1. Chronology

Berkshire, and in particular the middle Kennet Valley, is known for its high concentration of Upper Palaeolithic to Early Mesolithic remains. The Final Upper Palaeolithic is strongly represented, with sites typified by assemblages with large backed blades, some showing heavy edge-damage or “bruising”, known as long blades or bruised blades (Barton 1986, 1989, 1991). Long blade sites include Avington VI (Froom 1970, 2005; Barton and Froom 1986; Barton 1989; Barton et al. 1998), Wawcott XII (Froom 1970, 2005) and Crown Acres (Campbell 1977; Barton 1986; Froom 2005). Mesolithic material has been found in the vicinity of all three, but was stratified only at Avington, where a Late Mesolithic horizon was found above the Palaeolithic. There is no known site in the Kennet Valley with a stratified sequence of Upper Palaeolithic to Early Mesolithic material nor transitional material specifically identified. However, there is some slight evidence for a stratigraphic and chronological split at Crown Acres, on the basis of past descriptions and the patination of liths characteristic of both periods, Barton (1986, p84) suggested that while both assemblages underlay the peat, the earlier material came from sandy marl, which at Thatcham, stratigraphically underlies the Mesolithic levels. The only absolute date for Upper Palaeolithic activity in Berkshire is for Avington VI, with an optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) date for the occupation horizon of 10,250±1,100 (Ox-1523b) (Barton et al. 1998).

Dating of the Mesolithic of Berkshire has been focussed on a few large sites, and is summarised in [Table #1], with a range from 10,365±170 BP (10,900-9,700 cal BC, Q-659, Wymer 1962) at Thatcham III to 5260±130 BP (4360-3780 cal BC, BM-449, Froom 1972) at Wawcott (Lobb and Rose 1996). A number of conventional and AMS dates exist in particular for Thatcham. These show activity associated with a Mesolithic material culture started in the area within 2-300 years of the start of the Holocene, comparable with Star Carr in the Vale of Pickering (Mellars and Dark 1998; Dark 2000), the two forming the earliest Mesolithic sites recorded in Britain. It is suggested activity may have existed even earlier in the Holocene at Thatcham and at the nearby Chamberhouse Farm, with Final Upper Palaeolithic culture continuing beyond the end of the Lateglacial (Barton 2004; Wessex Archaeology 2005); overlap of the two cultures or continuity in settlement feasible in places if not proven. The Late Mesolithic is comparatively poorly represented in both artefactual remains and dated layers or sites. However, finds for the later period are more prevalent in east Berkshire and to the west of Berkshire at Avebury and the Kennet mouth, where, conversely, there is little evidence for Early Mesolithic activity.

2. Landscape, Land Use and Site Distribution

Site Distribution

Substantial Upper Palaeolithic sites occur only within West Berkshire. They are all open sites (there are no caves in the area) and include: Avington VI (Froom 1970, 2005; Barton and Froom 1986; Barton 1989; Barton et al. 1998), Wawcott XII (Froom 1970, 2005) and Crown Acres (Campbell 1977; Barton 1986; Froom 2005). Avington VI is the best stratified, it has 6000 artefacts dominated by bruised long blades and blade cores, also with endscrapers and burins seemingly in situ on and within clay of possible colluvial/soliflucted source but with fine (overbank) alluvial input, over terrace gravels. Typologically, the artefacts are similar to Belloy-type French assemblages and
material from Ahrensburgian sites in North Germany and Sweden (Barton 1989, p270). There, the tools have been associated with the killing and processing of large game and represent the fourth in a series of post-last glacial maximum techno-complex developments (Bokelmann 1991, Fischer 1991, Larsson 1991). No animal bones were found and preservation of environmental materials was too poor for useful interpretation at these sites but there was some indication of an open flora at Avington VI (Holyoak 1980).

Many of the Mesolithic sites comprise unstratified stray finds, often tranchet axes, including those dredged from the Thames, but their distribution [Fig #1] gives a broad picture of activity within the landscape. It is apparent there is a significant concentration of Early Mesolithic sites on low terraces and bluffs in the valley of the Middle Kennet and its tributaries in West Berkshire around Newbury, Thatcham and Hungerford. This pattern is apparently less well defined in the rest of the county, where there are also far fewer major sites, but is seemingly repeated to a degree along the lower Kennet and River Thames. Interpretation of this distribution should only be carried out cautiously since investigations have often been in response to development pressure rather than strategic research and therefore biased to particular areas. These include the lower gravel terraces and floodplains of the Kennet where considerable quarrying has taken place, also to urban areas, where much data is from the turn of the 19th century or associated with rescue archaeology of small areas. Although there is some lack of archaeological visibility on the river margins due to thick alluviation, and therefore a lack of fieldwalking data, coring surveys and monitoring of quarries along the Kennet has successfully led to the identification of several buried horizons and sites. However, Hawkes and Heaton (1993) have suggested the relative lack of known sites along the margins of the Thames may be due to rising water levels and deeply buried deposits. There is also a near absence of known sites along the Loddon, Whistley Court Farm Wokingham (Harding and Richards 1982), being the exception.

It can be seen that sites on the Boulder Clay to the east and particularly on the higher ground of the chalk Berkshire Downs are rare (Richards 1978), yet upland chalk sites are relatively common in neighbouring Hampshire and Wiltshire (Wymer 1977). Ford (1991, p263) noted that only 13% of known sites in the area come from ridges, hilltops and dry valleys on the chalklands and though this may be partially explained by the thorough work of Froom in the Wawcott area, low-lying areas do seem to have been preferred. There an apparent pattern in the tool types represented, indicating perhaps more transitory use of the lower Kennet and more specialised activity in the uplands represented mainly by tranchet axes (S. Allen pers comm.), with an occupation focus in the Middle Kennet. However, Ford (1992) felt the few sites outside the valley were also settlements, though smaller.

**Key Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic Sites in Berkshire**

Stratified Mesolithic sites and those with substantial surface assemblages or geographical importance are summarised in [Table #1]. As shown, most are of Early Mesolithic date and, again, are heavily biased to the west and along the river margins. They occur on the lower slopes, terrace edges and on the floodplains notably around the Wawcott, Hungerford and Thatcham area. At Thatcham Reedbeds five major Early Mesolithic lithic concentrations (Sites I-V) associated with hearths and substantial animal bone assemblages were excavated on the low Beenham Grange terrace edge and floodplain edge (Wymer 1958, 1959, 1960, 1962, 1963; Churchill 1962) (for dates see [Table #1]). Approximately 16,000 flakes and spalls, 1,200 blade-like flakes, 280 cores, 285 microliths, 17 axe-adzes, 130 scrapers, 15 awls, 6 hammerstones two of sarsen, and a variety of other flint implements were found, 18,402 in total. 3.5% were finished forms of Early Mesolithic type, the rest probable waste (Wymer 1963, p44), demonstrating intense *in situ* activity.

Two more concentrations occurred at the adjacent Newbury Sewage Works (Healy *et al.* 1992) and further assemblages were found in trial trenching on the opposite bank of the Kennet floodplain at
Lower Way and Chamberhouse Farm Newbury, (Wymer 1977; Wessex Archaeology 2005). Substantial Early Mesolithic activity, on an incipient soil on the Kennet gravels and base of the overlying peat on the edge of the floodplain and adjacent terrace is indicated. Waste flakes dominated all assemblages indicating in situ knapping. Home base sites visited time after time or even ones in continuous use through the early Holocene are indicated.

Substantial early assemblages also occur at Marsh Benham, (Froom 1976a; Jacobi 1994; Reynier 2006 in press; Hedges et al. 1996), Greenham Dairy Farm/ Abbatoir site/ Faraday Road, (Peake 1945; Sheridan et al. 1963; Jacobi 1973; Hedges et al. 1996; Wessex Archaeology 1997; Ellis et al. 2003). Wawcott, Kintbury, (Froom 1963b,c,d, 1965, 1970, 1972a and b, 1976b, 2005; Froom et al 1993; Lobb and Rose 1996), comprises >30 scatters and stratified sequences commonly associated with alluvial silt overlying the gravels. Several are Late Mesolithic in date and possibly were in long-term use, early material has also been recovered, notably at Wawcott XXX (Froom et al 1993; Froom pers comm.) and XV (Froom 1976b). Marked concentrations occur in small discrete areas (e.g. 3000 flints were found per square yard at Wawcott III, Froom 1976b) thought to represent short-term events.

To the east, major sites include flints found at Jennings Yard, Windsor (Hawkes and Heaton 1993) and Park Farm, Binfield (Roberts 1995), which lies on raised ground overlooking the river valley. Excavations at Moor Farm, Holyport, in Bray (Ames 1993), which lies adjacent to a minor tributary of the Thames, yielded >15,000 artefacts on the wetland edge, no one discrete occupation horizon was identified and the site was not radiocarbon dated, however typologically it is thought to be of Late Mesolithic age. 201 finished tools included obliquely blunted point microliths, scrapers, 2 adzes and saws, the rest waste, again clearly showing local knapping. Sites have also been described at Hungerford Lane and Easthampton Park (Roberts 1995; Ford 1988).

Structures are rare, as elsewhere in Britain, but Froom (2005) suggested there is slight evidence for temporary shelters or windbreaks at the Upper Palaeolithic site of Avington VI, also for Mesolithic sites at Wawcott (Froom 1972, 1976) and Stout (1994, p9) proposed a hut or shelter from possible stakeholes in the Earley Water Meadows near the Thames at Broken Brow. Wymer (1958, p31-32 after Money and Richards 1895) suggested a pile structure with associated flints in the peat at Bartholomew Street, Newbury might be Mesolithic and a dug out butt-ended ditch at Thatcham was identified as a possible fishtrap (Wymer 1963, p46).

With regard to the disparity between representation of Early and Late Mesolithic in the upper Kennet area to the west of Berkshire versus the lower and middle Kennet, it is tempting to suggest a shift in the focus of activity from the middle reaches of the Kennet to the upper Kennet and sites on higher ground to the east in the Late Mesolithic, forced by increasing waterlogging downstream (cf. Holgate 1988, Evans et al. 1993, Healy et al.1992), but the scarcity of known sites and sound dating of makes this supposition and is rejected by Whittle (1990, p105). While increasingly wet conditions on the floodplain and wetland edge indicated by peat growth may not have created conditions wholly unsuited to settlement and exploitation (Whittle 1990) it is likely that early Holocene changes that culminated in the thick accumulation of peat in the lowlands would have caused some changes in the pattern and nature of use.

**Subsistence Patterns, Seasonality and Use of the Landscape**

The archaeological evidence shows, unsurprisingly that the Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic inhabitants of Berkshire were hunter-gatherers. They were likely to have been highly mobile, and adaptive to the changing climate and landscape. However, contrary to the traditional view, there is no evidence that the Mesolithic populations moved on mass to the lowlands in winter, and to the uplands in summer following deer migrations. Indeed, the concept of movement into the uplands for hunting
in any season is not supported for the Kennet: few sites have been identified on the Chalk, while temporary sites with evidence of deer hunting have been found in the lowlands (e.g. Ufton Green, Allen and Allen 1992, Chisham 2004; Faraday Road, Ellis et al. 2003), indeed herbivores would have gravitated towards a water source. It may be that the middle Kennet Valley acted as the main base area, with occasional, possibly long-distance, trips beyond and resource management through burning used to make the strategy viable. Instead, as suggested, distribution of tool types suggests upland-lowlad site differentiation by specialist task rather than by hunting or season.

Wymer felt, on the basis of ethnographic analogy, that Thatcham was visited periodically as part of a network of sites rather than settled permanently (Wymer 1962, p337). Healy et al (1992) suggested the variety of activities indicated by usewear analysis indicated a home base site but did not suggest whether this was seasonal in nature. Bradley (1978, p98) has suggested that the Kennet Valley may have supported a semi-sedentary Mesolithic population, indeed the range of resources offered and the degree of shelter and ease of mobility offered by the river would have been attractive, and Richards (1978, p29) noted the contrasting lack of Mesolithic evidence for the adjacent chalk uplands might indicate a lack of local mobility. There has been little firm evidence to support or disprove these theories and firm evidence for seasonality is scarce and dominated by that from the Thatcham terrace sites. An assemblage of 120 charred hazel nut fragments reported by Scaife (in Healy et al. 1992, p65) at Newbury Sewage Works indicates at least autumnal use of the site, although storage was possible. Charred Carex sp. nutlets associated with a peak in a major phase in landscape burning in the floodplain peat and dated to 9,134±65 BP (8,480-8,230 cal BC, AA-55306, Chisham 2004) might indicate late summer activity, assuming the nutlets burnt on the stem. Carter (2001) assessed the age at death of 6 immature red deer (Cervus elaphus) specimens from Thatcham from tooth development. The age and season of death graph (Carter 2001, p1058 Fig 1) suggested killing took place in at least late summer/autumn and winter. However, although the author did not wholly discount year round occupation, periodic revisiting of the site at different times of the year was preferred, but not in a set seasonal pattern.

The Environment and Human-Environment Relationships

A few of the artefactual studies carried out in the county are supported by palaeoenvironmental analyses to elucidate the contemporary environment. Scant opportunities exist for investigating the upland environment, much, however, has been gained from molluscan studies and investigation of the few deposits suited to pollen analysis in the chalklands in and adjacent to the county by Waton (1982, 1983, 1986), Evans (1978), Evans et al. (1993), Allen (1992) and Birbeck (2000). Open grassland and scrub vegetation in the Lateglacial followed by the spread of deciduous woodland on the chalk was demonstrated for the early Holocene; contrary to the assumption such areas have always been grassland.

In contrast, in lowland areas notably the floodplains, it has been found that despite peat-cutting in the area, high quality waterlogged Lateglacial to early Holocene material remains in relative proximity to the archaeology. A body of environmental work exists for the Kennet Valley in particular, notably on Late Devensian and early Holocene sedimentation and hydrology, much produced under the umbrella of the Kennet Valley Project, including the theses of Chartres (1975), Cheetham (1975) and Holyoak (1980), and there has since been useful research undertaken by others such as Collins (1994), Collins et al. (1996). These have shown an open and relatively unstable Lateglacial environment in terms of sedimentation and hydrology, including high-energy braided river channels. A highly dynamic period of environmental fluctuation followed as warming began at the start of the Holocene, and which resulted in the deposition of thick bodies of calcareous marl in West Berkshire. Subsequently the landscape stabilised, with soil formation and establishment of open aspen-birch-pine woodland. These types were replaced from 9.3ka BP by dense thickets of hazel, with colonisation of common deciduous types such as oak, elm then lime and alder following soon after (Holyoak 1980, Chisham
Peat formation occurred on the floodplains and low terraces of the rivers Kennet and Loddon. Less formed or has been preserved around the Thames where erosion then thick alluviation seems to have occurred. Spring activity occurred in the Kennet Valley from the early Holocene and increasing in the Boreal to Atlantic periods, fed by calcium-rich water coming off the chalk uplands and evidenced by thick bodies of tufa at a number of sites.

Although significant woodland cover certainly occurred from the early Mesolithic, indications are that a mosaic of small gaps remained, notably at the river margins, with a low-growing herb and grass flora. These persisted through natural gap formation, and appear to have been maintained by grazing herbivores, possibly also beaver (cf. Evans 1975, p88) and human activity. Repeated phases of small patch burning of both the dry terrace edge and wetland landscapes occurred during the Early Mesolithic occupation of Thatcham (dated to 9,480±68 BP, 9,150-8,600 cal BC to 8,629±82 BP, 7,950-7,520 cal BC, AA-55303-AA-55308). The pattern was mirrored in the nearby contemporary sequence at Woolhampton but no evidence of burning other than local hearths was found at the more temporary hunting site at Ufton Green, perhaps indicating a pattern of small patch burning in the landscape of the major settlement sites related to navigation, access and encouragement of specific resources (Chisham 2004). Hints of Mesolithic impact on the vegetation were also described for Charnham Lane, Hungerford (Keith-Lucas 2002).

### 3. Society and Resource Exploitation

As with the rest of the UK, the ephemeral evidence available for the early prehistoric periods in Berkshire prevents meaningful assessment of numbers of people or their social organisation. There is no art, no writing or personal adornment recorded and very few structures. This paucity of material culture is typical of a mobile hunter-gatherer lifestyle, with few items collected to enable easy movement, conservation of the few items that are created, and use of natural items, which may not preserve or even be recognised as artefacts. Estimates of group size and organisation can only therefore be based on modern analogy and an assumption that the discard pattern and excavated site is representative of original occupation and that no superimposition of subsequent visits or conflation has occurred, which can be guaranteed. There are certainly no known cemeteries or even single burials, with no bones at all dated to the Upper Palaeolithic. The only human remains that might be ascribed to the Mesolithic are a human skull found in peat at Halfway near red deer antlers (Palmer 1878; Wymer 1958) and a humerus recovered at Thatcham. Neither has been dated nor are they securely stratified, although the humerus has undergone isotopic analysis and used to suggest a diet lacking in marine sources or freshwater fish, with similar results for a dog bone also found at the site (Schulting and Richards 2000). People were clearly present in this landscape given the exceptional concentrations of artefacts but the dead are not visible. Possible explanations for this phenomenon might be disposal of the dead in water, cremation and scattering of remains or (less likely) long distance transport of remains to coastal regions where the few inhumations of the period are to be found. No useful assessment of life expectancy, mortality rates, disease, diet or funerary practice can therefore be made.

The few hints of Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic lifestyle therefore come from the range of tool types and animal remains that indicate a broader range of activities and exploitation of the widening resource base once the Holocene began. A review of the faunal (and molluscan history) of the area is given Holyoak (1980, p218-233, 1983). To summarise, there a few remains from Pleistocene/Palaeolithic age deposits (dominantly terrace gravels) and none attributable specifically to the Upper Palaeolithic and it can only be assumed it was similar to that of southern England as a whole. Further, there is no evidence for exploitation of the mammalian fauna in the Upper Palaeolithic, with no recorded remains from the Berkshire archaeological sites. Faunal remains from Early Mesolithic sites are, however, common, showing presence and exploitation of a wide range of types for food and, potentially, fur and sinews. At Thatcham these included pike, mallard, crane, goldeneye duck,
hedghog, watervole, hare, beaver, fox, pine marten, wildcat, red deer, roe deer and auroch. Domestication of dogs is also evidenced. Normally red deer and roe deer were favoured but at Faraday Road and Thatcham, butchered wild boar remains dominated the onsite Early Mesolithic assemblages (Ellis et al. 2003, Carter 1976). At the Late Mesolithic sites at Wawcott only red deer and wild cattle continued to be recorded for the large herbivore types (Froom 1976, Carter 1976).

Use-wear analysis at Thatcham Sewage Works gives some indication that wood-cutting was carried out but an emphasis on scraping e.g. hides and cutting soft plant material e.g. roots and tubers, was suggested for the northern concentration, which appears to be later than the southern (Healy et al. 1992, p59). Use on harder material such as antler and bone, including boring and whittling, may have dominated the southern site. A functional difference is indicated and, if the sites were of different ages as suggested, different specialisms took place at Thatcham at different times. With only one likely projectile point and little bone, there was little evidence of hunting or butchery.

The range of sites, activities and the use of fire to clear small areas of landscape indicate social co-ordination, a high degree of planning, and re-use or semi-permanent use of chosen sites. A seeming lack of region-specific tool traditions, particularly in the Upper Palaeolithic, despite the rapidly changing technology of the time is interesting and might point to widespread communication between groups and maintenance of longer-distance ties. No exotic items (beyond regional) have however been recorded in Berkshire.

Evidence for the changes in society likely to have occurred in the Mesolithic-Neolithic transition are lacking, indeed few sediments or archaeological remains have been found in the area at all, in contrast to that in the Avebury area to the west.

4. Material Culture

The recovered material culture for Berkshire consists almost solely of the flint artefacts. These are typified by artefacts common across the UK and diagnostic of their period. Bruised or long blade assemblages accompanied by represent the (Final) Upper Palaeolithic traditions with no earlier (Creswellian) material present in the area. Assemblages are dominated by high quality flint from the Chalk requiring short-distance importation from exposures/outcrops, possibly brought to sites as pre-prepared cores (see Ford 1997, p3-5; Hawkes and Heaton 1993, p12), but with some local use of lower quality material taken from the London Clay and from river gravels e.g. occasionally at Holyport (Ames 1993) and Thatcham. Rarely were other stone types used, but included a Dorset chert axe at Wawcott (Froom 1963d, 1972b, 1976a). A single bone spearhead apparently unique in the British Mesolithic, resembling a Palaeolithic type was found with the Early Mesolithic assemblages at Thatcham (Wymer 1963).

The Mesolithic assemblages are dominated by microlithic technology, the early one being mostly obliquely blunted points. Reynier (2000, 2006 in press) has split the Early Mesolithic technology at Marsh Benham and Thatcham into two chronologically distinct types: Star Carr types are described as predating 9.2k BP, and possibly 9.5k BP, and the more prevalent Deepcar type is suggested to date from 9.2k BP. Resin on one lith of Deepcar type at Thatcham was dated to 9,200±90 B.P. (8,630-8,260 cal B.C., OxA-2848, Reynier 2000). Worked bone and antler have occasionally been found and it is of course possible other implements were used, perhaps of wood or bark which have not preserved on the drier archaeological sites. Ochre was also noted at Thatcham (Wymer 1963).

5. Transport and Communication

No direct evidence of transport and communication exists, such as the remains of boats or sleds or importation of exotic items to Berkshire. However, the opening up of small patches of the floodplain
and terrace edge environment have been described. The reasons for this may be manifold but it might be considered that the Rivers Kennet and Thames form a natural link or routeway across southern England to the Thames estuary to the east, the Severn to the west and the Chalk high ground to the north. Widespread mobility across Southern England and into Wales was probably unnecessary except in exceptional circumstance but concentrations of activity on these estuarine and coastal areas are notable. Some small support for the valley as a routeway is given by the find of the Dorset chert axe at Wawcott (Froom 1963d, 1972b, 1976a). It is possible a chain of small areas opened up by natural process and burning developed along these river valleys through the Mesolithic, allowing lines of communication and possibly trade or exchange. Similar patches of clearance were described for the Willamette Valley, Oregon, strung out along routeways, having been fired by nineteenth century hunter-gatherers returning to winter camps (Lewis and Fergusson 1999, Bell and Walker 2005).

6. Modelling the Mesolithic

It has already been noted that collection and excavation of artefacts for the early prehistoric period in Berkshire has been somewhat biased to the low Kennet Valley river terraces, including proposed quarry sites. However, extensive fieldwalking has also been undertaken across the rest of the county (e.g. Ford 1987, 1991, 1997; S. Allen pers comm) and it is suggested that the pattern favouring the lowland river margins is a true reflection of past activity in both the Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic. Most sites have occurred on the top of the floodplain and terrace gravels, sometimes in an incipient soil or in the base of the overlying peat and it is suggested this could be viewed as a marker horizon when looking at new stratified sequences. The relationship to the modern landscape is only that to the edge of the floodplains, which is partially reflective to the position of former channels. Some as yet unrecognised sites are likely to exist in areas with subsequent deep alluviation, peat growth and tufa deposition (cf. Thatcham Reedbeds where the incipient soil and activity layer lies at c.2m). Discovery of such sites relies on use of coring surveys and observation of deep cuttings and quarry faces. Work on finding, modelling and ground-truthing key Mesolithic horizons by remote sensing is also being undertaken as part of ongoing research at the University of Reading.
Table #1 Description of Known Major Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic Sites in Berkshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SMR no./ Grid ref/ unitary</th>
<th>Upper Pal/ Early/ Late Meso?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avington VI</td>
<td>Froom 1970, 2005; Barton and Froom 1986; Barton 1989; Barton et al. 1998</td>
<td>MWB3844/ SU377671/ West Berks</td>
<td>UP &amp; LM</td>
<td>6000 worked flints in two main concentrations, forming a coherent long blade assemblage at 89mOD in clays adjacent to the modern floodplain of the Kennet and its confluence with a small spring-fed tributary. Late Mesolithic occupation horizon higher in the sequence. Small hollows with flints apparently slumped in suggested by Froom to be (UP) postholes associated with a shelter but there is no associated organic or charred material preserved to support the interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Acres</td>
<td>Campbell 1977; Barton 1986; Froom 2005</td>
<td>MWB153/ SU509666/ West Berks</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>≤1000 flint artefacts dominated by blade fragments. Stratigraphy likely of peaty topsoil over patches of sand/ marl in hollows in the top of the gravels, the artefacts believed to have come generally from the marl. The site has been entirely removed in gravel extraction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wawcott XII</td>
<td>Froom 1970, 2005</td>
<td>MWB3779/ SU408675/ West Berks</td>
<td>UP/ EM?</td>
<td>Possible UP site, assemblage atypical for the Early Mesolithic, with a larger size range, though no true long blades were found. Site severely disturbed by ploughing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcham, Moor Ditch</td>
<td>Wymer 1958, 1959, 1960, 1962, 1963; Churchill 1962, Healy et al 1992; Wessex Archaeology 2005; Chisham 2004</td>
<td>MWB3567-70, 15653, 1566- 71/ SU500670/ West Berks</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Substantial Early Mesolithic activity, on an incipient soil on the Kennet gravels and base of the overlying peat on the edge of the floodplain and adjacent terrace, likely a repeatedly visited home base site or even one in continuous use through the early Holocene. 5 (Sites I-V) major concentrations of waste flakes and finished tools on the terrace and floodplain edge and 2 further back (Newbury Sewage Works) most associated with hearths, also worked and butchered bone. 1 possible dug-out fish trap. Contemporary activity and burning on the floodplain also demonstrated. Radiocarbon dates for remains securely associated with activity are as follows: TR II hearth 8,100±180 BP (7,550-6,550 cal BC, BM-65); TR III (bulks from) sequence of occupations, 10,030±170 BP (10,700-9,100 cal BC, Q-659) &amp; 10,365±120BC (10,900-9,700 cal BC, Q-659); TR III resin with bones 9,200±90 BP (8,630-8,260 cal BC, OxA-2848); Newbury Sewage Works hazel-nuts with lithics 9,100±80 BP (8,550-7,950 cal BC, BM-2744); TRA six phases of burning on the terrace and floodplain range in date from 9,480±68 BP (9,150-8,600 cal BC) to 8,629±82 BP (7,950-7,520 cal BC) (AA-55303-AA-55308)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcham Reedbeds and Newbury Sewage works</td>
<td>Wymer and Bonsall 1977; Wessex Archaeology 2005</td>
<td>-/ SU606590/ West Berks</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Lower Way comprises a large scatter with numerous cores indicating large scale knapping, it lies on the opposite terrace from the major sites excavated at Thatcham and is adjacent to the Chamberhouse Farm site, the latter showed the same stratigraphic sequence as Thatcham, the raised area bisected by a palaeochannel. Exploitation of wild boar in particular demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wawcott, Kintbury</td>
<td>Froom 1963b,c,d, 1965, 1970, 1972a and b, 1976b, 2005; Froom et al 1993; Lobb and Rose</td>
<td>MWB3764- 3791, 3832, 3836, 3851-67/ c. SU408675/</td>
<td>EM &amp;LM</td>
<td>(includes Kintbury I) &gt;30 scatters and stratified sequences commonly associated with silt overlying the gravels. Many are Late Mesolithic in date and possibly were in long-term use, but some early material has been recovered, notably at Wawcott XXX (Froom et al 1993, Froom pers comm.) and XV (Froom 1976b). Marked concentrations occur in small discrete areas (e.g. 3000 flints were found per square yard at Wawcott III, Froom 1976b) thought to represent short-term events. Froom (1972a and b) noted non-local stone lithics, probably from southwest England, including a black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wawcott I</td>
<td>1963a, 1970</td>
<td>MWB3837, 3842-50/ SU387677/ West Berks</td>
<td>Chert axe at Wawcott I, likely from near Shaftesbury, Dorset (Froom 1963d, 1972b). That site also displayed a hearth, charcoal from which gave a very late Mesolithic date of 5,260±130 B.P. (3,750-4,350 cal BC, BM-449) and, like Wawcott III and IV, included pits or hollows, in that case associated with postholes, interpreted by Froom as dwellings (1972b, 1976b). Wawcott III was dated to 6,120±134 B.P. (4,700-5,400 cal BC, BM-767, Froom 1976b, p160).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avington I-VIII, Barton Court and Kintbury II</td>
<td>Froom 1963a, 1970</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Also in the Wawcott area; showed an internally consistent flint typology and were interpreted as representing short-term Early Mesolithic activity sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Benham</td>
<td>Froom 1976a, 1974; Reynier 2002, Hedges et al. 1996</td>
<td>MWB3744/ SU412672/ West Berks</td>
<td>Avington I-VIII, Barton Court and Kintbury II also in the Wawcott area; showed an internally consistent flint typology and were interpreted as representing short-term Early Mesolithic activity sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenham Dairy Farm, Abattoir site and Faraday Road</td>
<td>Peake, 1945; Sheridan et al. 1963; Jacobi 1976; Hedges et al. 1996; Wessex Archaeology 1997; Ellis et al. 2003</td>
<td>MWB35, MWB3495/ SU477674/ West Berks</td>
<td>Dates of 8779±110 BP (7,600-8,250 cal BC, Q973) was gained from collagen of red deer bone (Jacobi 1976) but Reynier (2000, p44) suggested Deepcar type flints were found, dating from c.9.1ka B.P. (10.5ka cal BP) on the basis of typology. Dates of 8160±100 BP and 9120±80 (9150-8200 cal BC) were later gained for the occupation layer, but the former felt to be anomalous due to poor collagen preservation. Faraday Road is apparently an extension of the Greenham Dairy Farm sit, a charred hazelnut from the occupation layer there was dated to 8510±60 BP (7 660-7370 cal BC, R-24999/1), a wild boar bone to 9418±60 BP (9150-8450 cal BC, R-24999/2). The finds at both occur with alluvium and are associated with wild boar and deer bones, i.e. a phase of 9700-7500 cal BC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>Wymer 1977</td>
<td>MWB3496, 97, 99/ SU 474673/ West Berks</td>
<td>Large number of waste flakes and finished tools including microliths collected piecemeal during works to create the park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury: Market Place, Bartholomew street, Cheap Street</td>
<td>Ford 1976; Wymer 1962</td>
<td>MWB10110, 11, 12, 13/ SU472705/ West Berks</td>
<td>Several interventions have produced EM material from alluvial silts and black gravel sealed under the peat. Wymer associated the flints in the black gravel with a possible pile structure in Bartholomew street (details of which are unclear).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennetholme Farm, Midgham</td>
<td>Sheridan 1964; Wymer 1977; Wessex Archaeology 1986</td>
<td>MWB3719, 3722/ SU558661/ West Berks</td>
<td>Feature with burnt flint and EM flakes and scatters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Barn Hungerford</td>
<td>Froom coll.</td>
<td>MWB12618, 9864/ SU338679/ West Berks</td>
<td>15 cores, 150 flakes, 4 scrapers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ufton Green</td>
<td>Allen and Allen 1997; Chisham 2004</td>
<td>MWB6944/ SU619684/ West Berks</td>
<td>Temporary specialised (kill and butchery) site of Early Mesolithic date (c.9.1k BP) on the floodplain sealed by peat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Coordinates</td>
<td>Periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knighton and Leverton near Hungerford</td>
<td>From 1965</td>
<td>Froom 1965, MWB9881/SU327702/West Berks</td>
<td>LM?</td>
<td>Displayed Later? Mesolithic, possibly showing a series of short occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambourn Valley (A34 Bypass)</td>
<td>Birbeck 2000</td>
<td>MWB15468/SU455690/West Berks</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Two concentrations of Late Mesolithic flints were found on a silty clay loam above the floodplain on a slope at 81 and 84m OD, with a variety of tool types but dominated by waste flakes, interpreted as a homebase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folly Thatch Cottage Wokingham</td>
<td>Wymer 1977, Barnes 1969</td>
<td>00743.00.000/SU794678/Wokingham</td>
<td>EM/LM?</td>
<td>Small assemblage (7) blades, scraper, graver. Notable as Mesolithic so rare in this area, in on plateau gravel over Bagshot Beds, area was sandy heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moor Farm, Holyport</td>
<td>Ames 1993</td>
<td>00463.00.000/SU892790/Windor &amp; M’head</td>
<td>EM (+ poss LM)</td>
<td>&gt;15,000 worked flints, most fresh, but some using river pebbles on Taplow terrace adjacent to a stream (the Cut), on wetland edge but discrete occupation horizon not identified. Most artefacts from an alluvial fine grey sand, some in overlying peat. 201 finished tools included obliquely blunted point microliths, scrapers, 2 adzes and saws, the rest waste, clear local knapping. No dating other than typological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Bend, Down Place, Bray</td>
<td>Rutland and Thomas 1968</td>
<td>00104.00.000/SU921778/Windor &amp; M’head</td>
<td>EM/LM?</td>
<td>466 flints including finished tools found when digging a pool on the gravel terrace river edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weir Bank Farm Bray</td>
<td>Barnes et al. 1995</td>
<td>00086.02.000/SU910790/Windor &amp; M’head</td>
<td>LM (- EN)</td>
<td>Blades, bladelets, piercing tool and serrated pieces also LM-Early Neolithic transitional types. Fresh but in overburden and residual in later features, no primary contexts. Immediately adjacent to the Thames in alluvium over gravels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Valley Park, Earley</td>
<td>Wessex Archaeology 1997</td>
<td>06525.01-05.000/SU742742/Wokingham-Reading</td>
<td>(reworked) scatters, one possible Mesolithic age hollow and possible kill site associated with a palaeochannel but dominantly in colluvium on the boulder clay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clappers Island, Reading</td>
<td>9th C antiquarian journals; Peake 1931; Wymer 1977</td>
<td>00994.00.000/SU720741</td>
<td>?M</td>
<td>A pile dwelling described by Peake as Neo/ EIA was associated with 2 axeheads and 2 bones, re-assigned in Wymer as Mesolithic finds. Association with structure and date of that structure remains unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loddon Valley Survey (LVS) scatters</td>
<td>Ford 1997</td>
<td>06149.00.000/SU708629, 06100.00.000/SU781780, 06110.00.000/787775, /Wokingham</td>
<td>Three moderate surface scatters LVS48, LVS22, LVS24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Reference Numbers</td>
<td>Site Coordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Berkshire Archaeological Survey (EBAS) scatters</td>
<td>Ford 1987, 1991</td>
<td>03161.00.000/ SU806750/ Wokingham, 03162.00.000/ SU818745/ Wokingham, 03071.00.000/ SU841679/ Wokingham, 03371.00.000/ SU790743/ Wokingham</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Scatter sites 240, 250, 340, 480 on bluffs and slopes of the Boulder Clay (rather than river margins), all of LM typology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings Yard, Windsor</td>
<td>Hawkes and Heaton 1993</td>
<td>00136.60.000/ SU967771/ Windsor &amp; M’head</td>
<td>EM-LM?</td>
<td>817 pieces including blades and burnt flint, few cores and retouch, possibly incomplete assemblage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beenham Farm, Waltham St Lawrence</td>
<td>(SMR)</td>
<td>02574.00.000/ SU834755/ Windsor &amp; M’head</td>
<td>EM-LM?</td>
<td>73 blades, six cores and 9 fragments burnt flint excavated by Maidenhead Archaeological and Historical Society, from unknown stratigraphy over the Boulder Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Farm, Binfield</td>
<td>Roberts 1995</td>
<td>03370.00.000/ 846706/ Bracknell Forest</td>
<td>(UP?) EM-LM?</td>
<td>2 scatters on sloping side of ridge on the clay overlooking the valley. Area B 274 pieces in plough soil over colluvium, Area A/M 403 pieces including 1 possible UP-EM blade, rest undiagnostic Mesolithic to Early Neolithic types. Several retouched forms suggests a range of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whistley Court Farm, Wokingham</td>
<td>Harding and Richards 1982</td>
<td>03371.41.000</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Moderate assemblage includes cores, microliths retouched blades and arrowheads in plough soil over alluvium (with intrusive tile) adjacent to River Loddon, most fresh, laterally though not vertically in situ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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