nature of the broken roughouts that abound at Neolithic axe factory sites, and Neolithic axes, polished or unpolished, often have blunt sides.

Classifiers of stone artefacts need to remind themselves that specimens are likely to be imperfect, damaged or atypical more often than not: the tactics can only be to review the range of possibilities and make a reasoned choice from amongst them. The two Sussex finds considered here are in point, and there is no useful stratigraphic information to assist the discussion of them, nor is there helpful associated material that might offer some guidance to their true age.

Both artefacts remain in the possession of their finders, to whom the writer is grateful for the loan of the specimens for study.

Derek Roe

References


4 Mentioned and illustrated by L. V. Grinsell in his paper ‘The Lower and Middle Palaeolithic periods in Sussex’, S.A.C., vol. 70 (1929), 176, 181-2, though it was first published by R. Garraway Rice in an untitled note in Proc. Soc. Antt., N.S. vol. 32 (1920), 80-2. This implement is now in Worthing Museum.

A flint collection from Stud Farm,
Newhaven, East Sussex

Fieldwalking between 1974 and 1976 by Mr. and Mrs. R. Macmillan in the vicinity of Stud Farm (TQ 462 012) has produced a large quantity of humanly modified flint which consisted of the following:

- **Cores**
  - Class A, one platform 17
  - Class B, two platforms 7
  - Class C, three or more platforms 4
  - However, five small fine blade cores (two class A, three class B), were sufficiently distinct to be regarded as most probably of Mesolithic/earliest Neolithic date.

- **Core fragments**

- **Core rejuvenation flakes**

- **Unmodified flakes including waste flakes**
  - Many of these were heavily battered and superficially similar to implements (see below). Approximately 80% are with little or no cortex. Some pieces exhibit utilisation damage but because of the generally poor condition of most flakes, no separation was attempted. A few flakes from hammerstones also occur.

**Scrapers**
- Convex
- Hollow

- **On thermal flakes**
  - Convex
  - Hollow

- No attempt was made to subdivide the scrapers into the standard categories of end, side, etc. It is not felt that these rigid subdivisions are particularly helpful and in fact the scrapers from Stud Farm will not fit easily into these categories.

**Notched flakes**

Some attempt was made to differentiate between notches caused by a single blow which could be confused with natural damage such as that caused by a plough, and those having more elaborate preparation (M. Green, pers. comm.). The larger examples cannot really be distinguished from small hollow scrapers.

- Irregularly retouched flakes
- Awls/borers
- Spurred implements
- Fabricators
- Two are ‘D’ sectioned and one is triangular sectioned.

**Knife**

**Flint axes and axe fragments (unpolished)**

**Possible Mesolithic blade segment**

The flint occurs in several stages of patination from fresh to totally patinated. Most pieces which still retain some cortex are of chalk origin, although occasional pieces are from gravel and/or Clay-with-flints. No trends were observed between certain tool categories and either their state of patination or the flint source. The unmodified flakes and convex scrapers were analysed so as to be comparable with published assemblages from other sites of known date. Although a consistent series of chronologically significant traits has not yet emerged, recent work has confirmed some chronological trends (Farley 1979; Pitts 1978). The expected possible sources of error from analysing fieldwalked material were considered. However, in this case objective methods of collection were undertaken (Woodward 1978; Ford forthcoming), and consequently the material may represent one or more sites, or a general spread over several fields. More productive fields were probably visited more often and it is also suspected that the unmodified flakes were in fact collected as implements and that in-field selection occurred (i.e. ‘waste’ flakes not collected). This is to some extent confirmed by a ratio of flakes: implements of 1:1:1, which is extremely low, even for a fieldwalked collection. Hence with all these possible sources of ambiguity, little reliance can be placed on a metrical analysis and the results are not reproduced here but retained as an archive. However, other characteristics of the collection can be used as a chronological guide.

The numbers of blades and blade-like flakes is low, with only 3% having a length: breadth ratio of more than 5:2. The remaining unmodified flakes tend to be more squat than the Neolithic assemblage from Bishoptone (Bell 1977), but similar to numerous later Neolithic and Bronze Age collections examined by one of the authors (SF). The convex scraper collection does not contain many examples of later Neolithic types, such as those found at Belle Tout (Bradley 1970) and Rackham (Holden and Bradley 1975), but, although several examples are similar to earlier Neolithic types,
Fig. 1. Stud Farm, Newhaven, 1 fabricator, 2 awl, 3 spurred implement, 4 hollow scraper, 5 and 9 convex scrapers, 6 and 8 flint axes, 7 notched flake.
others could easily be of Bronze Age date. The seven axes and axe fragments are unlikely to be of Bronze Age date and are probably earlier Neolithic.

When the negative evidence is considered, if, as seems likely, there is a limited amount of earlier Neolithic material present, it is surprising that serrated flakes, leaf arrowheads, laurel leaves, etc. are absent. Similarly there is an absence of plano-convex knives, transverse and barbed and tanged arrowheads etc., which could have been expected if later Neolithic material was present in quantity.

The general lack of a wide range of implement types may also be significant, as it can be shown that Bronze Age sites tend to have fewer implements other than scrapers, and a restricted range of these in comparison to earlier sites.

Therefore it is felt that this collection contains material from several periods. First, the fine blade cores and few blade segments are probably Mesolithic and Stud Farm is in fact a previously recorded Mesolithic findspot (Bell 1977). Secondly, a limited amount of earlier Neolithic material is present, although this is somewhat different in composition from the assemblage from Bishopstone (Bell 1977). Finally, the bulk of the material seems to be of Bronze Age date.

To conclude, it seems fairly certain that at least one Bronze Age site exists at Stud Farm, which probably locates some of the settlement associated with the (assumed) Bronze Age round barrows on Roehy Hill. The significance of the earlier material is more problematic and it cannot be said with certainty that this represents a site. Only new fieldwork can resolve this question.
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Excavations at the Trundle, 1980

INTRODUCTION

During routine checking of planning applications, the Archaeological Officer for West Sussex, Mr. F. G. Aldsworth, was consulted on a proposal to erect a replacement microwave aerial inside the Trundle, within one of the two fenced compounds already existing there (Fig. 2). As the construction of the aerial required a concrete base set into the chalk subsoil adjacent to a known Neolithic ditch, rescue excavation in advance of building work was thought advisable. Permission to excavate was readily given by the Southern Electricity Board, and excavation was carried out for one week in January, 1980, under the direction of the authors. (The Trundle is a scheduled site, and this work was undertaken with the agreement of the Ancient Monuments Inspectorate).

EXCAVATION

The area excavated was just inside the west entrance into the hill fort (Fig. 2). No surface indication of archaeological features was visible, and Curwen (1929a) seemed to have located the Neolithic ditch here by means of ramming the ground, and listening for the different note given by ditch silts, as opposed to solid chalk. Turf and topsoil were removed over an area of c. 40m² (Fig. 3), down to the chalk subsoil. This revealed a short stretch of ditch, two post holes, and a variety of modern disturbances, i.e. two substantial concrete blocks from an adjacent mast, now dismantled, and a small, rectangular rubbish pit. One of the post holes, the square one, was also probably very recent, judging by the looseness of the fill. The round post hole, c. 30cm deep with V-shaped profile, had a tightly-packed fill, but was sterile.

Almost half of the exposed stretch of ditch had originally been excavated by Curwen (1929a), and therefore contained his backfill (stippled area in Fig. 3, corresponding to his trench SD.C1). This backfill was not re-excavated, leaving only a 3m length of ditch to be investigated. The portion of the ditch excavated in 1980 was rather irregularly cut, with a maximum depth of 1m; the ditch floor was wide and flat, and the sides were sloping. The only undisturbed section obtained in 1980 was an oblique one (Fig. 3), but it does not match Curwen’s fairly well (Curwen 1929a, 38), except that he does not distinguish or differentiate any deposit corresponding to our layer 4. He does not, incidentally, record the circular post hole. It would appear that this particular stretch of ditch is relatively short, up to 7m maximum, though it was impossible to verify this absolutely because of the presence of a concrete slab (Fig. 3).

There was no sign of a surviving bank corresponding to the ditch, but the irregular, rubbley chalk layer at the ditch edge (1A in Fig. 3) may correspond to the last traces of a bank.

Finds from the ditch consisted of late Iron Age pottery (from layer 2), Neolithic pottery (from layers 2-4), 68 pieces of struck flint (no implements), three pieces of carved chalk, and a little animal bone. Soil samples were taken for analysis of land snails.

DISCUSSION

The results of the limited 1980 excavation confirm Curwen’s finding of a small Neolithic ditch (part of his
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