

HARLOW TEMPLE - FOUNDATIONS

Ambulatory and Cella walls almost identical thickness where former not robbed out. Cella foundations 3'6" to 4' deep with up to 18" of loose pebbles below (p.23). Walls 2'9" - 2'11" thick. Ambulatory walls had foundations of 4'4" and 4'8" where sounded (p.31). Presumably builders were anticipating similar loads. Small fragment of tessera in ambulatory only some 9" above natural suggesting that there was little attempt at an obvious podium. Foundations of added rooms only foot or so deep with floor some 18 ins below the ambulatory floor level. Courtyard buildings, Room H, inner wall 1'9" and outer wall 2'3" - greater thickness because of steep slope of grounds, buttresses built for same reason. Foundations only about 1' deep. Room J both walls approx 2' thick with foundations 1 to 2 feet deep. (p.44-45). General observations confirmed in 1980's excavations.

Rooms added to temple and courtyard building walls probably of similar height and noticeably lower than Ambulatory. Probably constant roof slope from ambulatory. To enable rooms to have a useable height, ambulatory and cella walls would probably have to be higher than indicated in early reconstruction even allowing for possible digging down of floor levels to give adequate height.

TEMPLE NAILS

One complete 18cm long by 7mm thick. Fragment of a larger one 15mm thick surviving to a length of 9cm. These could join pieces up to 12cm thick or reinforce a joint in timbers up to 25-30cm thick. Many small nails found some broken and several bent possibly as a result of extraction. Some large diameter flat headed nails are probably ornamental. One nail 6cms long with a flattened point has the double bend suggesting miss-hitting by the carpenter followed by attempts to straighten it. Many nails of all sizes covered with traces of mortar on both head and shaft.

Of the smaller nails, three main lengths were recovered. The figures are only estimates as poor condition makes full length difficult to ascertain and there would also be variations in manufacture. The lengths below are averages for each category

1. 10cm 1 complete and perhaps ½ dozen fragments.
2. 8cm 22 mainly broken.
3. 5cm 28 approx. half incomplete to some degree.

Assuming each nail would be used to fasten two timbers each over half the nail's length in thickness:

1. timbers up to 7cm.
2. timbers up to 5cm.
3. timbers up to 3cm.

Type 1 probably used for fixing rafters and other structural timbers with the larger types being used for main frame timbers and roof trusses. Types 2 or 3 used for smaller timbers, particularly the planks on which the roof timbers were laid. There is no evidence for nails being clenched.

The site also produced examples of iron T-clamps probably mainly used on the roof for securing the bottom edge of the lower line of tiles to the planks on which they were laid. They could also have been used to help secure decorative features to the walls.

HARLOW TEMPLE 1980's STONE IN ROOM J (WEST RANGE) WALL

ROOM J WALL, WEST FACE.

Up to five courses of rubble work survived consisting mainly of flints and various locally derived limestone, sandstone and quartzite erratics. Some pieces of fair to good quality re-used worked stone were observed. These included a piece of fine, hard limestone with possible traces of working a similar piece with a smoothed face and a piece of grey stone which could either be limestone or glauconitic sandstone. One corner was rounded off but the total length of this worked edge could not be seen.

EAST FACE.

The general composition is similar to the other face with the addition of several pieces of the Lincolnshire limestones widely used on the site. These could be erratics or fragments of pieces broken for re-use. Several small fragments of limestones or sandstones, all fine grained and with worked surfaces were observed. One piece of worked fine grained limestone had a triangular section. A flat slab measuring in section approx. 28cm by 5cm had been broken away at each end and across the exposed face. The thinness suggests it could have been a flooring slab.

In an area which had to import all its quality building stone the immediate source of such re-used material must have been a nearby structure either being altered or demolished. When the flanking rooms were added to the cella considerable alterations would have to have been made to the porch. This, coupled with the possible replacement of worn steps or floor slabs could be the source of most of this re-used stone. Waste and accidents from stone cutting probably also provided some of the materials. Much of the re-used material seems to be of higher quality than the decorative masonry fragments found in the later destruction levels. Overall there was little Lincolnshire limestone visible in the wall and the very shelly types were totally absent. One fragment of tegula with flange was also noted in the filling.