University of Birmingham
Research at Birmingham

The development of arable cultivation in the south-east of England and its relationship with vegetation cover

de Vareilles, Anne ; Woodbridge, Jessie; Pelling, Ruth ; Fyfe, Ralph; Smith, David; Campbell, Gill; Smith, Wendy ; Carruthers, Wendy; Adams, Stacey; Hégarat, Karine Le; Allot, Lucy

DOI:
10.1177/09596836231185836

License:
None: All rights reserved

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):
de Vareilles, A, Woodbridge, J, Pelling, R, Fyfe, R, Smith, D, Campbell, G, Smith, W, Carruthers, W, Adams, S, Hégarat, KL & Allot, L 2023, 'The development of arable cultivation in the south-east of England and its relationship with vegetation cover: A honeymoon period for biodiversity?', *The Holocene*. https://doi.org/10.1177/09596836231185836

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

Publisher Rights Statement:
de Vareilles, A., Woodbridge, J., Pelling, R., Fyfe, R., Smith, D., Campbell, G., Smith, W., Carruthers, W., Adams, S., le Hégarat, K., & Allot, L. (2023). The development of arable cultivation in the south-east of England and its relationship with vegetation cover: A honeymoon period for biodiversity? The Holocene, 0(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/09596836231185836

General rights
Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

•Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
•Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
•User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
•Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy
While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Download date: 29. Apr. 2024

The development of arable cultivation in the south-east of England and its relationship with vegetation cover – a honeymoon period for biodiversity?

Anne de Vareilles[1], Jessie Woodbridge[2], Ruth Pelling[3], Ralph Fyfe[2], David Smith[4], Gill Campbell[3], Wendy Smith[4], Wendy Carruthers[5], Stacey Adams[6], Karine le Hégarat[7] and Lucy Allot[7]

[1]Historic England, London, UK

[2]School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Plymouth, Plymouth, UK

[3]Historic England, Portsmouth, UK

[4]Department of Classics, Ancient History & Archaeology, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

[5]Self-employed, Castellau, Wales, UK

[6]York Archaeology, York, UK

[7]Archaeology South East, London, UK

Abstract

The onset of prehistoric farming brought unprecedented changes to landscapes and their biodiversity. Past biodiversity patterns are broadly understood for different parts of Europe, and demonstrate trajectories that have been linked to prehistoric and historic demographic transitions, and associated land-use practices. To our knowledge, this paper is the first attempt to directly link evidence of agricultural practice from the archaeological record to biodiversity patterns. Records of fossil pollen are used to estimate plant and landscape diversity patterns, and novel approaches are employed to analyse 1194 harmonised archaeobotanical samples (~~charred~~ plant macrofossil remains) spanning the prehistoric and Roman periods, from an area in the south-east of England. We demonstrate changes in the use of crops and gathered edible plants and non-linear trends in cultivation practices. Whilst, overall, cereal production is characterised by ever larger and extensive regimes, different trajectories are evident for most of early prehistory, the Middle Iron Age and the Late Roman period. Comparisons with the Shannon diversity of fossil pollen records from the same region suggest a positive relationship between developing agricultural regimes and landscape scale biodiversity during the prehistoric period. The Roman period represents a tipping point in the relationship between expanding agriculture and pollen diversity, with declining pollen diversity evident in the records from the region.

Keywords

British prehistory, archaeobotany, biodiversity, palaeoecology, land use and land cover, Southeast England, late Holocene

1.Introduction

Biodiversity is inextricably linked to landscape type and stability. Climate change, human population densities and farming have been major forces that have had an impact on observable early Holocene levels of biodiversity (Redford and Richter, 1999; Giesecke et al., 2019). The latter two factors are interdependent as larger populations necessarily require increased food production, although it has been shown that population growth does not have a predictable, linear impact on vegetation and insect diversity (Woodbridge et al., 2021). How land was used for food production and the different time scales involved in species regeneration need to be considered when interpreting the effects of land use (Watts et al., 2020). Climate change is known to have influenced livelihoods and stages of climatic shifts in prehistory have been linked to population "booms" and "busts", adaptations in farming practices, and changes in land cover (Woodbridge et al., 2014; Bevan et al., 2017). The Birks et al. (2016) conceptual model on trends in biodiversity during the Holocene in north-west Europe describes how, within fertile soils, woodland clearance for farming had a positive effect on biodiversity through the creation of new habitats. This beneficial effect lasted until a tipping point was reached, after which continued woodland clearance/land use had a detrimental impact upon biodiversity (see also Woodbridge et al., 2021: Fig.1). It remains unclear when the tipping point was reached, and whether this was within prehistory (e.g. with the development of spatially-extensive enclosures (cf. Løvschal 2020)) or as a consequence of the rapid onset of mechanised agriculture in the past 200 years (Ellis 2019).

From the onset of farming across Britain and Ireland~~in the British Isles~~ at c.4000 BC, vegetation cover has gradually, though not continuously, become more open (Fyfe et al., 2013, 2015; Trondman et al., 2015). A similar pattern is evident in the diversity and evenness of fossil pollen (as a proxy for vegetation change) from the south-east of England, which show a continued increase in diversity between the Bronze Age and the Roman period (Woodbridge et al., 2021: Fig.4). Entomological remains from archaeological sites also indicate changes in habitats through time (Smith et al., 2019, 2020). The presence of synanthropic insect species in Britain increased during early prehistory and taxa associated with pastoral activities were common during the Bronze and Iron Ages. Changes in insect taxa are also associated with the Romanisation of Britain, such as new grain pests indicating denser human settlements and increased agricultural production (Smith et al., 2019, 2020).

In this paper we explore how arable production, evidenced from ~~charred~~ remains of crops, seeds and fruits, changed from its onset in the Neolithic to the Late Roman period and whether such changes coincide with landscape diversity trends inferred from fossil pollen records. ~~The Saxon period is not included as its arable farming regimes have been subject to detailed investigations (McKerracher, 2018, 2019; McKerracher and Hamerow, 2022).~~ Amalgamating data by archaeological period allows general trends in farming practices to be explored and compared to contemporary off-site fossil pollen records. With the aid of multivariate analyses and the ecological signatures of arable weeds, trends in farming practices are identified. Whilst these are common approaches in archaeobotany (De

Vareilles et al., 2021), we are not aware of direct comparisons with fossil pollen records, or studies that attempt to explain how land use drove biodiversity over long time scales. This research therefore represents a novel and important contribution to how we understand the relationship between land use, land cover and biodiversity. The research area covers the region of southern England south of the Thames, excluding the Southwest region other than a cluster of Neolithic sites in Wiltshire close to the border with Hampshire (Fig.1). This area contains some of the earliest farming sites in Britain and all periods are well represented in the archaeobotanical record.

Whilst acknowledging that cause and effect between climate, farming practices and biodiversity are complex and convoluted, the integration of two archaeological and palaeoecological strands of evidence represents a fundamental and important step to demonstrate, for the first time, how a better understanding of land-use practices can contribute towards explaining changes in land cover and biodiversity.

2. The development of agriculture in England, with a focus on the south-east

The introduction of farming in Britain and Ireland instigated localised and small-scale deforestation of deciduous woodlands (Fyfe et al., 2013; Woodbridge et al., 2014). Land-cover changes correspond well to the summed probability distribution (SPD) of radiocarbon dates which suggest a demographic incline during the ENEOL (Bevan et al., 2017: Fig. 1; Shennan et al., 2013: Fig.3). Indeed, the correlation between the arrival of farmers and the decline in deciduous woodland has been shown to be statistically significant (Racimo et al., 2020; see also Marquer et al., 2017). The restricted range of Neolithic arable weeds, predominantly annuals, point to permanent plots more than shifting cultivation (eg: Jones and Rowley-Conwy, 2007). Isotopic analyses on cereal grains from six sites across central England and Wales suggest both intensive (site in Derbyshire: Bogaard et al., 2013) and extensive (sites in Wales: Treasure et al., 2019) regimes were practised.

A dramatic change in agricultural practice across most of Britain and Ireland is evident from the start of the Middle Neolithic (*c*.3300 BC). Pollen records point to a regeneration of deciduous woodland (Treasure et al., 2019; Whitehouse et al., 2014) with an associated decline in vegetation diversity. Trends in the SPD of dates on cereal grains show a sharp decline across England, as opposed to the number of dates on hazelnut shells, suggesting that gathered nuts continued to be used whilst the cultivation of cereals was greatly reduced, and even stopped altogether in some regions, such as the south-east of England (Bevan et al., 2017; Stevens and Fuller, 2012, 2015). The rarity of cereals in later Neolithic assemblages has long been recognised (e.g. Brown, 2007; Jones, 1980, Moffett et al., 1989; Robinson, 2000), even though animal domesticates, particularly cattle, continued to be an important dietary element (Serjeantson, 2011). A transition from mainly fixed, agricultural communities to a reduced population of mobile pastoralists is therefore likely (Rowley-Conwy et al., 2020; Worley et al., 2019). The shift in lifestyle and decline in human demographics may have been triggered by unstable, colder and wetter climatic conditions (Bevan et al., 2017; Stevens and Fuller, 2015; Whitehouse et al., 2014). Additionally, crop pests and diseases could have contributed towards agricultural collapse (Antolín and Schäfer, 2020; Dark and Gent, 2001). A deterioration in soil quality has also been suggested, as a focus on a narrow range of cultigens by an increasing population may have led to soil depletion and harvest failures (Colledge et al., 2019; Shennan et al., 2013).

The Beaker period is marked by a new influx of people of central European ancestry by around 2400 BC (Olalde et al., 2018). Changes in material culture, such as the introduction of Bell Beaker pottery, and settlement patterns also attest to a shift in lifestyles (Bradley, 2019: chapter 4). Little is known of Beaker subsistence strategies, primarily due to the lack of settlement sites, although a study of the isotopic signatures in human bone suggests a diet high in terrestrial animal protein with steadfast consistency across Britain (Parker Pearson et al., 2016). The latter study also evidenced a high degree of mobility within Britain, supporting the idea that subsistence strategies continued to be based upon predominantly pastoral lifestyles (Bevan et al., 2017). The Beaker period is also marked by the expansion of Neolithic monuments, requiring a greater gathering of labour and organisation than previously seen (Gibson, 2020).

The resurgence in arable agriculture at around 1600 BC has been termed the Middle Bronze Age agricultural revolution (Stevens and Fuller, 2012), and is associated with renewed and repeated migrations from the European continent (Patterson et al., 2022). Fossil pollen records indicate a sharp decrease in woodland cover (Woodbridge et al., 2014), which coincide with the development of field systems and drove-ways, particularly in southern and eastern Britain (Bradley et al., 2016; Yates, 2007). The latter are suggestive of an inclusive use of enclosures, perhaps on a seasonal rotation system, to benefit crops and farm animals, as well as disturbance-tolerant weeds. Indeed, the increase in grassland perennials during the LBA is indicative of the cultivation of fields that had previously been under pasture (Stevens and Fuller 2018: 31). Spelt is a hardier wheat than emmer and its adoption from the MBA has been argued to reflect a change to more extensive arable cultivation (Van der Veen and Palmer, 1997). The change in regime is thought to have been in response to a need for increased cereal production and the quantity and type of farm animals (Van der Veen, 2016: 302). The Bronze Age in southern Britain sees a rise in sheep at the expense of cattle (Hambleton, 2008: 56), animals which cannot provide the same level of manuring or be used to plough fields. It is likely that spelt was initially mixed with emmer, but that, as a result of demographic growth, changes in animal husbandry, its greater adaptability to poorer growing conditions and its higher yielding capacity, spelt became the dominant cereal (Lambrick with Robinson, 2009: 258; Van der Veen, 1995: 342; 2016: 301-302). The Bronze Age agricultural intensification is also evident from agricultural tools and features, such as granaries (Bradley et al., 2016). Wells and waterholes enabled farmers to settle away from main waterways in permanent settlements, thereby expanding the agricultural potential of landscapes (Yates, 2007: 34), and increasing habitat diversity further inland. Insects chart a change from mostly wooded landscapes during the Neolithic and EBA, to open ground associated with pasture and fodder production during the later Bronze Age and Iron Age (Smith et al., 2019, 2020).

Commented [DVA1]: Remove?

Britain became more insular towards the end of the LBA, with limited evidence for foreign contacts from both archaeological and palaeogenomic evidence (Cunliffe, 2013; Patterson et al., 2022). A population decline (Bevan et al., 2017) would have led to reduced arable production and the abandonment of settlements/fields. In southern England, the MIA is a period of significant social change, with the emergence of multivallate hillforts encompassing a greater catchment area, indicating a level of social cohesion and organisation not witnessed in the preceding era and an increased political, or at least communal, control over land use (Jones 1985, 1996, 2008). Hillforts were abandoned by the LIA and a change in land use is once again visible with the scattering of settlements and new agricultural developments (Cunliffe, 1994, 2013).

The Iron Age weed spectrum in central and southern Britain became surprisingly uniform, perhaps indicating that by the LIA agricultural regimes became more influenced by rising market forces or a standardisation in crops and agricultural tools, than by local conditions and choices (Campbell, 2017; Carruthers and Hunter Dowse, 2019: 55). Frequent wild oat and brome grass are assumed to have been an accepted addition to the crop (Knörzer, 1967; Zech-Matterne et al., 2021), whilst ryegrass might have been an early fodder crop around Danebury (Campbell, 2000; see also Lodwick, 2017). Other common weeds include small grasses, vetches/tares, cleavers and clover types (clover, medicks, trefoil), and are suggestive of the use of grass fallow in a rotation regime (Carruthers and Hunter Dowse, 2019: 55). They are also indicative of a full annual agricultural regime, with crops sown in both autumn and spring. An increase in oat (*Avena* sp.) grains and awns is suggested to represent the LIA cultivation of this potential cereal (Campbell, 2000; Campbell and Straker, 2003). Oat and pea indicate spring sowing, a practice which may have led to growing spelt (in autumn) and spring barley as monocrops rather than as a mixed crop (Campbell and Hamilton, 2000).

Agriculture in southern England during the Roman period is characterised by large-scale, extensive regimes focused on growing spelt wheat (Allen and Lodwick, 2017; Campbell, 2017; Lodwick et al., 2020). Production was scaled-up to feed a growing population, a large army and even export grain to the continent (Allen and Lodwick, 2017; Orengo and Livarda, 2015; Van der Veen, 2016). The Roman period also saw an increase in horticulture and imports, making it sometimes difficult to separate locally grown from imported plant foods (cf. Van der Veen, 2014). Developments in ploughing technology, such as asymmetrical shares, first seen during the LIA, allowed the expansion of cultivation onto new, heavier soils (Jones, 1985, 2009). However, Roman technology is likely to have been restricted to the more Romanised settlements as it was not until the later Saxon and medieval periods that ‘Roman’ weeds became prolific (Allen et al., 2017; Stevens and Fuller, 2018: 33).

During the fall of the Roman Empire a reduction in arable production is traditionally associated with a population decline in Britain, though the dynamics between agricultural production and the changing political and social spheres remains elusive (Van der Veen, 2022). The starkest contrast between Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon cereal production is the almost complete replacement of spelt for free-threshing wheat (McKerracher, 2018; Van der Veen, 2022). The latter is usually considered a crop-contaminant in Roman samples, though its cultivation may have begun as small-scale productions to produce more refined, white bread for the elite (Van der Veen, 2022: 324-326).

3~~2~~. Materials and Methods

3~~2~~.1 Archaeobotanical dataset

Neolithic to rural Romano-British archaeological sites with records of archaeobotanical plant macrofossils (cereal grains and chaff, pulses, fruits~~, and~~ nuts and seeds of wild plants) were selected from the research area. Data collection was focused on records available online which are biased towards large-scale development projects, such as the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (Fig. 1). As early prehistoric samples tend to be sparser, greater focus was spent finding records from these periods. All plant macrofossils were registered by site in ArboDat 2016 English Version © (Kreuz and Schäfer, 2002), an Access database which associates each taxon with its plant part (e.g. seed, spikelet, awn), level of identification (genus, species, cf. species), preservation status (charred, waterlogged, mineralised), sample volume and flotation mesh size. Each site record has a unique ArboDat reference code (Table 1): these data will be made open access through the Archaeological Data Service. A dataset of 1718 archaeobotanical samples from 110 sites have been added to the ArboDat database.

To explore changes in land use from the Early Neolithic (ENEOL) to the Late Roman ~~(LRO)~~ period (LRO), the complete archaeobotanical dataset was filtered to remove:

- waterlogged plant macro~~-~~remains (carbonised, mineralised and silicified remains were retained. The latter two make up <5% of total counts and presence by period, and all species are also present in a carbonised state);
- taxa that are unlikely to represent edible plants or arable weeds, such as trees and shrubs with non-edible fruits, heather and ferns;
- unquantifiable plant parts, such as awns, glume fragments, culms, thorns and non-tuberous roots (edible roots of pignut (*Conopodium majus*) and roots of false oat grass (*Arrhenatherum elatius*) ~~grass~~ were retained though the former were found to be rare);
- indeterminate remains and taxa identified to cf. family (e.g. cf. Ranunculaceae) (Chenopodiaceae/Caryophyllaceae and Polygonaceae/Cyperaceae were retained);
- items not dated to the early, middle or late span of an archaeological period, either directly or by association. Dates and periods follow Historic England's Period List, FISH terminology (Updated March 2022: http://www.heritage-standards.org.uk/chronology/).

The filtering process resulted in archaeobotanical data from 1194 samples (93 sites) used in this study (Fig.1, Table 1). In order to further harmonise the data, taxa identified to possible species (e.g. *Apium* cf. *nodiflorum*) were recorded as species. Identifications to possible genus were either retained at genus level or recorded to family level, depending on seed morphology and ecological grouping. For example, cf. *Rubus* was recorded as *Rubus* because all British species grow under similar conditions, are edible and are distinct from other

Rosaceae seeds, whereas cf. *Danthonia* was recorded as Poaceae since small grass seeds are difficult to separate taxonomically. The mode value of 10 litres was used as a conservative estimate for missing sample volumes (bulk ~~soil~~ samples from archaeological deposits). Only the estimated volumes for the Early Roman Period (ERO) made up >10% of the total volume (14.5%). Although crop densities per period may have been artificially increased, using the mode value of 10 Litres makes it unlikely that the actual densities differ substantially (Table 2).

The number of samples and the number of identified archaeobotanical remains varies considerably between contemporary sites as well as archaeological periods (Table 2). Inconsistencies also exist in the recording of contextual provenance, with many reports containing poorly defined or missing information. To mitigate against these biases when comparing archaeological periods, all data were amalgamated by period regardless of context and all analyses were produced using presence/absence data, except for Figure 4. Transforming count data to a binary format has enabled us to include estimated as well as unusually large counts and to avoid apparent differences between periods based on seed count, which can reflect the scale of cereal processing and the use/discard of processing waste (Fuller et al., 2014)~~relate primarily to changes in the management of cereal processing by-products~~. Presence/absence data also reduces potential biases towards particular arable weeds and their associated ecological conditions; taxa may be more numerous in assemblages either because they produce more seeds or because they are retained with crops until the last stages of processing and are therefore more likely to become burnt as settlement waste (Hillman, 1984).

Figure 4b uses whole counts of plant macroremains and sample volumes to illustrate changes in assemblage concentrations by period. Although changes in assemblage densities reflect changes in settlement patterns and the organisation of crop processing/use, they are also associated with the growth of populations and are here used as a crude measure for the scale of production. The density of assemblages is plotted against the trend in pollen diversity (Shannon index H), further explained in section 3.2. The relationships between trends were tested using Spearman's Rank, which shows a positive correlation between pollen diversity and concentrations of crop remains (Spearman's rho = 0.6 and $r^2 = 0.5$, $p<0.005$).

Figure 1: The location of off-site pollen cores (b, colours represent site groups) and on-site archaeobotanical samples (c) used in this study. ~~Note that s~~Site numbers refer to Table 1. References to the pollen cores are listed in the supplementary information, Table 1.

Site ID	Site name	ArboDat code	BNGeasting	BNGnorthing	Period	Reference
1	A2 Activity Park	HE-AdV86	566133	170175	LBA, EIA, MIA	Le Hégarat, 2017
2	A2 Pepperhill-Cobham	HE-AdV58	555652	172311	EIA, MIA, LIA, ERO	Smith, 2012
3	A2/A282 Improvement Scheme	HE-AdV61	555652	172311	MBA, LBA, MIA, LIA, LRO	Smith, 2011
4	Aldermaston Wharf	HE-AdV132	460584	168092	LBA	Arthur and Paradine 1980
5	Beechbrook Wood	HE-AdV99	598500	145600	Beaker, LBA, MIA, ERO	Giorgi, 2006
6	Belle Tout 68-69	HE-AdV66	555700	95600	Beaker	Arthur, 1970
7	Bigberry 78-80	HE-AdV137	612000	157000	LIA	Jones, 1983
8	Black Patch	HE-AdV136	549500	108600	LBA	Hinton, 1982
9	Bower Road	HE-AdV107	605946	138812	ERO, MRO, LRO	Stevens, 2006
10	Broadstairs	HE-AdV76	637000	167700	ENEOL, MBA, LIA	Pelling et al., 2008
11	Chilbolton 86	HE-AdV135	439100	139700	Beaker	Green, 1990
12	Claypit Lane, Westhampnett	HE-AdV74	488400	106600	ENEOL, LNEOL, EBA, MBA, LBA	Hinton, 2006
13	Cobham Golf Course	HE-AdV129	568330	169550	MBA, LBA	Davies, 2006
14	Coneybury Anomaly	HE-AdV109	413420.1	141689	ENEOL, LNEOL	Carruthers, 1990
15	Coneybury Henge	HE-AdV108	413420.1	141689	Beaker, EBA	Carruthers, 1990
16	Copse Farm	HE-AdV138	489460	105510	LIA	Hinton, 1985
17	Cottington Hill (cemetery)	HE-AdV54	633845	164106	LRO	Stevens, 2009
18	Cottington Rd, Thanet	HE-AdV51	634011	164328	MNEOL	Stevens, 2009
19	Crowder Terrace (Oram's Arbour)	HE-AdV70	447595	129450	Beaker	Green, 2004
20	Cuxton	HE-AdV117	570743	166619	EIA	Davies, 2006

21	Damhead Creek Power Station	HE-AdV87	581140	172802	MBA, LIA, MRO, LRO	Hinton, 2017
22	Danebury 78 (hillfort)	HE-AdV77	432500	137500	EIA, MIA, LIA	Jones, 1984
23	Dartford Football Club	HE-AdV62	555140	173240	ERO	Pelling, 2011
24	Dorney	HE-RP27	492881.4	178047	ENEOL	Robinson, 2000
25	Dunkirt Barn, Danebury Environs Project	HE-AdV34	431400	141900	MRO, LRO	Campbell, 2008
26	East Kent Access Rd	HE-AdV113	633584	163813	ENEOL, LBA, MIA, LIA, ERO, MRO, LRO	Hunter, 2015
27	Easton Lane, 76-77	HE-AdV78	448000	129000	Beaker, MIA	Carruthers, 1989
28	Eden Park (Toddington Nurseries)	HE-AdV123	503520	103565	MBA	Pelling, 2012a
29	Ellington School	HE-RP2	637166.7	165332.5	ENEOL	Carruthers, 2021
30	Eyhorne Street Hollingbourne	HE-AdV128	583600	154302	LNEOL, Beaker	Davies, 2006
31	Field Farm	HE-RP4	463226	168612	EBA	Jones and Rowley-Conwy, 2007
32	Flint Farm, Danebury Environs Project	HE-AdV32	435000	140500	EIA	Campbell, 2008
33	Ford Airfield	HE-AdV111	499426	103067	LBA, LIA, ERO	Hinton, 2004
34	Fullerton, Danebury Environs Project	HE-AdV33	437457	140105	LRO	Campbell, 2008
35	Grateley South, Danebury Environs Project	HE-AdV31	427600	141000	LIA, ERO, LRO	Campbell, 2008
36	Green Park 95	HE-AdV104	469700	169600	LNEOL, MBA LBA	Campbell, 2004.
37	Greentrees School	HE-RP12	415160	132620	Beaker, MNEOL	Powel and Dinwiddy, 2016
38	Guston Roundabout	HE-AdV114	633190	143450	LBA	Pelling, 2002a
39	Harlington ICSG and RMC	HE-AdV120	508267	177935	LNEOL, MNEOL, EBA, MBA, ERO, MRO, LRO	Stevens, 2015
40	Hartshill Copse	HE-AdV80	453100	168500	LBA, EIA	Carruthers, 2004
41	Hascombe Camp	HE-AdV139	500500	138600	LIA	Murphy, 1979

42	Heathrow T5	HE-AdV102	505028	175827	ENEOL, Beaker, MBA, LBA, MIA, LIA, MRO, LRO	Carruthers, 2010
43	Horton Quarry (Kingsmead)	HE-AdV124	501683.3	175294	ENEOL, LNEOL	Chaffey and Brook, 2012
44	Isle of Grain- Shorne Gas transmission pipeline excavation	HE-AdV88	558620	117550	LBA, LIA, ERO, LRO	Allott, 2017
45	Itford Hill 49-53	HE-AdV133	544700	105300	LBA	Helbaek, 1957
46	King's Barrow Ridge	HE-RP17	413598	142168	MNEOL, LNEOL	Carruthers, 1990
47	King's Gate, Amesbury	HE-RP13	416550	140070	MNEOL, LNEOL, Beaker	Wessex Archaeology, 2014
48	Kingsborough – prehistoric	HE-AdV100	597757	172093	ENEOL, LBA, MIA	Stevens, 2008
49	Little Stock Farm	HE-AdV116	606646	138531	EIA, LIA	Stevens, 2006
50	Manston Rd, Ramsgate,	HE-AdV56	636175	165500	MBA, LBA	Hinton, 2009
51	Manston Rd1, Ramsgate	HE-AdV89	636169	165755	LBA	Allott, 2019
52	Monkton Road, Minster	HE-AdV119	630580	164625	EBA	Barclay et al., 2011
53	New Road (Oram's Arbour)	HE-AdV71	447800	129900	MIA	Green, 2004
54	Newham	HE-RP1	542500	182000	ENEOL	Pelling, 2012b
55	Nonington	HE-AdV92	626892	151707	ERO	Carruthers, 2011
56	Northumberland Bottom	HE-AdV103	563000	171500	ERO, LRO	Davies, 2006
57	Old Dairy	HE-RP14	416200	142000	MNEOL	Wyles, 2017
58	Old Sarum Airfield	HE-RP15	415460	133087	MNEOL	Wessex Archaeology, 2015
59	Old Sarum Spur	HE-RP16	413319	133124	MNEOL	Stevens, 2005
60	Olympic Park	HE-AdV84	538000	184500	MIA, ERO	Grant et al., 2012
61	Peacehaven, Lewes	HE-AdV60	542030	101600	ENEOL, EBA, MBA, LBA, MIA	Le Hégarat, 2015; pers. Comm.

62	Princes Road, Dartford	HE-AdV75	554100	173200	MBA	Pelling, 2003
63	Prospect Park	HE-RP9	505990	178191	LNEOL	Hinton, 1996
64	Redbridge	HE-AdV24	546830	188810	EIA	Adams, 2018
65	Regents Park	HE-AdV64	439200	113600	EIA	Biddle, 1986
66	Robin Hood's Ball	HE-RP25	410300	146100	ENEOL	Carruthers, 1990
67	Rowbury Farm, Danebury Environs Project	HE-AdV36	435346	140066	EIA, MIA, ERO	Campbell, 2008
68	Runnymede 78	HE-AdV126	501800	171800	MNEOL, LBA	Greig, 1991
69	Saltwood Tunnel	HE-AdV115	615750	136900	ENEOL, EBA, MBA, LBA, MIA, LRO	Stevens, 2006
70	Sandway Road	HE-AdV97	587975	151642	MNEOL	Giorgi, 2006
71	Springhead Sanctuary	HE-AdV68	561800	172750	LIA, ERO, MRO	Stevens, 2011a
72	Springhead, 1994 Pipeline	HE-AdV67	561819	172339	ERO	Campbell, 1998
73	St Anne's Hill	HE-AdV85	560268	99800	LIA	Hinton, 2016
74	Staple Gardens (Oram's Arbour)	HE-AdV69	447745	129809	EIA, MIA	Green, 2004
75	Sussex St (Oram's Arbour)	HE-AdV72	447820	129870	MIA	Green, 2004
76	Taplow Hillfort	HE-AdV65	490700	182300	ENEOL, EBA, LBA	Robinson, 2009
77	Thanet Area 16, Weatherlees & Ebbsfleet, Kent	HE-AdV52	633330	163000	LBA, LIA, ERO	Stevens, 2009
78	Thanet Earth	HE-AdV91	628900	166700	ENEOL, LNEOL, Beaker, EBA, MBA, MIA	Carruthers, 2019
79	The Beehive	HE-RP22	414359	133338	MNEOL	Higgins, 2003
80	The Portway	HE-RP23	414278	133022	MNEOL	Stevens, 2005
81	Thruxton Villa, Danebury Environs Project	HE-AdV37	429818	146199	MRO	Summers et al., 2008
82	Thurnham Roman Villa	HE-AdV59	579954	157111	ERO, MRO, LRO	Smith and Davies, 2006

83	Tilshead nursery school	HE-RP18	403510	148100	MNEOL	Amadio, 2010
84	Tutt Hill	HE-AdV98	597520	146600	Beaker, MBA	Giorgi, 2006
85	Weir Bank Stud Farm	HE-AdV118	490950	178900	MBA	Clapham, 1995
86	West Amesbury Farm	HE-RP21	414030	141390	MNEOL, LNEOL	Worley et al., 2019
87	Westwood Cross	HE-AdV125	636300	167600	ENEOL, MBA, LBA	Stevens, 2011b
88	White Horse Stone	HE-AdV127	575300	160410	ENEOL, LNEOL, MBA	Giorgi, 2006
89	Whitesheet Hill	HE-RP19	380300	134600	ENEOL	Jones and Rowley-Conwy, 2007
90	Wickhams Field	HE-AdV131	467500	169700	EIA	Crockett, 1996
91	Wickhurst Green	HE-AdV90	514800	130300	MIA, ERO	Vitolo, 2018
92	Wilsford Down	HE-RP26	410800	140800	ENEOL	Carruthers, 1990
93	Winnall Down	HE-AdV79	449893	130370	LBA, EIA, MIA	Monk, 1985

Table 1: Archaeological sites shown in Figure 1.

Archaeological Period	Nº Sites	Nº Samples	Total vol. (est.vol~~Litres~~) Litres	Density (items/l)	Nº crops	Nº gathered edibles	Nº possible weed taxa*/[seeds]
ENEOL	19	122	3243 (30)	6.7	4 (3)	3 (3)	9 (18) / [515]
M/LNEOL	22	146	3803 (200)	7.5	2 (4)	1 (5)	9 (14) / [191]
Beaker	12	51	752 (10)	1.8	2 (2)	2 (3)	4 (7) / [31]
EBA	9	18	362 (10)	1.8	3 (2)	2 (1)	1 (16) / [61]
MBA	18	124	2484 (20)	10	6 (1)	1 (8)	26 (38) / [6942]
LBA	25	190	3459 (360)	16.9	7 (2)	2 (4)	25 (68) / [15956]
EIA	13	56	1231 (120)	17.3	6 (1)	2 (1)	40 (36) / [4120]
MIA	19	76	2481 (80)	3.8	5 (3)	1 (3)	29 (54) / [3482]
LIA	17	76	1411 (90)	200.4	6 (1)	1 (3)	45 (25) / [4467]
ERO	18	168	2608 (380)	299.5	5 (3)	4 (4)	35 (63) / [37034]
MRO	9	65	1236 (20)	263	6 (1)	4 (4)	40 (34) / [16620]

LRO	14	89	1271 (110)	71.3	6 (2)	1 (4)	33 (51) / [6875]

Table 2: Summary data of the ~~charred~~ plant macrofossils by archaeological period. Counts are taxa present in ≥5% (<5%) of samples per period (for the EBA and the weeds of the Beaker period (n) is the number of taxa in only one sample); *Identifications to family and genus levels were only counted when more precise identifications were not present

3~~2~~.1.2 Ecological analyses

Seeds of herbaceous wild plants are here analysed as arable weeds. Whilst some may represent species that were eaten or used (as leaves, roots, etc), their presence as charred seeds associated with cereal grains/chaff suggests they grew in arable fields. An autoecological approach, based on modern field observations of individual species' tolerances to environmental conditions, was adopted ~~for the ecological analysis of the data gathered for the study region~~ (see De Vareilles et al., 2021 for a critique of different ecological approaches ~~to the analysis of~~on archaeobotanical material). The approach was first developed by Heinz Ellenberg, in which he measured plants' preferences to environmental gradients in Central Europe, using a 9-point scale (Ellenberg, 1988; Ellenberg et al., 1991). ~~Ellenberg numbers, or indicator values, were first defined for, and applied to, the flora of Central Europe, but are now also available for British plants (Bunce et al., 1999; Hill et al., 1999, 2000). Adjusted~~ Ellenberg numbers have been adjusted for British plants (Bunce et al., 1999; Hill et al., 1999, 2000), and ~~have been~~are used to record species' preferences for soil nitrogen (-2-3 = low, 4-5 = intermediate, 6-7 = high, 8-9 very high fertility) and light intensity (6 = shade to well lit, 7 = mostly well lit, 8 =~~–~~ ample light) (Fig.5b~~c~~&e~~d~~). Figure 5a,d~~b~~ and c~~e~~ illustrates species' life form (annual or perennial), preference to light or heavy soils and flowering habit of annual plants (Fitter et al., 1994; Online Atlas of British and Irish Flora). The onset and duration of flowering in annuals is associated with both the season of germination and a plant's tolerance to disturbance (Bogaard et al., 1999, 2001; Hodgson and Grime, 1990). Plants that flower early are more likely to develop in autumn-sown crops, growing in time with the crop. Similarly, plants that germinate and flower late are at a competitive advantage in spring-sown crops, where they avoid competition from autumn-germinating plants and the spring plough. Some annuals flower repeatedly throughout the year as an adaptation to disturbance, and~~.~~ duration of flowering time can therefore be used as an indication of disturbance frequency. Figure 5c~~e~~ translates flowering ~~onset and duration~~habit to season of germination and disturbance levels following Bogaard et al. (2001)~~: Table 3)~~. The ubiquity charts in Figure 5 are calculated using presence/absence data per sample, not the number of taxa or seeds. Relevant taxa within a given sample (i.e. all those with a score for a particular ecological/biological trait) are reduced to a single occurrence by score. The number of samples is that for which there is information on a given trait. The ubiquity scores by archaeological period are therefore a measure of the frequency of presence of a particular characteristic within an assemblage for an ecological/biological trait. The measured characteristics for each species are listed in SM Table ?.

3~~2~~.1.3 *Data analyses*

Within this study, several approaches are used to explore the archaeobotanical dataset for patterns of changing land use. As the number of samples varies between archaeological periods, we tested the relationship between plant taxa richness and the number and volume of samples. Both correlations are moderate, with Spearman's Rho centred around 0.6 and r^2 around 0.3 ($p<0.0005$ in both cases). Similar results are found when the correlations are calculated by individual time periods, except for the Beaker and Early Bronze Age (EBA) where correlations are weak (Rho=0.3/0.2 respectively, $p=0.3$). The latter confirms that the distribution and recovery of Beaker and EBA archaeobotanical finds are unpredictable, making it even more important to sample sites from these periods intensively. Despite variations in site types and sampling strategies, taxa richness is comparable in other periods, validating comparisons made below.

The presence of crops and gathered edible plants~~foods~~ per sample ~~across the whole dataset~~ was plotted ~~using ubiquity of taxa by~~ for all archaeological periods, to illustrate the changing use of plant foods through time (Fig.2). ~~The same charts are used to present biological and ecological values.~~ The internal structure of the dataset was explored using ~~two multivariate ordination techniques: correspondence analysis (Smith, 2014) was initially attempted but, as distinct clusters were not evident (see supplementary information Fig.1),~~ hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA, Fig.3)~~ was used~~ (Murtagh and Legendre, 2014; Ward, 1963)~~. Both were~~, performed in the 'Vegan' R package (Oksanen et al., 2020), after small samples and rare taxa had been removed, i.e. samples with fewer than 30 items (before the transformation to presence/absence data) and taxa occurring in fewer than 2% of samples (n=24). Excluding small samples affected the early prehistoric periods most strongly, removing two thirds to three quarters of the Middle/Late Neolithic, Beaker and EBA samples. HCA groups samples by similarity of composition and visual inspection of outputs and experimentation with different grouping levels suggested that six clusters adequately represent relationships of dissimilarity between different groups. This ordination technique is more commonly used in the field of palynology (e.g. Woodbridge et al., 2018), but has the advantage ~~over Correspondence Analysis~~ of allowing the taxonomic composition of each cluster to be explored as well as a taxon's frequency based on the cluster group assigned to each sample. Taxa that occurred in~~ more than~~ >50% of samples within a cluster ~~were identified and~~ are here described as 'common' (Table 3).

3~~2~~.2 *Fossil pollen data*

The fossil pollen datasets used in this study include 106 datasets from the south-east of England (Woodbridge *et al*., 2021; in review) (Table SM1). Pollen records (Fyfe et al., 2013; Leydet et al., 2007-2020; Trondman et al., 2015) from individual coring sites have been taxonomically harmonised and summed into 200-year time windows (Woodbridge et al., in review). Shannon diversity indices derived from the pollen datasets, which reflect both taxa richness and evenness, are presented in Fig. 4. Quantified land cover was reconstructed from a subset of 98 sites suitable for the application of the REVEALS (Regional Estimates of Vegetation Abundance from Large Sites) approach (Fyfe et al., 2013; Githumbi et al., 2022; Marquer et al., 2014; Sugita, 2007). This approach uses information about the productivity of different plants, the dispersal behaviour (fall speed) of different pollen types, and the site type (lake or peatland/bog) and size to quantify land cover using pollen count data. To produce estimates of regional vegetation using the REVEALS model, pollen sites need to be grouped together. This grouping is based on site type, site size, proximity to other pollen sites, and landscape characteristics. The grouping resulted in five sub-regions in SE England, which are illustrated in Fig. 1b (see Woodbridge et al., in review, for further details). A pairwise Wilcox test for non-normally distributed data was used to test the differences between pollen diversity scores by archaeological period. All comparison periods were shown to be statistically significantly different with a p-value below 0.05~~Sites have been grouped into sub-regions according to location and site characteristics (see Woodbridge et al., in review, for further details).~~

4~~3~~. Results

Figure 2: The ubiquity of crops (a), fruits and nuts (b) by archaeological period. Only taxa present in >5% of samples in at least one period are represented. Pulses includes *Lens culinaris, Pisum sativum, Vicia faba* and large Fabaceae; cabbage/mustard includes *Brassica nigra/oleraceae/rapa* and Brassica/Sinapis; berry includes Rubus spp.; Prunus includes *Prunus* spp., and acorn all *Quercus* spp. Keep 2a. Change graph to include oat, etc. Avena sp. may include undomesticated grains.

~~3~~4.~~1~~2 The representation of crops~~, arable weeds~~ and edible fruits and nuts (Fig.2, Table 2)

Spelt wheat (*Triticum spelta*) and hulled barley (*Hordeum vulgare vulgare*) became the main crops in Britain during prehistory and the Roman period. The trends in ubiquity suggest an overall temporal increase in the range and presence of crops across sites (Fig.2a). The trend mirrors that of the density of assemblages, showing that crop waste became more numerous and frequent. Exceptions to these trends are evident for the Middle to Late Neolithic (M/LNEOL), Beaker, Middle Iron Age (MIA) and the LRO. The drop in cereal remains in the M/LNEOL and Beaker periods is counteracted with a marked increase in two gathered resources: hazelnut and apples/pears (*Malus/Pyrus*). Compared to the Early Iron Age (EIA), the MIA sees a marked drop in the ubiquity of barley but an increase in that of emmer (*T. dicoccum*) and pulses. The decline in the ubiquity of crops is less marked for the LRO: a decline is visible for emmer, spelt and pulses though the score for free-threshing wheat (*T. aestivum/durum/turgidum*) increases.

~~The prevalence of wheat (*Triticum* sp.) and barley (*Hordeum vulgare*) over other crops is visible throughout the archaeological periods, but the relative proportion of barley to wheat is not constant.~~ Barley is tolerant of poorer growing conditions, both edaphic and climatic, and was an important animal feed (Rhiel, 2019). Whether the changing relative representation of barley is associated with changes in climate or animal husbandry cannot be fully explored here, although these two factors will ~~certainly~~ have influenced arable agriculture. Naked barley (*H. vulgare* var. *nudum*) is infrequent and only present in the early prehistoric samples, as is the pattern across the ~~British Isles~~United Kingdom and Europe (Lister and Jones, 2013).

Naked/free-threshing cereals are less visible in the charred archaeobotanical record since the grains ~~are less likely to adhere to any surrounding chaff and~~ require less processing (Hillman, 1984). Free-threshing wheat ~~(*T. aestivum/durum/turgidum*)~~ is most frequent in the Neolithic (n=193, 3% of all wheats) and Roman (n=398, 0.04% of all wheats) samples, although the number of remains are low. Rare grains and chaff of tetraploid free-threshing wheat from Thanet Earth (site 78) were radiocarbon dated to 3940-3660 cal. BC (Carruthers, 2019). Conversely, other grains from Neolithic contexts have ~~consistently~~ returned medieval and later dates ~~indicating that their presence is intrusive~~ (Pelling et al., 2015). The richest assemblage was recorded from late Roman samples at Grateley (site 35) and consists of 121 free-threshing wheat grains but only three rachises, amongst thousands of hulled barley and spelt wheat ~~(*T. spelta*)~~ remains. The dataset corroborates current evidence suggesting that free-threshing wheat was not a common crop in Britain before the Anglo-Saxon period (McKerracher, 2018). ~~Similarly, rye (*Secale cereale*) does not appear to have been regularly cultivated in Britain until after the Roman period as it occurs in less than five percent of samples per period (*cf.* Behre, 1992).~~ Cultivated oat (*Avena sativa*) is ~~also~~ poorly represented ~~in the dataset~~, its highest occurrence being in the Middle (MIA) and Late (LIA) Iron Age (in 3% of samples). However, domesticated oats are difficult to identify without their chaff and are likely to be under-represented in Iron Age and Roman samples, where oat caryopses recorded as *Avena* sp. are present in 40% to 58% of samples per period.

The likelihood of intrusive or residue cereals, particularly in ~~Middle to Late Neolithic (~~M/LNEOL~~)~~, Beaker and EBA samples, which tend to contain very few remains, makes interpretations difficult. For example, in contrast to the ENEOL, when emmer wheat (*T. dicoccum*) is well represented, the dataset contains only one grain positively identified to species in the M/LNEOL. ~~Emmer wheat was part of the original suite of domesticated cereals whilst European spelt (*T. spelta*) developed after farmers had settled in central Europe, where it became widespread during the Bronze Age (Blatter et al., 2004; Zohary et al., 2012: 49-50).~~ The earliest British record of spelt is from Monkton Road (site 52) where glume bases, associated with fragments of Celtic bean (*Vicia faba*), were dated to the end of the EBA (1896-1690 cal BC, Martin et al. 2012). Figure 2 clearly shows how spelt became the predominant wheat in the region by the Early Iron Age (EIA).

Early prehistoric finds of cultivated pulses (see Fig.2~~1~~ for taxa included in this category) should also be viewed with caution as all directly dated finds from Neolithic contexts pertain to later periods (Pelling et al., 2015; Stevens and Fuller, 2012; Treasure and Church, 2017). Celtic beans first appear during the EBA, becoming more prolific along the south coast and spreading inland from the Middle Bronze Age (MBA) onwards (Treasure and Church 2017). ~~Evidence for pea (*Pisum sativum*) is rarer. Its presence at the Thanet pipeline excavations (sites 17, 18 and 77), along with emmer, spelt, barley and Celtic bean provides evidence for one of the first more complex husbandry regimes in British prehistory (Stevens 2009).~~ The absence of pulses in the dataset from EIA samples is surprising, but reminiscent of a national pattern: pulses and flax were not universally grown during the Iron Age, perhaps reflecting regional cultivation of pulses in areas of poorer soils and the growth of fodder crops (de Carle, 2014: 160; Treasure and Church, 2017: 120). The frequency of pulses increases during the Roman period, when the only secure find of lentil (*Lens culinaris*) is recorded (site 71), although potentially imported. The drop in the ubiquity of pulses during the LRO may reflect a decline in trade rather than/as well as cultivation.

Flax (*Linum usitatissimum*) was grown for both its fibre and oily seeds and evidence for the former is confirmed by Bronze Age waterlogged deposits of retting fibres (Carruthers and Hunter Dowse, 2019: 42). As with cabbage/mustard and opium poppy seeds (*Papaver somniferum*), the size and oily nature of flax seeds inhibits their survival to charring and archaeological recovery. Nevertheless, large assemblages, such as the 509 seeds recovered from MBA Weir Bank Stud Farm (site 85) confirm the importance of seed production from at least the Bronze Age. Although poppy is only present in the dataset from the EBA, it has been recovered from Neolithic contexts further north, though only in very small numbers (Campbell and Robinson, 2007: 24, 33). Both poppy and cabbage/mustard plants were initially/also crop weeds. ~~This Mediterranean domesticate was cultivated during the Linearbandkeramic (Salavert et al., 2020) though its first introduction into Britain may have been as a crop contaminant. Cabbage/mustard (see Fig.1 for taxa included in this category) seeds were most frequent in the Late Bronze Age (LBA) and EIA samples, with the highest count being 142 seeds from EIA Hartshill Copse (site 40).~~ While large deposits of charred black mustard seeds (*Brassica nigra*) are not uncommon from Iron Age sites (e.g. Hartshill Copse (site 40), Brickley Lane in Wiltshire (Pelling, 2002b) and~~,~~ Balksbury Camp in Hmapshire (De Moulin, 1996)~~ and Down Farm (Murphy, 1977) in Hampshire~~), the dataset suggests ~~this practice~~that cultivating cabbage/mustard may have begun in the LBA in southern England.

Commented [DVA2]: Remove? As suggested by R1

Fruits and nuts are assumed to be wild in the early prehistoric period, but may include cultivated and imported varieties by the LIA and Roman period. The impact that the production/consumption of wild resources had on the landscape and its biodiversity cannot be measured through our dataset. Similarly, the effect of individual crop species is not known. However, the evident growth in the representation and density of crop assemblages from the MBA to the Roman period, and its association with increased areas of land under cultivation, is reflected in changing vegetation cover and diversity (Fig.4). ~~Of the seven categories of fruits and nuts (Fig.2b), hazelnut (*Corylus avellana*) is the most frequent and significantly outnumbers cereals in ubiquity in the M/LNEOL and Beaker periods, when crop production is argued to have been marginal in the south-east of England (Stevens and Fuller, 2012). However, the same trend is not evident for the other gathered edible taxa, suggesting that the proposed abandonment of cereal cultivation was not visibly replaced by an enriched diet in gathered plant foods. The hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*) peaks in the Beaker and EBA periods may be misleading due to the low number of samples; it makes a good leaf fodder and could be associated with the increased focus on pastoralism (Rowley-Conwy et al., 2020; Worley et al., 2019).~~

~~The possible arable weed assemblages will have been shaped by cultivation practices (intensity and scale), cereal processing stages and variations in the use of cereal processing by-products (Hillman, 1984; Stevens, 2014). Cultivation practices are explored in section 3.2 whilst Table 2 clearly demonstrates how taxa and seeds are most numerous in the LBA, ERO and Middle Roman period (MRO). The low representation of ENEOL weeds conforms to the small, low-density assemblages common for that period, and may relate to the practice of intensive cultivation that included careful weeding. The very low representation of weeds in the M/LNEOL, Beaker and EBA periods aligns with the poor representation of crops, though the low number of sites and processed volume of sediments for the Beaker and EBA make comparisons difficult. The MBA sees a significant increase in the representation of weeds and the overall density of samples, demonstrating a renewed emphasis on arable cultivation. This trend peaks in the LBA which, after the Early Roman period (ERO), has the highest range of taxa (n=93). The relatively low quantity of weed seeds, despite a high number of taxa (n=83) in the MIA, and the low overall density of samples, is unexpected. The singular results for the MIA are also evident in the other analyses and are discussed below. Similarly, the drop in the density of LRO samples, despite a comparable volume of samples and a greater number of taxa, is also reflected in the analyses below. Since all taxa are included and given equal weighting in the ecological analyses, the MIA and LRO signals cannot be explained by a poorer representation of arable weeds~~.

Commented [DVA3]: Moved to 3.3

4~~3~~.~~2~~3 ~~Multivariate~~ Hierarchical Cluster A~~a~~nalysi~~e~~s

Hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA) separated the samples into six clusters with some clear temporal trends (Fig.3). Clusters 1 and 5 are predominantly composed of early prehistoric samples, whilst cluster 6 contains LIA, ERO and MRO samples. Clusters 2, 3 and 4 suggest later prehistoric samples can be separated into three distinct groups. Cluster 5 is composed of almost half of the M/LNEOL samples and is made up entirely of hazelnut. Hazelnut is also common in cluster 1 where cereals, fruits and nuts also occur, but only four arable weed taxa (*Galium aparine*, *Fallopia convolvulus, Rumex* sp. and wild legumes). In contrast clusters 2, 3, 4 and 6 are influenced by cereal remains and each contain over 30 weed taxa. While the number of Beaker and EBA samples is very low and may not be representative, the inclusion of 20% of EBA samples in clusters 2 and 3 is suggestive of a renewed emphasis on cereal cultivation. M/LNEOL, Beaker and EBA samples are excluded from further ecological analyses below owing to the very low representation of possible arable weeds and the low correlation between the number and volume of samples, and taxa richness.

Figure 3: The Hierarchical Cluster Analysis classification of archaeobotanical samples into six clusters.

Clusters (samples predominantly from..)	Common Taxa (in >50% samples)	№ of other taxa
1 (early prehistory)	Hazelnut	15
2 (Iron Age)	Hulled barley grain, bromes, cleavers, indeterminate wild grasses	48
3 (Bronze Age with some Iron Age, mostly MIA, and Roman)	Emmer/spelt grain and chaff, emmer chaff, spelt chaff, indeterminate wild legumes	44
4 (Middle Bronze Age, Early to Middle Iron Age and Late Roman, with some Late Bronze Age and Late Iron Age to Middle Roman)	Emmer/spelt chaff, spelt chaff, indeterminate wheat grains, indeterminate wild grasses	62
5 (Middle/Late Neolithic)	Hazelnut	0
6 (Late Iron Age to Middle Roman)	Hulled barley grain, Emmer/spelt grain and chaff, spelt chaff, indeterminate cereal grain, indeterminate oat grain, ryegrass, corn gromwell, curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), indeterminate wild legumes, hazelnut	55

Table 3: Results of the hierarchical cluster analysis by six clusters, showing taxa present in ≥50% of samples within each cluster (see text for latin binomials)

Clusters 3 and 4 include the majority of the MBA to LRO samples. These clusters have similar compositions with spelt and/or emmer chaff present in >50% of samples (Table 3~~SM1~~). The main difference between the clusters seems to be the presence of emmer, which is less frequent in cluster 4 where IA and Romano-British samples predominate. Both clusters also contain other crops and 32 other weed taxa each, including stinking chamomile (*Anthemis cotula*), but corncockle (*Agrostemma githago*) is only present in cluster 4; both species are anthropochores associated with the expansion of cultivation in the Romano-British period (Preston et al., 2004; Stevens and Fuller, 2018). Stinking chamomile is an indicator of clay soils and is associated with the ~~introduction of more robust ploughing technology, such as asymmetrical shares, allowing the expansion of cultivation onto heavier soils (Jones, 1985, 2009). However, Roman technology is likely to have been restricted to the more Romanised settlements as it was not until the later Saxon and medieval periods that 'Roman' weeds became prolific (Allen et al., 2017; Stevens and Fuller, 2018: 33).~~ Spelt and emmer grains and chaff are also present in cluster 2, but in fewer than 50% of samples.

Cluster 2, which includes EBA, LBA and IA samples, is characterised by hulled barley grain, cleavers (*Galium aparine*), brome (*Bromus secalinus*) and indeterminate wild grass seeds.

Barley is also dominant in cluster 6, but in association with oats and ryegrass (*Lolium perenne*), rather than brome, as well as corn gromwell (*Lithospermum arvense*) which is indicative of light sandy soils, contrasting with the stinking chamomile and hulled wheats in clusters 3 and 4. The changing weed flora between phases 2 and 6 could indicate a development in the cultivation of barley through the Iron Age and Roman periods (*cf*. Campbell and Straker, 2003). In addition to cereal remains, cluster 6 also contains fruits and nuts, reflecting the rise in horticulture and exotics during the Roman period ~~(Fig.2b)~~ (cf. Van der Veen, 2014).

Table 2, which lists the number of weed taxa by archaeological period, further helps to understand the classification of samples into clusters. The low representation of ENEOL weeds conforms to the small, low-density assemblages common for that period, and may relate to the practice of intensive cultivation that included careful weeding. The very low representation of weeds in the M/LNEOL, Beaker and EBA periods aligns with the poor representation of crops, though the low number of sites and processed volume of sediments for the Beaker and EBA make comparisons difficult. The MBA sees a significant increase in the representation of weeds and the overall density of samples, demonstrating a renewed emphasis on arable cultivation. This trend peaks in the LBA which, after the Early Roman period, has the highest range of taxa (n=93). The relatively low quantity of weed seeds, despite a high number of taxa (n=83) in the MIA, and the low overall density of samples, is unexpected. The same is true for the LRO where there is a drop in the density of samples, despite a comparable volume and number of taxa to the other Roman periods.

4~~3~~.1~~3~~ Land cover, pollen diversity and scale of cultivation (Fig.4)

Figure 4: (a) quantified land cover, (each division in the REVEALS and pollen diversity represents a 200year time step from 11,000 BC to present); (b) ~~the~~ density of crops and gathered fruits and nuts (items per litre of deposit) alongside the Shannon diversity of fossil pollen by archaeological period. Note that the chart for crops uses a logarithmic scale whereas the one for fruits and nuts does not as they occur in much lower densities.

The ~~densities~~ concentrations of crops ~~(number of grains, pulses and chaff per litre of deposit)~~ and edible fruits/nuts represent an approximate illustration of the scales of cultivation and gathering activities between periods. The overall relationship between densities of crop assemblages and pollen Shannon diversity is positive and statistically significant. An increase in cultivation is correlated to an increase in vegetation diversity. The bar chart suggests that this relationship is strongest during Early Prehistory.~~. Although changes in assemblage densities reflect changes in settlement patterns and the organisation of crop processing/use, they are also associated with the growth of populations and are here used as a crude measure for the scale of production. The changing densities data through time compare well to the summed probability distribution of radiocarbon dates (SPD) for southern England, which are used as a proxy for fluctuations in population densities (Bevan et al., 2017: Fig.2a). With the exception of the MIA, the density scores also compare well to the trends in the Shannon diversity indices of fossil pollen (Fig.4b). The~~

Commented [DVA4]: Moved to methodology

~~plots provide a useful illustration of how cultivation may have contributed to changes in pollen diversity. Clearing land for cultivation and the type of agriculture practiced (e.g. intensive or extensive; household plots or larger community plots; crop rotation with or without animals) had an impact on the openness of landscapes and their vegetation diversity (De Vareilles et al., 2021: Fig.1; Racimo et al., 2020). The quantified vegetation cover derived from the pollen data using the REVEALS model (Fig.4a) clearly illustrates how the proportion of grassland and cereal land cover increased relative to forest cover when farming was introduced and as the scale of cultivation increased from the MBA to the MRO period.~~

Compared to the Mesolithic, the ENEOL is marked by a decrease in forest cover (Fig.4a). A decline in crop density and increase in the presence of gathered fruits/nuts after the introduction of agriculture is~~ clearly~~ evident (Fig.4b). Whilst this change may represent a shift in human behaviour and depositional activities, it coincides with a slight decline in pollen diversity and increase in forest cover (Fig.4a), suggesting it does reflect a change in landscape use and reduction in arable activity. Crop density then increases from the Beaker period, with a significant increase in the LIA and Roman period. The REVEALS model (Fig.4a) illustrates how the proportion of grassland and cereal land cover increased relative to forest cover when farming was introduced and as the scale of cultivation increased from the MBA to the MRO period. A decline in crop density is seen in the MIA, despite a continued increase in pollen diversity, and again, marginally, during the LRO period. The positive correlation between crop density and pollen diversity appears to change during the LIA when there is a decline in pollen diversity which continues into the LRO.

~~The trends in pollen diversity follow the direction of the crop densities up to the MIA. The MIA decrease in crop density is surprising given the general trend towards increasing arable production throughout the Iron Age and into the Roman period, as seen in previous studies (Lodwick, 2017; Stevens, 2014; Van der Veen and O'Connor, 1998). The MIA dip is also evident in other results within this study where this pattern compares more clearly with LBA results. As is explained in section 3.1, sample and site numbers cannot explain the decrease in crop density (Table 2). A population decline could explain the MIA offset, but SPDs indicate an earlier decline between the LBA and EIA, possibly owing to a time of climatic deterioration from a farming perspective (Bevan et al., 2017: S2). The flat shape of the radiocarbon calibration curve covering the Iron Age does make it difficult to assess the length and extent of the population downturn, making it possible that the MIA results reflect this period. Pollen diversity increases slightly in the MIA before reducing continually from the LIA onwards; the gradual reforestation of abandoned settlements and arable fields during a population downturn could result in increased vegetation diversity during the successional stages to woodland. Contrary to the early prehistoric trends, crop density and pollen diversity move in opposite directions during the Roman period, possibly even from the LIA.~~

Commented [DVA5]: Mocvd to discussion

4~~3~~.4 Biological and ecological traits (Fig.5)

~~Charred seeds that are not from edible plants, trees, ferns or heather are here considered as potential arable weeds and used to understand past field ecology (see section 2). Traits were attributed to all species and genus where their species have the same attributes.~~ In the previous sections, we have demonstrated that pollen diversity is affected by the scale of cultivation, i.e. the amount of land under cultivation. In this section, we analyse the possible weed floras to gain a better understanding of agrarian practices. ~~The number of samples by phase in the following figures varies as they only include samples for which data are available.~~

Figure 5: The ubiquity of measured characteristics by archaeological period, for five biological/ecological traits~~Biological and ecological traits of the possible arable weeds by archaeological period~~. 'Disturbance' includes plants that flower for no more than 3 months, those that flower for 4 or more months are in the 'high disturbance' category. Beaker and EBA samples are not representative (see 2.1.3). The ubiquity is calculated on the number of samples for which data on a particular trait are available.

4~~3~~.4.1 Life form (Fig.5a)

Three life forms were detected: annuals, plants that can act as both annuals and hemicryptophyte perennials, and hemicryptophyte perennials (perennials that propagate from stoloniferous or rhizomatous roots and benefit from shallow ploughing/disturbance (Bogaard et al., 1999; Jones et al., 2000)). True perennials (plants that take more than a year to grow from seed and regenerate from the same root stock) are not present in any period indicating that even the ENEOL assemblages are from well-established fields rather than recently cleared vegetation (Bogaard, 2002; Rösch et al., 2002). It is also possible that newly established fields were dutifully weeded of perennials and annuals alike, such that the few ENEOL taxa, most of which are twi~~n~~ning, essentially reflect weeding and harvesting techniques. The proportional difference between annuals and hemicryptophyte perennials is similar during the prehistoric and LRO phases, averaging at 25%. This may be an indication of disturbance as well as hand weeding; although shallow cultivation associated with the scratch plough (symmetrical ard that cuts a shallow furrow without inverting the soil) in early prehistory would have encouraged hemicryptophyte perennials, an intensive approach to weeding would have removed visible roots. The difference between life-forms is smallest ~~D~~during the ERO and MRO; perennial roots split and scattered by the plough ~~appear~~may not ~~to~~ have been removed, enabling them to regrow and seed.~~ The LIA has the highest ubiquity score for annuals (97%) and one of the lowest for hemicryptophyte perennials (60%), suggesting a more careful approach to weeding than in the two preceding and following periods.~~

4~~3~~.4.4~~2~~ Soil texture (Fig.5d~~b~~)

While light, free-draining soil indicators are present in all periods, the plants of heavy soils are also ubiquitous, either pointing to the cultivation of clay-rich soils~~, perhaps out of necessity,~~ or the inadvertent change in soil texture through prolonged shallow ploughing which can increase clay concentrations~~, even creating impermeable horizons~~ (Jones, 1981: 111). ~~Geoarchaeological analyses in the Thames Valley show how increased flooding events began in the Bronze Age, with continued land clearance resulting in extensive alluviation during the Iron Age (Lambrick with Robinson, 2009: 29-34).~~ The difference ~~between~~ in the ratio of indicators of heavy to light~~ and heavy~~ soils starts to decline in the LIA and is reversed in the LRO. This trend corroborates the finds of stinking chamomile from the LIA, commonly used to indicate the expansion of cultivation onto heavier soils enabled by deeper ploughing technology (Allen et al., 2017; Lodwick, 2018: 809).

4~~3~~.4.5~~3~~ Light intensity (Fig.5e~~c~~)

The increased proportion of weeds favouring ample sunlight coincides with an increasingly deforested landscape evident from fossil pollen (Fig.4a). These arable weeds may indicate that the increased scale of cultivation involved larger arable fields that, by the nature of their size, were less shaded by surrounding vegetation. In contrast, the arable plots of the ENEOL are noticeably more enclosed.

4~~3~~.4.2~~4~~ Soil nitrogen (Fig.5b~~d~~)

The ENEOL is the only period where weeds favouring very high fertility are the most ubiquitous, which concurs with the intensively managed (i.e. manured) fields deduced from cereal grain isotopic analyses from Lismore Fields, Derbyshire (Bogaard et al., 2013). Indicators of high fertility remain high in all phases~~,~~ but weeds tolerant of low fertility gradually increase up to the MRO period. The trends suggest that through time soil fertility was not maintained in all arable fields, ~~but that by the LRO~~though a more intensive approach to manuring may have been adopted during the LRO period. These results corroborate isotopic analyses performed on charred cereal grains from Stanwick (Northamptonshire), that showed a decline in nitrogen isotopes indicative of enriched soils from the MBA to the Roman period (Lodwick et al., 2020). The decline in levels of manuring and associated extensive cultivation practices appears to have begun in the Iron Age~~ and different cereals may have been manured to different extents~~. Another, not incompatible, explanation for the decline in the ratio of nitrophile to nitrophobe weeds during late prehistory could be an increase in autumn sowing (Stevens, 2011c). Experiments at Rothampsted (Hertfordshire) have shown that soil nitrogen levels are highest in the spring and tend to decrease rapidly if not maintained, suggesting that a gradual change in fertility indicators may not be due to soil exhaustion (*ibid*.), although little is known of the cumulative effects of different forms of soil management (e.g. crop rotation, green manure, fallow periods, animal fresh/dried manure).

4~~3~~.4.3~~5~~ Flowering onset and duration (Fig.5c~~e~~)

Autumn and spring sowing appear to have been practiced in all phases. However, there may be a bias towards spring sowing indicators in enriched soils, where spring weeds would be encouraged (Jones et al., 2000), an effect which could have been particularly strong in the ENEOL. There may also be a bias towards spring sowing indicators generated by the possible uneven representation of cereal processing products and by-products in the dataset. Small seeds, which are more heavily represented in crop-processing by-products (threshing and sieving waste), tend to be from nitrophile spring-germinating weeds (Bogaard et al., 2005; Jones, 1992). Caution is therefore needed in interpreting season of sowing, particularly as crop processing waste is better represented through time (see section 4.3~~3.2~~, Table ~~Fig.~~3). Taxa tolerant of disturbance, through tilling, weeding, ploughing and/or grazing animals, increase through time up to the LRO period. This signal is reflected in the increased proportion of hemicryptophyte perennials (Fig. 5a~~, section 3.4.1~~). High levels of disturbance are usually associated with small-scale, intensive cultivation rather than the large-scale, extensive regimes described for the Roman period (Allen and Lodwick, 2017). However, Figures 5a&~~e~~ may be depicting ~~changes in agricultural regimes and~~ the ~~development and increased adoption~~ of agricultural tools and changes to the amount of labour assigned to collecting weeds. Deeper ploughing in the LIA to Roman periods, enabled by iron ploughs and animal traction, would have favoured weeds tolerant of more intrusive disturbance. ~~In early prehistoric garden-type plots neither disturbance tolerant nor intolerant weeds would have been at a competitive advantage from effective weeding.~~ Although ubiquity scores are reduced in the LRO, the ratio between disturbance and high disturbance indicators remains comparable throughout the Roman period.

54. Discussion

Using presence/absence plant macroremains data and amalgamating all contexts per period into a single assemblage has enabled general temporal trends in land-use to be explored without biases incurred from context and settlement types, and habitation densities. Similarly, calculating the density of crop assemblages by archaeological period provides an indication of changes in the scale of production, and therefore area of land under cultivation as well as land used for all the infrastructure required to process, store and even trade crops. The changing densities data through time compare well to the summed probability distribution of radiocarbon dates (SPD) for southern England, which are used as a proxy for fluctuations in population densities (Bevan et al., 2017: Fig.2a). The statistically significant positive correlation between the density of crop assemblages and pollen diversity demonstrates that cultivation was one of the major practices to affect land cover in prehistory and the Roman period. By comparing results from the plant macroremain dataset to the off-site fossil pollen records, the relationship between arable agriculture and the natural vegetation can be explored. Previous research has demonstrated that increases in population do not, on their own, explain changes in vegetation diversity; how land was used is a crucial factor (Woodbridge et al., 2021). What follows is a discussion of arable practices and vegetation diversity by archaeological period, exploring how developments in the scale and method of cultivation affected land-cover.

5~~4~~.1 Early prehistory

~~The introduction of farming in the British Isles instigated localised and small-scale deforestation of deciduous woodlands (Fyfe et al., 2013; Woodbridge et al., 2014). Land-cover changes correspond well to the summed probability distribution (SPD) of radiocarbon dates which suggest a demographic incline during the ENEOL (Bevan et al., 2017: Fig. 1; Shennan et al., 2013: Fig.3). Indeed, the correlation between the arrival of farmers and the decline in deciduous woodland has been shown to be statistically significant (Racimo et al., 2020; see also Marquer et al., 2017).~~ The ENEOL dataset ~~has no clear evidence for the cultivation of newly cleared fields or the repeated use of woodland areas left to regenerate between cycles of cultivation (i.e. shifting cultivation). It is possible that samples from the first generations of farmers are not represented. The results~~ supports the arguments for~~a~~ fixed farming regimes, including the intensive cultivation (high energy input per unit of land) of relatively small fields (cf. Bogaard et al., 2013; Jones and Bogaard, 2017). Nevertheless, these interpretations are based on a restricted range of arable weeds. This is clearly demonstrated by the HCA which grouped ENEOL samples into cluster 1 where only four weed taxa are present, all of which are very difficult to remove, grow in most conditions, produce thousands of small seeds per plants and/or twine around the straw. ~~Across Britain, a variety of fix-plot regimes may have existed, as, contrary to results from Lismore Fields, isotopic analyse on ENEOL cereal grains from five other sites do not indicate intensive cultivation (Bogaard et al., 2013; Treasure et al., 2019).~~ These agricultural practices created mosaic-type landscapes of more opened and closed vegetation, promoting small-scale niches and driving ~~pollen diversity~~ecological novelty (cf. Woodbridge et al., in review). Pollen diversity and grassland vegetation increases after the end of the Mesolithic~~Compared to the Mesolithic~~, suggesting that the onset of farming~~ can therefore be seen to have~~ had a positive effect on landscape ~~bio~~diversity~~, reflected in pollen diversity~~, ~~initiating~~ marking the onset of a honeymoon period between agricultural land use and biodiversity.

~~A dramatic change in agricultural practises across most of the British Isles is evident from the start of the Middle Neolithic (*c*.3300 BC). Pollen records point to a regeneration of deciduous woodland (Treasure et al., 2019; Whitehouse et al., 2014) with an associated decline in vegetation diversity (Fig.4). Trends in the SPD of dates on cereal grains show a sharp decline across England, as opposed to the number of dates on hazelnut shells, suggesting that gathered nuts continued to be used whilst the cultivation of cereals was greatly reduced, and even stopped altogether in some regions, such as the south-east of England (Bevan et al., 2017; Stevens and Fuller, 2012, 2015).~~ The proposed abandonment of cereal cultivation in the south-east of England during the M/LNEOL is supported by the dataset. T~~his hypothesis is corroborated by the dataset in which t~~he ubiquity and number of hazelnuts clearly predominates, whilst the interpretation of cereals and pulses is further complicated by the likelihood of intrusive materials (Pelling et al., 2015). ~~The rarity of cereals in later Neolithic assemblages has long been recognised (e.g. Brown, 2007; Jones,~~

~~1980, Moffett et al., 1989; Robinson, 2000), even though animal domesticates, particularly cattle, continued to be an important dietary element (Serjeantson, 2011). A transition from mainly fixed, agricultural communities to a reduced population of mobile pastoralists is therefore likely.~~ Nevertheless, further work should explain the near absence of edible wild plants other than hazelnuts, large deposits of which are likely to be associated with particular behavioural activities. ~~The abandonment of arable plots, promoting w~~Woodland regeneration, presumably resulting from the neglect of arable plots, is associated with a decline in pollen and habitat diversity (Fig.4). Cattle are better adapted to forested landscapes than caprines, which may explain the adoption of a cattle-based mobile pastoralist lifestyle (Serjeantson, 2011; Worley et al, 2019). ~~The shift in lifestyle and decline in human demographics may have been triggered by unstable, colder and wetter climatic conditions (Bevan et al., 2017; Stevens and Fuller, 2015; Whitehouse et al., 2014). Additionally, crop pests and diseases could have contributed towards agricultural collapse (Antolín and Schäfer, 2020; Dark and Gent, 2001). A deterioration in soil quality has also been suggested, as a focus on a narrow range of cultigens by an increasing population may have led to soil depletion and harvest failures (Colledge et al., 2019; Shennan et al., 2013). However, it is unlikely that good quality soils were not available at the limited number of Neolithic sites known in the south-east of England, particularly if small-scale intensive agriculture was practiced.~~

~~The Beaker period is marked by a new influx of people of central European ancestry by around 2400 BC (Olalde et al., 2018). Changes in material culture, such as the introduction of the Bell Beaker cup, and settlement patterns also attest to a shift in lifestyles (Bradley, 2019: chapter 4). Little is known of Beaker subsistence strategies, primarily due to the lack of archaeobotanical and zooarchaeological evidence, although a study of the isotopic signatures in human bone suggests a diet high in terrestrial animal protein with steadfast consistency across Britain (Parker Pearson et al., 2016). The latter study also evidenced a high degree of mobility within Britain, supporting the idea that subsistence strategies continued to be based upon predominantly pastoral lifestyles (Bevan et al., 2017).~~ Archaeobotanical results for the Beaker period are comparable to those for the preceding M/LNEOL, though the very low number of samples may not be fully representative. Even fewer samples are attributed to the EBA and yet the number ~~(~~and ubiquity~~)~~ of wheat and barley remains are~~is~~ greatly increased. The classification of EBA samples by the HCA across clusters 1, 2 and 3 suggests a renewed focus on cereal cultivation (Fig.3), as does the regained increase in pollen diversity. The resurgence of cultivation is likely associated with the renewed emphasis on monumentality (e.g. the expansion of Stone Henge), enabled by increased production and reinforcing the dependable and cooperative communities that underpin agricultural economies.

5~~4~~.2 The Middle Bronze Age ‘agricultural revolution’

The resurgence in arable agriculture at around 1600 BC ~~has been termed the Middle Bronze Age agricultural revolution (Stevens and Fuller, 2012). It~~ is clearly demonstrated by the results presented here and is associated with ~~renewed and repeated migrations from the~~

~~European continent (Patterson et al., 2022). The intensification in land use is evident from pollen records, which show a sharp decrease in woodland cover during the later Bronze Age and the increase in vegetation types indicated by the~~further decreases in woodland cover and increases~~clear rise~~ in pollen diversity (Fig.4). Results from the analyses mark the MBA as the start in a progression towards larger fields of less intensively grown cereals (less weeding and manuring) in an increasingly open landscape. Manuring may have occurred more naturally, through a rotational system. As fields enlarged and the removal of weeds became less efficient, disturbance-tolerant weeds become more evident in the records. The extent to which an enlarged weed flora contributed to the pollen records cannot be ascertained, although greater floral diversity would have supported a greater range of insects. The Middle and Late BA see the greatest rise in pollen diversity and may represent the periods of greatest harmony between agrarian practices and biodiversity. ~~were favoured~~. ~~The development of field systems and drove-ways during the BA, particularly in southern and eastern Britain (Bradley et al., 2016; Yates, 2007), are suggestive of an inclusive use of enclosures, perhaps on a seasonal rotation system, to benefit crops and farm animals, as well as disturbance-tolerant weeds. Indeed, the increase in grassland perennials during the LBA is indicative of the cultivation of fields that had previously been under pasture (Stevens and Fuller 2018: 31). Spelt is a hardier wheat than emmer and its adoption from the MBA has been argued to reflect a change to more extensive arable cultivation (Van der Veen and Palmer, 1997). The change in regime is thought to have been in response to a need for increased cereal production and the quantity and type of farm animals (Van der Veen, 2016: 302). The Bronze Age in southern Britain sees a rise in sheep at the expense of cattle (Hambleton, 2008: 56), animals which cannot provide the same level of manuring or be used to plough fields. It is likely that spelt was initially mixed with emmer, but that, as a result of demographic growth, changes in animal husbandry, its greater adaptability to poorer growing conditions and its higher yielding capacity, spelt became the dominant cereal (Lambrick with Robinson, 2009: 258; Van der Veen, 1995: 342; 2016: 301-302). The Bronze Age agricultural intensification is also evident from agricultural tools and features, such as granaries, that became increasingly common during the later BA (Bradley et al., 2016). Fixed wells and waterholes enabled farmers to settle away from main waterways in permanent settlements, thereby expanding the agricultural potential of landscapes (Yates, 2007: 34), and increasing habitat diversity further inland. Insects chart a change from mostly wooded landscapes during the Neolithic and EBA, to open ground associated with pasture and fodder production during the later Bronze Age and Iron Age (Smith et al., 2019, 2020).~~

5~~4~~.3 Late prehistory and the Roman period

~~Britain became more insular towards the end of the LBA, with limited evidence for foreign contacts from both archaeological and palaeogenomic evidence (Cunliffe, 2013; Patterson et al., 2022). A population decline (Bevan et al., 2017) would have led to reduced arable production and the abandonment of settlements/fields, although there is no evidence for a reduction in habitat diversity. The MIA is a period of significant social change, with the~~

~~emergence of multivallate hillforts encompassing a greater catchment area, indicating a level of social cohesion and organisation not witnessed in the preceding era and an increased political, or at least communal, control over land use in southern Britain (Jones 1985, 1996, 2008). Hillforts were abandoned by the LIA and a change in land use is once again visible with the scattering of settlements and new agricultural developments (Cunliffe, 1994, 2013).~~ The suggested population decline towards the end of the BA (Bevan et al, 2017) is not corroborated by the datasets; there is no evidence for a reduction in the scale of production or habitat diversity. The rate of change between periods appears to slow down, perhaps indicating stability in the scale of production until the MIA. The flat shape of the radiocarbon calibration curve covering the Iron Age does make it difficult to assess the length and extent of the population downturn, making it possible that the MIA results reflect this period. The significant decrease in the density of MIA archaeobotanical assemblages is surprising and cannot be explained by lower sample or site numbers (Table 2). It either suggests a change in the depositional activities of crop processing waste (cereal processing and storage may have predominantly occurred in hillforts, but the dataset only includes one MIA hillfort (Danebury: site 22) as most Iron Age hillfort samples are only dated to the Iron Age generally), or a reduction in the production of cereals. Either way, the results suggest that the intensified cereal production indicated for the LIA (Van der Veen and O'Connor, 2008) was not the culmination of a progressive, linear trajectory. Pollen diversity increases slightly in the MIA before reducing continually from the LIA onwards; the gradual reforestation of abandoned settlements and arable fields during a population downturn could result in increased vegetation diversity during the successional stages to woodland.~~Pollen diversity reaches its maximum during the MIA (Fig.4), suggesting that complex, resilient and varied ecosystems were maintained throughout the earlier Iron Age.~~

The Late Iron Age sees a substantial increase in the scale of production and continued extensive cultivation practices (Figures 4 &5). The probable cultivation of oat is also evident in our results, as is the surge in wild legumes, brome grass and ryegrass, all common taxa in cluster 6 of the HCA~~The Iron Age weed spectrum in central and southern Britain became surprisingly uniform, perhaps indicating that by the LIA agricultural regimes became more influenced by rising market forces or a standardisation in crops and agricultural tools, than by local conditions and choices (Carruthers and Hunter Dowse, 2019: 55).~~ The change in agrarian practices, whereby production became more defined by market forces, may be reflected in the dip in pollen diversity, which is then maintained into the ERO; results suggest that increased and standardised arable production removed some of the diversity present in the prehistoric mosaic of habitats. ~~Wild oat and brome grass became so common that they are often assumed to have been an accepted addition to the crop (Knörzer, 1967; Zech-Matterne et al., 2021), whilst ryegrass might have been an early fodder crop around Danebury (Campbell, 2000). Other common weeds include small grasses, vetches/tares, cleavers and clover types (clover, medicks, trefoil), and are suggestive of the use of grass fallow in a rotation regime (Carruthers and Hunter Dowse, 2019: 55). They are also indicative of a full annual agricultural regime, with crops sown in both autumn and spring. An increase in oat (*Avena* sp.) grains and awns is suggested to represent the LIA cultivation of this potential cereal (Campbell, 2000; Campbell and Straker, 2003). Oat and pea indicate~~

~~spring sowing, a practise which may have led to growing spelt (in autumn) and spring barley as monocrops rather than as a mixed crop or maslin (Campbell and Hamilton, 2000).~~

Table 2 and Figure 4 show a significant increase in the density of Roman samples, suggesting another surge in arable production. The results corroborate evidence for the expansion of cultivation onto new soils and large-scale, extensive regimes described for the Roman period (Allen and Lodwick, 2017; Campbell, 2017). This appears to precipitate a decline in pollen diversity, suggestive of a reduction in the variation of landscape types, at least in the research area. Throughout prehistory pollen diversity increased with the expansion of agriculture, as forests were cleared for mixed agricultural regimes that encouraged ~~floral and entomological~~ biodiversity (cf. Birks et al., 2016). Results suggest that the tipping point between the expansion of open habitats and the growth of biodiversity may have been reached by~~in~~ the Roman period. We suggest that the increased scale ~~and extent~~ of arable cultivation during the LIA and Roman period marks a~~the~~ point in British farming history, when, for the first time, the expansion of cultivation ~~expanded at the expense of~~ had a negative effect on vegetation diversity. ~~The LRO period sees a reduction in arable production associated with the fall of the Roman Empire (Halsall, 2008).~~ The slight increases in the ratio between annuals and perennials and the drop in low fertility indicators in the LRO could suggest a reversal to smaller scale, more intensive cultivation, although this is not matched by a contemporary recovery in levels of pollen diversity (Woodbridge et al., in review). Broad ecological characteristics established during earlier farming regimes may have persisted for longer.

6~~5~~. Conclusion

The use of large-scale archaeobotanical data, over both time and space, and a novel use of HCA, has revealed new details in the development of arable production during the first c.4500 years of agriculture in the south-east of England. Despite differences in behavioural, depositional and taphonomical trajectories between sites and periods, long-term trends in the use of edible plants and cultivation practices are evident. Previously described phenomena, such as the fixed, 'garden'-type cultivation during the ENEOL, the dramatic change in subsistence strategies during the later Neolithic and the significant increase in arable production during the LIA and Roman period are corroborated. Other results indicate that different strategies for collecting and interpreting archaeobotanical remains from the Beaker, EBA and MIA may be required to adequately interpret shifts in subsistence and economic practices. Sites from the two earlier periods require more comprehensive sampling, whilst MIA evidence for cultivation may be concentrated in specific site types. Closer dating of archaeobotanical assemblages is needed to maximise information about temporal development, particularly during the Iron Age. Additionally, the possible Iron Age cultivation of oat needs to be explored through new analytical procedures, such as geometric morphometrics, to overcome the lack of defining chaff (Bonhomme et al., 2017; Wallace et al., 2018).

Hierarchical cluster analysis separated the samples not only by the frequency of grains and chaff but also according to the association of different taxa. Neolithic and Beaker samples cluster into two groups: one with only hazelnuts and the other where cereals, but very few weeds, are also present. EBA samples straddle across three clusters, showing similarities with the preceding periods in cluster 1 but also a new, barley-focused assemblage (see also Fig.2a). Clusters 3 and 4 contain assemblages where glume wheat chaff is present in most samples and seem to mark the shift from emmer to spelt cultivation during the Bronze Age. They also demonstrate that crop processing waste is better represented through time. By contrast, clusters 2 and 6 are dominated by barley. The difference between them seems to lie in the presence of brome in cluster 2 and oats and ryegrass in cluster 6, which could indicate a development in the cultivation of barley between the Iron Age and Roman periods.

Increased densities of archaeobotanical remains from the Bronze Age to the Roman period are, to some extent, shaped by depositional behaviours related to growing populations, but they also reflect an emphasis on cereal production for a market economy. The surge in the number and range of arable weeds through time reflect a gradual extensification in cultivation and an increase in floral diversity within arable fields. Comparisons with the Shannon diversity of fossil pollen has revealed that arable agriculture influenced changes in landscape types and indicate that early arable farming was not detrimental to biodiversity. Conversely, the onset of farming, increases in crop production and diverse forms of land use practices (varied cropping systems) resulted in elevated levels of biodiversity, reflected by trends in pollen diversity. This honeymoon period for farming and biodiversity was interrupted in the Roman period, when an expanding agricultural economy grew at the expense of biodiversity.

Acknowledgements

This research was carried out as part of the Biodiversity and Land-Use Change in the British Isles project funded by the Leverhulme Trust (grant reference RPG-2018-357). We would like to extend our sincere thanks to Jessica Viney for the vital help in uploading data.

References

Adams S (2018) Environmental Samples. In: Ennis, T. *ATAM Academy Little Heath, London Borough of Redbridge*. Archaeology South-East Report N.2017516, pp.15-18.

Allen M and Lodwick L (2017) Agricultural strategies in Roman Britain. In: Allen M, Lodwick L et al. *The Rural Economy of Roman Britain*. Britannia Monograph Series 30. London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, pp.142-177.

Allen M, Lodwick L, Brindle T, et al. (2017) *The Rural Economy of Roman Britain.* Britannia Monograph Series 30. London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

Allott L (2017) Charred macrobotanical remains and wood charcoal. In: Dawkes G. *Between Thames and Medway. Archaeological excavations on the Hoo peninsula and its environs*. SpoilHeap Publications, Monograph 13: pp.261-273.

Allott L (2019) Charred plant remains. In: Dawkes G, Hart D et al. *Beyond the Wantsum. Archaeological investigations in South Thanet, Kent*. SpoilHeap Publications, Monograph 22: pp.82-96.

Amadio L (2010) *Tilshead Nursery School, Wiltshire: A Neolithic Pit*. Devizes: Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society.

Antolín F and Schäfer M (2020) Insect pests of pulse crops and their management in Neolithic Europe. *Environmental Archaeology*, DOI: 10.1080/14614103.2020.1713602

Arthur JR (1970) Plant remains in the pottery. In: Bradley R. The excavation of a beaker settlement at Belle Tout, East Sussex, England. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 36: 373-375.

Arthur JR and Paradine P (1980) Seeds, pp.246-7. In: Bradley R, Lobb S et al. Two late Bronze Age settlements on the Kennet Gravels: Excavations at Aldermaston Wharf, Berkshire. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 46: 217-95.

Barclay A, Stevens C and Wyles S (2011) An Early Bronze Age Field System from Monkton Road, Minster, Thanet, and an early date for the cultivation of spelt. *PAST* 69: 2–3.

~~Behre KE (1992) The history of rye cultivation in Europe. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 1: 141-156.~~

Bevan A, Colledge S, Fuller D et al. (2017) Holocene fluctuations in human population demonstrate repeated links to food production and climate. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 114: E10524-10531.

Biddle B. 1986. Plant remains. In: Cottrell P. An Early Iron Age pit at Regents Park, Southampton. *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club Archaeological Society* 42: 23-33.

Birks HJB, Felde VA, and Seddon AW (2016) Biodiversity trends within the Holocene. *The Holocene* 26: 994–1001.

Bishop RR (2015) Did Late Neolithic farming fail or flourish? A Scottish perspective on the evidence for Late Neolithic arable cultivation in the British Isles. *World Archaeology* 47: 834-855.

~~Blatter RHE, Jacomet S, and Schlumbaum A (2004) About the origin of European spelt (Triticum spelta L.): Allelic differentiation of the HMW Glutenin B1-1 and A1-2 subunit genes. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 108: 360–367.~~

Bogaard A (2002) Questioning the relevance of shifting cultivation to Neolithic faming in the loess belt of Europe: evidence form the Hambach Forest experiment. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 11: 155-168.

Bogaard A, Fraser R, Heaton TH et al. (2013) Crop manuring and intensive land management by Europe’s first farmers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 110: E12589–E12594.

Bogaard A, Jones G, Charles M et al. (2001) On the Archaeobotanical Inference of Crop Sowing Time using the FIBS Method. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 28: 1171–1183.

Bogaard A, Jones G and Charles M (2005) The impact of crop processing on the reconstruction of crop sowing time and cultivation intensity from archaeobotanical weed evidence. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 14: 505-509.

Bogaard A, Palmer C, Jones G, et al. (1999) A FIBS approach to the use of weed ecology for the archaeobotanical recognition of crop rotation regimes. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 26: 1211-1224.

Bonhomme V, Forster E, Wallace M et al. (2017) Identification of inter and intra-species variation in cereal grains through geometric morphometric analysis, and its resilience under experimental charring. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 86: 60–67.

Bradley R (2019) *The prehistory of Britain and Ireland*. 2nd edition Cambridge World Archaeology Series, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bradley R, Haselgrove C, Vander Linden M et al. (2016) *The later prehistory of north-west Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown A (2007) Dating the onset of cereal cultivation in Britain and Ireland: the evidence from charred cereal grains. *Antiquity* 81: 1042–1052.

Bunce R, Smart S, van de Poll H et al. (1999) *Measuring Change in British Vegetation*, *Volume 2a. ECOFACT Research Report Series, Institute of Terrestrial Ecology. Cambridge: DETR Publications.*

Campbell G (1998) The Charred Plant Remains. In: Boyle A and Early R. Excavations at Springhead Roman Town, Southfleet, Kent. Oxford Archaeology Unit Occasional Paper 1: 35-38.

Campbell G (2000) Plant utilization: the evidence from charred plant remains. In: Cunliffe B (ed) *The Danebury Environs Programme: the prehistory of a Wessex Landscape. Volume 1: Introduction*. Oxford: English Heritage and Oxford University Committee for Archaeology 48, pp.45–59.

Campbell G (2004) Charred Plant Remains. In: Brossler A, Early R and Allen C. *Green Park (Reading Business Park). Phase 2 excavations 1995 – Neolithic and Bronze Age Sites*. Oxford Archaeology: Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph 19, pp.108-11.

Campbell G (2008) Charred and mineralised plant remains. In: Cunliffe B and Poole C. *The Danebury Environs Roman Programme - a Wessex Landscape during the Roman Era*, *Volume 2*. English Heritage and Oxford University School of Archaeology Monograph 71: pp.99-100, 128-130, 161-164, 167-174, 202-205.

Campbell G (2017) Market Forces – a discussion of crop husbandry, horticulture and trade in plant resources in southern England. In: Bird, D (ed) Agriculture and Industry n South-Eastern Roman Britain. Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp. 134-155.

Campbell G, and Robinson M (2007) Environment and land use in the valley bottom. In: Harding J and Healy F (eds) *The Raunds Area Project: a Neolithic and Bronze Age landscape in Northamptonshire*. Swindon: English Heritage, pp.18–36.

Campbell G and Straker V (2003) Prehistoric crop husbandry and plant use in southern England: development and regionality. In: Brown KA (ed) *Archaeological Sciences 1999. Proceedings of the Archaeological Science Conference, University of Bristol, 1999*. Oxford: Archaeopress British Archaeological Reports International Series 1111, pp.14–30.

Carruthers W (1989) The carbonised plant remains. In: Fasham PJ, Farwell DE and Whinney RJ. The archaeological site at Easton Lane. Winchester: Hampshire Field Club Monograph 6, pp.131-134.

Carruthers W (1990) Carbonised plant remains. In: Richards J. The Stonehenge Environs Project. Swindon: English Heritage archaeological Report 16, pp.250-252.

Carruthers W (2004) The charred plant remains. In: Brett M, Collard M and McSloy E. Excavation of 10th- and 5th-century BC settlement at Hartshill Copse, Upper Bucklebury, Berkshire, 2003. Canterbury Archaeology report 04049, pp.105-122.

Carruthers W (2010) Charred and Waterlogged Plant Remains. In: Landscape Evolution in the Middle Thames Valley: Heathrow Terminal 5 Excavations, Volume 2. Framework Archaeology Monograph. https://framearch.co.uk/t5/evidence

Carruthers W (2011) Charred plant remains. In: Helm R and Carruthers C. Early Roman evidence for intensive cultivation and malting of spelt wheat at Nonington. Archaeologia Cantiana 131: 362-369.

Carruthers W (2019) The plant remains. In: Rady J, Holman J et al. *Beneath the Seamark: 6000 Years of an Island's History. Archaeological Investigations at 'Thanet Earth', Kent 2007–12*. Canterbury: Canterbury Archaeological Trust. Volume 2, pp.1087-1135 and Volume 5, Tables 217-225.

Carruthers W (2021) The charred Plant remains. In: Rady J, Boden D and Wilson T (eds) *Evidence for a Neolithic midden, later prehistoric and Anglo-Saxon settlement at the site of the new Ellington and Hereson School, Ramsgate.* Canterbury Archaeological Trust Occasional Paper 13, pp.64-70.

Carruthers W and Hunter Dowse K (2019) *A review of macroscopic plant remains from the Midland counties.* Historic England Research Report Series 47.

Chaffey G and Brook E (2012) Domesticity in the Neolithic: Excavations at Kingsmead Quarry, Horton, Berkshire. In: Lamdin-Whymark H and Thomas J (eds) *Regional perspectives on Neolithic pit depositions: beyond the mundane*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp.200-215.

Clapham AJ (1995) Plant remains from the Neolithic and Bronze Age Settlement at Weir Bank Stud Farm, Bray. In: Barnes I, Boismier W et al. (eds) *Early Settlement in Berkshire; Mesolithic-Roman Occupation Sites in the Thames and Kennet Valleys*. Wessex Archaeology Report 6, pp.35-45

Colledge S, Conolly J, Crema E et al. (2019) Neolithic population crash in northwest Europe associated with agricultural crisis. *Quaternary Research* 92: 1–22.

Crockett A (1996) Iron Age to Saxon Settlement at Wickhams Field, Near Reading, Berkshire: Excavations on the Site of the M4 Motorway Service Area. In: Andrews P and Crockett A (eds) *Three excavations along the Thames and its tributaries, 1994: Neolithic to Saxon settlement and burial in the Thames, Colne and Kennet Valleys*. Wessex Archaeology Report 10, pp.113-170.

Cunliffe B (1987) *Hengistbury Head, Dorset. Volume: 1 the prehistoric and Roman settlement, 3500 BC-AD 500*. Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.

Cunliffe B (2013) *Britain Begins*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dark P and Gent H (2001) Pests and diseases of prehistoric crops: a yield "honeymoon" for early grain crops in Europe? *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 20: 59–78.

Davies A (2006) *The charred plant remains from Cobhamn Golf course, Cuxton, Eyhorne street and Northumberland Bottom (Kent)*. CTRL specialist report series. https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/ctrl/reference.cfm

De Carle D (2014) *Changing plant subsistence in Prehistoric Southwest Britain: archaeobotanical and anthracological evidence from the South Cadbury Environs Project*. Ph.D thesis, University of Sheffield, UK.

De Moulins D (1996) Charred Plant Remains. In: Wainwright GJ and Davies SM. *Balksbury Camp, Hampshire: excavations 1973 and 1981*. London: English Heritage, pp.87-92.

De Vareilles A, Pelling R, Woodbridge J et al. (2021) Archaeology and agriculture: plants, people, and past land-use. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 36: 943-954.

Ellenberg H (1988) *Vegetation ecology of Central Europe*. 4th edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellenberg H, Weber HE, Düll R et al. (1991) Zeigerwerte von Pflanzen in Mitteleuropa. *Scripta Geobotanica* 18: 1-248.

Ellis E (2019) Evolution: biodiversity in the Anthropocene. *Current Biology* 29: 831-83.

Fitter AH and Peat HJ (1994) The Ecological Flora Database. *Journal of Ecology* 82: 415-425. Available at: www.ecoflora.co.uk (accessed between 09/2021 and 12/2021)

Fuller DQ, Stevens C and McClatchie M (2014) Routine activities, tertiary refuse and labour organisation: social inferences from everyday archaeobotany. In: Madella M and Savard M (eds) *Ancient plants and people. Contemporary trends in archaeobotany*. University of Arizona Press, pp. 174-217.

Fyfe R, Twiddle C, Sugita S et al. (2013) The Holocene vegetation cover of Britain and Ireland: Overcoming problems of scale and discerning patterns of openness. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 73: 132–148.

Fyfe R, Woodbridge J and Roberts N (2015) From forest to farmland: pollen-infered land cover change across Europe using the pseudobiomization approach. *Global Change Biology* 21: 1197-1212.

Gibson A (2020) Des gobelets en Grande Bretagne. Le ‘set’ Campaniforme reconsidéré. *Préhistoires Méditerranéennes* 8: 1-31.

Giesecke T, Wolters S, van Leeuwen JFN et al. (2019) Postglacial change of the floristic diversity gradient in Europe. *Nature Communications* 10: 5422.

Giorgi J (2006) *The charred plant remains from Beechbrook Wood, Sandway Road, Tutt Hill and White Horse Stone (Kent)*. CTRL specialist report series. https:// https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/ctrl/reference.cfm

Githumbi E, Fyfe R, Gaillard MJ et al. (2022) European pollen-based REVEALS land-cover reconstructions for the Holocene: methodology, mapping and potentials. *Earth System Science Data* 14: 1581-1619.

Grant MJ, Norcott D and Stevens C (2012) *By rivers, fields and factories. The making of the Lower Lea Valley. Archaeological and cultural heritage investigations on the site of the London 2012 Olymic and Paraolympic Games*. Palaeo-environmental (Section 1). Wessex Archaeology. Available online: https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/wessexar1-132044/downloads.cfm

Green FJ (1990) Charred plant remains. In: Russell A. Two Beaker burials from Chilbolton, Hampshire. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 56: 153-72.

Green FJ (2004). Plant remains. In: Qualmann KE, Rees H et al. (eds) *Oram's Arbour. The Iron Age Enclosure at Winchester. Volume 1: Investigations 1950-1999*. Winchester: Winchester Museum Services, pp.75-81.

Greig JR (1991) The prehistoric riverside settlement at Runnymede: the botanical story. In: Needham S and Longley D (eds) *Excavation and salvage at Runnymede Bridge, Berkshire, 1978*. London: British Museum.

Gron K, Rowley-Conwy P, Fernandez-Dominguez E et al. (2018) A meeting in the forest: hunters and farmers at the Coneybury 'anomaly', Wiltshire. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 84: 111–144.

Hambleton E (2008) *Review of Middle Bronze Age – Late Iron Age faunal assemblages from Southern Britain*. Swindon: English Heritage Research Report 71.

Helbaek H (1957) Note on carbonised cereals. In: Burston G and Holleyman G. The late Bronze Age settlement on Itford Hill, Sussex. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 23: 206-209.

Higgins P (2003) Plant, mollusc and insect remains. In: Heaton M. Neolithic Pits at the Beehive. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 96: 60.

Hill M, Mountford J, Roy, D et al. (1999) *Ellenberg's indicator values for British plants, Volume 2b. ECOFACT Research Report Series, Institute of Terrestrial Ecology. Cambridge: DETR Publications.*

Hill M, Roy D, Mountford J et al. (2000) Extending Ellenberg's indicator values to a new area: an algorithmic approach. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 37: 2-15.

Hillman G (1984) Interpretation of archaeological plant remains: the application of ethnographic studies from Turkey. In: Van Zeist W and Casparie WA (eds) *Plants and Ancient Man: studies in palaeoethnobotany*. Rotterdam: AA Balkema, pp.1-41.

Hinton P (1982) Carbonised seeds. In: Drewitt P. Later Bronze Age downland economy and excavations at Black Patch, East Sussex. *Proceedings Prehistoric Society* 48, 321-400.

Hinton P (1985) Carbonised seeds. In: Bedwin O and Holgate R. Excavations at Copse Farm, Oving, West Sussex, 1984. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 51: 215-245.
Hinton P (1996) Charred plant remains. In: Andrews P and Crockett A. *Three excavations along the Thames and its Tributaries, 1994*. Wessex Archaeology Report 10, pp.43-47.

Hinton P (2004) Charred plant remains. In Place C. Excavations at Ford Airfield, Yapton, West Sussex, 1999. King's Lynn: Heritage, pp.6,7,14,15 and 44.

Hinton P (2006) Charred plant remains. In: Chadwick M. Bronze Age burials and settlement and an Anglo-Saxon settlement at Claypit Lane, Westhampnett, West Sussex. *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 144: 7-50.

Hinton P (2009) Charred plant remains. In: Andrews P, Allen MJ et al. Kentish *Sites and Sites of Kent: A Miscellany of Four Archaeological Excavations*. Wessex Archaeology Report 24, pp.233-236.

Hinton P (2016) Charred plant remains. In: Doherty A and Greatorex C. *Excavation on St Anne's Hill. A Middle/Late Iron Age site and Anglo-Saxon cemetery at St Anne's Road, Eastbourne, East Sussex*. Spoilheap Publications, Monograph 11, pp.197-199.

Hinton P (2017) Plant remains. In: Dawkes G. *Between Thames and Medway. Archaeological excavations on the Hoo peninsula and its environs*. SpoilHeap Publications, Monograph 13, pp.176-182.

Hodgson JG and Grime JP (1990) The role of dispersal mechanisms, regenerative strategies and seed banks in the vegetation dynamics of the British landscape. In: Bunce RGH and Howard DC (eds) *Species Dispersal in Agricultural Habitats*. London: Belhaven Press, pp.65–81.

Hunter K (2015) Plant macrofossils. In: Andrews P, Booth P, et al. *Digging at the Gateway. Archaeological landscapes of south Thanet. The Archaeology of East Kent Access Road (Phase 2), Volume 2*. Oxford Wessex Archaeology, Chapter 17.

Jones G (1992) Weed phytosociology and crop husbandry: identifying a contrast between ancient and modern practice. *Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology 73*: 133–143.

Jones G and Bogaard A (2017) Integration of cereal cultivation and animal husbandry in the British Neolithic: the evidence of charred plant remains from timber buildings at Lismore Fields. In: Rowley-Conwy P, Serjeantson D and Halstead P (eds) *Economic Zooarchaeology: Studies in Hunting, Herding and Early Agriculture*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp.221–226.

Jones G and Legge A (1987) The grape (*Vitis vinifera* L.) in the Neolithic of Britain. *Antiquity* 61*:* 452-455.

Jones G and Legge A (2008) Evaluating the role of cereal cultivation in the Neolithic: charred plant remains from Hambledon Hill. In: Mercer R and Healy F (eds) *Hambledon Hill, Dorset,* *England: excavation and survey of a Neolithic monument complex and its surrounding landscape,* volume 2. Swindon: English Heritage, pp.469-76.

Jones G and Rowley-Conwy P (2007) On the Importance of cereal cultivation in the British Neolithic. In: Colledge S and Conolly J (eds) The Origins and Spread of Domestic Plants in Southwest Asia and Europe. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press, pp.391-419.

Jones G, Bogaard A, and Charles M (2000) Distinguishing the effects of agricultural practices relating to fertility and disturbance: a functional ecological approach to archaeobotany. *Journal of Archaeological Science 27*: 1073-1084.

Jones MK (1980) Carbonized cereals from grooved ware contexts. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society 46*: 61–63.

Jones MK (1981) The development of crop husbandry. In: Jones MK and Dimbleby G (eds) *The environment of man: The Iron Age to the Anglo-Saxon period*. Oxford: Archaeopress British Archaeological Report 87, pp. 95-127.

Jones MK (1983) Palaeobotanical report on filling of waterhole, pp.276. In: Thompson FH. Excavation of Bigberry, near Canterbury 1978-80. *Antiquity Journal* 63: 237-278.

Jones MK (1984) The plant remains. In: Cunliffe B. *Danebury: An Iron Age hillfort in Hampshire. Volume 2, the excavations 1969-1978: the finds*, London: Council for British Archaeology, Research Report 52, pp.483–495.

Jones MK (1985) Archaeobotany beyond subsistence reconstruction. In: Barker G and Gamble C (eds) *Beyond Domestication in Prehistoric Europe: Investigations in subsistence archaeology and social complexity*. London: Academic Press, pp.107–28.

Jones MK (1996) Plant Exploitation. In: Champion TC and Collis JR (eds) *The Iron Age in Britain and Ireland: recent trends*. Department of Archaeology and Prehistory, University of Sheffield: J.R. Collis Publications, pp.20–40.

Jones MK (2008) A Feast of Beltain? Reflections on the Rich Danebury Harvests. In: C. Gosden C, Hamerow H et al. (eds) *Communities and Connections. Essays in honour of Barry Cunliffe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.142–153.

Jones MK (2009) Dormancy and the plough: weed seed biology as an indicator of agrarian change in the first millennium AD. In: Fairbairn A and Weiss E (eds) *From Foragers to Farmers*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp.58–63.

Knörzer KH (1967) Die Roggentrespe (*Bromus secalinus* L.) als prähistorische Nutzpflanze. *Archaeo-Physika* 2:30–38.

Kreuz A and Schäfer E (2002) A new archaeobotanical database program. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 11: 177-80. See also: https://nihk.de/en/research/current-projects/arbodat-ape?L=1

Lambrick GH with Robinson MA (2009) *The Thames through Time: the archaeology of the gravel terraces of the Upper and Middle Thames: The Thames Valley in later prehistory 1500 BC – 50 AD*. Oxford: Oxford Archaeology Press.

Le Hégarat K (2015) Charred plant remains. In: Hart D. *Around the ancient Track. Archaeological excavations for the Brighton and Hove wastewater treatment works and adjacent housing at Peacehaven, East Sussex*. SpoilHeap Publications, Monograph 10, pp.246-261.

Le Hégarat K (2017) Charred and mineralised plant remains. In: Dawkes G. *Between Thames and Medway. Archaeological excavations on the Hoo peninsula and its environs*. SpoilHeap Publications, Monograph 13, pp.113-115

Leydet M (2007–2020) The European pollen database. Available at: http://www.eu ropeanpollendatabase.net/ (accessed between 11/2021 and 12/2021).

Lister D and Jones MK (2013) Is naked barley and eastern or western crop? The combined evidence of archaeobotany and genetics. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 22: 439-446.

Lodwick L (2018) The charred and waterlogged plant remains. In: Fulford M, Clarke A et al. *Late Iron Age Calleva: The Pre-conquest Occupation at Silchester Insula IX. Silchester Roman Town: The Insula IX Town Life Project* 3. Britannia Monograph Series 32. London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, pp.285-313.

Lodwick LA (2017) Agricultural innovations at a Late Iron Age oppidum: archaeobotanical evidence for flax, food and fodder from Calleva Atrebatum, UK. *Quaternary International* 460: 198–219.

Lodwick L, Campbell G, Crosby V et al. (2020) Isotopic Evidence for Changes in Cereal Production Strategies in Iron Age and Roman Britain. *Environmental Archaeology* 26: 13-28.

Lovschal M (2020) The logics of enclosure: deep-time trajectories in the spread of land tenure boundaries in late prehistoric northern Europe. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 26: 365-388.

Marquer L, Gaillard MJ, Sugita S et al. (2014) Holocene changes in vegetation composition in northern Europe: why quantitative pollen-based vegetation reconstructions matter. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 90: 199-216.

Marquer L, Gaillard MJ, Sugita S et al. (2017) Quantifying the effects of land use and climate on Holocene vegetation in Europe. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 171: 20-37.

Martin J, Schuster J and Barclay A (2012) Evidence of Early Bronze Age Field System and Spelt Growing Together with an Anglo-Saxon Sunken Featured Building at Monkton Road Minster-in-Thanet. *Archaeologia Cantiana* 132: 43-52.

McClatchie M, Bogaard A, Colledge S et al. (2014) Neolithic farming in north-western Europe: Archaeobotanical evidence from Ireland. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 51: 206–215.

McClatchie M, Bogaard A, Colledge S et al. (2016) Farming and foraging in Neolithic Ireland: an archaeobotanical perspective. *Antiquity 90*: 302–318.

McKerracher M (2018) *Farming transformed in Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

~~McKerracher M (2019) *Anglo-Saxon crops and weeds. A case study in quantitative archaeobotany*. Access Archaeology, Archaeopress.~~

~~McKerracher M and Hamerow H (eds) (2022) *New Perspectives on the Medieval 'Agricultural Revolution': Crop, Stock and Furrow*. Liverpool: Liverpool university Press.~~

Moffett L, Robinson M and Straker V (1989) Cereals, fruits and nuts: Charred plant remains from Neolithic sites in England and Wales and the Neolithic economy, In: Milles A, Williams D and Garner N (eds) *The Beginnings of Agriculture*. Oxford: Archaeopress British Archaeological Reports International Series 496, pp.243-261.

Monk M (1985) The plant economy. In: Fasham PJ. *The prehistoric settlement at Winnall Down, Winchester*. Winchester: Hampshire Field Club Monograph 2, pp.112-117.

~~Murphy P (1977) *Early Agriculture and Environment on the Hampshire Chalklands c.800BC to 400 AD*. MPhil thesis, University of Southampton, UK.~~

Murphy P (1979) Hascombe: Carbonised cereals and crop weeds. In: Thompson FH. Three Surrey Hillforts: Excavations at Anstiebury, Holmbury and Hascombe, 1972-77. *Antiquity Journal* 59: 311-314.

Murtagh F and Legendre P (2014) Ward's hierarchical agglomerative clustering method: Which algorithms implement Ward's criterion? *Journal of Classification* 31: 274–295.

Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Friendly M et al. (2020) Vegan: Community ecology package. R package version 2.5-7. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan

Olalde I, Brace S, Allentoft ME et al. (2018) The Beaker phenomenon and the genomic transformation of northwest Europe. *Nature* 555: 190-196.

Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora. Available at: www.brc.ac.uk/plantatlas (accessed between 09/2021 and 12/2021).

Orengo H and Livarda A (2015) The seeds of commerce: a network analysis-based approach to the Romano-British transport system. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 66: 21-35.

Patterson N, Isakov M, Booth T et al. (2022) Large-scale migration into Britain during the Middle to Late Bronze Age. *Nature* 601: 588-594.

Pearson MP, Chamberlain A, Jay M et al. (2016) Beaker people in Britain: migration, mobility and diet. *Antiquity* 90, 351: 620-637.

Pelling R (2002a) The charred plant remains from Site 1. In: Parfitt K. *Report on archaeological work along the Dove Eastern Docks Supply Water Main*. Canterbury Archaeological Trust unpublished report, pp.15-17.

Pelling R (2002b) Charred and mineralised plant remains. In: Poore D, Thomason D and Brossler A. *Iron Age Settlement and Roman Activity at Brickley Lane, Devizes, Wiltshire, 1999*. Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine, vol 95, pp.231-235.

Pelling R (2003) Charred plant remains. In: Hutchings P. Ritual and riverside settlement: a multi-period site at Princes Road, Dartford. *Archaeologia Cantiana* 123: 71-73.

Pelling R (2011) Charred plant remains. In: Simmonds F, Wenban-Smith M et al. *Excavations in North-West Kent 2005-2007: One Hundred Thousand Years of Human Activity in and around the Darent Valley*. Oxford Archaeology Monograph 11, pp.270-273.

Pelling R (2012a) Charred plant remains. In: Dinwiddy M (ed) A multi-period site at Eden Park (former Toddington Nurseries), Littlehampton, West Sussex. *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 150: 58-65.

Pelling R (2012b) Charred and waterlogged plant remains. In: Stafford E, Goodburn, D and Bates, M (eds) Landscape and prehistory of the East London Wetlands: Investigations along the A13 DBFO Roadscheme, Tower Hamlets, Newham and Barking and Dagenham, 2000-2003, Oxford: Oxford Archaeology, pp.244-258.

Pelling R and Campbell G (2013) Plant Resources. In: Canti M, Cambell G and Greaney S (eds) *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Synthesis Prehistoric Landscape, Environment and Economy*. Swindon: English Heritage Research Report 45, pp.37–60.

Pelling R, Thompson J and Francis R (2008) Charred plant remains and charcoal. In: Poole C and Webley L. Prehistoric activity at Westwood, Broadstairs. *Archaeologia Cantiana* 128: 98-101

Pelling R, Campbell G, Carruthers W et al. (2015) Exploring contamination (intrusion and residuality) in the archaeobotanical record: case studies from central and southern England. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 24: 85-99.

Powell A and Dinwiddy M (2016) *Greentrees School, Bishopdown, Salisbury, Wiltshire*. Wessex Archaeology unpublished report series. https://doi.org/10.5284/1046094

Preston C, Pearman D and Hall A (2004) Archaeophytes in Britain. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* 145: 257-294.

Racimo F, Woodbridge J, Fyfe R et al. (2020) The spatiotemporal spread of human migrations during the European Holocene. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 117: E8989-E9000.

Redford KH and Richter BD (1999) Conservation of biodiversity in a world of use. *Conservation Biology* 13: 1246-1256.

Reynolds P (1981) Deadstock and livestock. In: Mercer R (ed) *Farming Practice in British Prehistory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp.97–122.

Rhiel S (2019) Barley in archaeology and early history. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of environmental Science.* https://doi.org/10.1093/ACREFORE/9780199389414.013.219

Robinson M (2000) Further considerations of Neolithic charred cereals, fruits and nuts. In: Fairbairn A (ed) *Plants in Neolithic Britain and beyond. Neolithic studies group seminar papers 5.* Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp.85-90.

Robinson, M (2009) Charred Plant Remains. In: Allen T, Hayden C and Lamdin-Whymark H. *From Bronze Age enclosure to Anglo-Saxon settlement. Archaeological excavations at Taplow hillfort, Buckinghamshire*. Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph 30, pp.149-153.

Rösch M, Ehrmann O, Herrmann, L et al. (2002) An experimental approach to Neolithic shifting cultivation. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 11: 143-154.

Rowley-Conwy P, Gron KJ, Bishop R et al. (2020) The earliest farming in Britain: towards a new synthesis. In: Gron KJ, Sørensen L and Rowley-Conwy P (eds) *Farmers at the Frontier. A pan-European perspective on Neolithisation.* Oxford and Philadelphia: Oxbow Books, pp.401–424.

~~Salavert A, Zazzo A, Martin L et al. (2021) Direct dating reveals the early history of opium poppy in western Europe. *Scientific Reports* 10: 20263.~~

Serjeantson D (2011) *A Review of Animal Remains from the Neolithic and Early Bronze Age of Southern Britain*. Historic England Research Report 29/2011.

Shennan S, Downey SS, Timpson A et al. (2013) Regional population collapse followed initial agricultural booms in mid-Holocene Europe. *Nature Communications* 4: 2486.

~~Smith A (2014) The use of multivariate statistics within archaeobotany. In: Marston J, D'Alpoim-Guedes J and Warinner C (eds) *Method and Theory in Paleoethnobotany*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado, pp.181-204.~~

Smith W and Davis A (2006) *The charred plant remains from Thurnham Roman Villa, Kent*. CTRL Specialist Report Series https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/ctrl/reference.cfm

Smith DS, Hill G, and Kenward H (2019) The development of late Holocene farmed landscapes: Analysis of insect assemblages using a multi-period dataset. *The Holocene* 29: 45–63.

Smith DS, Hill G, Kenward H et al. (2020) Development of synanthropic beetle faunas over the last 9000 years in the British Isles. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 115: 105075.

Smith W (2011) Charred plant remains. In: Simmonds F, Wenban-Smith M et al. *Excavations in North-West Kent 2005-2007: One Hundred Thousand Years of Human Activity in and around the Darent Valley*. Oxford Archaeology Monograph 11, pp.155-170.

Smith W (2012) Charred plant remains. In: Allen T, Donnelly M et al. *A Road Through the Past: Archaeological discoveries on the A2 Pepperhill to Cobham road-scheme in Kent*. Oxford Archaeology Monograph 16, pp.273-9 and 467-8.

Stevens C (2005) Charred plant remains. In: Powell AB et al. Excavations along the Old Sarum Water Pipeline, north of Sailsbury. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 98: 250–280.

Stevens C (2006) *The charred plant remains from Bower Road, Little Stock Farm and Saltwood Tunnel (Kent)*. CTRL specialist report series. https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/ctrl/reference.cfm

Stevens C (2008) The role of cereals and wild foods at Neolithic Kingsborough. Cereal agriculture and cremation activities. In: Allen M, Leivers M and Ellis C. Neolithic Causewayed Enclosures and later Prehistoric Farming: duality, imposition and the role of predecessors at Kingsborough, Isle of Sheppey, Kent, UK. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society 74*: 271-274, 296-299.

Stevens C (2009) Charred plant remains from the route of the Weatherlees - Margate - Broadstairs wastewater pipeline, table of all analysed samples. In: Andrews P, Allen MJ et al. *Kentish Sites and Sites of Kent: A Miscellany of Four Archaeological Excavations*, Specialist Report 5. Wessex Archaeology Report 24. https://www.scribd.com/document/28444631/Kentish-Sites-and-Sites-of-Kent-Specialist-Report-5-Charred-Plant-Remains

Stevens C (2011a) Environmental Evidence for Subsistence and Economy. In: Barnett C, McKinley J et al. *Settling the Ebbsfleet Valley. Volume 3: Late Iron Age to Roman Human Remains and Environmental Reports:* Tables 80-86. Available online: http://owarch.co.uk/hs1/springhead-northfleet

Stevens C (2011b) *An early Neolithic charred cereal deposit from Westwood Cross, Thanet*. Canterbury Archaeology Annual Report, 2009-2010, pp.44.

Stevens C (2011c) Crop-husbandry as seen from the charred botanical samples from Yarnton. In: Hey G, Booth P and Timby J (eds) Yarnton. *Iron Age and Romano-British settlement and* *landscape: results of excavations 1990-98*. Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology, pp.534-567.

Stevens C (2014) Intersite variation within archaeobotanical charred assemblages. A case study exploring the social organization of agricultural husbandry in Iron Age and Roman Britain. In: Marston J, D'Alpoim-Guedes J and Warinner C (eds) *Method and Theory in Paleoethnobotany*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado, pp.235-254.

Stevens C (2015) Charred and Waterlogged Plant Remains. In: Powell A, Barclay A et al. (eds) *Imperial College Sports Ground and RMC Land, Harlington*. Wessex Archaeology Report 33: pp.241-293.

Stevens CJ and Fuller DQ (2012) Did Neolithic farming fail? The case for a Bronze Age agricultural revolution in the British Isles. *Antiquity* 86: 707–722.

Stevens CJ and Fuller DQ (2015) Alternative strategies to agriculture: the evidence for climatic shocks and cereal declines during the British Neolithic and Bronze Age (a reply to Bishop). *World Archaeology* 47: 856-875.

Stevens CJ and Fuller DQ (2018) The Fighting Flora: an examination of the origins and changing composition of the weed flora of the British Isles. In Lightfoot E et al. (eds) *Far from the Hearth: Essays in Honour of Martin K. Jones*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research Monograph, pp.23-36.

Stika HP and Heiss A (2013) Plant cultivation in the Bronze Age. In: Fokkens H and Harding A (eds) *The Oxford handbook of the European Bronze Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.340-361.

Sugita S (2007) Theory of quantitative reconstruction of vegetation I: Pollen from large lakes REVEALS regional vegetation composition. *The Holocene* 17: 229–241.

Summers J and Campbell G with a contribution by Robinson M (2008) Charred plant remains. In: Cunliffe B and Poole C. *The Danebury Environs Roman Programme - a Wessex Landscape during the Roman Era. Volume 2 - Part 4: Thruxton, Hants, 2002*. English Heritage and Oxford University School of Archaeology Monograph 71, pp.102-105.

Treasure, ER and Church MJ (2017) Can't find a pulse? Celtic bean (Vicia faba L.) in British prehistory. *Environmental Archaeology* 22: 113–127.

Treasure ER, Gröcke DR, Caseldine AE et al. (2019) Neolithic Farming and Wild Plant Exploitation in Western Britain: Archaeobotanical and Crop Stable Isotope Evidence from Wales (c.4000–2200 calBC). *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 85: 193–222.

Trondman AK, Gaillard MJ, Sugita S, et al. (2015) Pollen-based land-cover reconstructions for the study of past vegetation-climate interactions in NW Europe at 0.2 k, 0.5 k, 3 k and 6 k years before present. *Global Change Biology* 21: 676–697.

Van der Veen M (1992) *Crop husbandry regimes. An archaeobotanical study of farming in northern England 1000 BC - AD 500*. Sheffield archaeological Monographs, Sheffield: JR Collis Publications.

Van der Veen M (1995) The identification of maslin crops. In: Kroll H and Pasternak R (eds) *Res Archaeobotanicae*. Kiel: Oetker-Voeges, pp.335–343.

Van der Veen M (2016) The arable economy. In Haselgrove C (ed) *Cartimandua's capital? The late Iron Age royal site at Stanwick, North Yorkshire, fieldwork and analysis 1981–2011*. York: CBA Council for British Archaeology Research Report 175, pp.287-303.

Van der Veen M (2022) All Change on the Land? Wheat and the Roman to Early Medieval Transition in England. *Medieval Archaeology* 66(2): 304-342.

Van der Veen M and O'Connor T (1998) The expansion of agricultural production in Late Iron Age and Roman Britain. In: Bayley J (ed) *Science in Archaeology, an agenda for the future*. Swindon: English Heritage, pp.127-143.

Van der Veen M and Palmer C (1997) Environmental factors and the yield potential of ancient wheat crops. *Journal of Environmental Sciences* 24: 163-182.

Vitolo M (2018) Charred plant remains. In: Margetts A. *Wealdbaera. Excavations at Wickhurst Green, Broadridge Heath and the landscape of the West Central Weald*. SpoilHeap Publications, Monograph 18, pp.280-283

Wallace M, Bonhomme V, Russel J et al. (2018) Searching for the origins of Bere Barley: a geometric morphometric approach to cereal landrace recognition in archaeology. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 26: 1125-1142.

Ward JH (1963) Hierarchical grouping to optimize an objective function. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 58: 236-244.

Watts K, Whytock RC, Park KJ et al. (2020) Ecological time lags and the journey towards conservation success. *Nature Ecology Evolution* 4: 304–311.

Wessex Archaeology (2014) King's Gate, 460 Units (Phase 3 Area and Phase 5 Access Road) Amesbury, Wiltshire: post-excavation assessment and updated project design. Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology.

Wessex Archaeology (2015) Old Sarum Airfield (Area C), Salisbury, Wiltshire: archaeological evaluation report. Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology.

Whitehouse NJ, Schulting RJ, McClatchie M et al. (2014) Neolithic agriculture on the European western frontier: The boom and bust of early farming in Ireland. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 51: 181–205.

Woodbridge J, Fyfe R, Roberts, N et al. (2014) The impact of the Neolithic agricultural transition in Britain: A comparison of pollen-based land-cover and archaeological 14C date-inferred population change. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 51: 216–224.

Woodbridge, J. Fyfe R, Smith D, et al. (2021) What drives biodiversity patterns? Using long-term multidisciplinary data to discern centennial-scale change. *Journal of Ecology* 109: 1396-1410.

Woodbridge J. Fyfe R, Smith D et al. (in review) Agricultural systems regulate plant and insect diversity and promote ecosystem novelty. *Anthropocene*.

Worley F, Madgwick R, Pelling R et al. (2019) Understanding Middle Neolithic food and farming in and around the Stonehenge World Heritage Site: An integrated approach. *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports* 26: 1–19.

Wyles S (2017) Charred plant remains. In: Harding P and Stoodley N. Newly-discovered barrows and an Anglo-Saxon cemetery at the Old Dairy, London Road, Amesbury, Wiltshire, *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 110, 93-94.

Yates DT (2007) *Land, Power and Prestige. Bronze Age field systems in southern England*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Zech-Matterne V, Derreumaux M, Pradat B et al. (2021) Should *Bromus secalinus* (rye brome) be considered a crop? Analysis of *Bromus* rich assemblages from protohistoric and historic sites in northern France and textual references. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 30: 773-787.

~~Zohary D, Hopf M and Weiss E (2012) *Domestication of crops in the Old World*. 4th edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.~~