held for the
project team to discuss the site and the academic issues.

10.1.2 Obtaining independent chronological control for the main archaeological
elements is vital for understanding processes of change through time, and the
interrelation of stratigraphically unconnected features. In particular,
consideration should be given to dating the punishment burial uncovered
adjacent to evaluation Trench 1, and residues on the early Saxon pottery will be
sought. Discussion have already commenced with Alex Bayliss of English
Heritage about dating matters. These will be completed and a decision will be
taken about what samples are appropriate for this method of dating. Samples
will then be submitted rapidly in order to obtain results before the completion of
the project.

10.2 Finds analysis and reports

10.2.1 Pottery
The Anglo-Saxon assemblage will be fully recorded and reported. The fabric
groups have the potential to contribute to the understanding of the site through
analysis of the overall assemblage.

The pottery will be recorded using standard methods, allowing material from
other sites to be compared. All material will be examined through a x20
microscope. Fabrics will be described according to their principal inclusion
types and definition of forms and decorative attributes will follow accepted
terminology. The pottery will be compared with contemporary assemblages
from nearby sites.

A selection of vessel fragments will be drawn to illustrate the range of
material, unusual forms, decoration and significant individual groups.
10.2.2 *Flint*

The flint recovered from fieldwalking does not require further analysis and the assessment report which is included here will be adapted for publication. However, the flint assemblage from pits 305 and 312 does merit more detailed investigation in the form of its technological analysis. Diagnostic attributes will be recorded on around 60 flints, including butt type (after Inizan *et al.* 1992, fig. 32) termination type (after Cotterell and Kamminga 1987), probable hammer-mode (Onhuma and Bergman 1982), flake type (after Harding 1990, with slight modification) and the extent of dorsal cortex. The presence or absence of platform edge abrasion and dorsal blade scars will also be recorded. The metrical analysis will require taking the maximum length, breadth and width measurements of a specimen (after Saville 1980). An analysis of the data will provide a means of refining the date of the flintwork and will allow a more detailed discussion of the reduction strategy.

Material will be selected for illustration and drawing briefs prepared. A report for publication will be written.

10.2.3 *Other worked stone*

The lithology of the rotary quern and building stone chunk (331) will be further investigation in order to determine their source. Comparative material will be sought from local sites and in local collections.

10.2.4 *Metal objects*

The iron sheet fragments recovered from pit 329 will be x-rayed and examined in detail. Their material and method of manufacture will be compared with the waste fragment/spillage from the same feature. Contemporary parallels will be sought.

10.2.5 *Human bone*

Human bone with interesting pathology, poses questions as to the possible cultural practices of the community during this period of occupation. Establishing the date of the burial by radiocarbon will be of great importance in order to assess its social significance (see above).

Further analysis will be undertaken to confirm the age and sex and pathology of the skeleton, and to characterise the decapitation. The burial will be compared with material from similar ritual contexts within the Upper Thames Valley and others in the vicinity, and with Wessex.

10.2.6 *Animal bone*

It is recommended that the fish bone is identified from context 106 and added to the bone report already completed for the assessment. This will be done at the Centre for Applies Archaeological Analyses at Southampton University. No further work will be necessary.

10.2.7 *Charred plant remains*

The material from Sutton Courtenay would add to our understanding of Saxon fuel use and add to a growing corpus of information on Neolithic gathering
practices. The range of charcoal identified in the assessment will be confirmed, following conventional well-established procedures and making identifications by direct comparison with reference material. The extent modern contamination will be taken into account before more detailed work begins. The assessment results will be included in the final publication report.

10.2.8 **Land snails**
The residues from the bulk sampling have been retained. Further work will consist of confirmation of identifications and scanning of residues to increase the species list with estimates of individual species abundance made. A report will then be written.

10.2.9 **Geoarchaeological analysis**
The samples taken on site will be impregnated with resin under vacuum and thin sectioned to 0.03 mm. Micromorphological analysis will be carried out using standard petrological techniques. A report will be written.

10.2.10 **General**
In a category where no further analysis is recommended, the assessment report will be published, subject to any necessary editorial adjustments.

10.3 **Stratigraphic and structural analysis**

10.3.1 Further refinement of the stratigraphic sequence will be undertaken. Features will be categorised by form, size and fill in order to define feature groups and understand site-formation processes. This analysis will use the context database and hand-drawn sections. The analysis will contribute to appreciating different activities and acts of deposition in different contexts and at different times. Post-depositional histories can also be constructed. Definition of this analysis will generate tables, plans and some sections, as well as notes from which site descriptions and drawing briefs can be written.

More detailed stratigraphic analysis will be undertaken in those circumstances where sequences survive, especially within the Saxon timber hall building in order to understand its structural history. Interpretative sections will be produced with notes which will form the basis of site descriptions and drawing briefs.

10.3.2 Distributions of all categories of artefacts will be analysed, and their occurrence in different types of feature, and with other categories of finds and ecofacts will be investigated. Particular attention will be paid to deposits that may have been deliberately placed.

10.3.3 The evaluation sampling methods (air photography, fieldwalking, geophysical survey and machine trenching) will be compared in order to shed light on the results they have provided. These results will also be compared to current state of knowledge on the depths of the ploughsoil.
10.3.4 A descriptive narrative will be written of the excavation results and drawing briefs will be produced so that illustrations can accompany the text.

10.4 **Historical and documentary research**

10.4.1 The site will be assessed in the light of other contemporary settlements and cemetery sites in the area. The SMR and other records will be examined for stray finds from the local area. The records from the 1950s excavations at Drop Short Roman villa will be sought and their potential for elucidating subsequent settlement in the area will be assessed.

10.4.2 The aim of the documentary side of the landscape study is to obtain an overall understanding of the operation of the medieval landscape for the light this may throw on earlier arrangements. Essentially this will be to plot the extent of arable fields, meadow and pasture, in relation to village settlement and routeways.

Given the remarkable association of royal manors and Abingdon Abbey properties, the study area should comprise the central parishes in Ock Hundred (Steventon, Milton, Drayton, Sutton and Appleford); this will link in with other work being done on Abingdon and the Wittenhams.

The sources examined will be estate maps, enclosure maps, tithe maps, and printed maps (e.g. Rocque and OS first-editions), together with the most relevant printed sources (e.g. VCH Berkshire), and selected mss sources as necessary.

The product will be a 1:10,000 map (on a six-inch OS base) showing the medieval landscape, and smaller analytical maps showing possible stages of development.

10.5 **Report writing**

10.5.1 The post-excavation analysis will generate illustrated descriptive text for the site discoveries, and finds reports for each separate material category.

10.5.2 The evidence for each material category will then be reviewed in order to gain a picture of the totality of the evidence for the area, and the discussion for the report will be written. The introductory chapter will be written and these sections of the report will be illustrated as appropriate.

10.6 **Report assembly and publication strategy**

10.6.1 The report will be compiled, and edited by a Senior Research Officer. The primary means of dissemination will probably be a short article in *The Archaeological Journal* (the Editor has been consulted). A publication synopsis is provided in Section 11. In light of the fact that the site has already been heavily metal-detected, no plans have been made as yet for display of the results.
10.7 **General project tasks**

10.7.1 The project will be managed by Gill Hey and the Research Officer and monitored internally by Alistair Barclay. Drawing office management will be undertaken by Paul Backhouse and IT support by Paul Miles. Finds, environmental and archive administration will be undertaken by Leigh Allen, Dana Challinor and Nicola Scott.

10.8 **Archiving**

10.8.1 Oxford Archaeology’s archiving standards will be adhered to at all times with regard to project documentation and archivally suitable materials used (see Walker 1990). All post-excavation documentation will be filed, ordered and indexed as part of the research archive. This will be submitted to the National Archaeological Record for microficheing. After completion of the project the archive will be deposited with the Ashmolean Museum (this has been discussed and agreed).
11 PUBLICATION

11.1 Draft publication synopsis

Summary (c 500 words)

Introduction (c 2,500 words)
  Project background
  Reasons for and circumstances of the project
  Excavation methodology
  Archaeological background

Archaeological Description (c 6,000 words)
  Non-intrusive survey
  Trenching and test pitting
  Documentary research

Artefactual evidence (c 4,000 words)
  Pottery
  Flint
  Other finds (worked stone, metal objects)

Ecofactual evidence (c 5,000 words)
  The human remains
  Animal bone report
  Charred plant remains

Discussion (c 3,000 words)
  The site development
  The site in its local and regional context

Acknowledgements
Bibliography

Figures and plates
  Figures will include:
  Location of the site (national/regional/local)
  Plans of excavated features by trench (inc. enlarged detailed areas) (c 4 illustrations)
  Plan of burial
  Sections of Saxon pits and other features (c 4 illustrations)
  Sections of Saxon building construction trench
  Saxon pottery (c 2 pages)
  Flint (c 10 objects)
  Miscellaneous objects (worked stone)

  Plates will include:
  View of Trench 1
  Human burial in situ
  Saxon hall
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13 RESOURCES AND PROGRAMMING
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### 13.2 Task list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task no.</th>
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<th>Aims (Section 9)</th>
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<td>Helena Hamerow, Paul Blinkhorn,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kate Cramp, Leigh Allen,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annsolit Witkin, Dana Chalmonor,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Stafford, Matt Canti, Alex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayliss, Mark Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Discuss radiocarbon dating and submit samples</td>
<td>Alex Bayliss, Research Officer,</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>10.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annsolit Witkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Finds analysis and reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Saxon Pottery</td>
<td>Paul Blinkhorn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, esp. 1.2,</td>
<td>10.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3; 1.6; 3.1; 3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Kate Cramp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1; 3.2; 3.3</td>
<td>10.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Source worked stone</td>
<td>Ruth Shaffrey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, esp. 1.2; 1.6</td>
<td>10.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X-ray and analyse metal-sheet fragments</td>
<td>Leigh Allen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2; 1.6</td>
<td>10.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Human bone, analysis and report</td>
<td>Annsolit Witkin</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1, esp. 1.5;</td>
<td>10.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poss. 2.2 &amp; 3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fish bone</td>
<td>CAAA, Sutton Uni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, esp. 1.3</td>
<td>10.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Confirm identification of charred plant remains and write report</td>
<td>Dana Chalmonor, Mark Robinson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1, esp. 1.2; 1.3 &amp; 2.1</td>
<td>10.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Analyse further residues for land snails and write report</td>
<td>Elizabeth Stafford</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Geoarcheologcal</td>
<td>Matt Canti</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>1.3 &amp; 2.2</td>
<td>10.2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Finds illustration</td>
<td>Illustrator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Stratigraphic and structural analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Analysis of evaluation data</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>10.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Integration of finds data</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>10.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Analysis of fieldwalking finds in light of geophysical survey and site evaluation analysis</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>10.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Drawing briefs</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Documentary research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Historical research</td>
<td>Helena Hamerow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Historical review</td>
<td>Helena Hamerow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Map regression analysis</td>
<td>Julian Munby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Work Packages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site description</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>Gill Hey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Introduction/background</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>Gil Hey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Discussion</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>Helena Hamerow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Drawing briefs for introduction and discussion</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>Mark Robinson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Illustration</td>
<td>Illustrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Check and amend illustrations</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>Illust</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Work Packages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33 Report production</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Report assembly</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Report edit</td>
<td>Senior Research Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 General tasks</td>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>Gill Hey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Finds Management and liaison with Museum</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>Leigh Allen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Graphics management</td>
<td>Paul Backhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 IT support</td>
<td>Paul Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Environmental management</td>
<td>Dana Challinor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Internal monitoring</td>
<td>Alistair Barclay</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Archive</td>
<td>Nicola Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[*] English Heritage specialists whose costs are not included in the application for funds
## 13.3 Costs

### 13.3.1 Costs in year 1 (2003/4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Performed by</th>
<th>Duration (days)</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Witkin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>£ 120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annsofie Witkin</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>£ 180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D Challinor</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>£ 335.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E Stafford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>£ 240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gill Hey</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>£ 315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illust</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>£ 575.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kate Cramp</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>£ 329.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leigh Allen</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>£ 201.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>£ 94.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>£ 2,580.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth Shaffrey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>£ 120.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: £ 5,089.00**

### Direct Costs

- **Travel**: £ 400.00
- **Direct Project Consumables**: £ 300.00

**Total: £ 700.00**

### Specialists

- **Helena Hamerow**: 1.5 days, £ 315.00
- **Paul Blinkhorn**: 1.5 days, £ 240.00
- **Southampton Uni**: 1 day, £ 160.00

**Total**: £ 715.00

### Overheads

- **Re OAU**: £ 1,447.25
- **Re Specialists**: £ 71.50

**Total**: £ 1,518.75

**Total**: £ 8,022.75
13.3.2 Costs in year 2 (2004/5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performed by</th>
<th>Duration (days)</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alistair Barclay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£176.30</td>
<td>£176.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Challiner</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>£137.35</td>
<td>£68.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Hey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>£215.25</td>
<td>£1,076.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrator</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>£117.88</td>
<td>£825.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Munby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£176.30</td>
<td>£352.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Allen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£137.35</td>
<td>£137.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Scott</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£123.00</td>
<td>£246.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Backhouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£137.35</td>
<td>£137.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Miles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£176.30</td>
<td>£352.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>£123.00</td>
<td>£1,599.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£137.35</td>
<td>£412.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direct Costs**
- Travel: £100.00
- Direct Project Consumables: £300.00
- £400.00

**Specialists**
- Helena Hamerow: 8 days @ £210 = £1,680.00

**Overheads**
- Re OAU: £1,445.83
- Re Specialists: £168.00
- £1,613.83

**Total**
- £9,077

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>£8,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>£9,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£17,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 13.3.3 English Heritage specialists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>No days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003/4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Bayliss</td>
<td>Radiocarbon dating (4 &amp; 5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Robinson</td>
<td>Environmental advice (4 &amp; 13)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Canti</td>
<td>Geoarchaeology (4 &amp; 15)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2004/5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Robinson</td>
<td>Environmental overview (29)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Site location