

CH

CONTEXT **F 3617** ✓TCUTTING **R4**DATE EXPOSED **CH 79**DATE COMPLETED **CH 79**DESCRIPTION **Post-hole**
Co-ordinates **E: 1.3m.**
N: 6.5m.MAX. WIDTH AND DIRECTION **45cms N-S**MAX. LENGTH AND DIRECTION **60cms EW**

MAX. DEPTH/HEIGHT THICKNESS

OVERLIES

OVERLAIN BY **? Presumably 2951, but this not clear from RR's notes.** * **See also**CUTS **2961 and Gull bedrock**

CUT BY

ABUTS OR CONTIGUOUS WITH

PLANS No. **Overlay 1 for** SECTIONS No.
PLAN 4, R4 Joe also F3655

PHOTO: B/W COL. NEG. NOS.

SAMPLE Type: Nos.

EXCAVATOR **?** RECORDER **RMJC**ASSOCIATED FEATURES **? F3618, F3619, F3620, F3621. ?**ASSOCIATED FINDS **Appear to have been none in 1979.**

COMMENT This feature, & F. 3618, F3619, F3620, & F3621. are extremely dubious - ~~they~~ they don't appear to have had finds and so were not recorded at the very end of CH 79. RR. says that they may not have been fully excavated. The sides show ~~an~~ old land surface - ie. they appear to be cut through it - however, as I don't know what fill was taken out it's impossible to establish whether the fill was different, or whether the excavators were only removing & old land surface, & simply didn't finish. - As a result these ~~may~~ must be considered highly dubious.

~~None~~ 3618, 3619, 3620 & 3621 not sectioned as almost certainly unfinished, P.T.O.

SECTION:

See 3655.

NOTES/PHOTOGRAPHS:

* RR. notes that he is fairly sure they appeared when the top 5 cm of land surface was removed, & that there was actually something there. There were features there, but their shape is uncertain.

~~If they showed when the top 5 cm of land surface was removed~~
If they showed when the surface of 2961 was removed it would seem likely that they were filled with something else. — but ?!