

CH 76

CONTEXT F 2132....

CUTTING p.99 and p.98..... CO-ORDINATES: East..... North.....

DATE EXPOSED DATE COMPLETED

DESCRIPTION SURFACE OF WORN LIMESTONE SLABS

MAX. WIDTH AND DIRECTION

MAX. LENGTH AND DIRECTION

MAX. DEPTH/HEIGHT THICKNESS

OVERLIES

OVERLAIN BY

CUTS

CUT BY

ABUTS OR CONTIGUOUS WITH

PLANS No..... SECTIONS No.....

PHOTO: B/W COL. NEG. NOS.

SAMPLE Type:..... Nos.

EXCAVATOR

RECORDER

ASSOCIATED FEATURES

ASSOCIATED FINDS

TWO NEOLITHIC POLISHED STONE AXES

COMMENT

PHASING

F2132 (P99 and P98)

WORN SURFACE After the initial detouring and brushing of cuttings P99 and P98 there showed up a very extensive area of flat worn and eroded limestone blocks. Within this eroded area there were also a number of heavily burnt ~~patches~~ patches, including an area of stacked limestone, though this latter area may be due to 20th century activity. The whole of P98 was planned at this level to record the extent of this surface. No features cutting the surface could be identified, therefore 1-2" were taken off to reveal a surface of what can best be described as limestone rubble, which was later found to extend down about another 6-7". Within this rubble surface features could be identified. This therefore presents somewhat of a problem with the stratigraphy. The worn surface F2132 had lying on its surface parts of two neolithic polished stone axes, and was not cut into by any other features, yet sealed a number of features including a posthole whose fine cutting would tend to date it to Iron Age. Anyway this surface awaits any further discussion or ideas. No help as to the problem of stratigraphy was revealed by the section at the edge of P98, and perhaps will be solved with the later excavation of O99 and O98. But suffice it to say, the impression given is that this is a deliberately kind surface of flat limestone blocks, the erosion being due to its use as a pathway or trackway, but of what date is uncertain.