

STONEHENGE WORLD HERITAGE SITE  
LANDSCAPE PROJECT  
WINTERBOURNE STOKE CROSSROADS  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORT

Sam Bax, Mark Bowden, Anna Komar and Sarah Newsome



*This report has been prepared for use on the internet and the images within it have been down-sampled to optimise downloading and printing speeds.*

*Please note that as a result of this down-sampling the images are not of the highest quality and some of the fine detail may be lost. Any person wishing to obtain a high resolution copy of this report should refer to the ordering information on the following page.*

Research Department Report Series 107-2010

# STONEHENGE WORLD HERITAGE SITE LANDSCAPE PROJECT

## WINTERBOURNE STOKE CROSSROADS

### ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORT

S Bax, MCB Bowden, AM Komar and S Newsome

NGR: SU 101 417

© English Heritage

ISSN 1749-8775

*The Research Department Report Series incorporates reports from all the specialist teams within the English Heritage Research Department: Archaeological Science; Archaeological Archives; Historic Interiors Research and Conservation; Archaeological Projects; Aerial Survey and Investigation; Archaeological Survey and Investigation; Architectural Investigation; Imaging, Graphics and Survey, and the Survey of London. It replaces the former Centre for Archaeology Reports Series, the Archaeological Investigation Report Series and the Architectural Investigation Report Series.*

*Many of these are interim reports which make available the results of specialist investigations in advance of full publication. They are not usually subject to external refereeing, and their conclusions may sometimes have to be modified in the light of information not available at the time of the investigation. Where no final project report is available, readers are advised to consult the author before citing these reports in any publication. Opinions expressed in Research Department reports are those of the author(s) and are not necessarily those of English Heritage.*

*Requests for further hard copies, after the initial print run, can be made by emailing:*

*Res.reports@english-heritage.org.uk*

*Or by writing to:*

*English Heritage, Fort Cumberland, Fort Cumberland Road, Eastney, Portsmouth PO4 9LD*

*Please note that a charge will be made to cover printing and postage.*

## SUMMARY

To the north-west of the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads (also known as the Longbarrow Crossroads but now a roundabout) is a large group of barrows, as well as other earthworks of unknown date, those related to the early 20<sup>th</sup>-century Larkhill Military Railway and adjacent features both outside and inside the plantation known as Winterbourne Stoke Clump. Seventeen of the barrows have been assigned to what has been known, since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, as the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads barrow cemetery, which straddles the parish boundary between Winterbourne Stoke and Amesbury. Of these, nine or ten are aligned on the prominent long barrow. A further cluster of eight small round barrows lies to the north-west of this group. There is Bronze Age settlement immediately to the west and south-west, partly under the modern roundabout, and probably contemporary field systems. The area covered by the barrows was surveyed at a scale of 1:1000 in August 2009 and January 2010 as part of the Stonehenge World Heritage Site (WHS) Landscape Project. This has revealed previously unrecorded features and demonstrated some chronological relationships between the barrows.

## CONTRIBUTORS

The survey was undertaken by Anna Komar (EPPIC Placement in Archaeological Survey and Investigation), Sarah Newsome (Senior Investigator, Archaeological Survey and Investigation) and Samantha Bax (EPPIC Placement in Aerial Survey and Investigation). The text was edited and substantially re-written by Mark Bowden on the basis of comments from Martyn Barber and David Field. The figures were prepared by the authors, and the fair copy of the hachured plan by Deborah Cunliffe.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

English Heritage is grateful to Mr John Elliot of the Druids Lodge Estate and Mr Mike Dando of the National Trust for allowing access to the site. Anna Komar would like to thank Mr Robert Tannahill for advice on the dates of the flint artefacts.

## ARCHIVE LOCATION

The archive is deposited at the NMR, Swindon.

## DATE OF INVESTIGATION

August 2009 and January 2010

## CONTACT DETAILS

NMRC, Kemble Drive, Swindon, SN2 2GZ  
nmrinfo@english-heritage.org.uk

## CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	iv
INTRODUCTION	I
GEOLOGY, TOPOGRAPHY AND LAND USE	3
THE EARTHWORKS	5
The barrows	5
The linear earthworks	23
Larkhill Military Railway and other tracks	23
Boundaries	25
Other linear earthworks	27
Other features	28
ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	29
Mapping and aerial photography	29
Excavation, field-walking and geophysical survey	31
DISCUSSION	37
Earliest activity	37
Spatial relationships of the barrows	38
Stratigraphic relationships of the barrows	39
Evidence from excavation	41
The barrows and other earthworks	43
CONCLUSION	45
The barrows	45
The missing periods	46
The 20 <sup>th</sup> century	46
METHODOLOGY	47
REFERENCES	48

## LIST OF FIGURES

Fig 1: Map of the World Heritage Site with the survey area highlighted	1
Fig 2: Barrows 1, 2 and 3 and the approximate site of 2a	6
Fig 3: Barrows 3a, 4, 5, 16 and 16a, and the site of Wilsford 1a	10
Fig 4: Barrows 6, 7, 7a and 11	11
Fig 5: Barrows 8, 9 and 10	13
Fig 6: Concrete marker, barrow 12	15
Fig 7: Barrows 12, 13, 14, 15 and mound H	16
Fig 8: Barrows 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 21a, 21b and V	21
Fig 9: Main linear earthworks and the Longbarrow Cross	24
Fig 10: The cross base	28
Fig 11: Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads, Christmas Eve 1943	36
Fig 12: Barrow 5 with 4 beyond	40
Fig 13: Barrows 8, 5, 6 and part of 9	42
Fig 14: Survey plan reduced to 1:2000	52
Table 1: Concordance of barrow numbers	51

Cover: Barrow 4 from the mound of barrow 5; barrow 2 can be seen in the background to the right. The scale is 1m. (Photo MCB Bowden/NMR)

## INTRODUCTION

The Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads, situated on the western edge of the Stonehenge World Heritage Site, gives its name to a long barrow and a group of about seventeen round barrows to the north-west (Scheduled Ancient Monuments 10483, 10464). A further eight small round barrows lie between the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads group and the A360 road (Scheduled Ancient Monument 10306). The fields and woodland where these barrows lie were subject to analytical earthwork survey at 1:1000 scale in August 2009 as part of the English Heritage Stonehenge WHS Landscape Project.



Fig 1: Map of the Stonehenge WHS, with the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads survey area highlighted

In furtherance of Objective 10 of the Stonehenge Research Framework, the barrow cemeteries were surveyed to 'modern standards', providing in the first instance a 'detailed topographic survey' (Darvill 2005, 129). The work also contributes to research priorities 12, 16 and 17 of the Framework by 'characteris[ing] and investigat[ing] field systems; validating and dating features revealed by air photography and [contributing to] an understanding [of] recent land use' (*ibid*, 108-20). The survey also assists in the fulfilment

of Aim 6 of the Stonehenge WHS Management Plan (Young *et al*/2009, 113) to improve understanding of the WHS necessary for its appropriate management.

The site (Figs 1 and 14) lies 6km west of Amesbury and c12km north-west of Salisbury. It is situated just over 2km west-south-west of Stonehenge, within the north-eastern angle of the A303 and A360 crossroads, and is centred upon NGR SU 101 417 on Winterbourne Stoke Down. Both roads were turnpiked in 1761 (Freeman 1995, 276). The boundary between Winterbourne Stoke and Wilsford-cum-Lake parishes crosses the site, incorporating ten of the barrows in its course.

The area of the earthwork survey included a small part of Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads plantation, known as the Clump, and was otherwise delimited by modern roads and field boundaries. The survey area falls within two properties, the Druid's Lodge Estate owning the western part and the National Trust owning the narrow strip containing the main linear barrow group, and the Clump.

Several different numbering systems have been applied to the barrows (*see* Table 1); for this report the parish numbers given by Goddard (1913) and Grinsell (1957), the most widely used system, have been adopted (*see* Fig 14). In addition to the barrows there are known to be elements of later Bronze Age (and possibly Romano-British) settlement and agriculture within and around the surveyed area. These include: the settlement excavated by the Vatchers in advance of the roundabout construction (Richards 1990, 208-10; Leivers and Moore 2008, 37-9); a group of linear ditches forming a rectilinear enclosure to the west (NMR: SU 04 SE 142), now levelled; linear ditches to the south (e.g. SU 14 SW 129); and extensive 'Celtic' fields, particularly to the south and south-west (SU 14 SW 22 and 40) but also to the north. Later landscape elements include the medieval Longbarrow Cross (SU 14 SW 155) and traces of 20<sup>th</sup>-century military activity.



## GEOLOGY, TOPOGRAPHY AND LAND USE

The area lies on Cretaceous Upper Chalk, and is situated on a ridge at an elevation of between 110m and 115m OD. The soils on this ridge are humic rendzinas of the Icknield series while those on the lower ground to either side are brown rendzinas of the Andover I Association (Soils Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 6 1983). There are no nearby rivers: the River Till, which runs through the village of Winterbourne Stoke to the west, is some 2.5km distant, while the river Avon between Amesbury and West Amesbury is about 4km to the east. The site is not inter-visible with Stonehenge due to the intervening plateau, which extends from the survey area for a considerable distance to the east.

The Winterbourne Stoke Enclosure Award map (1812, EA/104, Wiltshire Heritage Centre (WHC)) shows this part of Winterbourne Stoke Down divided into strips parallel to the parish boundary (and therefore parallel to the linear barrow group); the strip adjacent to the boundary and containing the barrows was in the hands of John Richards of Franklands. However, there is no indication on later maps, on aerial photographs or on the ground that these strips were ever in fact laid out or enclosed.

Nevertheless, the land that surrounds the barrows and that to the south and west of the crossroads has been cultivated through much of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries and continues to be cultivated at the time of writing. This activity was interrupted during the Great War, for the construction of various military buildings and facilities, and since that time part of the land between the parish boundary and the A360 road has been laid to pasture to safeguard the barrows offset from the main group, while the surrounding fields were returned to their former use. Early maps, from the 18<sup>th</sup> century, indicate that there has long been a crossroads here.

Air photographic evidence of how land use has affected the monuments and features in the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads area begins in the 1930s and shows that the north-west sides of the barrows along the ridge were fenced, which protected them, for the most part, from the grazing and cultivation that took place on the Druid's Lodge Estate land throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

By the 1930s, cultivation had already levelled the remaining small round barrow (Winterbourne Stoke 22) which had been one of three that continued the line of the main Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads group to the north-east (beyond the current survey area). They have been mapped from crop- and parchmarks on aerial photographs. The disused tracks of the Larkhill Military Railway and other earthworks can also be seen on photographs of this early date (e.g. RCHME 1979, pl 2).

In the early 1950s the survey area and some of the fields south of the A303 were returned to pasture (aerial photograph RAF/540/854 3071 3462) but further episodes of ploughing later in the 1950s, 60s and 70s damaged some of the barrows (see for instance

SU 1041/27/93 (816 093)). By 1980 trees had been planted in the areas of the new roundabout excavated by the Vatchers, as well as the south-west corner of the present Winterbourne Stoke Clump, the latter between 1978 and 1980. The whole of the survey area was in pasture and fenced from the arable cultivation to the north by 1991, though fields to the south and west of the A303 were all under cultivation. Many of the trees in the older part of the Clump had gone, possibly as a result of the 1987 hurricane (OS 91176 13685/1 135).

The nine round barrows that form a line along the ridge are on land presently owned by the National Trust, which has been left un-grazed, while the other barrows to the west are situated on land belonging to the Druid's Lodge Estate, which is used as sheep pasture. The nature of the vegetation on the barrows within the National Trust land may have had an impact on the details surveyed in these areas. More details were visible when the site was re-visited in winter, the vegetation in this area then being considerably lower than had been the case in the summer when the site was initially surveyed. Nevertheless, several of the barrows and indeed the ground surrounding them is covered in tussocks of grass and large ant-hills, making less prominent earthworks difficult to see.

## THE EARTHWORKS

All the earthworks and other items of archaeological interest surveyed are depicted on Fig 14 and fall into three main categories. They are described below under the following headings: (i) barrows and (ii) linear features, the latter being sub-divided into boundaries and routes of various types, and (iii) other features (some plough-levelled features and a stone cross base). As stated above, in this report the numbers given by Grinsell (1957) are used for the barrows, while letters are used for other features and for mounds without Grinsell numbers; there have been a variety of numbering schemes for the barrows in the past (these are cross-referenced in concordance Table 1).

### The Barrows

The barrows in the study area are treated in this report in numerical order. The main linear group lies along a low ridge that stretches south-west to north-east from the Winterbourne Stoke crossroads and comprises nine, mostly elaborate and large, barrows. A further group is offset to the west of this linear group, where the ground slopes away from the ridge; this comprises some low simple barrows and some 'fancy' forms. A third and very distinct group is situated on the lowest ground within the survey area, to the north-west, and comprises a tight cluster of eight small, mostly simple barrows.

Previously these barrows have been assigned to one of two barrow groups: the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads Group (NMR SU 14 SW 35), and the Winterbourne Stoke Group (NMR SU 04 SE 36). This was because the barrows fall on two different OS map sheets and the groupings are not therefore necessarily helpful; the description of barrows mapped in the course of this survey will disregard this division.

#### *Barrow 1 – the Long Barrow*

The only long barrow of the group (Fig 2), barrow 1 is situated at its south-westernmost extent, and comprises an elongated mound some 3m high, with ditches on both of its long sides. Its north-eastern end is higher and broader than the south-western, and both are wider and more elevated than the portion of the barrow between them. This gives the appearance of two round-barrows joined but this is almost certainly the result of later disturbance (see below), with the north-east end of the barrow seemingly having been enhanced, while the south-western end has been damaged by later activity. The mound measures 83.7m north-east to south-west, and 26.9m transversely.




Fig 2: Barrows 1, 2 and 3 and the approximate site of 2a; north to top

The south-east ditch is almost imperceptible in places, reaching a maximum depth of only 0.3m and seems to have been filled in by the construction of later features (including possibly a 'Celtic' field boundary) and obliterated by vehicle tracks. It appears to be present for c43.5m along the southern part of the barrow's south-east side. The north-

west ditch is in marked contrast, considerably wider and deeper, reaching a depth of c1 m, and extending for c63m along the north-west side of the barrow. It is possible that this ditch was re-cut at some point, although ditches of comparable size accompany other long barrows.

The mound itself shows signs of extensive damage by excavation, animal burrowing and other causes. Fifteen separate intrusions were noted, the largest of which has damaged a considerable part of the barrow's north-west side, extending from the top to the base of the mound. It is known that Thurnam excavated this mound in 1863 (1865, 140-3). However, much of the disturbance is the result of quarrying for chalk in the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Cunnington 1914, 407).

Evidence for a slight break in the slopes of the barrow was also recorded along the north-western and south-eastern sides. The breaks and berm may represent the level of the former land surface between the mound material and the ditch. However, they may also have been created by a combination of later modifications to the mound and animal disturbance.

## *Barrow 2*

Situated away from any other round barrow, barrow **2** (Fig 2) is a substantial bell barrow (though identified as a bowl by Grinsell (1957, 201)) which lies just less than 60m to the north-north-west of the north-eastern end of the long barrow. It is similar in size to barrow **13**, and comprises a circular mound which rises to 2.5m in height and measures 16.6m north-south and 17.5m east-west. A berm between 1.6m and 2m wide separates the mound from the ditch. This berm is clearest on the north side of the barrow, while elsewhere material from the mound appears to have collapsed and largely obscured it. A ditch encircles the mound, and survives to a depth of between 0.1m and 0.3m. Its width varies between 3m on its north-east and 6.5m on its south-west side, where it is interrupted for c10m. The ditch has an overall diameter of 32m but is missing on the western side, possibly due to agricultural use or the passage of vehicles.

There is extensive damage to the mound which takes various forms, ranging from small rabbit holes to larger crescent-shaped areas of collapse like that on the north side of the barrow near the base of the mound, which measures 12m east to west and almost 3m north to south and could be the result of badger damage.

A further large area of collapse is present on the east side of the mound; it measures some 9m across and extends from just below the summit to the base of the mound. There are other smaller areas of collapse to the west and south. Several narrow 'ledges' are present at various points around the mound; these could have been worn into the mound by grazing animals, or rabbits, or be the result of a fence and track which can be seen crossing the north-east side of the mound on aerial photographs of 1968.

A small nearby barrow, **2a** (Grinsell (1957, 201), immediately to the south-west of **2**, was not identified during the survey. The 1<sup>st</sup> edition OS 25" map (1877) shows this barrow right against the fence alongside the road (Fig 2). It may have been destroyed by the same activity that levelled the western side of the ditch of barrow **2**.

### *Barrow 3*

Barrow **3** (Fig 2) is the south-westernmost round barrow of the linear group situated along the ridge. It is surrounded by a roughly circular bank, c25m in overall diameter and approximately 0.3m high, which shows signs of erosion caused by cultivation around its outside. The bank has also been damaged by the pushing-in of material from the south into the interior of the monument, probably by mechanical means. This has caused a flattening of the south-eastern portion of the bank, and seems to correspond to an elongated mound, c10m long, 3m wide and 0.3m high, to the north-west of this damage. There is a further mound situated north-west of centre which appears to have been piled against the bank on the west-north-west side of the barrow. It measures 11m by 5m, and is c0.25m high, and may be contemporary with the activity that led to the pushing-in of the south part of the bank and the creation of the elongated mound; it certainly appears to overlie the bank and is therefore a later feature.

A small mound lies within the bank, and is situated just north-east of centre. It measures 4m by 5m, and is a mere 0.1m high. It is, however, quite convincing as an original barrow mound; despite being covered in ant-hills and tussocks, it retains a fairly regular shape in plan. Its presence suggests this may be a saucer barrow, though it was recorded by Grinsell as a truncated bowl (1957, 201).

There is a slight suggestion of an external ditch around the north side of the monument, although it is almost imperceptible and was not surveyed. The south-western portion of the bank seems to have been cut away, rather than simply overlain, by bank **J-J** (see Fig 9), which at one time formed the boundary between this group of barrows and the woodland to the east (now replaced by a fence diverging to the east). The bank is still the parish boundary and makes the south-east side of the feature appear to be straight-sided. A further curvilinear hollow **K-K** is visible to the west-north-west of the barrow and this or a similar feature continues south-eastwards to cut and flatten the barrow's south-western extent.

### *Barrow 3a*

This pond barrow (Fig 3) measures 20.5m in overall diameter and comprises a slight circular bank enclosing a circular internal hollow. The bank reaches a height of 0.1m and the hollow a maximum depth of 0.7m below the external ground surface.

The north-eastern portion of the bank overlies the south-western extent of the ditch of bell barrow **4**, and also seems to have affected its berm. The barrow is cut on its south-east side by a shallow ditch (part of J-J). The bank is interrupted on its south-western side where there is a gap of c9m.

#### *Barrow 4*

The largest of the round barrows (Fig 3), this bell barrow measures 55.5m in diameter overall and comprises a large circular mound which appears as if it might have been constructed in at least two phases; the uppermost part of the mound is slightly off-centre from the rest of the monument. The lower section of the mound measures c30m in diameter and the upper has a diameter of c18m. The mound reaches a maximum height of 3.7m. The mound is surrounded by a ditch 6.5m wide and c1.0m deep. Between the base of the mound and the ditch is a 5m-wide berm, which probably represents the remains of the original land surface on which the mound was constructed.

The ditch is overlain at its south-west extent by the bank of pond barrow **3a**, and just to the east of this, by the low bank of boundary (J-J). An extension of this bank, at a right-angle, overlies the south-eastern part of the barrow. These banks overlie the berm and mound of barrow **4**, but the trees which once grew along them have been cut down (with the exception of one large example along the south-eastern extension of the bank). It is not known how long ago the boundary was created or indeed when the trees were removed. There is an irregular-shaped hole in the top of the upper section of the mound which may relate to 19<sup>th</sup>-century excavations by William Cunnington (Hoare 1812, 122).

Hoare's barrow 13 lay to the east of the ridge, according to Crocker's bird's-eye view (Hoare 1812, opp 121), immediately to the south-east of barrow **4** in what is now Winterbourne Stoke Clump (Fig 3); it has been designated Wilsford 1a (Grinsell 1957, 224), though it has never been located.

#### *Barrow 5 – the 'King Barrow'*

Barrow **5** (Figs 3 and 12) is known as 'King Barrow' due to the rich finds discovered (Hoare 1812, 123). The second largest barrow in the group, it measures c51.2m in overall diameter and appears to comprise at least two phases of circular mound construction, one atop the other, with the upper mound slightly off-centre from the one below. The lower mound has a base diameter of 28.5m while the upper mound measures 15m in diameter. Both together reach a height of 3.1m and are surrounded by a ditch 6.8m wide and 0.2m deep. The mound is separated from the surrounding ditch by a berm between 2m and 4m wide, which probably represents the original land surface on which the mound was constructed. The lower mound has suffered considerable slumping, probably

caused by the extensive rabbit burrowing that has affected so many of the barrows on the site. The south-western side of the encircling ditch is cut by the ditch of bell barrow 4 which creates a 16m gap in its outer edge.




Fig 3: Barrows 3a, 4, 5, 16 and 16a, and the approximate site of Wilsford 1a; north to top

There is a rectangular vegetation mark on the north-eastern side of the barrow, which extends from the top of the upper part of the mound to the bottom of the lower, in a roughly south-west to north-east direction, and may continue into the ditch. The intrusion may be related to Hoare's excavation of the barrow (1812, 123) as there is no record of any subsequent archaeological investigation, but is more likely to be the remains of a former boundary, like that which overlies part of barrow 4 and which is on a similar alignment. The south-east side of the barrow ditch is straighter in plan than the other sections, and has probably been modified by the creation of the boundary between the barrows and the woodland to the south-east. The boundary presently comprises a post-and-wire fence.






Fig 4: Barrows 6, 7, 7a and 11; north to top

### *Barrow 6*

Barrow **6** (Figs 4 and 13) is much smaller than those to the south, and most of those to the north. It lies 31m north-east of barrow **4**, and comprises a sub-circular mound measuring 16m east to west by 14m north to south at its base, and 1.8m high above the base of the ditch; it is much damaged by rabbit burrowing. The ditch which surrounds the mound has a diameter of c22m and is 1.5m to 2m wide, 0.1m deep with a flat base and gently sloping sides.

There has been some significant animal damage on the south-east side of the monument, which has exaggerated (if not created) a ledge, and which gives the mound the appearance of having been constructed in two phases, with its upper part slightly off-centre from the lower, much like its large neighbour Barrow **5** to the south-west.

Part of the barrow ditch lies beyond the fence which crosses the north-western segment of the barrow. This part of the ditch is wider, and its outer edge is straighter than the rest, reflecting different agricultural regimes on either side of the fence.

### *Barrow 7*

Barrow 7 (Fig 4) is a very low and spread barrow, probably a bowl, which lies just 5m north-east of barrow 6. It comprises an irregular sub-circular mound approximately 18m in diameter, with the top of the mound once again off-centre, in this instance probably as the result of later plough damage. The mound survives to a maximum height of c 0.3m and hints of a ditch are present, less than 0.1m deep and only visible in certain light conditions. The long grass that covers this area, even in winter, makes it difficult to ascertain the extent of the mound and, in particular, the ditch.

### *Barrow 7a*

Barrow 7a (Fig 4) comprises a low mound 26.5m in diameter and 0.5m high. Its eastern side has been truncated by the fence which separates it from the line of barrows that occupy the centre of the ridge. It is not possible to decipher any relationship with barrow 8 due to the placement of this fence between them and the soil that has accumulated along it. The barrow has been damaged by ploughing, which has obliterated any signs of archaeological excavation. It has the appearance of a simple bowl barrow and was classified as such by Grinsell (1957, 201).

### *Barrow 8*

Barrow 8 (Figs 5 and 13) is the southernmost of three large bell barrows at the northern extent of the group of barrows situated along the ridge (though all three were classified as bowls by Grinsell (1957, 201)). It comprises a 1m high circular mound separated from its outer ditch by a berm. The ditch has an overall diameter of 38m and is on average 0.3m deep and 5m to 6m wide. It has fairly straight, gently sloping sides and a fairly flat bottom. The mound appears to have slumped onto the berm on the south side of the monument, possibly due to animal burrowing, resulting in an almost straight slope running from the top of the mound to the base of the ditch on that side of the barrow.

The north-west side of the mound has sustained some damage from rabbits, and the south-east portion of the ditch appears to have been flattened, possibly by ploughing, giving it a straight side in plan. The north-west part of the ditch has been flattened in a similar way. Although the fence which separates the barrows from those on Druid's Lodge land is presently situated at least 2m away from its north-western edge, the damage may be the result of an earlier fence that was perhaps situated closer to the barrow. The fence to the south-west of the barrow which separates it from barrow 7a, and the soil which has built up against the fence, masks any relationship between the two barrows that may have existed.




Fig 5: Barrows 8, 9 and 10; north to top

### *Barrow 9*

The central of three large bell barrows at the north of the linear group, Barrow 9 (Figs 5 and 13) lies just over 9m north-west of Barrow 8, and comprises an external ditch, a berm, and a circular mound which appears to be slightly off-centre, and which appears to have slumped onto the berm on its south-east side, as was the case with its southern neighbour.

The ditch measures 40m in overall diameter, is 7m wide, varies in depth from 0.3m on its south-west side to 0.8m on its north-east side, and is fairly flat bottomed with steep, fairly straight sides. The berm is 3m wide, and is topped by a mound 21m in diameter and c1.6m high, which has a very wide, flat summit.

### *Barrow 10*

The northernmost of the linear arrangement of barrows within the current survey (barrow Winterbourne Stoke 22, just over 100m to the north-east and outside the current survey area, continues the alignment), this bell barrow (Fig 5) is situated 14m north-west of barrow 9, and comprises a circular mound which is surrounded by a ditch c34m in diameter, which is c5m wide and separated from the mound by a berm which may represent the original ground surface on which the mound was constructed. The ditch is flat-bottomed with fairly straight sides and varies in depth from 0.1m at its south-west to 0.5m on its north-east side, and appears to have been partly clipped on its east-south-eastern side, making it narrower and giving it a straight outer edge. The ditch encloses an area 21m from north-west to south-east; the mound, which is 1.5m high and 18m in diameter at its base, sits eccentrically to the north of centre and has slumped onto the berm on that side. This slumping has created a straight slope which extends from the top of the mound to the bottom of the ditch. The somewhat irregular shape of this barrow may reflect the numerous phases of activity within it demonstrated by the excavated evidence (*see below*).

### *Barrow 11*

Situated 12.9m south-west of barrow 7a, barrow 11 (Fig 4) is another low and much abraded bowl barrow of which only the sub-circular mound remains. It measures c22m in diameter and is barely 0.5m high. Its southern extent seems to have spread more than its northern side, making the top now off-centre. There are no signs of an encircling bank or ditch, or of either of the two antiquarian excavations known to have taken place here (Hoare 1812, 124).

### *Barrow 12*

The larger of the two pond barrows in the study area, barrow 12 (Figs 6 and 7) comprises a shallow bowl-shaped depression in the chalk which measures c16.3m in diameter, and has a depth of 0.5m below the present ground surface. The circular bank which surrounds this depression is c5m wide and survives to a height of 0.5m making the feature appear deeper than it in fact is. The barrow has an overall diameter of c27.3m.



The bank is quite well defined despite its outer edge having been damaged by cultivation, a farm track which has eroded the north side and the modern fence-line which also seems to have cut at least part of that side of the bank. Approximately in the centre of the barrow is a concrete block (Fig 6), which measures 0.5m by 0.5m and 0.4m high, inscribed with the characters A.M. [Ancient Monument?] No 2. The addition of a broad arrow indicates that this is a military marker, probably of early 20<sup>th</sup>-century date.

Fig 6: Concrete marker, barrow 12

### *Barrow 13*

The barrow (Fig 7) comprises a circular mound 2m high and c18.8m in diameter and is encircled by a ditch 3.6m wide and 0.4m deep. It is similar in size to pond barrow 12. A narrow ledge is present around the greater part of the barrow mound. While this may be the remnant of a berm onto which mound material has collapsed, the ledge could also be evidence of two phases of barrow construction. Fragments of the outer scarp of the encircling bank survive on the north side of the feature, but are damaged by cultivation, making the potential relationship between this barrow and pond barrow 12 indiscernible. The ditch of barrow 13 is overlain by the bank of disc barrow 14 to the west, and therefore pre-dates it.

There are clear signs that barrow 13 has been excavated (see Hoare 1812, 123-4), taking the form of a crescent-shaped hollow across almost its entire summit from north-west to south-east. There is a sub-circular mound to the south-west of the hollow, which could be a heap of spoil from the excavation, while two further intrusions lower down the mound, one to the north-west and one to the south-east, possibly also relate to the excavations, and could represent episodes of slumping of the material used to backfill Hoare's section through the barrow. One further substantial hollow is present near the bottom of the mound on its north side, and appears to be the result of rabbit burrowing. There are several more small rabbit holes around the monument.




Fig 7: Barrows 12, 13, 14 and 15 and mound H; north to top

### *Barrow 14*

The north-easterly of two disc barrows in this group, barrow **14** (Fig 7) has an overall diameter of 56.6m, just 0.2m greater than adjacent disc barrow **15**. It comprises a bank 0.35m high with a maximum width of 1.8m at its top, and which surrounds a ditch 1.7m wide at its bottom and 0.3m deep. The ditch encloses an area 32.4m in diameter and contains two small mounds. Neither of the mounds is centrally placed within the barrow. One is situated to the north and one to the south of the central area, and both are quite irregular in shape, suggesting damage from antiquarian excavation or more recent agricultural or military activity. The northern, sub-circular, mound has a base diameter of approximately 12.7m and reaches a height of 0.6m. The base of the northern, more irregular, mound measures 13.7m east to west and 9.6m north to south, and has a spread of material on its south-east side. There is a clear semi-circular intrusion in the north-west half of its summit which is somewhat lower than the south-east half. There is a small

mound of earth, possibly spoil, on the north-west side of this intrusion. This anomaly is probably what remains of Cunnington's 19<sup>th</sup>-century excavation (Hoare 1812, 123).

The southern mound also has a sizeable spread of material to its south-west side. Although this could not be definitely identified as a separate mound, given the size of the other two mounds within the disc, Hoare's identification and excavation of three mounds suggests that this probably represents a third and smallest 'tump' within the disc-barrow. It reaches a height of 0.3m and measures 9.5m north-west to south-east and 8m transversely. The damage, apparently caused by excavation, seems to have affected its shape to the extent that it now appears to merge with the southern mound, although a separate top for this, possible third mound, is just discernible.

The bank on the east side of barrow **14** overlies the ditch (and suggested external bank) of barrow **13**, and appears to overlie the (defaced) bank of disc barrow **15** on its south-west side, and therefore to post-date them. Although the point of intersection, where more material might be expected if one bank was constructed over the other, is in fact the lowest and most degraded part of the earthworks, this absence of material might signify later damage.

### *Barrow 15*

The second disc barrow in the group, barrow **15** (Fig 7) comprises a single central ovate mound which measures 10.4m east to west and 12.8m north to south, rising to a height of 0.4m, accompanied on its south-east side by a 17m long, crescent-shaped ditch barely 0.2m deep and 1.6m wide at its base. These lie within a flat area c34.6m in diameter, which is enclosed by a circular ditch and incomplete external bank. The ditch is 1.7m to 1.9m wide at its base, and c6m to 7m at its top with a maximum depth of 0.3m, while the bank is 0.9 to 1.2m wide at its top and 3m to 4m at its base, and rises to a maximum of 0.2m above the surrounding ground level. The whole monument has a diameter of 56.4m, only 0.2m less than that of disc barrow **14**.

There are several interruptions to the bank, the most significant of which occurs on the barrow's north side, where it clearly had a relationship with disc barrow **14**. The break measures 26.5m and is clearly the result of vehicle traffic, at least in part. The remains of the bank on this side form the south-west side of a track which obliquely slices through the banks of both barrows. Its north-east end however, also has the appearance of a slight bull-nose, although a splaying of the bank where it has been damaged by vehicles is unsurprising. The ditches of both barrows **15** and **14** appear slightly shallower at their intersection, though this could also be explained by vehicle damage. The other breaks to the bank occur on its south side, where it is interrupted for c33.4m in which only 12m of its outer scarp survives. This damage could be the result of cultivation or of other vehicle tracks, particularly if vehicles drove *through* the monument, which could explain the

splaying of the north-east end of the eastern bank section. The barrow lies c9m north-east of bowl barrow 16.

### *Barrow 16*

Similar in size and shape to low bowl barrow 16a, less than a metre to the south-west, barrow 16 (Fig 3) lies c9m south-west of barrow 15. The barrow comprises a simple sub-circular mound, whose summit is somewhat off-centre, and which measures 20m north to south and 17.4m east to west, and reaches a height of 0.3m. A small dump of material is present on the west side of the top of the mound. Its west side is almost straight, as though an attempt were made at the time of construction to site it as close as possible to its neighbour, barrow 16a, without actually intruding upon it. However, it is possible that material around all but this side of the barrow has been considerably spread by cultivation and that it was originally much more compact.

### *Barrow 16a*

A low bowl barrow, 16a (Fig 3), previously incorrectly located (NMR SU 14 SW 338), is centred at NGR SU 1006 4169 and comprises a circular mound measuring 19.1m east-west and 18.5m north-south, which rises to 0.3m in height and whose top appears off-centre.

The barrow is situated less than 1m to the south-west of barrow 16, and its nearly straight east-north-east side could suggest that it was deliberately placed close to, but not intended to intrude upon that barrow. This placement might suggest that they are contemporary. The western side of the mound seems to have been spread as a result of cultivation or possibly damage by the Larkhill Military Railway, the surviving length of which (C-C) suggests that it would have run directly over this side of the mound, although no sign of the railway survives here.

### *Barrow 17*

Barrow 17 is the first of a group comprising a cluster of seven or eight small barrows at the north-westernmost extent of the survey area (Fig 8). A ditched bowl barrow (classified as a saucer by Grinsell (1957, 224)) comprising a circular mound and external ditch, barrow 17 lies less than 5m west of barrow 18 and just over 1m north-east of barrow 21a. It appears to be the least damaged of the barrows in this cluster, with most of its ditch surviving the cultivation and vehicle tracks which seem to have damaged many of the others. Its northern edge is clipped by a post-and-wire fence, which might have



served to protect this side of the monument, while the barrows which surround its other sides prevented damage there.

The barrow measures 31.2m in overall diameter, with a mound c14.2m in diameter and 1.1m high, a ditch c2m wide and less than 0.05m deep, and a surrounding bank that survives to a maximum height of c0.05m and is between 0.7m and 2m wide at the top.

There are two breaks in the bank. On its south-west side the bank has been truncated completely by both vehicle activity (tracks run up onto its bank from the south) and cultivation; the break measures c7.4m. On its east side the c4m-long break in the bank has almost rounded edges. This could represent an older breach where there has been some subsequent weathering and slumping, or could suggest that the bank was constructed with a gap at its east side, prior to the re-cutting of the ditch. Barrow **V** lies less than 2.4m to the south-east of this break. A slight step in the east side of the mound may be the result of animal damage but is clearly not recent.

### *Barrow 18*

Situated 17.5m north of barrow **20**, barrow **18** (Fig 8) comprises a sub-circular mound measuring 16.5m north-west to south-east, and 14m transversely. Its summit reaches 0.3m above the surrounding ground level and is slightly off-centre. Remains of a 4m wide and 0.2m deep ditch surround the south side of the mound, and survive for a length of almost 31m, while none is present around the north side of the barrow.

Some 8.8m east of the mound is a gently curving scarp which could represent the east side of a track. Although the other side of this track is not apparent, such disturbance could explain why only part of the ditch survives.

On the south-west side of the ditch, is a small mound (barrow **V**, see below) which the ditch seems to cut and thus to post-date. As no sign of mound material survives within the ditch it appears as though the ditch cut away a substantial portion of this pre-existing mound. The pre-existence of barrow **V** may explain why the ditch of barrow **18** appears flattened on its south-western side.

### *Barrow 19*

One of the smaller barrows within the group, barrow **19** (Fig 8) comprises a circular mound 13.8m in base diameter and 0.8m high. Its fairly flat top has a diameter of some 2m. There are short fragments of a shallow scarp beyond the north-east and south-east sides of the barrow, which measure 4.5m and 5.2m in length respectively. These may indicate the position of an outer ditch, although the scarps lie at a distance of 1.1m and

2.6m from the mound. This uneven distance might suggest either that the scarps indicate two different features, or that they are remnants of vehicle tracks. The short scarp to the south-east of the mound in particular might actually relate to ploughing or vehicle movement around barrow **21**, although rather than encircling that barrow, the curve of the scarp does seem to mirror the mound of barrow **19**.

The north-east side of the mound appears almost straight and along with the short fragment of surviving ditch to the north, this suggests that the barrow has also been damaged by cultivation. No signs that this barrow has been excavated survive, but some damage to the mound has occurred as a result of the vehicle track which has encroached on and flattened c1.4m of its west side.

### *Barrow 20*

Barrow **20** (Fig 8) is the south-easternmost of the group, and comprises a sub-circular mound, with a small sub-oval mound on its east side and a short remnant of a possible ditch beyond. The main mound measures 18.7m north to south, 16.6m east to west at its base, and is 0.7m high. The anomaly on its eastern side has straightened that side of the feature in plan, and consists of a small mound which overlies c2.4m of the barrow's eastern edge. This small mound measures 10.7m north to south and 4.7m east to west, and is also 0.3m high. It could be the spoil from excavations in this side of the barrow. To the east of this mound there appears to be the remnant of an encircling ditch. This only survives for a length of 14.6m north to south and appears almost linear, suggesting perhaps that it is more likely the result of more recent agricultural or military traffic which ran past the barrow.

There is a linear hollow on the east side of the barrow and just 0.2m west of the sub-oval mound, which could be evidence for a cutting that produced the spoil. There is also an additional hollow in the top of the barrow mound; this hollow follows the shape of the summit in plan, leaving a ledge of material around the top of the mound.

### *Barrow 21*

The southernmost of this cluster, bowl barrow **21** (Fig 8) comprises a circular mound 1.3m high which measures 14.3m in diameter, and an irregular encircling ditch 0.1m to 0.3m deep and between 0.6 and 1.6m wide, which makes the overall diameter of the monument some 24.5m.

The ditch around the north side of the monument has a peculiar relationship with that which seems to surround the south side of barrow **19**, as the two appear to be linked by a 3m long north-south hollow or section of ditch, which may be related to later vehicle

activity or ploughing, as may the 3.6m-long break in the ditch around the north-west side of the barrow. There is a low and almost straight scarp beyond the ditch on the south-west side which measures 14m in length and runs north-west to south-east. It is possible that this may be the remnant of an outer bank, although it was more probably created by later vehicle activity.




Fig 8: Barrows 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 21a, 21b and V: north to top

### *Barrow 21a*

The smallest round barrow in the group, barrow **21a** (Fig 8) lies between barrows **21b**, **17** and **19**, located 4.8m to the north-west, 1.7m to the north and c 2m to the south-east respectively. More recently it has been sandwiched between two well-used vehicle tracks which have damaged the western and eastern sides of the barrow, making them almost straight.

The mound measures c 11m north to south and c 9m east to west at its base, and rises to a height of 0.4m. Its top is slightly off-centre and has a diameter of 0.5m. No intrusions are

apparent, other than the ledges worn into the sides of the barrow by the vehicle tracks. These ledges run from south to north on both eastern and the western sides of the barrow, and are approximately 1.8m wide.

### *Barrow 21b*

Barrow **21b** (Fig 8) is the westernmost of the barrows. Only its eastern half survives while its western half has been destroyed by the construction or widening of the A360 road. It is separated from the other barrows in the group by a fence.

The barrow comprises a mound which was presumably circular, and which rises to a height of 1.3m and measures 18.4m in base diameter. Only a small section of its top survives, and comprises a narrow platform which appears like half an egg in plan; it measures 5m north to south, and 1.4m east to west. The whole is covered by long grass which has served to stabilise the cutting made in the construction of the highway. No other intrusions are visible.

The post-and-wire fence that separates it from the rest of the group 'hugs' the mound so closely that it is not possible to see whether an encircling ditch is present. The well-used vehicle track immediately east of the fence makes it unlikely that any associated earthworks located here could survive, and none were observed during the survey.

### *Barrow V*

Although not noted by Hoare or Grinsell, this feature has the appearance of a barrow. It comprises a small mound which measures 13.8m north-west to south-east and 11.2m transversely, and is c0.3m high. It is cut by the ditch of barrow **18** on its north-east side. The barrow was noted by PA Stevens, the OS Archaeology Division Investigator in 1974, who said that although 'it has the appearance of a denuded bowl barrow [it] is unlikely to have been missed by Colt Hoare, so may be the spoil from his excavation or later dumping' despite the fact that he recognised its relationship to barrow **18** (NMR SU 14 SW 131). The apparently clear relationship, again observed during the present survey, contradicts his statement.

A further small round mound **H** (NMR SU 14 SW 734) is situated between barrows **14** and **20** on the current field boundary; however, this is not considered to be a barrow and is described below.

## The linear earthworks

A number of linear earthworks were identified amongst the barrows and within Winterbourne Stoke Clump. Some of these are the remains of the Larkhill Military Railway and others are fragments of earlier tracks and boundaries. This section will discuss first those that might be associated with the railway and other tracks, before considering the remains of ancient boundaries and finally those earthworks that do not appear to relate to any other features thus far identified in the study area. Earthworks identified in the survey are referred to below by letters (Figs 9 and 14).

Immediately south of the group of small barrows **17-21b** is linear scarp **B-B**. It runs east to west for some 44.6m, extending the line of the fence between the fields in which the barrows are situated and the arable field to the north. The scarp is so shallow as to be almost imperceptible but a slight fall can be seen from north to south. The north side of enclosure SU 04 SE 142 and another levelled bank are depicted close to this earthwork by the RCHME (1979, map 1) but this scarp is probably indicative of a recent fence or ploughing edge.

### Remains of the Larkhill Military Railway and other tracks

A linear earthwork was surveyed which seems to be clearly the remains of a branch of the Larkhill Military Railway (James 1987, 203-6 *et passim*, NMR SU 14 SW 644), dating to the First World War.

Earthworks **C-C** (Fig 9) are situated inside the south-western boundary of the Winterbourne Stoke Clump. They are aligned north to south, and comprise a linear hollow c0.4m deep, which extends almost from the A303 to the fence which separates the woodland from the field to the north, and survives for a length of approximately 105m. There are two very narrow v-shaped cuts running along either side of the hollow, which give its centre (between 0.05m and 0.1m higher than these) a slightly convex profile. The sides of the hollow ascend to ground level and the scarps that run along the outside of this hollow probably represent a bank created by upcast from the railway's construction. The eastern scarp is c0.1m high and reaches a maximum length of 72m from north to south, while the extent of the bank on its west side is much harder to define, largely as a result of damage by construction of the fence at the western extent of the Clump, which seems to have been erected along it. The hollow and accompanying banks have a combined width of c 9.5m.




Fig 9: The main linear earthworks and the Longbarrow Cross (S): north to top

Two north-south parallel scarps **D-D** (Fig 9) are situated in the field to the north of the clump, c35m north of earthworks **C-C**. The western scarp is 25m long, and the eastern scarp 31m, and the two define a 2m wide linear hollow. Earthwork **D-D** is slightly offset from the alignment of **C-C** and an extrapolated line between scarps **D-D** and linear hollow **F-F** (see below) to the south, suggests that these two sets of earthworks may be related.

A short scarp **E-E** is situated to the north of barrow 2. It is c6m long and about 0.2m high. It appears to follow the same alignment as the much longer scarp **G-G** (see below). It cannot be directly connected with the military railway and it lies too far east to be the eastern side of enclosure SU 04 SE 142. In fact it is almost certainly a ploughing edge.

Hollow **F-F** (Fig 9) extends from the A303 at its south-south-western end along the line of the woodland's south-west boundary for approximately 48m. It is aligned upon, and could be part of the same feature as, **D-D**. It is 4.2-4.3m wide at its top and 0.3m deep. The north-east part of this earthwork is obscured by the hedge line, which seems to cut it. **F-F** may be a hollow way or vehicle access track which probably post-dates the extension of Winterbourne Stoke Clump, undertaken sometime between 1901 and 1924 (OS 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> edition 25" maps (1901; 1924)), but as the OS maps seem to show an alteration to the parish boundary between these dates, **F-F** could also be one version of this boundary (that shown on the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition). However, **F-F** did cross to the south side of the A303 (e.g. RCHME 1979, pl 2), which the parish boundary does not.

Scarp **G-G** runs to the west of the two disc barrows. The scarp is orientated north-east to south-west and extends for 47.4m. Its course is more westerly than the alignment of the light railway as mapped by the NMP (NMR SU 14 SW 644) and it is almost certain that it represents a ploughing edge.

Mound **H** (Fig 7) is 0.4m high and 1.2m in diameter. Its circular top appears slightly off-centre. The mound could be part of the railway structure rather than a small previously unrecorded round barrow; the top of the mound lies just to the east of the centre line of the track. It is possible that the mound could be the eroded remains of a barrow but it seems unlikely that Hoare and his colleagues would have missed it, particularly as they recorded equally eroded barrows close by (Hoare 1812, 121-5). Though this is the same argument as that used by the OS Investigator to dismiss Barrow **V**, there is nothing in the surviving earthworks to contradict the argument in this case.

## Boundaries

Earthwork **J-J** (Fig 9) comprises a bank with a short segment of ditch on its north-west side, which follows the north-western edge of Winterbourne Stoke Clump. This represents part of the 19<sup>th</sup>-century boundary of Winterbourne Stoke Clump as seen on OS 25" 1<sup>st</sup> edition map (1877), which may have much earlier origins (see Discussion). Stumps along the bank indicate that trees that once grew along it have been removed,

although they are still present along its south-west portion. The bank is 84m long and runs from beyond the southern edge of barrow **3**, over the ditch of pond barrow **3a** and over the ditch and berm of bell barrow **4**. The south-western half of the feature lies within Winterbourne Stoke Clump and beneath the present boundary, which comprises a post-and-wire fence.

The bank of **J-J** is very low, rising to a maximum of 0.4m, and is between 3.5m wide to the north-east and 4m to the south-west. The ditch on its north-west side is only visible between barrows **3** and **3a**, and is 28m long, 3m wide, and 0.1m deep, and appears to have been deliberately cut only between these two monuments, as it can clearly be seen tapering at either end; its purpose is unclear.

There is further tentative evidence of a continuation of bank **J-J** on barrow **5**, in the form of a rectangular patch of brambles amid the grass that covers most of that barrow, though this could equally mark the position of a back-filled excavation trench. The alignment of that vegetation anomaly, however, and bank segment **J-J**, are almost exactly followed by the modern post-and-wire fence to the south-west.

There is a gap of 3m at the north-east end of **J-J**, beyond which an extension, nearly at a right angle, continues for approximately 17m in a south-easterly direction until it meets the fence on the northern edge of the Clump. This bank has been constructed over the ditch, berm and part of the mound of barrow **4**. It is of a similar height and width to the rest of bank **J-J** and is part of the same boundary, which uses barrow **4** to mark its corner, and is also shown as a boundary on the OS 1<sup>st</sup> edition 25" map (1877).

A short segment of scarp **K-K** (Fig 9) is visible within the woodland at the south-west end of **J-J** and this extends to the north-east of Barrow **3**. The south-eastern section survives for a length of almost 14m and to a height of 0.2m, and heads south-east from the point where it meets the south-west end of **J-J**. To the north-east of the Clump and of barrow **3** it is 0.1m high and 29m long. Although the area between the two sections of the scarp is obscured by boundary fences, trees and long grass, which make it impossible to ascertain if they join, together they seem to form a curved feature around the south and west of Barrow **3**, which seems to have damaged this side of the monument.

The final section of these boundary earthworks is bank **L-L** (Fig 9), which is in two parts, and is situated entirely within the Clump. It extends for a total length of 120m from the post-and-wire fence at its north-west end in a south-easterly direction towards the A303. Its north-western segment is c40m long, with an average width of 2.7m, while its southern fragment is 72m long, and between 3.5m and 4.5m wide. Both reach a height of between 0.2 and 0.3m. There is a widening approximately half way along the northern bank segment which corresponds to the location of a mature tree and appears to have been caused by it; a number of similar, smaller widenings are present along both segments at the locations of well established trees. The two bank segments are separated from each other by a gap of c0.9m. No signs of a continuation of this earthwork were observed to the north of the woods and it presumably marks the western side of the Clump, as



indicated on the OS 1<sup>st</sup> edition 25" map (1877). However, it also shares the same alignment as elements of the field system (NMR SU 14 SW 40) to the south of the A303 (see Discussion).

### Other linear earthworks

At the south-west corner of the Clump, the southern part of **C-C** (the bed of the light railway) and the linear hollow **F-F** cut a series of four parallel linear hollows **M-M** (Fig 9) aligned west-south-west to east-north-east. These hollows continue into the field to the west of the Clump, where they appear to cut the eastern ditch of the long barrow.

These hollows **M-M** are all of similar width, ranging from 3.7m to 4.1m, with only a short segment of the southernmost linear reaching 7.2m wide where it nears the A303. Elsewhere this segment is 3.5m wide. The linears range in depth from 0.1m to 0.5m. The spacing between the hollows is inconsistent, and varies between just over 2m to in excess of 9m. The third hollow from the north is the longest at c118m with a break near its eastern end where it is cut by hollows **R-R** (see below). The second hollow from the north comprises four sections and is 65m long in total; the westernmost section fades out before reaching the long barrow. The west end of the northernmost hollow seems to be cut by a small pear-shaped feature in the side of the eastern ditch of the long barrow.

The south-west end of the southernmost hollow seems to run into the fence at the south of the study area and head towards the roundabout. There is a lack of clarity here in the relationship between the southernmost of these hollows and earthwork **F-F**, as they appear to merge; this could be the result of vehicle activity around the intersection. This ambiguity suggests that the southernmost hollow is a separate feature altogether, possibly related to the southern boundary of the field in which it is situated. There is an isolated, curved south-east facing scarp near the extreme eastern end of **M-M**; its origin is uncertain but it could represent the corner of a 'Celtic' field.

North of the long barrow are two further linear east-facing scarps, **N-N** and **P-P** (Fig 9). The latter is 1.9m wide, 0.1m high and extends for 33m, and is aligned approximately north-south. Its northern end appears to be cut by **N-N**, which is 62.7m long, 3.8m wide and 0.2m high; it follows the alignment of the western ditch of the long barrow, which terminates near its south-western end, and continues north-eastwards, before turning north. This extends the line of a fence shown on the OS 1<sup>st</sup> edition 25" map (1887).

A number of short, irregularly shaped earthworks have been identified between hollow **F-F** and the long barrow. The southernmost of these is situated just to the north of the gate giving access to the field from the A303 and is no doubt simply the result of erosion at this well-used access point. There is a tree only a few metres north of the gate, around which a further hollow is situated, with more, smaller hollows not far away. These are modern animal scrapes. Several modern vehicle tracks extend northwards from the gate.

A number of these can be seen all the way along the western boundary of the field, although only those at the southern end have been surveyed.

Finally, east of **C-C** and inside the Clump are three curved linear hollows **R-R** (Fig 9), aligned approximately north to south, with an average depth of 0.3m; they vary in width between 3m and 4m, with base widths of 1.3m to 1.5m. The westernmost of these is c57m long; the central hollow is c46m long; the easternmost feature has only one surviving scarp, c27m in length. The hollows have the appearance of vehicle tracks and are spaced c5.3m apart; they appear to end independently of other features within the wood, though they cut hollows **M-M**; they do not follow the alignment of any other earthwork.

## Other features

A square stone **S** (Figs 9 and 10), which measures 0.8m by 0.8m and stands approximately 0.3m high, lies at SU 10046 41500, less than half a metre east of the eastern side of **C-C**. Its upper edges curve inwards towards the carved square 'well' at its centre which measures 0.45m by 0.47m and is 80mm deep. This is the base of a medieval wayside cross, sometimes known as Longbarrow Cross, though the base has also been called the 'Drinking Stone' (NMR SU 14 SW 155).



Fig 10: The cross base

The large rectangular enclosure (SU 04 SE 142) mapped from aerial photographs (RCHME 1979, map 1) lies largely to the west of the A 360 but extends into the area between barrows **2** and **21**. Part of its northern perimeter is shown as a bank on the 1<sup>st</sup> edition OS 25" map (1877) and this bank seems to have survived as a very slight earthwork into the 20<sup>th</sup> century but it is no longer visible on the ground.

There are numerous slight undulations in the ground surface within the Clump but these were not surveyed.

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

### Mapping and aerial photography

Four barrows at Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads were depicted schematically on Andrews and Dury's 1773 *Map of Wiltshire* (WHC; WANHS 1952). Perhaps unsurprisingly, even such schematic depictions are absent from the enclosure and tithe award maps of the area (Winterbourne Stoke Enclosure 1812; Durnford Enclosure 1793; TA Durnford 1841; TA Amesbury 1851; TA Winterbourne Stoke 1847, WHC). The first attempt at an accurate depiction of the barrows at the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads was produced by Philip Crocker, who surveyed them for Hoare's *Ancient Wiltshire* (1812, f 112, opp 121, opp 170), followed by the OS on their 1<sup>st</sup> edition 25" map (1877).

The Andrews and Dury map also shows the Longbarrow Cross (S; NMR SU 14 SW 155), as does the 1801 *New Map of Wiltshire* (Carey, WHC). It is depicted here on the north-west side of the cross roads, suggesting possibly that the north-south road was then on the line indicated by hollows R-R. Like the barrows, the cross was absent from the enclosure and tithe award maps, and subsequent mapping, until 1877, when it was depicted on the north-east side of the crossroads on the OS 1<sup>st</sup> edition 25" map and had been re-named the 'Drinking Stone'. This suggests that the cross had by then been removed from the base, which has remained in the location mapped by the OS until the present (Fig 10).

Both Hoare (1812, 126) and Thurnam (1869, 309) referred to further barrows (NMR SU 14 SW 100, NMR SU 14 SW 533 and NMR SU 14 SW 534) continuing the line of the main Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads group north-eastwards, from the three extant bell barrows at its northern end. These were later numbered 22, by Grinsell (1957, 201), 76 and 77, by the RCHME (1979, 3). Thurnam, who stated that they were in a field under cultivation, showed only one (1869, 309). It is interesting that these three barrows were plough-levelled so quickly, as according to the Tithe Awards of Durnford, Amesbury and Winterbourne Stoke, the area was in pasture at least until 1841 (TA Durnford, Amesbury and Winterbourne Stoke, 1841, 1851 and 1847, WHC). Despite this, two of them seem to have been completely levelled in about 20 years, with only one, possibly 22 (NMR SU 14 SW 100), surviving until the late 1930s, when it was shown on the OS 4<sup>th</sup> edition 6" map (1939). None of these three barrows now survives as earthworks.

Aerial photography shows the damage sustained by the barrows in the 20<sup>th</sup> century (see above), and has also revealed a number of archaeological features surrounding them. These were mapped as part of the SPTA and the Stonehenge WHS National Mapping Projects (NMP), which began in 1994 and 2001 respectively (Crutchley 2000; 2002). The

photographs reveal the more ephemeral surrounding settlement sites and 'Celtic' field systems, and show how these relate to the many boundaries and tracks near the Winterbourne Stoke crossroads.

The parish boundaries that converge near the crossroads appear both on the historic mapping and air photographs, and seem to have remained unchanged from their earliest depictions at the time of the enclosures. The boundary between Winterbourne Stoke and Wilsford parishes at the barrows survives as bank **J-J**, while the boundary to the south and south-east of the roundabout utilises a Bronze Age linear ditch (TA Winterbourne Stoke 1843, TA Dumford 1841, WHC; NMR SU 14 SW 129).

These two earthworks were also utilised as the boundary between Underditch Hundred and Branch and Dole Hundred, as shown on Greenwood's *Map of Wiltshire* (1830, WHC), while the eastern end of **J-J**, aligned north-west to south-east, is depicted as part of the Hundred boundary between Amesbury and Underditch Hundred on the OS 1<sup>st</sup> edition 25" map (1877). A track on the line of **L-L** is marked on Andrews and Dury's 1773 map, extending south-eastwards across Wilsford Down, and both it and the eastern end of **J-J** extend south-east of the A303 on the OS 1<sup>st</sup> edition 25" map, the former as a fence; they form part of the 'Celtic' field system (NMR SU 14 SW 40) mapped by the NMP.

The early 20<sup>th</sup> century saw the addition to the landscape of the Larkhill Military Railway from Larkhill to Druid's Lodge (James 1987, 125-6). It was mapped by the EH Aerial Investigation team for almost its entire length and can be seen in Fig 11. It ran across the site from north-east to south-west and bifurcated just to the north of the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads barrows. One branch then headed around the south side of barrow **9** (this branch went to Stonehenge Aerodrome), while the other passed to the west of the disc barrows and turned south, passing to the east of the long barrow, **C-C**, and continuing south of the A303. It was short-lived, having been constructed after the outbreak of war in 1914 (*ibid*) and shown by the Ordnance Survey as 'dismantled' by 1924 (OS 3<sup>rd</sup> edition 25" map).

In the 1930s the parish boundary comprised bank **J-J**, which overlay all of the round barrows along the ridge. Photographs of the early 1940s seem to show that the bank had been removed and replaced by a fence. Interestingly, neither the ditch nor bank was mentioned by Hoare despite the bank's clear intrusion on one of the more impressive barrows at the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads (1812, 121-6). This omission could suggest that the bank post-dates his survey of c1810, although it is equally possible that it was not mentioned because it had already become a very low, disused earthwork or because he was not interested in such recent land divisions.

Many of the smaller tracks seen in the recent survey could be more recent additions to the landscape and appear on aerial photographs of the area. These include substantial hollows which correspond to the location of **R-R**, and which seem to originate at the

A303. Track **F-F** and the four hollows **M-M** are also visible, as is a smaller track which runs from the intersection of **R-R** with the road and heads north-eastwards, apparently through the gap in the longest of the **M-M** hollows before reaching the woodland. Earlier photography is not as clear but shows a substantial track or double fence-line that could contribute to the sharp angle in the south-east end of the western ditch of the long barrow (RAF/540/854 3462 29-Aug-52), while tracks which partly overlies the east ditch of the long barrow seem to have eroded it, making it far shallower than its partner.

The crossroads themselves have also undergone change. Until about 1939 the A360 ran straight from north to south and was perpendicular to the A303, which it crossed several metres south-west of the long barrow (OS 3<sup>rd</sup> edition 25" map (1924)). The turning northwards on to the A360 from the A303 was then moved 60m west along the A303, and was joined to the un-altered section of the A360 some 160m north of the original crossroads by a curved road (OS 4<sup>th</sup> edition 25" map). To the south-west of the old crossroads, a café was built at some time after 1936, and was enclosed by a new boundary (WHC, GI/760/158), which coincidentally enclosed the north-west end of the Late Bronze Age linear ditch (SU 14 SW 129).

The turning was abandoned in favour of a roundabout, which was built in 1967-8, and which returned the northern section of the A360 to its former course; this may have been concurrent with the demolition of the café, which can be seen in air photos dated to 1952 but does not appear on those from 1967 (RAF/540/854 3462 29-Aug-1952; NMR 930/67 12-May-1967).

A large curvilinear feature, which is thought possibly to have been a horse gallop, though it might alternatively have military origins (M Barber pers comm), appears faintly in aerial photographs of the 1930s (e.g. RCHME 1979, pl 2) but as a more substantial feature in 1943 (Fig 11), surviving as a boundary until 1970 (OS/70067/11130/149). It filled the triangle of land formed by the Winterbourne Stoke and Wilsford-cum-Lake/ Amesbury parish boundary to the east, the A360 to the west and the A344 to the north.

## Excavation, field-walking and geophysical survey

Most of the barrows near the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads were excavated by William Cunnington (Hoare 1812, 121-6). Some 50 years later, Dr John Thurnam, who synthesised the results of many round and long barrow excavations and had a keen interest in craniology, re-excavated two of the round barrows (**7** and **16**), in which he found cremations (1869, 309), one of the pond barrows (**3a**), with 'negative result' (1868, 166 note b), and excavated the long barrow. He also found human remains within the north-east end of the long barrow (Thurnam 1865, 140-3; 1868, 184; Marsden 1974, 58).

Cunnington and Thurnam uncovered features beneath several of the barrows, the earliest of which appear to be the three empty pits discovered by Thurnam beneath the long

barrow (1865, 143). One of these was at the head of the primary interment which comprised a 'crouched [young] male skeleton' with a 'bludgeon-shaped' flint nodule (*ibid.* 142-3; 1868, 194, fig 2); Field describes the nodule as 'almost phallic-shaped' and notes instances of other phallic nodules and carvings in Neolithic contexts (2006, 140-1, fig 65). The pit measured 18 inches [0.46m] in depth and in diameter, but Thurnam merely remarked that the other two were similar, with no mention of their situation in relation to one another. A further find of what he called the 'symphysis of the ischium of an old horse' (*ibid.* 143) is a problematic piece of evidence that will be discussed below.

Secondary deposits in the long barrow were found at its north-east end, 'about 2 feet [0.6m] below the highest part of the tumulus', and comprised the skeletons of a man, a woman, a child and three infants 'the youngest, perhaps foetal' (Thurnam 1865, 141-2). They were accompanied by an urn and flint scraper, and are therefore interpreted as early Bronze Age burials (*ibid.* 1869, 379, 420-1).

Barrow 4 (Hoare's barrow 15) which was excavated by Cunnington, contained a single skeleton within a wooden 'box', accompanied by sheet bronze fragments, an Early Bronze Age bronze dagger and knife/dagger (the latter broken), bone mounts (possibly pommels), and a bone pin and tweezers (Hoare 1812, 122; Clarke *et al* 1985, 284). The dagger was of the same type as those found in Barrow 5 to the north. There were also five or more secondary interments (Hoare 1812, 122).

Barrow 5 (Hoare's number 16 and also excavated by Cunnington) contained a wealth of objects alongside its primary interment which comprised a skeleton inside an elm box within a 'shallow oblong cist' (Hoare 1812, 122). The finds included a red 5-handled urn along with two bronze daggers and a bronze awl, with several bone items. Hoare noted that the urn was 'different both in shape and colour to any we have ever found in the British sepulchres' (1812, 122-3). This has subsequently been described as having affinities with Breton *vase à anse*-style pottery from the period which correlates with the Wessex Early Bronze Age (Tomalin 1988); the daggers have long been regarded as indicating Breton links (Gerloff 1975, plate 44e, 108-109). This issue has recently been re-examined (e.g. Needham 2000; Needham and Woodward 2008).

The daggers from graves in barrows 4 and 5 are extremely rare finds (Needham 2000, 180), though there is a similar example from Bush Barrow on Normanton Down (NMR SU 14 SW 439). The dagger from barrow 5 had 'gilt' traces on its wooden hilt remains and finely drilled holes which constitute possible evidence of the 'gold studding in the Armorican-style' observed on the Bush Barrow dagger (Needham *ibid.* Lawson 2007, 222-3, table 7.4). The example from Winterbourne Stoke was much degraded however. If not directly imported, the three daggers may at least have been made from imported metal, which when tested was found to be unusually low in tin and unusually high in arsenic, unlike other British examples but not unlike those from Brittany (Needham *ibid.*). As discussed above, the red vessel is similar to Early Bronze Age vessels from the same part of the continent, although its differences from native examples suggest it might not

have been imported but perhaps be a copy of a Breton type (Needham 2000, 181). The secondary inhumations in Barrow 4 were unfortunately undated, although interestingly, they occurred within the barrow in which the primary interment was 'capped' by a clay mound prior to the earthen mound's construction, a feature not present in any of the other Winterbourne Stoke barrows that contained wooden 'coffins' or metalwork.

A secondary deposit in barrow 5 was a rather unusual large piece of 'fossil wood' (Hoare 1812, 122), now at the Wiltshire Heritage Museum in Devizes. Whatever this deposit represents, it may be connected with the enhancement of the barrow mound, for the earthworks suggest that a small secondary mound was constructed over the earlier one (as described above).

Further to the north, three more of the barrows in this line (8, 9 and 10) contained skeletal remains, all laid 'north to south' (Hoare 1812, 124), in one case (9) contained in a boat-shaped wooden box within an 'oblong cist' (*ibid*). The two skeletons which were found within barrows 8 and 9 were accompanied by miniature vessels, which are also associated with 'Wessex' burials; like the individuals in barrows 4 and 5, those in barrows 8 and 9 were also accompanied by metalwork, two whetstones (found in barrow 8) and 'oblong beads' (*ibid*).

Barrows 6 and 7 are both quite different from their larger neighbours and from each other in outward appearance and excavated evidence. The more southerly and larger of the two, barrow 6, contained the remains of a 'young person or female' orientated north to south, beneath a 'large conical pile of flints...' (Hoare 1812, 124) while barrows 7 and 16 possibly contained only 'burned bones in shallow graves' (Thurnam 1869, 310). No finds were recovered and 7 is the only barrow within the cemetery (with the possible exception of 10), which had a flint mound at its core beneath the earthen mound.

At the extreme south-west of the alignment lies the much eroded barrow 3, which contained cremated remains. As in barrows 19, 21, 18 and 21a, the remains do not appear to have been deposited in a hollow, as was the case in barrow 17.

At the north-east end of the main alignment is the large barrow 10, which contained a skeleton within a rectangular feature (in this case a cist cut into the chalk), like other bell barrows on this alignment. Hoare's 'family sepulchre' (1812, 125), barrow 10 is quite distinct from the rest of the barrows in the cemetery. After an initial deposit of two individuals within a grave cut from the natural chalk, six further skeletons were placed directly (it seems) on top of the first, after which, as Cunnington observed, 'the vast quantity of chalk dug out of [the grave] was once again thrown in to cover them' (*ibid*). A further deposit of an urned cremation (in what would now be classed a Deverel-Rimbury urn) was inserted into the grave in which the skeletons lay but 'vegetable earth' which covered the secondary interment was present beneath as well as above it, leading Cunnington to the conclusion that it 'was deposited at a period subsequent to all the others'. Later still, two dog skeletons were buried some five feet above the human

remains (Hoare 1812, 125-6). Like other barrows in the study area, the earthwork as it survives today seems to indicate some of these phases of activity.

Barrow **20** is Hoare's Barrow 7 and contained a primary inhumation of a skeleton with a 'drinking cup' at its feet lying within a 'cist', a hole cut into the chalk. A secondary inhumation of a child was also recovered from this barrow, alongside a 'basin-like urn' (Hoare 1812, 121). Unfortunately neither of these items is with the collection of finds at the Wiltshire Heritage Museum at Devizes where many of the objects from Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads barrows are held, and the 'basin-like' vessel cannot be dated; but the 'drinking cup' is undoubtedly a Beaker vessel. Barrows **20** and **17** were the only two in this small group in which interments were placed in a cist. Barrows **21**, **21a** and **18** contained only 'simple interments of burned bones' (Hoare 1812, 121-6). They could be largely of later date; Middle and Late Bronze Age burials are present, in barrows **13** and **21b**, and indeed this is the only barrow cemetery in the immediate Stonehenge area to have produced Deverel-Rimbury ceramics in significant quantities (Woodward and Woodward 1996, 288).

Barrows **20** and **21b** were the only two in this north-western group in which secondary interments were found, although these too were different from one another. Barrow **20** contained the skeleton of a child with an undated vessel while **21b** contained a secondary cremation with a, possibly Late Bronze Age, urn (no primary deposit was found).

Although Hoare published maps and bird's-eye views of the Wiltshire barrow groups, no sections of the monuments were provided and an examination of Cunliffe's letters to Hoare in which he described his excavations suggests that, as might be expected at this date, none were drawn (Hoare 1812, opp 121, opp 170; Cunliffe MS 13, 1807, WNHAS). Thus many of his finds are at best described as 'primary' or 'subsequent', or as having been found 'near the surface' of the mound, 'four feet above the floor of the barrow' or 'in a cist cut into the chalk' (Hoare 1812, 121-4). The descriptions of stratified deposits are rare (*ibid*, 125). Hoare sometimes expounded on the appearance of a deposit which sealed a burial in some detail but, unfortunately, did not match these with measurements or a description of the deposit's extents.

The first documented modern excavation near the Crossroads was that undertaken by Faith and Lance Vatcher in 1967 prior to the construction of the roundabout. They excavated the four quadrants of the crossroads, and to the north of the A303 (very close to the long barrow) found 'four circular structures, probably Late Bronze Age huts', as well as 'several small, shallow, circular pits containing a few thick urn fragments, a Beaker sherd', and a possible boundary ditch with banks on either side (*Wiltshire Archaeol Natur Hist Mag* 63 1968, 108-9; Richards 1990, 208-10; Leivers and Moore 2008, 37-9). To the west of the A360 two 'stockade trenches' were also uncovered; one ran from north to south and one from east to west. Richards (1990, 208) suggests that these were Late Bronze Age linear ditches. The ceramics yielded by the Vatcher excavation included Beaker, Middle Bronze Age and Roman pottery; it can be suggested that the houses and



pits they uncovered formed a Deverel-Rimbury settlement associated with the 'Celtic' fields and with the Deverel-Rimbury interments in the barrows.

Significant chance surface finds have also been made within the survey area. The earliest of these was a 'finely made, backed flint bladelet, from the centre of the long edge of the [long] barrow' (Wiltshire Heritage Museum catalogue no DZSWS: 1982.70), which is dated to the Mesolithic period. A flint scraper, possibly of Neolithic date, (NMR SU 14 SW 524) was also found in the vicinity of the long barrow while a flint flake (NMR SU 14 SW 525) was found near the crossroads. There is some uncertainty about the precise location of an additional 'single-backed flake' (NMR SU 14 SW 526).

Field-walking was carried out as part of the Stonehenge Environs Project to the south-east of the barrow cemetery and south of the A303 (Sites 50 and 59 – Richards 1990, fig 8), on portions of known 'Celtic' field systems. The exercise recovered several plain sherds of early Bronze Age pottery from the parts of the collection sites closest to the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads barrow cemetery. The locations also produced Deverel-Rimbury and Late Bronze Age pottery (Richards 1990, fig 154), presumably related to the settlement uncovered in 1967, enclosure (SU 04 SE 142) or possibly a further enclosure to the west (SU 04 SE 141).

Most recently, test pitting, trial trenching and field walking around the Winterbourne Stoke crossroads were undertaken as part of the A303 Stonehenge Improvement scheme between 1992 and 2003 (Leivers and Moore 2008); this revealed 'Middle Bronze Age features and material ... [which] provides further convincing evidence of settlement activity...associated with the enclosed settlement encountered during the construction of the roundabout' (NMR SU 04 SE 141 and 142) (*ibid*, 63). Geophysical survey was also undertaken as part of the A303 Stonehenge Improvement scheme, and this pointed to a settlement focus north-west of the roundabout (Leivers and Moore 2008, 63) which could be associated with the 'Celtic' field systems mapped from air photography further to the north-west or to the enclosure SU 04 SE 142, as well as the settlement excavated at the roundabout in 1967.

The pond barrows within the group, **3a** and **12**, were the subject of ground penetrating radar (GPR) survey in 1995 (Flaxman 1996), the purpose of which was to ascertain whether they concealed shafts similar to the nearby Wilsford Shaft (NMR SU 14 SW 153). Although a signal 'not inconsistent' with a shaft was noted beneath the shallower barrow **3a**, there were no anomalies beneath either that could positively be interpreted as evidence of an underlying shaft.



Fig 11: Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads, Christmas Eve 1943: north is to top. The parish boundary between Winterbourne Stoke and Amesbury bisects the linear group of barrows in the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads cemetery (top right to bottom left). 'Celtic' field systems are visible within the 'gallop', in the fields to either side, and to the south of the A 303. The northern edge of enclosure SU 04 SE 142 is visible as an earthwork just to the south of the north-western group of barrows. The 'gallop' is bisected by a ditch or track which extends to the cross roads (centre top to bottom left). The remains of the Larkhill Military Light Railway can be seen as a thin white line from top right of the photograph towards bottom left, where it splits in two just below centre; one branch continues just to the east of the long barrow, the other curving between barrows 8 and 9. The Longbarrow Crossroads café is at the extreme bottom left-hand corner of the photograph. (US 7PH GPLOC1221048 24121943 M Series: © English Heritage (NMR) USAAF Photography)

## DISCUSSION

### Earliest activity

Evidence for early human activity to the north-east of the crossroads comes in the form of an unstratified Mesolithic flint recovered from the surface of the long barrow and possibly the pits beneath. There is as yet no evidence for Mesolithic settlement in the area, so it is not possible to know whether the find has any particular significance but it is by no means unusual for Mesolithic material to be incorporated in Neolithic mounds.

It is not possible to tell whether the pits beneath the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads long barrow were contemporary with one another, or even to ascertain their precise date. Pits beneath long and round barrows have been noted elsewhere; many of the long barrows dug by Cunnington were built over such features (Eagles and Field 2004, 58), as were a number of round barrows; while some contained human remains, others, like the long barrow at Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads, did not. It has been suggested that large postholes beneath long barrows are evidence of collapsed mortuary enclosures (Marsden 1974, 58), but they sometimes occur in odd numbers or singly and could have held free-standing 'monumental' posts (D Field pers comm) which marked an already significant place. Lawson has drawn attention to the 'coincidence' of Mesolithic pits in close association with Neolithic ceremonial monuments, especially near Stonehenge (2007, 36).

Based on Bayesian analysis of recent radiocarbon dates from a small group of chambered long barrows, their construction potentially spans a short time period – c 3750-3400 cal BC (Bayliss and Whittle 2007). The Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads long barrow was probably constructed within this period and is therefore the earliest monument in this part of the Stonehenge landscape. The long barrow is aligned on midsummer sunrise but it is also aligned in accordance with the local topography, along the ridge, and this combination of factors may in itself have been significant in the decision to locate the barrow here (Field 2006, 69).

The 'symphysis of the ischium of an old horse', previously mentioned, was found 'a yard from the feet of the primary interment' (Thurnam 1865, 143); horse remains are very rare in the Neolithic (Lawson 2007, 39, 172-3) so this might be a significant piece of evidence. However, this particular find is not with the remainder of the Thurnam Collection at the Duckworth Laboratory, Cambridge, with the result that his identification of the horse bone cannot be verified. English Heritage animal bone specialists have suggested that, 'depending on the size of the fragment, the knowledge of the examiner and age of the animal it might be possible to confuse horse with either cow or large deer' (S Vincent pers comm). The food vessel found with the secondary interments in the long barrow (Thurnam 1865, 141-2; 1868, 196, fig 5) demonstrates early Bronze Age re-use of the long barrow.

The position of the long barrow, orientated along a ridge towards midsummer sunrise, must be significant, especially in light of the importance of this orientation at Stonehenge itself. However, its relationship with the nearby long barrows Winterbourne Stoke 71 (RCHME 1979, 1) and Wilsford 34 (Grinsell 1957, 145) also has to be considered. There has been some discussion regarding the intervisibility of long barrows around Stonehenge (Lawson 2007, 52-3); the Crossroads long barrow is potentially intervisible (depending on vegetation cover) with four other long barrows (Amesbury 14, Wilsford 30 and 41, Winterbourne Stoke 53) but not with its nearest neighbours (Exon *et al*/2000, 34-42). These two barrows are only 500m to the south and south-east of the crossroads. Wilsford 34 also occupies the top of a spur and is orientated south-west to north-east whereas Winterbourne Stoke 71, which is similarly orientated, lies on the south-eastern slope of the same spur. However, it has recently been suggested, on the basis of aerial photographs, that the latter may not be a long barrow but a site of more recent, possibly military, origin (NMR: SU 14 SW 535). Until this uncertainty is resolved further discussion on this point may be premature.

## Spatial relationships of the barrows

The round barrows in the study area belong to the groups named by the OS as 'Winterbourne Stoke' and 'Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads' but have been studied together here because the division as it stands is unhelpful. One problem, for example, is that barrow **2** has been arbitrarily placed with the former group (because it is on the same map sheet). It is noteworthy however, that barrow **2** does in fact lie at the south-west end of a line that can be drawn through the two disc barrows (**14** and **15**) and **16**. The missing barrow **2a** might also share this alignment. (Study of the plan, however, suggests other possible alignments (e.g. **2**, **16a**, **16**, **13**, **11** and **7a** or **2**, **21**, **21a** and **17**)).

The main line of barrows along the ridge was certainly deliberately aligned on the long barrow. Nevertheless, as Field has pointed out (2006, pl 11), the alignment is not precise and owes as much to the shape of the ridge as to the direction of midsummer sunrise. The second line of barrows that is offset to the west, suggested above, is less neatly aligned than the first, which almost suggests that their position in relation to each other was less carefully considered. This could indicate that these barrows were not part of the primary cemetery layout and that they therefore post-date the barrows along the ridge. (It could also be argued that the two disc barrows, **14** and **15**, in some way mirror the pair of bell barrows **4** and **5**.)

However, despite the problems of dividing the cemeteries noted above, the distinctness in size and form of the small, simple barrows in the cluster to the north-west from the barrows in the linear formations indicates that this cluster could be regarded as a separate cemetery; additionally, because it comprises mostly smaller and simpler bowl barrows, most of its monuments might be later than the group of larger barrows along the ridge.

(Woodward 2000, 145), though clearly its origins are in the Beaker period or earlier. Some evidence for the sequence of cemetery development can be deduced from apparently phased mound construction, stratigraphic relationships between barrows and a number of finds.

The spacing between the barrows in each of the barrow groups is also noteworthy. Although some of the barrows are juxtaposed with others, as will be discussed below, there are relatively large spaces elsewhere. This deliberate spacing could also be significant, possibly suggesting that 'flat' cemeteries or other features may exist between the monuments.

### Stratigraphic relationships of the barrows

Some direct relationships between individual barrows survive, although in most cases they have either been damaged or destroyed by cultivation.

The clearest sequence is that between barrows **5**, **4** and **3a**, the outer bank of the last overlying the ditch of **4**, which in turn cuts that of **5** (Fig 3), which is apparently therefore the earliest of the three. However, it is clear that these are multi-phase barrows; strictly therefore, the observation tells us only that the ditch of **4** was dug or recut after the ditch of **5**; possibly **4** was still being elaborated whilst **5** was completed or closed; it does not necessarily tell us which barrow was *begun* first (*but see below*). Nevertheless, the sequence in which barrows **3a**, **4** and **5** seem to have been constructed suggests that at least part of this linear arrangement developed from the north-east towards the south-west – heading *towards* the long-barrow. This present appearance of the earthworks masks the potential complexity of monument construction and use that is suggested by underlying features, burials at different levels within the mounds, and by some visible additions to the tops of the barrow mounds; the evidence is certainly insufficient to suggest that the whole line was constructed from north-east to south-west.

A second stratigraphic sequence can be seen in the relationships between disc barrows **14** and **15** and barrow **13** (Fig 7). The bank of **14** certainly overlies the ditch of **13**, which is situated just to the east of the possible second line of barrows of which **14** is a part. The relationship between the two barrow elements shows that the ditch and bank of disc barrow **14** were constructed or recut after the ditch of barrow **13** had been dug. Again, the evidence does not necessarily reveal which barrow was *begun* first, or how the possible early phases of each looked.

Vehicle tracks have almost obliterated the relationship between disc barrows **15** and **14** but a relationship can, with some difficulty, still be teased out. It appears that if the bank of disc barrow **15** were projected north to the point of intersection with that of **14**, it and not the bank of barrow **14** should still be visible on the other side of the damage. The observation that it is the bank of barrow **14** which is visible north of the vehicle damage,

suggests that **I4** is the later of the two disc barrows; Philip Crocker's engraving of the barrows in *Ancient Wiltshire* (Hoare 1812, opp 121) can be read as showing this relationship; and Barrow **I5** is less perfectly circular, the outer lip of its ditch straightened at the point of overlap, which would also support this interpretation. On the other hand it is possible that the banks were never complete and that the two barrows were built at the same time in one operation (D McOmish pers comm). However, the interpretation that **I4** overlies **I5** is preferred here; barrow **I4** therefore overlaps and, perhaps deliberately, links pre-existing barrows **I3** and **I5**.



Fig 12: Barrow 5, the 'King Barrow', with 4 beyond

Due to the extensive vehicle track damage to many of the barrows in the north-western group, only one clear relationship between any of these monuments survives. This is at the north-east extent of the group between bowl barrows **I8** and **V**, where the ditch of the former cuts across the north-east portion of **V** suggesting that the mound of barrow **V** was constructed before **I8** (though, as noted previously, a simple mound could potentially mask a more complex history). The existence of barrow **V** was not noted by Hoare or Grinsell, despite its similarity in height and form to barrow **I8** which cuts through it. The OS Field Investigator suggested that it is actually a mound of spoil, largely

on the strength of Hoare's failure to identify it, despite it having the appearance 'of a denuded bowl barrow' and its relationship to barrow **18** (NMR SU 04 SE 131). Its remarkable similarity to other monuments in this cluster however, as well as the observation that it pre-dates barrow **18**, suggests that this feature is indeed a barrow.

There is a hint of an additional relationship between the ditches of barrows **21** and **19** although it is confused by a short segment of ditch or track which appears to be unrelated, but which lies at the interface between the two barrow ditches (Fig 8).

Given the accumulated evidence for multiple phases in the construction and use of round barrows in the Stonehenge area, from excavations and field observation, there is no certainty that the mound of any barrow is contemporary with the construction of its bank or ditch, as currently observable, or indeed that the mound was created in a single phase; as indicated above, in some cases the shape of a mound suggests a multi-phase construction. Stratigraphic relationships between barrows do not therefore in themselves, strictly speaking, reveal which parts of the cemeteries were constructed first, or in which direction they developed. As mentioned above, the relationship between pond barrow **3a** and bell barrow **4** for instance, shows only that the bank of the former post-dates the ditch of the latter; nevertheless, it is highly probable that the ditch of **4** as currently visible is a late element of that monument and that the bank of **3a** is at least partly the result of excavating the pond, and that the observed relationship is therefore of greater significance. It follows then, that the relationship between barrows **3a** and **4** can be extrapolated to suggest a 'trend' and that pond barrow **12** may also post-date the bell barrows.

## Evidence from excavation

Work done by the University of Bournemouth as part of the Wessex Barrow Project has suggested that, although clear distinctions do appear to exist between Beaker and Wessex round barrows elsewhere, the 'hybrid traditions' they believe they can see at the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads, in barrows whose forms do not allow a strict association with a specific burial practice or with particular goods, are present in many Wessex barrow cemeteries (Martin forthcoming). Until this work is published in full it will not be possible to comment further.

Barrow **2** covers a primary cremation but is very similar in form and size to barrow **13**, which covers a primary inhumation. The primary inhumations at the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads have mostly come from large bell and bowl barrows but they have also been found in smaller bowl barrows, such as **6**. Not all of the round barrows contained pottery vessels or other dateable artefacts. However, Beaker vessels were found alongside the primary inhumations in both the large bell barrow **10** and the low bowl barrow **7**; in the latter barrow it may have been deposited separately from the human remains. Miniature

vessels of various styles have been found in both large and small bowl barrows, as well as in one of the disc type. Neither is the deposition of later inhumations and cremations restricted to a particular barrow form.

Perhaps the barrow group grew from 'flat' graves, some of which developed into ditched or 'hengiform' enclosures similar to the Fargo Henge (NMR SU 14 SW 30), in itself a multi-phase monument, near the western end of the Stonehenge Cursus and c 1.3 km north-east of Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads, with further embellishments being in some cases directly related to subsequent burials added to a particular grave. These enclosed burials could have been further enhanced over time until they reached their present form and the practice of enhancement ceased.



Fig 13: Barrow 8 (centre) with 5 and 6 in the background and part of 9 right foreground

The Middle and Late Bronze Age sees settlement established close to the barrows and, in at least two cases, use of the barrows for funerary activity. This is part of a pattern that sees Deverel-Rimbury settlements and cemeteries concentrating on the periphery of major monumental zones of the Neolithic and earlier Bronze Age in Wiltshire (Woodward and Woodward 1996, 288).



## The barrows and other earthworks

Other relationships between features help to chart the later development of the landscape. By far the best example of this is bank **J-J** which overlies pond barrow **3a** and barrow **4**, and appears to be aligned on a 'Celtic' field system to the south (NMR SU 14 SW 40). The present bank could show that the 'Celtic' fields originally came this far north and that this boundary is of that date or that part of a 'Celtic' field system was extended at a later time, perhaps in the Romano-British period or when the land was divided into Hundreds or parishes. However, the lack of any clear lynchet build-up suggests that this is not part of the field system but a later boundary. Nevertheless, the land division represented by the bank has been long-lived, being the present (and historic) parish boundary between Winterbourne Stoke and Wilsford-cum-Lake to the west and east of the main barrow alignment respectively. It also, as noted above, marks the boundary between Hundreds. It is the linear barrow cemetery, however, which provides the major orientation in the landscape. Interestingly, the parish boundary continues the alignment of the barrows for some distance beyond barrow **10**, which marks the corner of three parishes (Winterbourne Stoke, Wilsford and Amesbury), passing through the site of Winterbourne Stoke 22 and turning only when it reaches Amesbury 55, the Monarch of the Plain.

Although almost completely destroyed in the open area, remains of the Larkhill Military Railway survive within the Clump, **C-C**. The line was constructed in 1914-15 and lifted by 1923 (James 1987, 125, 203, 206). The railway linked Larkhill military camp with Druid's Lodge camp c 2.3km to the south of the crossroads along the A360, while the branch that can be seen (Fig 11) heading eastwards and sweeping around barrow **9** connected the main line with the Stonehenge Aerodrome.

The series of four tracks **M-M** which are cut by the railway lie on a similar alignment to the present A303. This alignment and the location of the cross base (**S**) just to the north of the north-west intersection of the railway with the tracks, suggest that the tracks are the remains of former alignments of the turnpike. This case is further supported by the clearly visible path of the southernmost track of **M-M** towards the current roundabout. The cross, which is seen at this location on the earliest OS mapping, may have had a secondary use as a directional post at the crossroads. However, its original use was presumably as a wayside cross used for preaching, processional practices and perhaps for more secular occasions such as the beating of the parish bounds. Its location in relation to the parish boundary and the barrow cemetery is as significant as its relationship to the crossroads.

Similar earthworks **R-R** cut across the eastern end of the four tracks **M-M**. Although it is not clear to which period they might belong or with which activity they are related, they are later than **M-M** and their alignment could suggest that they are previous manifestations of the road that is now the A360, or could link them to the building or use of the military railway in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Another linear earthwork (**F-F**) is visible

just 8.5m west of the railway and also cuts across at least three of the four tracks (**M-M**). A ditch identified on an aerial photograph (RCHME 1979, pl 22; NMR: SU 04 SE 22) continues the line of **F-F** for at least 120m to the south of the surveyed area. This line can be projected through **F-F** as far north as **D-D**, a short fragment of a similar though much shallower earthwork. These features seem to represent a track alongside the Military Light Railway.

Finally, it has not proved possible to interpret with confidence shallow earthwork features **N-N** and **P-P**. They seem to be related to one another in some way, and survive in short segments which begin and end at arbitrary points. These features are not aligned on any of the other features seen in the recent survey or on those mapped from aerial photography. They are probably best explained as the fragmentary remains of short-lived fence lines.

## CONCLUSION

### The barrows

The long barrow which is the earliest monument within this cemetery is aligned both upon midsummer sunrise and the ridge. This alignment is followed by the most prominent of the round barrows but it is clear that there is no chronological progression from south-west to north-east; rather there is a more complex sequence of development. The barrows offset to the west and north-west also indicate that there is no straightforward sequence of development.

The individual barrows themselves are complex monuments. The adherence of some scholars of previous generations to a barrow typology reliant entirely on form may have delayed the recognition that some barrows, at least, are a physical manifestation of the most recent activities to take place there. Earlier manifestations of such monuments can often be read from detailed observation of the surviving earthworks. The current survey demonstrates that both the forms of individual barrows and the relationships between them can be analysed to suggest a more complex history. This complexity in visible barrow architecture is mirrored by a similar complexity in burial practices throughout the Neolithic and Bronze Age 'far more intricate or multifarious' than previously thought (Gibson 2007, 49).

How the barrows were viewed in the Middle and Late Bronze Age is of some interest; aerial photographic and excavation evidence shows a plethora of later Bronze Age activity around the south and west sides of the barrow cemetery in very close proximity. Whether this is normal settlement and agricultural practice or something more ceremonial and connected with the barrows is unclear; the excavation results themselves do not seem to hint at anything extraordinary and the fact that there is evidence of burials contemporary with the settlement within the barrow cemetery is not unusual, though it is rare in the Stonehenge environs (Woodward and Woodward 1996, 287-8). The houses excavated at the roundabout remain the only Bronze Age houses in the immediate Stonehenge area (Lawson 2007, 280).

When originally constructed in the Early Bronze Age the linear group of barrows, intentionally or not, marked out a boundary along the ridge in what was previously an unbounded landscape. This boundary has persisted until the present day, one of a growing number of examples of the potential antiquity of current administrative boundaries.

## The missing periods

There are a few recorded finds in the immediate vicinity from the Romano-British, Medieval and early Post-medieval periods but none that suggest Iron Age or Saxon use or occupation of the immediate landscape surrounding the barrows. In the medieval and early post-medieval period at least this was presumably undisturbed sheep pasture at the extreme edge of the parish (Freeman 1995, 275, 280-1); the lack of any significant archaeological signature (with the exception of the Longbarrow Cross) is therefore unsurprising. However, there are faint traces of ridge-and-furrow to the south of the cross roads, which indicate that this part of the down was ploughed, perhaps only briefly, at some time in the medieval or post-medieval period (RCHME 1979, xix, pl 22). Perhaps a similar pattern of land use can be extrapolated back into late prehistory; the 'Celtic' fields may have been in agricultural use for a relatively short period in a much longer era of pastoral use. The poor soils of the down would not have supported arable agriculture for long periods under traditional manuring regimes.

The cross roads has been approximately at its current location since the earliest accurate mapping but there are indications that both roads have moved. First, the Longbarrow Cross base is some distance from the current road alignments and secondly, one of the plough strips to the south of the cross roads is cut by the current A360, implying that the road to Salisbury formerly followed a more easterly line (RCHME 1979, xix).

## The 20<sup>th</sup> century

Although most aspects of the 20<sup>th</sup>-century use of this area, such as the Larkhill Military Railway, are tolerably well understood there are puzzling features; the use of the feature tentatively designated a 'gallop' and the very straight track crossing it, for instance, is not recorded. It is also remarkable that the railway has been so effectively erased from the landscape, only the section within the Clump surviving as an earthwork.

## METHODOLOGY

Survey and investigation at Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads were undertaken in August 2009 and January 2010. Detail was surveyed using a Trimble R8 survey grade GNSS receiver working in Real Time Kinematic mode (RTK) with points related to an R8 receiver configured as an on-site base station. The position of the base station had previously been adjusted to the National Grid Transformation OSTN02 via the Trimble VRS Now Network RTK delivery service. This uses the Ordnance Survey's GNSS correction network (OSNet) and gives a stated accuracy of 0.01-0.015m per point. The survey data was downloaded into Korec's Geosite software to process the field codes and the data transferred to AutoCad software for plotting out for graphical completion in the field. Additional detail within the wooded area was surveyed using a Trimble 5600 Total Station theodolite by taking radiating readings from each station in a closed traverse. The traverse was adjusted for errors using Korec's Geosite software and plotted at a scale of 1:1000. Further detail was added to the plot using standard graphical techniques of offset and radiation from the temporary network of pegs previously located with the GNSS and Total Station theodolite and plotted on to polyester drawing film at the elected scale of 1:1000.

## REFERENCES

- Bayliss, A and Whittle, A 2007 'Histories of the dead: building chronologies for five southern British long barrows' *Cambridge J Archaeol* **17/1**. 21-8.
- Clarke, DV, Cowie, TG and Foxon, A 1985 *Symbols of Power at the Time of Stonehenge* National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland/HMSO: Edinburgh.
- Crutchley, S 2000 *Salisbury Plain Training Area: a report for the National Mapping Programme* Aerial Survey Report Series. Swindon: English Heritage
- Crutchley, S 2002 *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Mapping Project: Management Report* Aerial Survey Report Series AER/14/2002. Swindon: English Heritage
- Cunnington, ME 1914 'List of the long barrows of Wiltshire' *Wiltshire Archaeol Natur Hist Mag* **38**. 379-414
- Darvill, T 2005 *Stonehenge World Heritage Site: an archaeological research framework* EH/Bournemouth University.
- Eagles, BN and Field, D 2004 'William Cunnington and the long barrows of the River Wylye' in R Cleal and J Pollard (eds) *Monuments and Material Culture, papers in honour of an Avebury archaeologist: Isobel Smith* Hobnob Press: East Knoyle. 47-69.
- Exon, S, Gaffney, V, Woodward, A and Yorston, R 2000 *Stonehenge Landscapes: journeys through real-and-imagined worlds* Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Field, D 2006 *Earthen Long Barrows* Tempus: Stroud
- Flaxman, EW 1996 'A radar survey of pond barrows' unpublished report.
- Freeman, J 1995 'Winterbourne Stoke' in DA Crowley (ed) *A History of Wiltshire 15 (Amesbury Hundred and Branch and Dole Hundred) The Victoria History of the Counties of England* Oxford University Press/Inst Hist Res: London. 275-84.
- Gerloff, S 1975 *The Early Bronze Age Daggers in Great Britain and a Reconsideration of the Wessex Culture* (Prähistorische Bronzefunde) Beck: Munich
- Gibson, A 2007 'A Beaker veneer? Some evidence from the burial record' in M Larsson and M Parker Pearson (eds) *From Stonehenge to the Baltic: living with cultural diversity in the third millennium BC* Brit Archaeol Rep International Series **1692**. 47-64
- Goddard, EH 1913, 'List of Prehistoric, Roman and Pagan Saxon Antiquities' *Wiltshire Archaeol Mag* **38** 153-378.

Grinsell, LV 1957 'Archaeological gazetteer' in Pugh, RB and Crittall, E (eds) *A History of Wiltshire I: I The Victoria History of the Counties of England* Oxford University Press/Inst Hist Res: London. 21-279.

Hoare, RC 1812 *The Ancient History of South Wiltshire*. William Miller: London. (Facsimile edition published by EP Publishing/Wiltshire County Library 1975)

James, NDG 1987 *Plain Soldiering: a history of the armed forces on Salisbury Plain* Hobnob Press: Salisbury

Lawson, A 2007 *Chalkland: an archaeology of Stonehenge and its region* Hobnob Press: East Knoyle

Leivers, M and Moore, C 2008 *Archaeology on the A 303 Stonehenge Improvement* Wessex Archaeology/Highways Agency: Salisbury

Marsden, BM 1974 *The Early Barrow Diggers* Shire: Aylesbury

Martin, A forthcoming 'The alien within: the forgotten subcultures of early Bronze Age Wessex' in A Jones and G Kirkham (eds) *Beyond the Core: reflections on regionality in prehistory* Oxbow: Oxford

Needham, SP 2000 'Power pulses across a cultural divide: cosmologically driven acquisition between Armorica and Wessex' *Proc Prehist Soc* **66**. 151-208

Needham, SP and Woodward, AB 2008 'The Clandon Barrow finery: a synopsis of success in an Early Bronze Age world' *Proc Prehist Soc* **74**. 1-52

Richards, J 1990 *The Stonehenge Environs Project* English Heritage: London

RCHME 1979 *Stonehenge and its Environs: monuments and land use* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Thurnam, J 1865 'On the two principal forms of ancient British and Gaulish skulls' *Memoir Anthropol Soc* **1**. 120-68

Thurnam, J 1868 'On ancient British barrows, especially those of Wiltshire and the adjoining counties (Part I – Long Barrows)' *Archaeologia* **42**(1). 161-244

Thurnam, J 1869 'On ancient British barrows, especially those of Wiltshire and the adjoining counties (Part II – Round Barrows)' *Archaeologia* **43**(2). 285-544

Tomalin, DJ 1988 'Armorican vases à anses and their occurrence in southern Britain' *Proc Prehist Soc* **54**. 203-22

WANHS 1952 *Andrew's and Dury's Map of Wiltshire 1773: a reduced facsimile*  
Wiltshire Archaeol Natur Hist Soc (Records Branch vol 7): Devizes

Woodward, AB 2000 *British Barrows: a matter of life and death* Tempus: Stroud

Woodward, AB and Woodward, PJ 1996 'The topography of some barrow cemeteries in Bronze Age Wessex' *Proc Prehist Soc* **62**. 275-91

Young, CJ, Chadburn, A and Bedu, I 2009 *Stonehenge World Heritage Site: Management Plan 2009* English Heritage: London



Grinsell no	Type	Temp Project Id	Hoare no	NMR no	Wilts SMR no	SAM No
Wilsford Ia		not located	13	541	-	10306
1	long	A	1	92	125	10462
2	bell	S	2	122	668	10464
2a	bowl	not located	-	123	669	10463
3	bowl	B	12	322	818	10306
3a	pond	C	14	323	819	10306
4	bell	D	15	324	820	10306
5 King Barrow	bell	E	16	325	821	10306
6	bowl	F	22	326	822	10306
7	bowl	G	23	327	823	10306
7a	bowl	H	24	328	824	10306
8	bell	I	25	329	825	10306
9	bell	J	26	330	826	10306
10	bell	K	27	331	827	10306
11	bowl	L	21?	332	828	10306
12	pond	M	20	333	830	10306
13	bowl	N	19	334	829	10306
14	disc	O	18	335	831	10306
15	disc	P	17	336	832	10306
16	bowl	Q	10	337	833	10306
16a	bowl	R	11	338	834	10306
17	bowl	X	8	129	676	10483
18	saucer	U	9	130	672	10483
19	bowl	AA	5	124	671	10483
20	bowl	T	7	125	670	10483
21	bowl	BB	6	126	673	10483
21a	bowl	Z	4	127	675	10483
21b	bowl	Y	3	128	674	10483
22	bowl	not surveyed	-	100	714	10448
-	bowl	V	-	131	-	10483

Table 1: Concordance of barrow numbers. NB: all Goddard/Grinsell numbers refer to Winterbourne Stoke parish except for Wilsford Ia; all NMR and SMR numbers are prefixed by the OS sheet number SU 04 SE (for barrows 17-21b and V) or SU 14 SW (for all others). Temporary project identifiers are included in the table to assist researchers using the project archive.




Fig 14: Survey plan reduced to 1:2000



## ENGLISH HERITAGE RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

English Heritage undertakes and commissions research into the historic environment, and the issues that affect its condition and survival, in order to provide the understanding necessary for informed policy and decision making, for sustainable management, and to promote the widest access, appreciation and enjoyment of our heritage.

The Research Department provides English Heritage with this capacity in the fields of buildings history, archaeology, and landscape history. It brings together seven teams with complementary investigative and analytical skills to provide integrated research expertise across the range of the historic environment. These are:

- \* Aerial Survey and Investigation
- \* Archaeological Projects (excavation)
- \* Archaeological Science
- \* Archaeological Survey and Investigation (landscape analysis)
- \* Architectural Investigation
- \* Imaging, Graphics and Survey (including measured and metric survey, and photography)
- \* Survey of London

The Research Department undertakes a wide range of investigative and analytical projects, and provides quality assurance and management support for externally-commissioned research. We aim for innovative work of the highest quality which will set agendas and standards for the historic environment sector. In support of this, and to build capacity and promote best practice in the sector, we also publish guidance and provide advice and training. We support outreach and education activities and build these in to our projects and programmes wherever possible.

We make the results of our work available through the Research Department Report Series, and through journal publications and monographs. Our publication Research News, which appears three times a year, aims to keep our partners within and outside English Heritage up-to-date with our projects and activities. A full list of Research Department Reports, with abstracts and information on how to obtain copies, may be found on [www.english-heritage.org.uk/researchreports](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/researchreports)

For further information visit [www.english-heritage.org.uk](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk)

