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## Рroject Background and Research Aims

2021 saw the third season of work carried out by the Bennachie Landscapes Fieldwork Group along with a number of fresh faces willing to try their hands. This work forms part of the wider Bennachie Landscapes Project run jointly by the Bailies of Bennachie and the University of Aberdeen. More information concerning this community project can be found at www.bailies0fbennachie.org.uk/ bennachie-landscapes-project. This season proved to be very productive in attracting over 23 volunteers attending and resulting in 177 days worked over 15 days. A heartfelt thanks go out to all participants that made this dig such a success and to Macdonald Hotels, the estate owners, who permitted this work to go ahead.

This season continued the work started on this part of the estate in 2019. Some former trenches were extended in order to capitalise on what had been discovered previously and some new trenches were opened to concentrate on new questions. The overall site under consideration comprises two distinct parts. Whether they are associated chronologically and with respect to purpose is one of the questions being asked. The smaller portion of the site is centred upon a mound situated just east of the present 'turnpike' path. Excavation in 2019 resulted in a 10th century radiocarbon date from a possible structure on top of the mound and the recognition of the existence of a concentric earthwork partially encircling the mound. Both areas saw further exploration this year.

The mound overlooks a large sub-rectangular enclosure that is physically associated with a range of earthwork features that appear to span several centuries. Work in 2019 looked at several features that impinged upon this large enclosure. These investigations enabled a relative chronology to be created that


Figure 1. Site plan showing all trenches.


Figure 2. Large enclosure detailing 2021 trenches.
suggested strongly that the enclosure pre-dated all of the investigated earthwork remains. This season's investigations concentrated on the enclosure dyke itself and attempted to characterise its construction. One other trench opened in 2019 - that investigating the hollow-way cutting through the enclosure - was also looked at in greater detail this season in order to confirm and expand upon the earlier results.

The large enclosure will be considered here first, followed by the investigations carried out on the mound. Figure 1 shows the complete site with the mound overlooking the enclosure and associated features to the east along with the trenches opened in 2019 and 2021. Figure 2 shows the southern portion of the enclosure detailing the 2021 trenches. Three of the trenches began as two parts but were eventually joined to create larger trenches. Their original numbering has been retained, i.e. Trenches 6 and $11 ; 8$ and $12 ; 9$ and 13.

## The Enclosure

Trench 6, 11

## Description

Last season's backfill was removed from the north end of the trench in an attempt to clarify the stratigraphy in this area. Owing to the proximity of a number of old beech trees and the rich soils present in the hollow-way, the soil stratigraphy of this trench was confused by the tangle of roots. The results from the 2019 investigation were considered to be lacking in the detail required to understand the history of this feature (Ralston \& Shepherd, 2020, 12). Accordingly, the trench was re-opened and the former west side cut back by a further 250 mm and extended northwards into Trench 11 (see Figure 3).

Results
The hollow-way appears to have linked the lower-lying farmlands to the resources higher up the hill. Hollow-ways are formed when traffic disturbs the ground surface and becomes adversely by the climatic effects of rain and ice. The hollow formed by the traffic becomes increasingly muddy and requires cleaning


Figure 3. Section 27 across the hollow-way [AL].


Photo 1. Trench 6, 11 showing hollow-way entering the enclosure from the west and under excavation in the foreground.
out in order to make it passable again. The mud from the base of the hollowway is thrown to the side forming an upcast of soil. Over time, such effects of weather and periodic scouring can result in incredibly deep earthworks. In some cases, a ditch might be cut between the track and the upcast in order to help drainage.

All of these processes appear to be visible in section 27. [AK] is the track formed by the underlying natural subsoil. ${ }^{1}$ [AE] appears to be a drainage gulley created to help limit the effects of rain washing-out the track surface. (761) is an orangey, sandy soil that appears to be the original soil that formed above the glacial till. This has been removed by the cutting of the ditch and during the use of the track but survives under the upcast of soil (728). This upcast was presumably formed during the digging of the ditch and the removal of topsoil in the preparation of the track surface and was described as a loose, coarse sandy layer that may be accounted for by the mixing of the different soils during the preparation of the track and drainage gulley. Overlying (728) was a patch of redeposited natural that probably arrived there during a later cleaning episode. Overlying these deposits was a natural accretion of soils (829), (707) and (706) deposited after the hollow-way went out of use.

Trench 7

## Description

Trench 7 was designed to investigate an earthwork comprising two banks with an intervening hollow. The site survey shows this to be a complicated part of the landscape where a number of earthworks impinge upon the hollow-way (see Figure 4).

1 Across the site it has been seen that a natural process whereby minerals from the topsoils are washed down through the underlying soils form a hard 'pan' where they come in contact with the less porous natural subsoil. In this case the natural subsoil is a glacial 'till' laid down as the ice sheets melted at the end of the last glaciation. Beneath this harder 'pan' the natural subsoil remains in its post-glacial state.


Photo 2. Trench 7 showing the earthworks and the area of metalled surface in between.


Figure 4. Detail of site plan showing earthworks and hollowway [AL] associated with Trench 7. A small area of 'metalling (806) is shown in Trench 7, just west of the mound.

The bank to the west of the mound comprised mainly a sandy, dark greyish-brown loam (776) (see Figure 5). This appears to have been a fairly rich 'agricultural soil'. It did, however, appear to be distinctively different to the soil from the eastern mound that was described as a compact brown loam with lenses of paler clayey soil (808). It is noteworthy that the light, orangey sand, recognised as a post-glacial soil, (777) had been removed prior to the deposition of (808). This suggests that the mound $[\mathrm{AU}]$ is artificial but is also unlikely to have been produced simply by the re-deposition of the missing section of hollow-way bank. Such a situation is likely to have left (777) in place. Moreover, just to the west of [AU] and sitting on top of the natural was an accumulation of small stones, reminiscent of 'metalling' (806). This also suggests fabrication. The top layers of [AU] comprised the natural accumulations (775) and (778).

## Discussion

It might be noted that Trench 4, opened in 2019, also indicated that the mound lying to the east of [AU] was similarly artificial and contained the tumbled remains of a stone structure that was also positioned on the natural. The soil profile to the west of that stone setting comprised a range of deposits hinting that the stone structure may formerly have provided a revetment for them.

In other words, Trenches 4 and 7 together suggest the mounds are archaeological constructions rather than simple opportunistic 'dumping' of residual material. Furthermore, within a pre-modern environment such indiscriminate wastage of valuable topsoils is unlikely to have occurred.


Figure 5. Sections 29 and 17.

It is impossible, in the absence of further information, to speculate on the uses of such 'mounds'. One, perhaps bizarre, consideration might however be thrown in the ring for probable ridicule. Within a lordly landscape the provisioning of burrows for encouraging and managing rabbits was a widespread phenomenon. The resulting 'pillow mounds' can be found in a wide variety of types (Williamson, 2007), though some may conform to the size and shapes of the mounds considered here. Either way, further excavation would be necessary to enquire more fully as to the nature of these earthworks.

Trench 8, 12

Description
Trench 8 was located towards the southeast corner of the enclosure and was positioned across the line of the enclosure dyke on the east side of a large upright stone set within the dyke [AJ]. Trench 12 adjoined it to the west and provided scope to examine a longer section along the north face of the dyke (Figure 6).

## Results

As well as permitting a stone-by-stone view of the construction of


Photo 3. Trench 8, 12 showing the excavated dyke. this part of the enclosure dyke, these trenches show how the dyke may have had more than one phase and how its foundations lay relative to the soils (Figures 7 and 8). A similar set of conclusions can be drawn from the evidence presented by Trenches 9, 13 (see below).

The dyke was built along lines characteristic of later drystane dyking across the area. Large basal stones were pinned by smaller ones to provide a stable foundation. External stones were then laid along with the careful use of well-packed 'hearting' to make the core of the dyke. In this instance the stones had not been set down on the hard natural but onto a fairly dense natural, sandy subsoil that was clearly considered suitable for the proposed height of the dyke.


Figure 6. Plan of Trenches 8 and 12.


Figure 7. Section 25 showing the position of stones [AW].


Figure 8. Section 33 the foundations with respect to the underlying natural soils.


Photo 4. Showing the excavated coin in situ.

The suggestion that the wall had, at one point, started to fall into disrepair prior to its re-establishment is made by the stones [AW]. These appear to have tumbled from the wall as they lay close to it with no other stones present anywhere nearby. They were not, however, lying on the same level as the wall foundation stones and so were not simply 'left-overs' from the initial construction phase. They appear to have fallen after an accumulation of soil had already built up against the inner side of the enclosure dyke.

Small Finds
Trench 8: Two late mediaeval(?) pottery sherds Cat. Nos. 78, 79) were recovered from context (767). Unfortunately, further sherds of early-modern pottery were also recovered from this same context suggesting that the earlier ones were simply residual and that the mixing of the soils had occurred no earlier than the early 19th century.
Trench12: A copper alloy coin (Cat. No. 109), also from (767) was found but has, so far, not been dated.

Trench 9
Description
Trench 9 was located along the east side of the enclosure dyke and was positioned with regard to potential stratigraphy, lack of mature trees and in order to give a sample set at ninety degrees to Trench 8. It was also extended eastwards in order to characterise the soils outside the enclosure. Trench 13 adjoined Trench 9 and characterised the outer face of the enclosure dyke to complement the inner face examined in Trench 12 (Figure 9).

## Results

The scattered stones [AZ] appear to tell a similar story to [AW] in Trench 12. Although some were pushed into the soil on which the dyke [AJ] sat, others were positioned in the overlying context. These were then sealed by a substantial overburden of further soil layers that were better defined here than in Trench 8, 12. Further evidence for a later phase of dyke reconstruction was shown by the soil layer (768).


Figure 9. Plan of Trenches 9 and 13.


Photo 5. Possible plough marks [AR] showing as parallel cuts in the natural subsoil.

This had been cut through contexts (769) and (780) subsequent to their deposition and the top dyke stones were bound within its matrix. It may be suggested that the earliest phase of the enclosure may have been associated with stock enclosure whilst subsequent phases were more concerned with stock exclusion. There was no sign of a foundation trench for the dyke, though this was expected. Confirming this absence would be a priority for future work.

By the time of the rebuilding suggested by the stones within (768) a large accumulation of loamy soil had accrued that had, presumably, slid down to this end of the enclosure as 'soil creep'. Interestingly, although the enclosure is surrounded by rig and furrow (Ralston \& Shepherd, 2019, 13), the depth of soil outside is nowhere near as deep as inside. This suggests a 'plaggen' soil - i.e. soil that has been enhanced by the addition of extra soil from elsewhere - and that it was used for garden or arable production, at least in its later phases of use.

Outside of the enclosure, parallel scars were noted in the natural subsoil [AR]. These are tentatively suggested to be plough marks. However, if this is the case, they appear to be running at roughly ninety degrees to the rigs recorded by LiDAR imagery (ibid., Figure 1) and are, presumably, earlier in date.

Feature [AY] was what appeared to be a hollowed area running along the front of the dyke. The geological 'hard pan' had been eroded away at this point and it is suspected that this may have been the result of trampling during the construction of the dyke. However, it was also noted that within the enclosure this pan was also absent from beneath the soil layers. Whether this may have been the result of stock trampling inside the enclosure is a moot point but would support the notion of its earliest use being for stock enclosure rather than exclusion.


Figure 10. Sections 19 (west and east).


Figure 11. Sections 22, 24 showing the stone structure [AS].

Within the enclosure were further features. A small setting of stones [AV] may represent a stone setting to support a post. Further up the slope was a stone structure [AS] (Figure 11). This is probably to be seen as the remains of a wall, though whether related to a building or simply another enclosure would require further excavation. A small piece of alder charcoal (sample 26) sealed


Photo 6. Trench 9, 13 with internal structure [AS] in the foreground and the possible plough marks outside the enclosure near the top of the photo.
in context (805) beneath this structure was submitted for C14 dating and returned a date of between 551 and 404 BC at $95 \%$ probability (SUERC-101066). This Iron Age date is clearly of great interest and invites further speculation concerning the nature of this structure and what other Iron Age structures my be in the vicinity. It is also hoped that further work can be carried out to discover more about any possible relationship between this feature and the larger enclosure.

Small Finds
A ?perfume bottle top (Cat. No.109) found within context (786). This bottle top was identical, apart from the embossed number on the top, to one found within the north end room of the 'Bede House' found in 2018. Someone was clearly not very imaginitive in his gifts to his 'true love'!

## The Mound

Figure 12 shows a topographical survey of this part of the site and the associated trenches. Trench 5 was expanded into Trench 10 and Trench 2 was confined to its central section in order to concentrate the search for the encircling feature in that part of the trench. Trench 2 may be characterised as 'the trench of the roots'! Excavation between the roots was so painstakingly arduous that work re-commenced here where it had left off in 2019. The 'dog-leg' in the trench was made in order to go around a large mature beech tree. Trench 5 was also positioned in order to best avoid mature beeches.

Trench 2
Results and Discussion
Figure 13 shows a plan of the trench with roots crisscrossing the area. [ABA] was a platform of compacted stones of medium size. At its front edge, defined on the figure by a black line, the stones were only one course thick, fairly small but very


Figure 12. The 'Mound' and the associated trenches.


Figure 13. Plan of Trench 2, middle section.
well-defined. Behind them, the roots made it impossible to define them stone by stone but they appeared be deeper further down the slope. The angle of slope can be seen in Figure 14. On its northern side (bottom of figure) the stones also suddenly stopped. However, there was no, neat, clearly defined edge as there had been on the upslope, western side. What is of note is that the stones appear to have been laid directly onto the natural, light sandy soil, suggesting that the site had been cleared prior to construction. On the other hand, it might be worth considering whether


Figure 14. Trench 2, section c.


Photo 7. Trench 2 showing the hard edge to feature $A B A$ and the density of stones behind it in the foreground.
this soil had been severely leached by the dense root activity. Such action can denude soil of its humus content quite rapidly. And these trees are very old specimens.

The face of the wall - if that's what it was - appears to respect concentric line indicated by the surviving earthwork. However, the earthwork does not appear to accurately reflect the underlying archaeological deposits. This strange affair was also noted with respect to Trench 10 on top of the mound. In this instance, later destructive processes appear to account for the surviving earthwork (see below). It is to be wondered whether a similar situation pertains to Trench 2.
It is hard to work out what the stones represent. They clearly appear to suggest a structure of some form, but of what was it constructed? The stones are not sufficient to support a stone dyke of any size and they do not really seem sutable for an earthen or timber structure. Whether they are simply the remains of underpinning stones that supported more substantial, robbed boulders may be a possibility. Again,
further work would be needed to try to answer these questions, but the presence of the mature trees makes such work extremely difficult.

Trench 10
Background
Trench 10 was opened in response to the sample excavation, Trench 5, carried out in 2019. The aim of Trench 10 in 2021 was to seek to characterise the context of the 10th-century date determined by C-14 analysis of roundwood charcoal recovered in 2019. At the time it was suspected that this charcoal may represent the remains of a former wattle structure on the top of the mound.

The former Trench 5 was used as a baseline to a larger trench, 2 metres wide and, initially, 5 metres long on the top of the mound and across the topographic circular evidence that


Photo 8. The foundation trench with foundation stones under excavation. The scorched red area to the left of the frame shows the position of the burnt post base and the engraved stone can be seen below and to the right of the point of the upper ranging pole. caused the original interest in the site (see Figure 12). The complexity of the archaeological evidence resulted in the lower layers of this trench being restricted to the western end measuring 3 metres by 2 metres. However, the former Trench 5 was also re-opened in this area as it had not been excavated to natural. This means that the final, fully-excavated Trench 10 measured 3.8 metres by 2 metres as well as the extra bit of Trench 5 .

Excavation (See Figure 15-18, the sections)
The uppermost layers can be characterised as destruction deposits, apparently created during the robbing of the underlying structures for stone. (720) was ubiquitous across the site and comprised a mix of brown soils, disturbed stones - often with bonding-clay still attached - and charcoal. It may even represent a 'tidying up' of the site after the robbing of the stones. The site lies within an early 19 th-century beech planatation laid out as policies for Pittodrie Castle with its proximity to the public 'turnpike' perhaps prompting a degree of landscaping and 'making good' during the tree-planting process. Were (720) not present, the underlying destruction layers would have created a very 'bumpy' horizon. Intriguingly, the topographic feature (792) that originally drew attention to the site appear to have been a product of the robbing of the site rather than having anything to do with its earlier archaeology.

The contexts immediately beneath (720) are destruction deposits - (794), (772/3), (760), (824), (796) - containing matrices of stone, burnt material, clay from stone bonding and a single fragment of clear, flat glass that appears to attest the early modern date for this robbing episode. (With the exception of one or two small pieces of 19th-century 'picnic-ware' found within the leaf litter (717), no other ceramics or glass were found in this trench.) The soils of the stone-robbing deposits comprised a wide range of types that made the whole trench and the resultant sections rather colourful. They varied from bright orange sands through brown soils to greyish-white deposits that may represent powdery, heated clay residues. Some of the latter had been trampled into quite dense compounds that had been observed overlying the charcoal deposits (752) in 2019 (Trench 5, (725)) (Ralston \& Shepherd, 2020, 7).

In the south-east quarter of the trench was a range of deposits, sealed by (794), that appear to relate to the original, historic destruction of the structures. (797) and (803) added to the multi-


Figures 15-18. Sections drawn of Trench 10.


Figure 19. Plan of the earliest features seen in Trench 10.
coloured nature of the deposits by adding thin lenses of different colours that appear to derive from intense burning. 'Slimey' lenses of grey and orange material suggest the types of residues present after large bonfires followed by rain and trampling. Beneath these was (816), a black matrix containing much burnt material.

The plan of the earliest features (Figure 19) shows the hollow within which the deposit (816) was found along with two foundation features [804] and [817], both cut into the natural surface. These were similarly filled with burnt material, (818) and (822). A further deposit containing much burnt material (823) overlay and blended with both of the underlying deposits (816) and (822), making subdivision impossible to define. Within the cut feature [804] were the clay-bonded remains of a foundation course of stones [800]. No such foundations were noted in [817]. Also within [804] was what appeared to be the in situ remains of a burnt upright timber [820] sitting on a scorched and (?fire-)hardened surface (821). (819) was the cut in the natural subsoil that had also been scorched red by the burning episode.

The foundation cut [804] did not extend further east than the stone foundations [800], suggesting that this was the corner of the structure. In the north-west corner of the trench the natural had been levelled to produce a horizontal surface (see Figure 16, [815]). Beyond the corner of the structure the natural retained its original, uneven surface. The northern cut of [804] defined a very straight course whereas the southern edge, cut into the softer, overlying sandy natural (791) 'splayed out' towards the south-west where the stone foundations [800] were much wider than at the northeast corner. The former foundation stones also appeared to be mainly in situ as shown by their bonded nature and the soil-stained cut in (791). The reason for this widening is, at present, unknown. A suggestion may be made that it represents a 'porch-like structure', though this would require testing. The burnt timber upright appears to lay approximately 2


Figure 20. Profiles of foundation trenches [804] and [817]. See Figure 19 for relative positions.


Photo 9. The engraved stone found in the debris of the Trench 10 structures.
metres in from the presumed corner of the structure in the north-east of the trench. It is worth noting that thisspacing produces a fairly common bay width recognised in later medieval, small vernacular buildings across the northeast (Shepherd, 2021, 95).
[817] was also cut into the natural and is also considered to represent a foundation trench - both trenches appearing to have been dug at the same time. However, only scattered stones were present in [817], with the exception of the flat stone shown under the level number ' 327 ' in Figure 19. It is suggested that this narrower trench (see Figure 20, E-D and F-G) may have held upright timbers.

Finally, in the sections, (791) has been distinguished from (791a). Both are bright, orange sandy deposits that appear to be derived from the natural sub-glacial deposits immediately overlying the hard 'pan'. It is suggested that (791) is an in situ natural deposit whilst (791a) has been anthropologically re-deposited.

## Finds

With the exception of the few early modern pieces noted above, the only finds came from the north-east foundation deposit [800]. The first appears to have entered the deposit during one of the two destruction episodes. Whether it had formed a part of the original construction or was present within the structure as an artefact is impossible to say. It is an engraved piece of argillaceous metamorphosed sedimentary rock, similar to the local slates, and is likely to have been found locally. It appears to have been finished fairly smooth prior to a design of concentric circles being engraved on its surface. What remains is simply a fragment of the original engraving and, was itself, broken in two prior to or during deposition. Superficially, it bears a resemblance to a 'sun stone' found in Denmark and dated to the Neolithic (www.sciencealert.com/vasagard-danish-island-300-mysterious-sunstones-sun-worship). It is worth remembering that a piece of late neolithic or early bronze age pot was found during excavtion of this mound in 2019 (Ralston \& Shepherd, 2020, 9). Quite what the relationship of this piece is to the structure is difficult to say. It may simply have been a stray stone used in its construction but is more likely to have been found and kept as either a good-luck talisman or simply as an interesting curiosity.

The other finds seem to represent pieces of worked stone. Two appear to derive from the same craftsman owing to their similarity. What they represent is difficult to say, though they resemble stonework associated with window or door openings.

## Dating

Two charcoal samples were presented for C14 analysis: a piece of cherry wood from near the burnt post base [820] and a piece of pine from amongst the tumbled stones [800] at the east end of the foundation trench. The samples appear to confirm the identification of the charcaol remnants as belonging to a period not preceding the second half of the 1600s (SUERC-101067 and SUERC-101068). Sadly, owing to the calibration curve of the procedure, the latest date could be anything up to 1950 ! Realistically, however, it is unlikely that they date to any period after the mid 19th century owing to the map evidence available. These two matching dates, furthermore, suggest that the earlier 10th-century date from charcoal recovered in 2019 was either simply wrong or came from a much older piece of wood that had somehow become caught up in the local landscape by some unknown process.

The late medieval date also fits well with the other evidence uncovered that suggests a rectangular building of a type well-documented across the area. It is hoped that further work can be carried out here to discover more about the construction technique used. Although well-known from documentary sources, little archaeological work has been carried out on lower-status rural buildings of this period in the north-east. This, therefore, is a very useful addition to the archaeological record of the region.

## Discussion

Four major episodes characterise this trench, Firstly, the building of the structure. Secondly, the apparent destruction of that structure resulting in a large amount of burnt material. After this came a third period of abandonment with no evidence of archaeological activity until, finally, an episode of stone-robbing that greatly disturbed and muddled the deposits. It is suggested that this final phase may have occurred as a result of the requirement for stone to build the enclosure dykes of the Pittodrie policies around the beginning of the 19th century. Arguably, the archaeological earthworks remained a significant landscape feature prior to this final destruction as it certainly attracted the attention of workers seeking a convenient source of stone. This is also recognised as being the period of stone-robbing at the Bede House.

It is also worth noting the evidence supplied by two rentals pertaining to the Pittodrie Estate: the Logiedurno rental of 1636 ((MS 3043-70) and Pittodrie rental of 1771 (MS 2392). The former groups small agricultural units within the contexts of their larger fermtouns. Under 'Pittodrie' is mentioned Firboggs, Craigwell, Miln Croft, .... Mound Croft, .... Croft and Dorlethen. Sadly, two of the words are difficult to decipher in the document. The order appears to run from north to south - from Firboggs to Dorlethen. Craigwell is known to lie on the north side of the site, which leaves three sites to be inserted between there and Dorlethen. The three present crofts north of Dorlethen may have formed part of the lands pertaining to that particular fermtoun, although the later rental (see below) lists Muirtown as forming a part of Pittodrie. But, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that .... Mound Croft does not relate in some way to the mound being considered here.

If .... Mound Croft pertains to the mound considered here, Miln Croft is suggestive of a relationship with the Rush Mill, after which the burn appears to have been named. Quite where that lay is still open to conjecture, though the name implies a connection with that particular burn. Finally, there was a third croft about which nothing can realistically be said at this time. However, a consideration of the rents paid is quite interesting and shows that Craigwell and Miln Croft were assessed highest at 20 marks each, whilst .... Mound Croft paid 5 just marks and the unknown croft paid $£ 46 \mathrm{~s}$ - slightly more than .... Mound Croft. Clearly, Craigwell was a more substantial holding, which may indicate why it survived into later periods. If the Miln Croft was responsible for the running of the mill, that would have explained its higher value. But, these two holdings - Craigwell and .... Miln Croft - were rated higher than any other croft noted in this rental.

| Fermtoun/croft | Est. value (fsd Sterling) | Infield | Outfield | Pasture | Moor | Moss | Plantings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mains of Pittodery inc. the |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| leitt waird and the whin park of Craigmiln | 47.4.4 | 48 | 40 | 47 |  |  | 219 |
| Gardeners Croft | 2.2.0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Croft of Craigwell | 4.13 .6 | 6 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Part of the Braeside | 4.19 .7 | 6 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Doubstown | 7.1.10 | 7 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |
| Ditto part of Braeside | 2.18 .6 | 4 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Rush miln croft | 1.6.? | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Ditto Braeside | 2.0.0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Ditto | 2.13 .6 | 4 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Saughen Waird croft | 4.0.6 | 4 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Wairdside croft | 5.1.8 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Guttertown | 4.18 .6 | 7 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |
| Craignathunder | 3.6 .6 | 4 | 3 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Clubb | 2.16 .10 | 4 | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Part of Braeside | 0.11.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Muirtown | 3.14 .2 | 5 | 2 | 13 |  |  |  |
| Pasture ground used in common among the crofts in the Braeside | 0.0.0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  |  |  |
| Farm of Dorlethen | 14.18 .10 | 17 | 41 | 50 |  |  | 3 |
| Hill, moor and moss part of Benduphigh | 0.0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1179 | 59 |  |

Table 1. Rental for Pittodrie, 1771 (MS 2392, University of Aberdeen Special Collections).
Moving forward to the 1771 rental, it can be seen that the hillside had become more populated with small-holdings. Whether the same general north to south ordering of the holdings applied to this rental is hard to know. Table 1 lists the holdings recorded and the rents paid in the Pittodrie part of the rental. ${ }^{2}$ It should be noted that, by this time, rents were calculated in $£$ Sterling rather than $£$ Scots, which accounts for the apparent rental decrease between this rental and the earlier one.

For the purposes of this note, the detail of this interesting rental will not be gone into here. But, it can be seen that .... Mound Croft had ceased to be mentioned, though Rush Miln Croft was still in existence. The rent for this had fallen dramatically and, it might suppose, its mill had fallen out of use by this time, leaving it as the lowliest of all holdings on this part of the hill. Speculatively, it may be reflected in the longhouse discovered by Barry Foster just north of the Rushmill Burn. It might also be suggested that other remains uncovered in the present excavations are probably to be associated with some of the other holdings listed here. Quite which one is which, however, is probably unlikely to ever be resolved unless further documents come to light. Although, for the moment, the structure found in Trench 10 may have a good claim to being the .... Mound Croft of the 1636 rental. If so, this low status, rural structure would, at the moment, be unique in the North-east for sharing both documentary and archaeological evidence from this period.

2 It is interesting to note that Firbogs no longer formed a part of the Pittodrie fermtoun lands and that Muirtown and Dorlethen did. It is not impossible that Muirtown had formerly been a part of Dorlethen's holdings and that the Rushmill Burn marked the divide between Pittodrie and Dorlethen.
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|  | ${ }^{1!50 d ə a}$ | ${ }^{11}$ | 0＋L |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }^{1!}$ sodad | ${ }^{1+1}$ | $6 ¢ L$ |
|  | ！ 1 ！ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (uoupos } \\ & \text { Iodd } \mathrm{C}) \mathrm{IL} \end{aligned}$ | 8 8L |
|  |  | ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~L}$ | LEL |
| （६9L）әлояв <br>  | ${ }^{1 \text { ssoda }}$ a | ${ }^{\text {tr }}$ | $9 £ L$ |
|  <br>  <br>  | ${ }_{1}^{1!50 d o}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{\text {¹ }}$ L | ¢¢L |
| т！os uмоля | ！ 1 ［sodod |  | † ¢ L |
|  | ${ }_{1}^{1!50 d e}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | （uоற̣วง | $\varepsilon £ L$ |
|  <br>  | ${ }^{1!}$ sodad |  | г¢L |
|  | H！sodea | ${ }^{91}$ | I $£ 2$ |
|  | H！${ }^{\text {sodod }}$ | （uоุ̣วง I．add $\cap$ ）$て \mathrm{I} \mathrm{L}$ | O¢L |
|  <br>  | ${ }^{1 \text { Isoda }}$ a | （นо̣̣วง add $\cap$ ）$て 1 \mathrm{~L}$ | 6 CL |
| иب̣ имодq uп！ | ${ }_{1}$［soded | 91 | 872 |
| CGavavoxa ktina lon： <br>  <br>  | ${ }^{1 \text { ISoded }}$ | $\underset{\text { ıodd } \cap \text { ）}}{\text {（uopas }}$ | LZL |
|  | H．sodea | ${ }^{11}$ | 972 |
| uopduprsa | ${ }^{\text {ad }} \mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{L}}$ | вa．रV |  |



|  | $\because$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{80}{20}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \％ | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\pm$ | $=$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc+$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\simeq$ | $\simeq$ | $\simeq$ | $\simeq$ | $\simeq$ | $\simeq$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{y}{Z} \\ & \frac{E}{4} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{9}{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | cin |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 彩 } \\ & \text { 岩 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 范 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Overlies（753）．Abuts and appears to overlie | Underlies（717）．Overlies（720）and（757）． |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 合 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |
| $\stackrel{\circ}{8}$ | 哀 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 言 } \\ & \text { 亮 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 高 } \\ & \text { 亯 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 言 } \\ & \text { 菏 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 言 } \\ & \text { 道 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 䓂 } \\ & \frac{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 落 } \\ & \frac{20}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 落 } \\ & \text { 合 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 䓂 } \\ & \text { 合 } \end{aligned}$ |
| \％ | $\Xi$ | F |  |  | $\Xi$ | $\Xi \pm$ | $\Xi \Xi$ |  | $\Xi$ | \％ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\cong$ | $\cong$ |
| 㜢 | F | $\ddagger$ | 先 | 年 | ¢ | き | 알윤 |  | $\bar{s}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | n | 寺 | in | 员 |



| Feature |  |  |  |  | era | Date |  |  |  | associations | Quantity | Shard | Glass | Glass | Quantity | Quantity | Quantity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 772 | Tr10 | Deposit | Gritty white crumbly matrix that may be the same as (751) recognised in 2019. Seems to be part of the stone-robbing episode and may simply be a sub-set of (720)/(794). Seals (794) and also underlying contexts that appear to represent the original destruction of the structure. |  | ?19th c. |  | 15 | West, North |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | yes |
| 773 | Tr10 | Deposit | Whitish ochre coloured light sandy matrix. Probably simply part of (772). |  | ?19th c . | 08/07/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 774, 833 | Tr2 (Mid Section) | Deposit | Orange loam with stone $5-6 \mathrm{~cm}$ inclusions below (702). Layer becomes darker within top few centimetres. | (This context was renumbered here for section drawings). |  | 08/07/2021 | 15 | West, North |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | yes |
| 775 | Tr7 | Deposit | Loose, soft, blackish-brown soil with small branches \& bracken roots present. | This soil is believed to be the rotted down leaf litter layer. Rich in organics and turns to a more stable brown soil with time. | Modern | 07/07/2021 |  | 17 | $5-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gun cartridge | yes |
| 776 | Tr7 | Deposit | Sandy dark greyish brown compact soil. Inclusions: $5 \%$ stones (round) up to 5 cm in diameter. 3 stones 15 cm in size ( 2 sub-rounded other angular. | A patch of ash $5 \mathrm{~cm} \times 1 \mathrm{~cm} \times 1 \mathrm{~mm}$ thick plus small flakes of charcoal present located at the west end of trench. Also two possible cobble stones. One looked as if it may have been worked on three sides. Those stones were 'floating' in soil and therefore noted here but left on site. |  | 08/07/2021 |  | 17, 19 | c. 34 cm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | yes |
| 777 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tr7 (east } \\ & \text { end) } \end{aligned}$ | Deposit | Sand, compact light orange stony soil. Inclusions: stones c .5 cm . Roots (bracken and trees) present. | Now thought to be 'soft natural. | Glacial ? | 08/07/2021 |  | 17 | c. 7 cm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 778 | Tr7 | Deposit | Leaf litter. | Leaf litter covering entire trench. | Modern | 08/07/2021 |  | 17 | 5 cm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 779 | Tr9 | Deposit | Grass turfleaf liter. | Covers the entire trench. | Modern | 11/07/2021 |  | $\begin{gathered} 19,20,21, \\ 22,24 \end{gathered}$ | 2 cm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 780 | Tr9 | Deposit | Brown soil without significant stones (stone very rare in up slope area). Gritty with small stones in down slope area. Grades laterally next to wall/dyke [AN]/[AJ] into darker soil with more roots (waterlogged). *Context sheet (786) show this context under (780) and over (792). | Associated with phase 2 dyke? Several fragments of green bottle glass, white pottery shards and charcoal pieces were recovered from the upper area of trench west of the enclosure wall/dyke [AN]/[AJ]. |  | 11/07/2021 |  | $\underset{24}{19,21,22,}$ |  |  |  | yes | yes |  |  |  | yes |
| 781 | Tr9 \& Tr13 (east side of enclosure dyke [AN]/[AJ]) | Deposit | Grity brown soil with orange clayey pieces. | Small fragment of charcoal found within (781). This layer overlay natural. Context (781) appear to be the fill of a weathered path/channel running along the outside of the enclosure wall/dyke [AN][AJ]. It would appear that 'natural' consist of alternating bands of hard and soft strata. The hard band here has been broken through (by human/animal) traffic or by water action? and this was later filled by (781). Context (781) has been noted as 'possible plough furrows [AR] infilled with brown gritty soil (781)' (see feature sheet [AR]). Also context (781) is shown as possibly the same as (792) in section no. 19 . |  | 12/07/2021 |  | 19, 20 | c. 5 -c. 16 cm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | yes |
| 782 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tr8 (north } \\ & \text { side of } \\ & \text { enclosure } \\ & \text { dyke [AJ]) } \end{aligned}$ | Deposit | Loam, loose, soft brown-black soil. 'The soil has a mixture of large and small grains'. | Thought to be rotted roots within context (767)? |  | 12/07/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 783 | $\stackrel{\text { Tr8 }}{\substack{\text { Tr8 } \\ \text { (0utside }}}$ | ${ }^{\text {Deposit }}$ | Leaf liter. | Covered entire trench area. | Modern | 12/07/2021 | 20 | ${ }_{23}^{26}$ | 2 cm | 788 789 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 784 | Tr8 (outside south of enclosur dyke [AJ] dyke [AJ] | Deposit | Dark humic soil. | Rotted down leaf litter. Noted as being 'very wet'. | Modern | 12/07/2021 |  | 23, 26 | 7 cm | 789 |  |  |  |  |  | yes |  |
| 785 | Tr8 (outside south of dyke [AJ]) | Deposit | Light brown soil. | Described as being well sorted. Amongst the small finds recoded was what appears to be a lump of resin like substance but not quite yet fossilized. | Modern | 12/07/2021 |  | 26,28 | 19 cm |  | yes | yes | yes |  |  | yes | yes |
| 786 | Tr9 \& Tr13 | Deposit | Brown soil, gritty with stones $2-8 \mathrm{~cm} .3$ large stones up to 0.40 m long at 0.80 m up slope from wall [AN]/[AJ]. Somewhat similar to (781) context to the outside of the enclosure. | *Context sheet sketch show (786) below (780) and runs eastwards up to enclosure dyke [AN]. ' Possible subset of ( 780 )?' This layer was relatively rich in small finds including the perfume? bottle dispenser top the same type of which was recovered from the north room in the 'Bede House'. Context (786) is shown as possibly equal to (770) (see section no. 19). Context (786) continued on the east side of enclosure dyke [AN]. |  | 22/07/2021 |  | $\underset{24}{19,21,22,}$ | c. 17 cm |  |  | yes | yes |  |  | Gun cartridge; Perfume? bottle top | yes |

Appendix 1 - Contexts (continued)


| Feature |  |  |  |  | era | Date |  |  |  | associations | Quantity | Shard Quantity | $\begin{gathered} \text { Glass } \\ \text { Quantity } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Glass } \\ \text { Quantity } \end{gathered}$ | Quantity | Quantity | Quantity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 799 | Tr10 | Deposit | Grey-brown soil with charcoal and possibly a high humus content. Overlay disturbed structure [800] and interleaved with (791). Appears related to the initial destruction of building. Charcoal possibly accrued from underlying burnt deposits. Probably the interface surface of (822) and (823). |  | ? |  | 17 | South |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | yes |
| 802 | Tr10 | Deposit | Grey-brown soil punctured by feature [793]. Relationship with (795) presently unclear. Possibly associated with (794). |  | ? |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 803 | Tr10 | Deposit | Pinky-orange sandy matrix underlying (797) and sealing (816). Top surface in the westfacing section shows a creamy-clayey lens separating it from (797). (Not shown on plans as considered to be an extension of (791a) at the time.) |  | ? |  |  | West, North |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 805 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tr9 (west } \\ & \text { end) } \end{aligned}$ | Deposit | Orangey/brown soil. Relatively soft. | This context appear to lay only west (up slope) and partly sealed by feature wall/dyke [AS]. *Charcoal sample sent for Carbon-14 dating. *Wood sample identified as 'Alder' (see email 21/09/2021). C-14 dating - Radiocarbon Age BP: $2424+/-26$ years i.e. Iron Age (see SUERC letter 29/11/2021). |  | 27/07/2021 |  | 19,22, 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 806 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Tr} 7 \text { (east } \\ & \text { end) } \end{aligned}$ | Deposit | Metalled surface? (remains of). Consist of soft sandy orange (natural?) material between stones ranging between $5-10 \mathrm{~cm}$. Depth of layer approx. 10 cm . | Layer looks like natural which has been seen elsewhere on site consisting of a hard pan layer forming a band within soft glacial material. Context (806) appear to lay within a rectangular artificially cleared area stripped of organic soils and flattened for an unknown purpose and therefore taken here as of archaeological significance. Possibly related to features in Tr 4 and Tr 6 . |  | 04/08/2021 | 18 |  | c. 10 cm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 807 | Tr8 (outside south of enclosure dyke [AJ]) | Deposit | Light brown clay material. | Note fully excavated. Thought likely to be geological deposit of clay material filling a natural gully? | Glacial | 05/08/2021 | 20 | 28 | $19+$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | yes |
| 808 | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Tr} 7 \text { (east } \\ & \text { end) } \end{aligned}$ | Deposit | Brown loam compact soil. Inclusions: Stones 510 cm scattered. Lenses of paler clayey soil. | - Forms bank $4[\mathrm{AU}]$ at east end of $\operatorname{Tr} 7$. Two small charcoal flakes found (c. 1 cm long). ' 2 'tessera' type stones found separately - one with slate coloured surface, one with red surface'. Interpretation: Thought to be of archeologically significance and likely to be related to features in nearby Tr4 and Tr6. | 20th C? | 05/08/2021 | 18 | 17 |  |  | yes |  |  |  |  |  | yes |
| 809 | Tr8 (north side of enclosure dyke [AJ]) | Deposit | Sandy gravely, light yellow crumbly splodge. 'Compact and smooth on top, giving way to sandy gravely stuff. Compact section is roughly $2-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ deep. When smooth surface is broken, it turns into a sandy gravel - seems to be all the same soil.' | Context (809) below (793) and above (814). |  | 05/082021 | 20 | 23 | $\begin{aligned} & 2-15 \mathrm{~cm} \\ & \text { tapering out } \\ & \text { to nothing } \\ & \text { towards } \\ & \text { enclosure } \\ & \text { dyke [AJ]. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | yes |
| 811 | Tr9 | Deposit | Orange/buff subsoil, stony. | This subsoil layer appear at the west end of $\operatorname{Tr} 9$ and fizzles out towards the enclosure dyke [AN]/[AJ]. |  | 09/08/2021 | 19 | 19, 22,24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 812 | Tr12 | Deposit | Fine, soft, light soil | Overlaid partly by stony layer [AW] which is believed to be the 'hearting' stones of [AJ] dislodged during early ruinous phase. |  | 09/08/2021 |  | 25 | c. 12 cm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 813 \\ & 814 \end{aligned}$ | Tr12 <br> Tr8 (north side of enclosure dyke [AJ]) | $\xrightarrow{\text { Deposit }}$ Deposit | Fine, soft, loose, orangey browny yellow soil. Clay, fine, loose, light brown crumbly soil. 'light but sticky brown soil. Some darker patches, but those look the same as the rabbit burrows above. Approximately 10 cm deep. | NOT FULLY EXCAVTED <br> Shard of blue and white pottery found under the hard, sandy smooth surface. Directly below the pottery is a hard, black section (tree root/burrow). Lots of rocks near the dyke'. Believed to be the demolition of enclosure dyke [AJ]. |  | $\begin{aligned} & 09 / 08 / 2021 \\ & 09 / 08 / 2021 \end{aligned}$ | 20 | $\begin{gathered} 25,31 \\ 23,33,34 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\text { c. } .10 \mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{~cm}+}{ }$ |  |  | yes | yes |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { yes } \\ & \text { yes } \end{aligned}$ |
| 816 | Tr10 | Deposit | Extensive area of burnt material. Stones sit on top. Overlays (791a). Suggested as collapsed wall material. |  | historic? | 12/08/2021 | * | West, North |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 818 | Tr10 | Deposit | Burnt deposit within cut [804] and between stones [800]. |  | historic? | 12/08/2021 | * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 819 | Tr10 | Deposit | Burnt edge of cut resulting from burning of timber post. |  | historic? | 12/08/2021 | * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 822 | Tr10 | Deposit | Burnt deposit filling foundation trench [817]. |  | historic? | 12/08/2021 | * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 823 | Tr10 | Deposit | Area of dark brown soil with charcoal merging with (813) and (816) at their interface |  | historic? | 12/08/2021 | * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 824 | Tr10 | Deposit | Black burnt deposit under (720) seen in eastfacing section. |  | ?19th c . | 12/08/2021 | * | East |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 825 | Tr6 \& Tr11 | Deposit | Leaf litter. | Leaf litter covering trench area. | Modern | 12/08/2021 |  | 27 | $4-20 \mathrm{~cm}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Appendix 2 - Feature Contexts

| Context <br> Feature | Area | Type | Description | Notes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Accession } \\ & \text { Date } \end{aligned}$ | Plan No. | Section No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Tr1 | Wall | Drystane wall for building [AM] consisting of large facing stones with small stone pinning and hearting. This building in general overlay the alignment of the enclosure dyke [AJ], [AC] and possibly [AF] at a different angle and is evidently later than those features. | Extant wall length: $=9.80 \mathrm{~m}$ to where it appear to be cut by water coarse that is fed by Craigwell. Width: $=0.80 \mathrm{~m}$ ( 31 inches or 2 ft 6 "). Height: from top of wall [A] = 0.40 m (at highest point of inner side of wall down to lowest point of outside of wall, west facing). Next stone to south ca. 0.30 m high and sitting 0.75 m down to bottom of foundation stones [U]. Possible floor cobbles under (750) in southwest corner of building next to wall [A]. See photo DSC08977 | 02/07/2018 | 5, 9, 13 | 11 |
| B | Tr2 | Feature | Collection of stones up to 0.20 m in diameter. Most of the stones are set into (712) overlaid by (711) and partially covered by it. Thickness of stones is 0.30 m . More stone concentrated on west side of trench than on east side. Stone feature directly above break of slope midway down slope of the Mound [AG] with grey material (wattle and daub?, same as in $\operatorname{Tr} 5$ above brake of slope at top of mound [AG]) seem to be associated. Stone spread below is thought likely to have come from this feature. | Located at c .25 m point midway down slope of Mound [AG]. Andrew's note in context sheet 'Could have been drystane structure with organic material infilling voids'. | 22/07/2019 |  |  |
| C | Tr5 | Earthwork | Linear boundary feature. | Feature [C] was noted as a slight rise in the ground level with different vegetation at the northern end of Tr 5 . Feature [C] appears to be c .1 .5 m in width. It is though possible that this may once have formed an earlier trackway boundary - an earlier forerunner to the current 'Turnpike' path. Alternatively, it is thought possibly to be the remains of one wall of a turf walled building that may have sat on top of this Mound [AG]. | 23/07/2019 | 3 | 12 |
| D | Tr2 <br> (Lower <br> Section) | Wall/dyke? | Stones up to 0.25 m in diameter. Loosely fitted. Surrounded by grey material (723). Appear only to be one or two stones deep. Thought possibly to be the remains of a drystain dyke or a wattle and daub structure? | Feature located between the 23 m and 24 m points towards the edge of the flat rampart midway down Mound [AG]. | 01/08/2019 | 12 | 16 |
| E | Tr1 | Wall | East wall of building [AM] consisting of drystane construction of large stones with small stone pinning and hearting. | Wall covered with context (700). Wall consisting of drystane construction of large facing stones with hearting surviving to one stone high. Large southeast corner stone shared with wall [W] and also both walls foundation $[\mathrm{X}]$. Width of wall $[\mathrm{E}]=0.85 \mathrm{~m}$. Extant length of wall $[\mathrm{E}]=3.60 \mathrm{~m}$ running North to South. Traces of wall $[\mathrm{E}]$ seem to continue northwards and may have been cut by the re-cutting of the water coarse from Craigwell. | 05/08/2019 | 5,13 | 13 |
| F | Tr1 | Floor | Cobbled floor surviving as two patches within building [AM] west of wall [E]. | The larger patch of surviving cobbles measure 0.90 m by 0.70 with a thickness of c .0 .07 m . The smaller patch measure c .0 .45 m by c .0 .38 m . | 05/08/2019 | 5,13 | 11,13,14 |
| G | Tr5 | Stone feature |  |  | 08/08/2019 | 3,6 | 12 |
| H | Tr5 | Feature |  |  | 08/08/2019 | 3, 6 | 12 |
| I | Tr3 | Wall | A very wide east to west running wall. Consisting of very large stones (recorded in context sheet of up to 1.5 m long by 0.80 m wide) consisting of granitic, gabbro, jasper \& quartz. Extant wall length: c. 4 m , wall width: c. 1.40 m . | Wall is built onto natural subsoil. This subsoil has been reduced in high on either side of wall $[I]$ to leave the wall standing proud of the neighbouring ground surface. To the south is what appear to be a gully [T] and on the north possibly a cobbled area of feature [M] | 19/08/2019 | 7 | 3 |
| J | Tr3 | Wall | Remains of a north to south running wall consisting of stones up to 0.45 m in size. It appear to be running at $70-75$ degrees angle to wall [I]. Wall length 2.50 m (remaining), wall width 0.80 m and is thought to extend under stone pile [S] | It is unsure if a large stone $(0.90 \mathrm{~m}$ by 0.75 m$)$ to the south of and in line with wall $[\mathrm{J}]$ is associated. | 19/08/2019 | 7 | 1,3,9 |
| K | Tr3 | Stone feature | Cobbled area along the outside of or foundation stones to wall [J]. Located between wall [I] and possible door step/threshold [L]. | It is noted in David Richards context sheet '... Suggest strongly that $[\mathrm{K}]$ is younger than $[\mathrm{I}]^{\prime}$ | 19/08/2019 | 7 | 6 |
| L | Tr3 | Feature | Large very flat topped stone $(0.50 \mathrm{~m}$ by 0.30 m$)$ within line of wall [J]. | Possible door step or threshold leading from cobbled surface? [AD] which run parallel with platform $[\mathrm{N}]$ on its north side down to path? $[\mathrm{M}]$ eastwards. | 19/08/2019 | 7 |  |
| M |  | Path? | Possible a roughly laid stone path leading up to feature [L] | Possibly a farm yard? This feature remain mainly unexcavated and further obstructed by the presence of the stone pile [ S ] with many loose overlaying stones making it difficult to interpret. | 19/08/2019 | 7 |  |
| N | Tr3 | Feature | Roughly laid stone feature with clear edging. Possible building platform similar to in Tr1. Consisting of rough cobbles/stones of $0.25 \mathrm{~m}-0.40 \mathrm{~m}$ in size. Platform appear now as being laid simi-horizontaly and very uneven surface. | Possible cobbled floor but more likely a damp proofing platform layer. Feature [N] seem to abut and respect wall [ J$]$ to the east. The area directly north of $[\mathrm{N}]$ is hollow and now full of loam soil (704). Under (704) was found possibly the remains of a cobbled surface [AD] laid upon the natural subsoil and at a lower level to the stone platform [ N ]. | 19/08/2019 | 7 | 1,9 |
| o | Tr3 | Cobbles? | A scatter of stones that are reminiscent of cobbling? Possibly associated with remains of feature $[\mathrm{P}]=$ wall?. | Feature [O] is very ruinous and difficult to make sense of. May be associated with feature [P]. Located directly south and possibly partly disturbed by the cutting/recutting of water course. Feature [O] consist of a fairly jumbled collection of stones of $0.15 \mathrm{~m}-0.40 \mathrm{~m}$ in size laying on gritty to clayey natural (715). Two large stones up to 0.90 m by 0.80 m may indicate original position of a now lost wall/dyke $[\mathrm{P}]$. A fragment of slate was found laying on feature [O]. Feature [O] was covered by the upcast (714) bank [R] from the cutting/re-cutting of the nearby water course. | 19/08/2019 | 7 |  |
| P | Tr3 | Wall? | Possible a very ruinous wall/dyke? west of stone pile [S] and possibly partly covered by [S]. Stones generally were between $0.25 \mathrm{~m}-0.30 \mathrm{~m}$ with some up to 0.50 m in size. | Feature possibly associated with $[\mathrm{O}]=$ cobbles?. Feature $[\mathrm{P}]$ covered by upcast bank [R] from the cutting/recutting of the nearby water course. | 19/08/2019 |  |  |


| Context Feature | Area | Type | Description | Notes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Accession } \\ & \text { Date } \end{aligned}$ | Plan No. | Section No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q | Tr3 | Cut | The cutting/re-cutting (canalisation) of the water course from Craigwell via the possible mill pond. Width of cut 0.50 m | Thought probably to be the canalisation of a once natural water course. Possibly to facilitate activities to do with buildings in Tr 1 and Tr 3 . Also this may have been to improve drainage. The final re-cutting $[\mathrm{Q}]$ was done after the abandonment of the stone structures in Tr 3 and possibly in Tr 1 . This was done probably after the stone from those structures having been reduced for re-use to ground level. This re-cutting cut though the foundation layers of those structures with the discarded stones forming stone pile [S] and possible others likely piles in the area. The soil upcast material formed (714) of bank [R] | 19/08/2019 | 7 | 2 |
| R | Tr3 | Earthwork | Upcast embankment parallel to burn (water course) from Craigwell. Width 1.50 m and c .20 m noted | Upcast material (714). | 19/08/2019 | 7 | 2 |
| S | Tr3 | Stone pile | Large heap of stones forming a stone pile measuring c .3 m by c .3 m . Feature [ S ] is made up of stones $0.20 \mathrm{~m}-$ 0.40 m in size partly covered with upcast soil (714). Seem to cover part of feature [O] (= cobbles?). | Upcast from cutting/re-cutting neighbouring water course through the stone structures within $\operatorname{Tr} 3$ (thought to be foundations to several building phases) that once was situated in this area | 19/08/2019 | 7 |  |
| T | Tr3 | Earthwork | A gully laying 2-3m south of wall [I] with a width of c. $0.50 \mathrm{~m}, 0.30 \mathrm{~m}$ deep and 8 m long (unexcavated). |  | 19/08/2019 | 7 |  |
| U | Tr1 | Wall | Foundation stones for building [AM] beneath wall [A]. Those foundation stones are bounded by clay (742). | Foundation appear to be made up of medium to large size stones i.e. c. 0.36 m upwards. Length of foundations excavated $=\mathrm{c} .0 .60 \mathrm{~m}$ and extended c .0 .40 m below wall [A]. Height from top of wall [A] down to bottom of foundation stones $=0.75 \mathrm{~m}$ | 19/08/2019 |  | 11 |
| v | Tr4 | Feature | Stone feature (wall/dyke/stone marker?), surviving to only one stone high. | On the west side of this feature [V] it appears that it sits directly onto soft natural that was found to be 0.20 m thick over hard natural and is covered by context (735). East side of this feature [V]: Top of stones down to hard natural here is ca. 0.45 m i.e. no soft natural present. This would suggest possible cultivation on the down slope side and that the ground had been dug over mixing the soft natural with the organic soil producing a deeper garden soil. Feature [V] width: c .0 .54 m with excavated length across width of trench is 1 m on an approximate N . S alignment. | 20/08/2019 | 8 | 4 |
| W | Tr1 | Wall | South wall of building [AM] consisting of drystane construction of large stones with small pinning stones and hearting. | Wall [W] share the same very large corner stone [X] with wall $[\mathrm{E}]$ to form the foundation. Length of wall $[\mathrm{W}]=4.90 \mathrm{~m}$ (outside to outside of walls $[\mathrm{A}]$ and $[\mathrm{E}]$ ) by 0.89 m thick. Extant high at the southeast corner $=$ c. 0.60 m . | 22/08/2019 | 13 | 13 |
| X | Tr1 | Wall | Feature $[\mathrm{X}]$ is the corner foundation stone for the south and east walls respectfully i.e. walls [W] and [E] of building [AM]. |  | 29/08/2019 | 13 | 13 |
| Y | Tr6 | Earthwork | Linear earthwork along south side of hollow-way [AL]. | It is though likely that this is the upcast from the construction of the hollow-way [AL] that crosses the site. Feature [Y] has a c. 2 m wide spread. (It should be noted here that it is very difficult to determine this feature's dimensions since it easily blends into the background and further due to vegetation cover). The height of $[\mathrm{Y}]$ is c .0 .60 . | 04/09/2019 | 4 | 5 |
| Z | Tr4 | Earthwork | Soil bank along hollow-way reaching a high of c. 0.50 m within area of Tr 4 | The northern part of this earthwork bank might be the upcast from the construction of the hollow-way [AL] that run immediately north of trench 4 . There is a gap between bank $[\mathrm{Z}]$ and bank $[\mathrm{Y}]$ immediately to the west. It is thought possible that this may have been a trackway or entrance through those banks. Bank [Z] appear to be part of a much more complicated series of earthworks in this area including an apparent flat rectangular shaped area (This feature was sectioned; See 2021 Tr7). Beneath bank [Z] a stone feature (wall/dyke?) [V] was found. | 04/09/2019 | 4 | 5 |
| AA | Tr1 | Drain cover | Stone drain cover within building [AM] running approximately N -S along wall [A]. | The drain was found mid section along is uncovered length to be accessible through the removal of several roofing slates that spanned and sat on the drain walls. | 04/09/2019 | 5, 9 (overlay to plan5), 13 |  |
| AB | Tr1 | Cut | Cut into (747) (possible natural subsoil) |  | 04/09/2019 | 10 |  |
| AC |  | Dyke | The discreet part of enclosure dyke [AJ] located to the west of Tr1. | Irvine's dyke - This stone feature was uncovered on our last day of the season on site (i.e. 29 Aug 2019). It proved to be part of the enclosure dyke [AJ] and aligned with the northwest corner of [AJ] and wall [I] in Tr 3 . Both the inner and out faces of the dyke were revealed. Dyke [AC] was found to be constructed from field clearing stones surviving to at least two stones high in this area. Length uncovered from vegetation overburden was 1.95 m . Width of the dyke here is between c .0 .86 m 0.90 m wide. | 15/10/2019 | 14 |  |
| AD | Tr3 | Cobbles | Possible cobbled surface to the north of $[\mathrm{N}]$ (= stone platform? feature) leading eastwards to what appear to be a doorway threshold or step [L]. | Feature [AD] was found to be under rich black loam turf soil (704) and consist of circa fist size stones laid directly onto the natural subsoil. Only traces remain to suggest a cobbled area. Adjacent at a higher level to the south is feature $[\mathrm{N}]$ thought to be possibly a building platform and likely to be associated with [AD] | 07/11/2019 |  |  |
| AE | Tr6 | Cut | Appear to be a gully cut into the hard natural subsoil along the south side of the hollow-way [AL]. Material from this appear to form bank [Y] bisected in Tr6. |  | 29/12/2019 |  | 5,21,27 |
| AF | Tr1 | Feature | Hard packed + stones along alignment of enclosure dyke in $\operatorname{Tr} 1$ | [AF] appear to be part of an early phase that took place outwith the enclosure dyke [AJ] on its north side. This was subsequently build over by building [AM]. Several earthworks located to the east of [AF] may be associated with it or to the later phase. | 29/12/2019 | 5, 10, 14 |  |

## Appendix 2 - Feature Contexts (continued)

| Context Feature | Area | Type | Description | Notes | Accession Date | Plan No. | Section No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AG | Tr2 <br> (Upper, Mid and Lower Sections), Tr5 (2019); Tr10 (2021) | Earthwork | Pittodrie Mound in general. | It would appear that this naturally occurring hillock was anthropologically raised by at least 1 m . It has a noticeable rampart midway down its east and southern slops. The northern side slope appear to have been damaged by the possible excavation for an apparent Mill Pond [AQ] feature. Mound [AG] also has sustained damage to its west side by the cutting of the current 'Turnpike' path and adjacent early 19th Century boundary dyke. Around the top edge of the mound was recovered a charcoal sample C-14 dated to the 10th Century from what appear to be a wattle and daub structure [AI] (2019). Excavation has shown the remains of a building that once stood on top of this mound. It is tentatively proposed that this might be the named '... Mound Croft' in the 1636 estate rentals. Also recovered within the foundations of this building was a possible 'sunstone' of a similar discription to once found in Denmark (2021). | 29/12/2019 | 3 (1) |  |
| AH | Tr2 (Upper Section) | Feature | Large stone - Imbedded within an anthropologically deposited layer that was used to raise the mound [AG]. Stone is located to the east side at bottom of trench. |  | 29/12/2019 |  | 7 |
| AI | Tr5 | Feature | Appear to be a wattle \& daub structure (palisade?). <br> Next to break of slope (rampart) at top of Mound [AG] |  | 30/12/2019 | 6 | 12 |
| AJ |  | Feature | Pittodrie enclosure dykes in general. | Enclosure dyke consist of field clearing stones. Some of very considerable size. Width: (were trackway [AL] break through enclosure dyke on west side of site) $=$ $0.85 \mathrm{~m})$; at $[\mathrm{AC}]=0.86 \mathrm{~m}$ wide. A straight line can be drawn between the northwest corner of enclosure [AJ] with [AC] and big wall [I] in the far northeast corner area and all seemingly part of this same structure. [AN] is the discreet part of the enclosure dyke on its east side within $\operatorname{Tr} 9 / \operatorname{Tr} 13$. | 30/12/2019 | 14, 20 | $\begin{aligned} & 25,28, \\ & 31,33 \end{aligned}$ |
| AK | Tr6 | Feature | Hard natural surface of hollow-way [AL] | The general description of the hollow-way surface as revealed in $\operatorname{Tr} 6$ and $\operatorname{Tr} 11$ is that it has signs of degradation by weathering and traffic. | 31/01/2020 | 4 | 5 |
| AL |  | Feature | Hollow-way in general running through Pittodrie enclosure [AJ]. | This hollow-way clearly breaks through the enclosure dyke [AJ] on the west side with a large stone being pushed to one side. The hollow-way exits in the northeast corner of [AJ]. It would seem that this hollowway was established after the enclosure [AJ] fell out of use. It would appear that the hollow-way served the buildings [AM] in Tr 1 and the several buildings present in Tr 3 . From this information a general chronology of the site can be gained. | 01/02/2020 | 14 | 5 |
| AM | Tr 1 | Feature | Building [AM] in general. Directly overlays but at an angle to the earlier enclosure dyke [AJ]. Presumably [AJ] no longer was standing at the time [AM] was built. Indeed the foundations of [AM] are recognisable as being the large stones re-used from the enclosure dyke [AJ]. | Consisting of context (750), including walls [A], [E], [W] |  |  |  |
| AN | Tr9 (east end) \& Tr13 | Feature | Enclosure wall/dyke, remains of. Consist of field clearance stones; typically 0.50 m but up to $1.20 \times 0.90$. x 0.70 m at least 20 m long clearly visible along $\mathrm{Tr} 9 / \mathrm{Tr} 13$. Biggest stones on outer and inner side faces with smaller pinning stone 'hearting' between. | [AN] is the discreet part of [AJ] (= enclosure wall/dyke in generally) within $\operatorname{Tr} 9$. Feature [AS] = wall/dyke lays 2.70 m westwards from [AN]. | 08/07/2021 | 19 | 19, 20, 21 |
| AO | Tr2 (Mid Section) | Feature | Collection of stones up to 25 cm . Rounded. Many in context. Some only separate. Covered by dark organic rich loam - probably (702) and may be (711). Stones lie within (774). Darker and more carb rich phase of (774) around stones ?soil? |  | 09/07/2021 |  |  |
| AP | Tr2 (Mid Section) | Feature | Collection of stones. Stones more of less in context. Up to 20 cm . Rounded. Overlain by dark peaty loam (702). Within orange pebbly fine grain loam with rounded stones to 6 cm stones lie within (774). Roots appear to cut through feature pushing stones apart. More deeper stones on east side of trench. |  | 09/07/2021 |  |  |
| AQ |  | Feature | Thought possibly to be a Mill Pond (General) | This feature appear to have cut part of the 'mound' [AG] on its north side and is fed by the water exiting Craigwell. | 09/07/2021 |  |  |
| AR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tr9 (east } \\ & \text { end) } \end{aligned}$ | Feature | Scarring on the natural subsoil surface. $[\mathrm{AR}]$ is a linear features recognised in the top hard natural at the east end of $\operatorname{Tr} 9$, aligning approximately N-S and parallel to enclosure dyke [AN]/[AJ]. Up to 60 cm long by 1 cm deep; infilled with brown gritty soil (781). | Geologists disgard glacial scarring. Thought possibly therefore to be the traces of plough furrow marks? It is interesting to note that the apparent later rig-and-furrow present in the area, and clearly seen on the University of Aberdeen LiDAR scan runs at 90 degrees orientation to [AR]. | 04/08/2021 | 19 | 19 |
| AS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tr9 (west } \\ & \text { end) } \end{aligned}$ | Feature | Stone structure set in moderately straight alignment but slightly off alignment to the main enclosure dyke [AN]/[AJ]. Feature approximately 0.40 m wide. Separated from main enclosure dyke [AN]/[AJ] by 2.7 m . | Possible a wall or a dyke? | 04/08/2021 | 19 | 19, 22, 24 |
| AT | Tr2 (Mid Section) | Feature | Group (tumble?) of stones. Stones to 25 cm , rough or rounded, granite etc. Almost touching in brown fine humic soil (702) and sitting on orange loam (712). Some stones below the main surface layer. These are seated within (712) but are limited to thin area. | Interpretation: Tumble although very close proximity to wall raises suspicions. | 04/08/2021 |  |  |
| AU | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tr7 (east } \\ \text { end) } \end{gathered}$ | Feature | Earthwork, bank no. 4 (see plan no.4-2019 season). Raised bank with convex sides. Approximately 5.70 m long (N-S) by approximately 1.80 m wide (E-W). | Possibly the upcase from a possible ditch like feature directly to the east. | 05/08/2021 | 18 | 17 |

## Appendix 2 - Feature Contexts (continued)



Appendix 3 - Small Finds and Samples Catalogue

| Entry No | Object Name | Material | Context No | Small Finds No | Location | Date | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 74 | Pottery Shards (x2) | Ceramic | U/S |  | Same as Cat.No.73. Found at same location. Found by Andrew Wainright \& Iain Ralston at site found by Colin Shepherd in 2019 halfway between Turnpike path junction and the Pittodrie Bede House. | 06/06/2021 | Cream glazed (traces only remaining) to outside on brown fabric. Unglazed to inside. |
| 75 | Pottery Shard | Ceramic | 717 |  | $\operatorname{Tr} 10$, found amongst the surface leaf litter. | 07/07/2021 | Cream glazed on cream coloured fabric with blue pattern to outside surface. |
| 76 | Pottery Shard | Ceramic | 780 |  | Tr9 | 12/07/2021 | Cream ware with white glazed to inside and out surfaces. |
| 77 | Pottery Shard | Ceramic | 780 |  | Tr9 | 12/07/2021 | Cream ware rim with off-cream glaze on both sides (smoke damage?) with brown band line around outside of rim. |
| 78 | Potter Shard | Ceramic | 782 or 767? |  | Tr8 | 12/07/2021 | Orange body shard. Thought possibly to be medieval in date. Found in context (782) which later proved to be no more than rotted root layer. This pottery shard may therefore be attributed to context (767) together with pottery shard Cat.No.79. |
| 79 | Potter Shard | Ceramic | 767 |  | Tr8 | 12/07/2021 | Orange body shard with slightly green tint glaze to both surfaces. Thought to be late medieval in date. |
| 80 | Slate | Stone | 785 |  | Tr8 | 12/07/2021 | Slate (x2) thin frags. only. |
| 81 | Glass (green) | Glass | 785 |  | Tr8 | 12/07/2021 | Very small frag. only. |
| 82 | Glass (green) | Glass | 780 |  | Tr9 | 12/07/2021 | Bottle glass (x2), one thick other thin, frags. |
| 83 | Glass (green) | Glass | 780 |  | Tr9 | 12/07/2021 | Bottle glass base frag. |
| 84 | Gun cartridge | Metal | 775 |  | Tr7 | 12/07/2021 | Metal end piece with firing indentation. |
| 85 | Gun cartridge | Metal | 769 |  | Tr9 | 07/07/2021 | Metal end piece with firing indentation. |
| 86 | Gun cartridge | Metal | 768 |  | Tr9 | 07/07/2021 | Metal end piece with firing indentation. Label reads 'base of 768 outside [AN]'. |
| 87 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 781 | Sample 13 | Tr9 | 12/07/2021 | Small charcoal frag. |
| 88 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 780 | Sample 12 | Tr9 | 12/07/2021 | Small charcoal frag. |
| 89 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 780 | Sample 11 | Tr9 | 12/07/2021 | Small charcoal frags. (x3). |
| 90 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 772 | 7, Sample 10 | Tr10 | 08/07/2021 | Small charcoal frags. (2 bags of). |
| 91 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 780 | Sample 14 | Tr9 | 21/07/2021 | Small charcoal frags. |
| 92 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 786 | Sample 15 | Tr9 | 22/07/2021 | Small charcoal frags. |
| 93 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 787 | Sample 16 | Tr8 (north end of trench) | 22/07/2021 | Small charcoal frags. (north end of trench near 'Granny's pot' shard). |
| 94 | Pottery Shard | Ceramic | 787 |  | Tr8 (north end of trench) | 22/07/2021 | Flat base of plate? shard with white background glaze on both sides with blue print on upper surface on cream coloured clay fabric. (Found at north end of trench near charcoal sample no.16). |
| 95 | Bottle top with tube dispenser | Metal/organic | 786 | 8 | TR9 | 22/07/2021 | Small bottle top from perfume? bottle. Tube dispenser protruding through top. Corroded top surface but can still see stamped wording ' 16 ', and 'B R O'?. Identical to one recovered from the north room of 'Bede House' during the 2018 excavation which has the same pattern of markings but a different central number. Presumably both may have come from 'London' as is stamped on the better preserved artefact. Suggested to be possibly Christmas gifts from the Laird to staff members i.e. Christmas hampers? Top has organic fibre seal inside. Found by David Richards. |
| 96 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | ? | Sample 22 | Tr10 | ?/07/2021 | Small charcoal frag. |
| 97 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | ? | Sample 23 | Tr10 | ?/07/2021 | Small charcoal frag. |
| 98 | Peat Sample | Organic | ? | Sample 21 | Tr10 | 22?/07/2021 | Large lump with several small frags. |
| 99 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 780 | Sample 11 | Tr9 | 12/07/2021 | Small charcoal frags. (x3). |
| 100 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 780 | Sample 12 | Tr9 | 12/07/2021 | Small charcoal frag. |
| 101 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 785 | Sample 17 | Tr8 | 26/07/2021 | Small charcoal frag. |
| 102 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 785 | Sample 18 | Tr8 | 27/07/2021 | Small charcoal frag. |
| 103 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 707 | Sample 19 | Tr11 | 26/07/2021 | Small burnt? lumps (several of). |
| 104 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 707 | Sample 20 | Tr11 | 27/07/2021 | Small charcoal frag. |
| 105 | Glass (green) | Glass | 786 |  | Tr9 | ?/07/2021 | Bottle glass (x8) including neck pieces and lip. |
| 106 | Glass (green) | Glass | 768 |  | Tr13 | 26/07/2021 | Bottle glass. Very thick. Though to come from the base. |
| 107 | Iron | Metal | 785 |  | Tr8 | 26/07/2021 | Two iron objects 1) nail shank? 2) flat blade like object with hole at one end. |
| 108 | Pottery Shard | Ceramic | 785 |  | Tr8 | 27/07/2021 | Four fragments that all join together of white fabric with white glaze on both sides. |
| 109 | Coin | Metal | 790 | 9 | Tr12 | 27/07/2021 | Small coin. Surfaces covered in copper oxide obscuring markings. D. 17.5 mm Th. 1 mm . |
| 110 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 776 | Sample 28 | Tr7 | 10/08/2021 | Small charcoal frags. (x4). |
| 111 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 814 | Sample 29 | Tr8 (central area) | 09/08/2021 | Several small charcoal frags. |
| 112 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 770 | Sample 30 | Tr 9 (outside of enclosure) | 10/08/2021 | Several small charcoal frags. |
| 113 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 781 | Sample 31 | Tr9 | 09/08/2021 | Small charcoal frag. |
| 114 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 787 | Sample 24 | Tr8 | 05/08/2021 | Small charcoal frags. (x2). |
| 115 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 805 | Sample 26 | Tr9 (soil sealed by wall/dyke [AS]) | 05/08/2021 | Small charcoal frag. Identified as Alder wood. C-14 dated to $2424+/-26$ years BP (Iron Age). |
| 116 | Charcoal Sample | Organic | 809 | Sample 27 | Tr8 | 05/08/2021 | Small charcoal frags. (x2). |
| 117 | Iron | Metal | 784 |  | Tr8 | 09/08/2021 | Iron lump with rectangular object evident. Extant length of object 18 mm W. 14 mm Th. 4 mm . |
| 118 | Glass (green) | Glass | 813 |  | Tr12 | 09/08/2021 | Bottle frag. |
| 119 | Pottery Shard | Ceramic | 814 |  | Tr8 | 09/08/2021 | Pottery shard of cream wear with flat bottomed? with edge. White glaze and blue pattern on all three surfaces. |
| 120 | Pottery Shard | Ceramic | 786 |  | Tr9 |  | Cream body, flat with white glaze surviving on one side. |
| 121 | Slate | Stone | 808 |  | Tr7 | 09/08/2021 | Very small frag. only. |
| 122 | Fossil? | Stone | 770 |  | Tr13 | 04/08/2021 | Shiny hard object imbedded into parent rock. Geologist onsite suggested possible fossil. |
| 123 | Fossilised resin? | Organic? | 785 |  | Tr8 | 04/08/2021 | Lump of light brown material. Shiny smooth on scrapping with finger nail. |
| 124 | Glass (green) | Glass | 786 |  | Tr9 |  | Bottle frag. |

Appendix 2 - Small Finds and Samples Catalogue (continued)

| Entry No | Object Name | Material | Context No S | Small Finds No | Location | Date | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 125 | Gun cartridge | Metal | 786 |  | Tr13 |  | Corroded metal end with traces of paper type material casing. |
| 126 | Incised Stone | Stone | [800] | 10 | Tr10 | 05/08/2021 | Stone in two parts that join together with eight concentric circles (ca. half of stone only recovered) with possibly several incised lines radiating out from the centre. Thought possibly to be a Neolithic 'sunstone' (see www.sciencealert.com/vasagard-danish-island-300-mysterious-sunstones-sunworship). Found by Colin Shepherd. |
| 127 | Worked stone | Stone | [800] |  | Tr10 | 19/08/2021 | Block of stone with a rounded 90 degree corner. All surfaces dressed and to various angles with sides sloping inwards. It would appear that this block was a floor flagstone with a diamond shaped hole cut in its surface ( c .6 .3 cm across top of diamond cut tapering out at c .2 .5 cm deep from the surface). Block L.c. 21 cm W.c. $14-17 \mathrm{~cm}$ Th. $5-9 \mathrm{~cm}$. |
| 128 | Worked stone | Stone | [800] |  | Tr10 | 18/08/2021 | Large block of stone with 90 degree corner and traces of another at opposite end. Several types of tool marks present. End side particularly smooth to facilitate a neat joint to its neighbouring block. Much of the upper surface is dressed except for central part which protrudes higher in the centre and show rough stone shaping stage. L. 36.5 cm W. 16 cm Th. 10 cm . |
| 129 | Worked stone | Stone | [800] |  | Tr10 | 19/08/2021 | Block of stone with a 90 degree corner surviving. Corner show signs of smoothing possibly from knife sharpening? Bottom of block left un-dressed and only roughly shaped. L. $25 \mathrm{~cm} W .12 \mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{Th} .10 \mathrm{~cm}$. |
| 130 | Worked stone | Stone | [800] |  | Tr10 | 19/08/2021 | Block of stone with two 90 degree corners. Also angle along one side to the outer surface and shaping to the inside area to accommodate possibly a wooden window frame. Tool marks present. All surfaces has been dressed. L. 20 cn W .17 cm . Th. 8 cm (side) Th .4 cm (front face). |
| 131 | Charcoal | Organic | 818/820 | Sample 32 | Tr10 |  | Medium piece of charcoal from close to the burnt post [820] within the matrix (818). Identified as Cherry wood. C-14 dating to $146+/-26$ years BP. |
| 132 | Charcoal | Organic | 799 | Sample 33 | Tr10 |  | Medium size piece of charcoal overlaying [800] and abutting (791). Identified as Pine. C-14 dating to 145 +/-26 years BP. |
| 133 | Charcoal | Organic | 818 | Sample 34 | Tr10 |  | Roundwood charcoal found near top of (818) close to south-west stones of [800]. |
| 134 | ?Stone | Inorganic? | 816 | Sample 35 | Tr10 |  | Burnt ?stone. |
| 135 | Bulk | Organic | 820 | Sample 36 | Tr10 |  | Small bulk sample taken en bloc from [820] - the base of the apparently burnt post. |
| 136 | Bulk | Organic | 818 | Sample 37 | Tr10 |  | Small bulk sample of burnt material within (818). |
| 137 | Bulk | Organic | 816 | Sample 39 | Tr10 |  | Small bulk sample of mixed burnt deposit from within (816). |
| 138 | ?Stone | Organic Inorganic? | 800 | Sample 40 | Tr10 |  | Lumps of burnt material - probably not charcoal from around stones. |
| 139 | Misc | Organic | 822 | Sample 41 | Tr10 |  | Small miscellaneous burnt material. |
| 140 | Misc | Organic | $\begin{gathered} (822) /(816) \\ \text { beneath } \\ (823) \end{gathered}$ | Sample 43 | Tr10 |  | Miscellaneous burnt material. |
| 141 | Misc | Organic | (818) | Sample 44 | Tr10 |  | Miscellaneous burnt material including charcoal. |
| 142 | Glass (green) | Glass | 787 |  | Tr8 | 12/08/2021 | Bottle glass. Very small frag. only. |
| 143 | Misc | Organic | 822 | Sample 42 | Tr10 |  | Large lumps of miscellaneous burnt material. |
| 144 | Bulk | Organic | 818 | Sample 38 | Tr10 |  | Small bulk sample of clay-like matrix forming part of (818) in the southern extension - the former Trench 5 of 2019. |

