

Archaeological Evidence and Discussion

Phase 1 Pre-1255 (Fig. 6)

The features comprising the pre-moat phase represented the earliest recognisable occupation of the site, which appears to have taken place in the late 12th to early 13th centuries at the earliest.¹⁶⁸

Owing to the small amount of excavation that took place in this phase the interpretation of the structures is open to debate. These structures consisted of a maximum of five buildings which were excavated to a lesser or greater extent. The most completely excavated was Building P, a cob-walled structure (F967, 1127, 1128), which was a minimum of 10.5 m. long by 7.5 m. wide, and orientated north-west to south-east. It contained a floor (F1106) of material obtained from chalk Head. Head is a solifluction deposit, in this case derived from the chalk of the Chilterns, and consists of chalk and sub-angular flints in a matrix of finely divided chalk and silt. The floor was made from this material, trampled well down and overlain in places by occupation debris (F1137).

A sequence of large, unmade hearths (F372) lay slightly off centre to the building. There was no evidence of internal partitioning of the building, while the lack of roof tile debris suggests it was probably thatched.¹⁶⁹ A cob building of similar dimensions (8.5 m. by 12.5 m.) was excavated at Wallingford Castle, 8 km. (5 miles) to the south of Chalgrove,¹⁷⁰ and interpreted as a kitchen. Like the Wallingford example the Chalgrove cob building had no foundation trench or dwarf stone walls and but for the fact that it was preserved by moat upcast would probably have left little trace.

The building was abutted on at least three sides by fragmentary flint courtyards (F180, 966, 1140). One of these (F966) also abutted what was thought to be the western wall (F1112) of another structure, Building R. This latter structure was observed only in trench XIV and in a section of trench I. What may have been its eastern wall (F794) had been partially cut away by the later moat (F279), while neither the northern nor the southern wall was located. Like Building P, it had had a floor (F847) of material which was probably derived from chalk Head and indicated the approximate dimensions of the building. An iron hinge pivot was found on that floor.¹⁷¹ This building was probably of timber construction rather than cob, although cob walls set on stone foundations were common, particularly in the west country.¹⁷²

Adjacent to, and to the north of, structure R the remains of a hearth or oven (Section 73, 12, F778, 857) were sectioned by trench XIV. This feature was apparently edged with stone and constructed on the natural alluvium. There was a great deal of evidence of burning. Two concentrations of charcoal (Section 73, Figs. 12 & 6, F778/2, 849/1) both overlay the remnants of what might have been a floor of redeposited chalk Head mixed with clay (Section 73, Figs. 12 & 6, F778/3, 849/2). Although there was no evidence of a structure related to the hearth, when it was destroyed in Phase 2 an approximately rectangular spread of ash (Section 73, Figs. 12 & 7, F534) c. 7.0 m. by 3.5 m. and up to 0.16 m. thick sealed the remains, and may have indicated the extent of a building. Within that demolition debris were fragments of tile and mortar, and a clay floor tile was recovered from the ash spread

Some iron working slags¹⁷³ which were associated with blacksmithing were also found in that layer and may indicate the use to which the hearth had been put. The sealing layer of ash also produced a considerable amount of pottery, including two cooking pots.¹⁷⁴

Just to the north of Building P were the enigmatic remains of another structure, S. These were observed only in the south side of a later robber trench (F559). They consisted of a dwarf stone wall (F1215), that is a low rubble limestone wall set directly on the contemporary surface, with no construction trench. This wall had been abutted by a series of alternating redeposited chalk Head floors and occupation debris (F1216). The full extent of this building is unknown, although there was evidence of a slight earthwork which may be part of it to the north of the later hall building (Fig. 7).

Finally, on the northern edge of the site and cut by the northern moat arm, a length of substantial rubble limestone foundation (F736) was partially exposed. Whether this was part of a building is uncertain but it was obviously intended to support a stone wall, and is the only such substantial piece of masonry found in this phase.

If the identification of the moated site at Manor Farm, Chalgrove with the curia of the de Plessis is correct,¹⁷⁵ it would seem likely from the topographic evidence that it was the Barentins who acquired the one existing capital messuage when the manor was split into two equal shares in 1233.¹⁷⁶ This being so, one possible interpretation of the excavated remains in this phase might be that they represented the earlier unmoated curia later sealed by upcast from the moat, as for example was the case at Brome, Suffolk.¹⁷⁷ The structures were not incompatible with those that might be associated with a manorial complex, while the substantial wall footing mentioned above together with an architectural stone fragment¹⁷⁸ on the surface between Buildings P and R may hint at the presence of a nearby stone building. Several other pieces of worked stone, including Norman voussoirs which had been re-used in the 15th-century kitchen, were recovered.¹⁷⁹ While these may have come from alterations to the church,¹⁸⁰ they could equally have come from an early hall building. However, the lack of material of a date earlier than the late 12th century, either in this phase or residual in later phases,¹⁸¹ is perhaps the least convincing aspect of the hypothesis that these remains represent the earlier manor. A limited period of observation during the development of the field adjacent and to the north of Hardings Field revealed no other structures,¹⁸² although it is possible that further buildings remain buried under the upcast on the site.

It is perhaps more likely that the excavated remains in this phase simply represent an extension of the medieval village as occurred in many places in England in the 12th and 13th centuries,¹⁸³ and which was noted during the excavation of the village of Seacourt, Oxfordshire.¹⁸⁴ However, without complete excavation of the site or further documentary evidence the question of what these structures belong to is unlikely to be answered.

Possibly belonging to this phase¹⁸⁵ was what appeared to be the remains of an isolated oven or kiln (F692). There was only slight evidence that the feature had been cut into the underlying alluvium although this part of the site had been disturbed

during topsoil stripping.¹⁸⁶ The feature consisted of an approximately oval spread of burning with a circular concentration of daub, together with a quantity of pottery and bone not apparently contained within any structure. Similar features excavated at Wintringham, Cambridgeshire were interpreted as kilns of wattle and daub for malting or corn drying.¹⁸⁷

[FIGURE 7]

Phase 2 1255-1300 (Fig. 7)

It is thought that in the second half of the 1250's, Drew Barentin was responsible for the levelling of the Phase 1 structures, the excavation of the moats and the construction of the stone hall, Building A.¹⁸⁸

As was suggested in Phase 1 (see above) the Barentins probably acquired the only manor house when the manor was divided equally between them and the de Plessis in 1233. The Plessis half would therefore have required a manor house, and this is believed to have been constructed in the 1240s.¹⁸⁹ The decision to rebuild the old curia of the Barentins in c. 1255 probably reflects the trend by which landowners were becoming much more involved in direct or demesne farming during the 13th century. This involvement often resulted in the reorganisation and rebuilding of the curia.¹⁹⁰ There may also have been the desire to maintain the status of the site. The Plessis manor may well have been moated from its inception, and certainly was by 1336.¹⁹¹ Since moats were regarded as something of a status symbol, the Barentins may well have felt the need to emulate their neighbours' establishment.¹⁹² It is interesting to note that the size of the moated islands on which the two curiae were sited was almost the same.

[FIGURE 8]

There was some topographic evidence to suggest that an existing stream, which today forms the western and south-western boundary of Hardings Field (Fig. 5), was deepened and straightened to form part of the moat arms.¹⁹³ The original course of the stream may be that suggested in Figure 8, flowing between the two islands. This would account for the irregular shape of the larger island. The man-made arms of the moat were taken off from the stream and cut into the underlying alluvium and clay. These moats were noticeably straighter. The use of an existing water course to form one or more arms of a moated island is relatively common and there are other examples in the county.

Where the smaller rectangular moat was taken off from the stream there was a constriction in its width. Unfortunately, it was not clear from the trench excavated at this point (see Tr.VIII, Fig.5) whether the narrowing was the result of post-demolition infill or simply that the moat was not dug at this point. The latter is perhaps more likely as infilling elsewhere had not obscured the line of the moats.

If this were the case it would have been a good position for either a sluice or a bridge. A sluice gate would have been necessary to control the flow of water around

the rectangular island. Similarly another sluice may have been sited to divert water around the north and east arms of the larger triangular moat. If they existed no trace has survived. The width of the moats was generally between 9.0 and 10 metres, after topsoil stripping, although in some places they were up to 13 m. wide. The profile was typical of other excavated moats,¹⁹⁴ being a rather shallow 'U' shape, with a flat bottom, and between 1.0 m. and 1.5 m. in depth, after the loss of the topsoil

There was no evidence that the two moated islands were not contemporary but the almost total lack of finds from the smaller moated island makes this difficult to confirm. The absence of finds and features on that island suggests that, as was often the case, the protection of a moat extended to 'valuable gardens and orchards'.¹⁹⁵ The latter is perhaps more likely as an orchard was recorded on the site in 1600.¹⁹⁶

Apart from the 'footbridge' (F730) mentioned below, nowhere were the remains of any bridges across the moats discovered. Neither was there any indication of where the likely bridging points would have been, with the possible exception of the constriction in the smaller rectangular moat.

As has commonly been found to be the case in other parts of the country the spoil excavated from the moats was deposited in the interior of the island to form a low platform (F924).¹⁹⁷ At Hardings Field this was confined to the north-east corner of the larger island. A mound of alluvium, between c. 50 to 60 m. east-west and 30 m. north-south, with an average depth of 0.20 m. to 0.25 m. was created. There was also a slight trace of an internal bank on the smaller island and traces of dumping on the inner edge of the moat (F275).

It was on the top of the platform that the stone-walled aisled hall was built. This building (A) was 19.9 m. by 10.12 m. and was aligned lengthways with the northern edge of the moat. Its foundations were wide (1.2 m.), and relatively shallow (0.50 m.), of clay bonded limestone rubble, on top of which the walls narrowed to between 0.80-0.85 m. In this phase only very slight remains of the walls survived. The 'facing' stones of the walls do not appear to have been dressed, although the stones seemed to have been selected for their straight edges, while the core was filled with rubble. As far as could be determined they were randomly coursed and of Portland limestone, the nearest sources of which were the quarries at Great Haseley, 4.8 km. (3 miles) to the north of Chalgrove.¹⁹⁸ The deserted medieval village of Standhill on the Great Haseley/Pyrton parish border is one site where the Middle and Upper Portland Beds appear to have been quarried in the early Middle Ages. The name of the township, first recorded in a reputedly early 11th-century charter (surviving only in a 13th-century copy) as Stangedelf, simply means 'stone quarry'.¹⁹⁹

The stones were not bonded with a hard lime mortar but seem to have been simply bedded in a dark yellow sandy loam, suggesting the method described by W. Marshall, writing of the 'Rural Economy of Yorkshire' in 1796: 'formerly ordinary stone buildings were carried up entirely with "mortar", that is common earth beaten up with water, without the smallest admixture of lime'.²⁰⁰ This phenomenon was also noted during the excavation of the deserted medieval village of Lyveden, Northamptonshire. At this site the walls were made of cornbrash set in a yellow clay, little or no mortar being used.²⁰¹

During the alterations to this building (see Phase 3/1), clay roof tile was recovered from the debris (F144, 243) associated with the later structural changes. In the demolition phase of the manor the clay roof tile debris was almost ubiquitous, indicating that this was how the building was roofed.²⁰² Some fragments of stone slate were also recovered, but not in sufficient quantities to indicate that this building had at any time been roofed with them.²⁰³

The presence of window glass fragments in the above mentioned debris indicates that some windows were glazed. From later contexts two fragments of window glass are thought to have been of 13th-century date, one of which had obviously been in a window for a long time before being buried.²⁰⁴

Inside the manor house the surface had been levelled up with a layer of dump (F942), almost indistinguishable from the underlying platform, except that sandwiched between them were fragments of construction debris (Section 76, Fig. 14, F891, 892). No remains of a contemporary floor surface survived and it is possible that the top of the levelling represented the floor.

The manor building is thought to have been a three-bayed aisled building of the 'end hall' type,²⁰⁵ with the middle and western bays forming the Great Hall. The eastern bay was a two storey service block of the same width as the hall. Evidence for the aisles was slight, but one reasonably convincing aisle post pad (F1045) was located 2.0 m. out from the side wall and 6.2 m. from the west end wall of the hall. The length of the west bay, at 6.2 m., seems to have been almost a standard for this type of hall building.²⁰⁶

In the hall the presence of a sequence of hearths in the west end bay from this phase onwards indicates that this was the 'high' end of the hall although there was no evidence of a dais at this time. Although almost completely destroyed, the demolition debris (F1075, 1076) from this hearth (F1077) suggests it was of tile-on-edge construction, possibly with a limestone kerb.

It is possible, as was often the case, that a great window was set in the wall behind the 'High' table.²⁰⁷ Some fragments of glass were found in debris from the demolition of the west wall (F646, 1069).

There were two stone benches (F62, 558) set against the opposite sides of the Hall

The eastern bay of Building A appears to have been constructed as a piece with the aisled hall as they both shared a common northern foundation (F824). The length of this bay (A/2) is inferred from the position of the later eastern gable wall (F12) which must have destroyed totally the original wall belonging to this phase. There was no evidence that the position of the later wall (F12) was any different to its predecessor.

Taking these factors into consideration the bay would have been 5.3 m. long internally. It was difficult to tell from the excavated evidence whether this bay represented a 'cross-wing' which was roofed separately to the hall or what J.T. Smith describes as a 'compartment', which was roofed with the hall.²⁰⁸

It was perhaps more likely that it was enclosed as part of the hall roof since a transverse roof would imply a more substantial divide between the solar block and the hall than there was evidence for. However, a simple pitched roof would have limited the head room in the solar. At Warnford, Hampshire,²⁰⁹ this was overcome to some extent by lowering the floor level of the service rooms.

As the detached kitchen appears to have lain to the north of the hall (see below) and not east of the service end there would have been no need for a corridor to divide the buttery and pantry. It is therefore more likely that the service bay was divided longitudinally into two rooms as was suggested at Warnford, Hampshire,²¹⁰ or as was the case at Wenlock Priory, Shropshire.²¹¹

The hall and service end would have been separated by a cross passage,²¹² usually with opposed doorways,²¹³ and from this passage a pair of grouped doorways would have given access to the buttery and pantry. The service rooms would almost certainly have had a first floor above them which served as the solar, as was the case at Warnford, Hampshire, Crowhurst, Sussex and Old Soar, Plaxtol, Kent.²¹⁴ Access to the solar may have been by a vice or newel stair set into the internal wall, or by a flight of stairs leading to a first floor doorway.²¹⁵ It is just conceivable that the length of wall footing (F1135) which continued the line of the northern wall of the manor to the east represented the base for an external stair. However, the wall foundation seemed both too long and incorrectly located for this to have been very likely.

Owing to the insertion of a later wall (F819) between the hall and service bay, the length of the middle bay can only be inferred. It would probably have been the same length as the west end bay of the hall.²¹⁶ In that case the aisle posts and accompanying wall would have lain just beneath the wall (F819) or slightly to its east. Either way the demolition of the eastern service bay in Phase 3/1 and the construction of the new cross-wing would probably have removed any trace of the Phase 2 structure, and indeed none was found. It is also worth pointing out that the construction of the wall (F819) would have destroyed any evidence of a spere truss, such as that inferred at Lampetts, Fyfield, Essex.²¹⁷ In that example the hall bays were of apparently uneven length owing to the presence of spere walls. If that was the case at Chalgrove then the doorways at opposite ends of the cross passage would have been approximately 1.5 m. to the east of the position as represented in Phase 3/1.

From the north-east corner of the manor house a length of wall foundation (F1135) projected to the south-east. It was of the same width and depth of foundation as the walls of the main building. It was suggested above that it may have been the foundation for an external staircase. However, the solidity of its construction suggests it was part of a chamber attached to the corner of the hall, such as at Old Soar, Plaxtol, Kent or Cefn-y-Fan, Caernarvonshire.²¹⁸ Unfortunately there was no evidence of any other walls and its appearance was that of an uncompleted building project.

Although it is unlikely that the manor house stood in isolation there was no stratigraphic or material dating evidence to link Buildings D or E with this phase. Both were, however, cut directly into the upcast.

Building D is believed to have been a kitchen/bakehouse. It was uncovered but not excavated. It lay 5.0 m. to the north of the hall, converging slightly with it, and was probably a stone-walled building. Only the foundations survived and these were of rubble limestone, 0.60-0.70 m. wide in a trench 0.30 m. deep. A small concentration of limestone slate was found at the east end of the building in its demolition debris (F1177), and a layer of slates (F1148) abutted its southern wall, possibly associated with its construction. If that were the case then stratigraphically Building D is later than Phase 2. Although the amount of material excavated was small, it could be that the roof of this building was slated.²¹⁹

Within Building D there was evidence of two or possibly three ovens or hearths (F742, F772, F773) located at the west end of the building, and some patches of burning at the east. These, together with two fragments of mortars,²²⁰ one found in the building and the other in its demolition, suggest its use as a detached kitchen and bakehouse. A timber-framed kitchen of similar dimensions to this building was excavated at the Moat Site, Walsall,²²¹ although it was located in the usual medieval position, that is beyond the service end of the hall and attached to it by a pentice.²²² An alternative position would be not far from the side wall of the hall, as was the case with Building D. A documentary reference to such a kitchen at Woodstock, Oxfordshire in 1244 also implied it was linked by a covered way to the back door of the hall.²²³

The western end of this building had been badly mauled by topsoil stripping and this had probably contrived to produce the rather odd shaped plan (Fig. 7). The only available evidence indicated that the building really did narrow down as shown and that this small bay was an integral part of the larger structure, since there was no sign of a west end wall to the main bay. The peculiar indented western end of the building (F720) may be the remains of a hearth setting against the wall, as in the 14th-century kitchen at Wintringham, Cambridgeshire.²²⁴ A similar setting was found in a building at South Witham, Lincolnshire,²²⁵ which was interpreted as a smithy.

What was left of the supposed hearth setting at Chalgrove showed no signs of burning but it was badly damaged. Immediately to its east were the remains of a possible oven (F772). The small bay containing these features was of similar dimensions to the early 14th-century bakehouse attached to the manor house at Wintringham.²²⁶

There were the remains of what might have been a chimney base located against the north-east wall of this building. However, as no hearth appeared to be associated with it, it could equally well have been a buttress. There was another small buttress in the extreme north-east corner of the building. These buttresses may have been necessary along this wall since the building was close to the edge of the moat.

The oven (F692) mentioned in Phase 1 may well in fact be associated with this building as it lay only 10 m. to its west.

To the east of the kitchen and bakehouse, the circular Building E was interpreted as a dovecot. The width of its foundations (F699) implies it was stone-walled; within the fastness of these walls the nesting boxes for the birds would have been located. There was no archaeological evidence for a potence, the revolving ladder used for the collection of the eggs. The dovecot was quite small (3.1 m. internal diameter)

compared with other extant examples in the Midlands and the south of England. Similar sized dovecots have been recorded at Bussow Vean, Towednack, Cornwall (c. 3.05 m. internal diameter) and Monkton in Pembrokeshire (3.2 m. internal diameter), but both of these are of the western type with a corbelled stone roof, a building style that imposes limitations on the diameter of the structure.²²⁷ The lack of known parallels in this particular area makes it unlikely that the roof was corbelled, although it is quite possible that some of the stone slates found during the excavation were from the roof of this building. In the demolition debris of Phase 5 an iron pick, which could have been a slater's tool, was discovered.²²⁸ Despite the small diameter of the building it does seem most likely from its shape and position that it was a dovecot. A circular dovecot of similar diameter (3.90 m.) was excavated at Newstead, Yorkshire.²²⁹ In this or possibly a later phase a crude hearth (F756) was made against the wall of the dovecot and this produced a small quantity of carbonised grain.

To the south-west of these domestic buildings were the fragmentary remains of four structures (N, O, Q and U) which are believed to have been approximately contemporary.²³⁰ Since they were of inferior construction to the domestic buildings (see below) and were located on that part of the moated island which was later the farmyard, they are interpreted as farm buildings. Other than this it is difficult to suggest what their functions were. They all had narrow rubble limestone footings with little or no foundation trench, indicating that these were dwarf stone walls for a timber superstructure.

Structure 'U' may have been the forerunner of the probable stable block (K) in Phase 3/1. It lay on the same alignment, was of the same width, and was cut by the later stables.

There was evidence in the demolition debris (F441, 447) that structure 'Q' may have been roofed with clay peg tiles. It also contained one interesting find, an iron Jew's Harp.²³¹ This was found on a floor surface of medium-sized and large flint cobbles (F415, 432). Although the south-east edge of the cobbles was irregular, its north-east edge abutted a robber trench (F467) which was believed to represent the northern wall of Building Q.

Structure 'O' had the remains of a pitched stone hard standing (F301) set against its south-west corner, which could have been a hard standing for a water butt or trough.

The remains of only one small bridge (F730) were located during the excavation, and there was no indication of where the main entrance onto the island had been. The small bridge lay just to the east of the dovecot. It consisted of an abutment of rubble limestone which was 2.3 m. by 1.8 m. and situated on the edge of the moat. Unfortunately it was not possible to establish if the opposing abutment survived as it would have been situated under a considerable make up-of earth in a modern garden. As the stratigraphy associated with the abutment had been removed by topsoil stripping, it was not possible to determine if it was associated with this phase, although it was in use in Phase 4/2 (see below) when it served as a postern in a walled garden.

The narrowness of the abutment implies that this was only a footbridge, while the lack of any evidence to the contrary suggests that its superstructure was of timber, rather

than stone. It would have spanned a channel which was c. 10 m. wide (see Earthwork survey, Fig. 5.) This would probably just qualify it as a 'short bridge', by the definition used in Rigold's corpus of timber bridges which 'often comprise a single self stable support'. In this case such a support may well have been a trestle of Rigold's type III. This would have sat transversely in the middle of the moat and supported the walkway, and was 'by far the commonest and more persistent type of support in English moat bridges'.²³² No surviving timbers were located, but owing to the presence of a modern wet ditch in the top of the moat, and the modern building on its north side, it was not possible to cut a complete section through the moat by the bridge (see Trench XIX, Figs. 5 & 6).

Phase 3/1, c. 1300 (Fig. 9)

Following the establishment of the manor in the mid 13th century by Drew Barentin, few structural changes seem to have taken place until the late 13th to early 14th century.²³³ Drew died in 1264-5. His heir, Sir William Barentin, does not seem to have been as successful and was apparently often in debt. This may account for the apparent stagnation of the site. On the death of Sir William his son Drew Barentin II succeeded to the manor. He seems to have been a much more prominent figure than his father. His principal manor house appears to have been at Chalgrove for he was recorded as being non-resident on his Essex manors in 1296 and in the previous year a neighbouring lord was said to have written to him at Chalgrove, to announce the birth of a son.²³⁴ His acquisition of the manor seems to coincide with the considerable alterations of Phase 3/1, when the buildings and their layout were extensively modernised to meet the increased standards of prestige and comfort a man of Drew's standing would have expected.

Major alterations were made to the manor house which still contained the restrictive aisle posts in the hall. It would seem that rather than extend the existing service and solar bay by the addition of a cross-wing abutted perpendicularly to the north side of the east end bay, it was instead totally demolished, and a completely new cross-wing was added at the lower end of the hall (Fig. 9). The evidence for this was as follows: where the walls (F12, 526, 536, 632, 992) of the 'new' cross-wing were sectioned they were found to be in foundation trenches up to 0.40 m. deeper than those of the Phase 2 building (Section 76, Fig. 14). Also, the walls were founded on pitched stone foundations rather than simply rubble, as was the case in Phase 2. The junction between the old (F993) and new (F992) lengths of the south-west wall of the manor building was also revealed by excavation (Fig. 9). It was clear that the new south-east wall (F12) was one unbroken length which cut the former north-east wall (F824), rather than abutting it.

Thus it seems that the walls of the eastern bay were demolished and had their foundations totally robbed out, with the exception of most of the northern wall (F824) and a very small part of the south-east extension of that wall (F1135). It was not necessary to remove these latter two completely as they were simply being suppressed. The lines of the other two walls of the service bay were retained but their foundation trenches were deepened. It is possible that while these alterations were taking place the wall with its aisle posts that divided the hall from the old service end was retained, so that the hall could remain in use. The decision to demolish the entire old service bay rather than add to it, may to some extent reflect the separateness, in the medieval mind, of the hall and the chambers that serviced it.²³⁵ Another factor may have been a desire to increase the headroom in the chambers on the first floor of the hall by increasing the height of the walls of the cross-wing.

The ground floor of the cross-wing comprised two large chambers and one small one. The first of these occupied the area of the old service bay and was of a similar internal length, but was extended in width by just under 3.0 m. (A/9 and A/10). To its north the second chamber (A/4), although of one build with the service end, narrowed down to the east, while sharing a common south-east wall (F12). In the re-entrant angle between the hall and the projecting service wing was a small room (A/8).

The walls of the cross-wing had survived in places up to 0.40 m. above their foundations and were of the same construction as those of Phase 2. The cross-wing was divided from the hall by the construction of a substantial interior stone wall (F819). As with the other walls of the cross-wing it was founded on pitched stone footings and was set in a construction trench. Its construction appeared to have removed any evidence of the earlier wall and aisle posts. Its location now divided the main part of the building into three bays of equal length, the western and middle bay forming the hall and the eastern one the service end, as in Phase 2.

The service chamber was divided unequally into two rooms (A/9 and A/10) by a corridor running longitudinally through this bay and central to the hall bay. This then produced the common medieval layout of butteries, or buttery and pantry divided by a corridor, leading to a kitchen.²³⁶

There are examples of this type of uneven division, although frequently sub-divided into two rooms of equal size. At Haddon Hall, Derbyshire, built c. 1300, the rooms were of almost identical dimensions to those at Chalgrove and were in the same position relative to the hall.²³⁷ This division produced one room that was exactly square. One reason why this bay may not have been subdivided equally by the corridor was that this would have ruined the symmetry of the usual arrangement of three doorways.²³⁸ The two outer doorways gave access to the buttery and pantry, while the middle one led through the corridor to the kitchen. A threshold through the internal wall (F819) indicated the position of the doorway into the larger of the two service rooms (A/9).

At the opposite end of the corridor a doorway led to the kitchen (W). The stone rebate for this door had survived in situ (Fig. 9) suggesting a door 1.1 m. wide. In the demolition debris of this building several other pieces of worked stone were found in the larger room, at least two of which appear to have been part of door jambs, possibly from the service doors. One piece of door jamb was found associated with the partition wall but not apparently in situ.²³⁹ There was evidence of a threshold giving access from the larger of the two service chambers (A/9) into the chamber beyond (A/4).

There may have been some significance in the different sizes of the rooms. If this was the case it may well have been that the Phase 2 service chamber was also unevenly divided as was the case at Warnford Manor House, Hampshire.²⁴⁰

There were few small finds associated with these rooms in this phase. In each of the two rooms the remains of a glass vessel were found.²⁴¹ The slightly deeper stratigraphy of the larger room (A/9), which had resulted from the need to bury and level up the suppressed wall (F824), meant that the amount of pottery recovered from this room was substantially greater than from the other service room (A/10). This difference was also enhanced by the fact that the area excavated in room A/9 was larger. This room yielded pots of a variety of forms, including a kitchen ware vessel and three bowls. There were also those vessels which might well have been associated with a buttery: jugs and a bottle. One of the jugs was of interest as it was a polychrome wine jug of the type produced in Saintonge, south-west France, and represents one of few such finds in Oxfordshire.²⁴² Among the finds from the larger room were a large number of small bones which included the remains of fish,

birds and smaller mammals.²⁴³ Within the service wing there was evidence of construction debris (Section 76, Fig. 14, F982), which overlay the wider top of the foundations, and abutted the interior face of the walls. In the larger room (A/9) the suppressed wall (F824) was slightly proud of the ground surface and this, together with its robber trench (F877), had been buried with a mixed layer of dump (F745, 962, 970, 971, 977), the majority of which was probably gained from the excavation of the construction trenches, although it also included debris from construction. Within the dump three pieces of worked stone were found, all of which seem to have been pillar facings, but it is unlikely that they were used as such in this chamber.²⁴⁴

The layer of dumping was confined to room A/9. The first layer which seems to have been common throughout the service bay was one of flint cobbles in a yellow-brown gravelly sand (F56, 734, 930). This floor had been laid before the insertion of the corridor. Overlying the floor and located under the middle of the southern corridor wall was a small area of burning (F358), which had a thin layer of ash or occupation debris (F766, 926/7 and 926/8) associated with it which was spread throughout the bay. This burning was presumably associated with the construction of the building. There was some evidence that an attempt had been made to cover this layer (F793, 763, 927) and this material had survived as patches of loam mixed in with the charcoal layer.

That the burning occurred during the construction of the building could be seen from the fact that it was cut by one of the five post settings (F357) which supported the first floor over this end bay. This post setting was packed with two pieces of worked stone.²⁴⁵ The posts ran down the middle of the north-east to south-west axis of the bay and appear to have been simply post-pads which kept the ends of the timber uprights off the ground. The position of the south-west support (F958) is dubious.

The posts may have supported timbers running lengthways across the bay, that is from north-west to south-east, this being the shorter span. Joists may then have been tenoned between the beams to take floorboards. Alternatively it is possible that they were laid directly across the beams. The construction of the corridor walls (F354,359) would have made use of the timber uprights (F113,357) in the middle of the bay and their crossbeams. There was evidence that both the buttery and pantry had been plastered internally, but no plaster survived on the inside walls of the corridor.²⁴⁶

It is clear from surviving examples that the buttery and pantry would have been lit by at least one window each, and where it was possible these would be on opposing walls.²⁴⁷ While it is likely that the side wall of room A/9 would have had a window inserted into it, the only available free space for an external window in room A/10 would have been on the south-east wall.

Archaeological evidence of windows was found in the demolition debris associated with these rooms. At least one piece of worked stone in the demolition debris of the service bay appears to have been an architectural fragment associated with a window.²⁴⁸ There was also evidence of lead comes,²⁴⁹ indicating that the window was made up of small rectangular pieces of glass c. 80 mm. by 50 mm.

There was no evidence of external doorways into either of the above rooms and there seems no reason to believe that access was other than by the doorways which led off from the cross-passage.

To the north-east and adjoining the northern service room (A/9) was a large chamber which may have served as the wardrobe, as this was usually placed close to the lord's chambers and often beneath them.²⁵⁰ Access to this room (A/4) was through the buttery, as shown by the threshold in the common wall (F536). There was no evidence for an external door and it seems unlikely that any was provided. Since the wardrobe was used as a room for the storage of valuable materials, it was often stone vaulted to provide a secure, fireproof environment.²⁵¹ However, this does not seem to have been the case with this chamber. In the middle of the room there was a single chamfered stone block (F779). This was too small to have been a pillar base for a quadripartite vault, and it seems likely that the first floor was supported on a central wooden post. As with the rooms already discussed, there was evidence of construction debris abutting the walls and in this case covering the floor in places (F1058, 1070). This material had been cut by one of two small postholes (F1056, 1057) which, although they may have been associated with the construction of the cross-wing, do not appear to have been structural to this room. Other than the layers associated with the construction of the wardrobe it was not possible to tie in the very fragmentary succeeding layers with this, or any other phase.

The wardrobe very often contained a hearth, and had a privy chamber attached.²⁵² Although there was no evidence of a hearth, at some stage a garderobe (A/5) was in use to the north of the wardrobe, possibly with a doorway between the two rooms.

Above the rooms already discussed would have been the lord's private chambers. These would have been reached by the common medieval method of a newel or spiral staircase built into the thickness of the internal dividing wall (F819).²⁵³ In this instance two such staircases (F81, 893) were located in the cross-passage, on the outer sides of the doorways leading into the buttery and pantry. Despite having been robbed out down to their foundations, it was possible to tell, in the case of the northern example, that it had spiralled clockwise upwards in the conventional manner,²⁵⁴ as at Old Soar, Plaxtol, Kent.²⁵⁵

It seems likely that the stairs gave access to one large room over the buttery and pantry, this being almost certainly the solar or principal chamber. Apart from the evidence of its position, this room appears to have had a fireplace set against its major external wall,²⁵⁶ the evidence for which was the chimney base (F620) projecting from the eastern wall (Fig. 9). A number of fragments of moulded brick were found in the demolition debris adjacent to this room. These are believed to have been used as part of a decorative moulding around a hearth or fireplace, such as might have been found in the solar. They are thought to be of late medieval or early post-medieval date, in which case they must be seen as an improvement to, or a replacement for, the existing fireplace.²⁵⁷ However, it would not be impossible for them to have been part of the initial construction of the cross-wing.

Access to the room over the wardrobe would presumably have been from this solar. The room may have been a bedchamber as was suggested for a similar chamber in the mid 14th-century manor house at Yardley Hastings, Northamptonshire.²⁵⁸

The `L'-shaped plan of cross-wing and hall seems to have been a development to increase the number and size of the private chambers of a lord. Goodrich Castle, Hereford is a contemporary example of this, although there the cross-wing was attached to the dais end of the hall.²⁵⁹

The cross-chamber was almost certainly roofed at a right-angle to the hall,²⁶⁰ with the ridge of the roof probably stepping down over the wardrobe in a similar manner to the roofs of the solar and chapel at Charney Bassett Manor House, Oxfordshire.²⁶¹ The roof of the solar may well have been of the long crown-post type, as defined by Fletcher and Spokes in their survey,²⁶² and can be found in the date range 1280-1300. Two local examples, the solars at Charney Bassett and `The Abbey', Sutton Courtenay, Oxfordshire, have the combination of tall crown post, tie beam and trussed rafter, and are of a similar span to that of the solar at Chalgrove.²⁶³

It was customary to have a garderobe off the solar block. There was evidence of such a stone walled chamber (A/5) at the northern end of the cross-wing, although this may have been added at a later date since its foundations (F728) abutted those of the rest of the cross-wing (F632); however, there was no evidence of a garderobe elsewhere that might have served the solar block. It seems unlikely that the chamber (A/7) on the southern corner of the solar served as a garderobe. Although examples are known in this position,²⁶⁴ in this instance there was no associated pit or evidence of cess in the chamber. The same can be said of the chamber (A/8) between hall and solar. With the facility of the moat at hand there would be no reason to site the garderobe in either of those positions. It would be most unlikely that no garderobe was provided in what seems to be an obvious position to serve the cross-wing.²⁶⁵

The rather thin stratigraphy associated with this chamber (A/5) meant that there was not sufficient dating material to indicate when it was built. Conceivably it was part of the original build, and its foundations were laid a little later than those of the main building. Alternatively it may have replaced, at a later date, a structure belonging to this phase. This process of renewal and improvement of chambers in the same position was noted in both the case of the chapels and of the kitchens (see below).

The slight remains of a narrow (less than 0.30 m.) dwarf stone wall (F785) survived within this chamber, which divided the ground plan of the garderobe into two unequal parts. To its north the ground was cess-stained in a slight pit (F935). This wall could be interpreted as the base for a timber privy seat or as an internal division of the stone chamber, possibly at a much later date. In the latter case the shaft of the upper privy serving the solar and bedchamber would have been carried behind the lower privy which served the wardrobe. It is not inconceivable that this was all that survived of an earlier timber-framed garderobe, as was the case with the chapel (A/7). Although none of the wall of the garderobe had survived above its foundations there may have been a clearance arch, as at Old Soar, Paxtol, Kent in the northern wall to allow the sewage to escape into the moat.²⁶⁶ The garderobe would of course have been roofed separately from the cross-wing. While this may have been a simple tiled gable roof it is interesting to note that while not in quite the same position, the roof of the garderobe at Old Soar was slightly hipped.²⁶⁷

Located in the re-entrant angle between hall and solar was a small chamber (A/8). This was at the opposite end of the screens passage to the door with the main porch (A/6)(see below). It had become common in the 14th century to have a second porch at the opposite end of the screens passage: however, if this room was a porch, it would have been a small one. The position of its north-western wall (F544) precludes there being two directly opposed doors at either end of the screens passage, unless the southern door was offset within its porch, which seems unlikely. There would have been just enough room for a small postern from the cross passage into that chamber (A/8). In spite of this it seems most likely that it represents a porch of some kind. A similar arrangement was found at Haddon Hall, Derbyshire, but in that case it was much larger, being c. 4.0 m. square.²⁶⁸ It was unfortunate that none of its associated walls survived, but only the foundations; thus the position of any doorways must be conjectural. The fact that it was enclosed surely means that it was for access to the cross passage and not into the buttery/pantry (A/9). It just might have been a small oriel chamber: its external dimensions of 3.2 m. by 2.75 m. compare not too unfavourably with those of the Abbot's Grange, Broadway, Worcestershire.²⁶⁹

Whether it was a porch or an oriel it would probably have been carried up to the first floor, to judge from the size of its foundations (F544, 823, 872). There were no small finds associated with the use of this chamber and only a very small amount of pottery.²⁷⁰ It contained within it quite a thick layer of very clean material (F1170), which levelled up the interior surface and was most likely obtained from the excavation of the construction trenches. Attached to the southern corner of the solar was another chamber (A/7) which is believed to have been a chapel. This had been constructed on top of the demolition debris from the Phase 2 service wing.

This layer of debris (Fig. 9, F144, 176, 243) seems to have been concentrated around the southern corner of the house. It is noticeable that no demolition debris remained within the confines of the demolished bay, and very little to its north. There were two spreads of limestone rubble (F984, 1058) which may represent the building debris on the north side, confined within room A/9. The impression gained therefore was that the debris was cleared from the area that would be inside the new cross-wing and piled against the southern corner of the house. An attempt was then made to bury the rubble with a layer of loam (Fig. 9, F170, 228), which also levelled up the corner and produced a building platform.

The 'chapel' must have been a timber-framed building since the slight wall footings that survived (F168, 214, 226) could only have been from dwarf stone walls. Its interpretation as a chapel is based partly on its position. Old Soar has a chapel of a similar date in the same location.²⁷¹ There is little else it could have been except possibly a garderobe, and that seems unlikely for reasons given above. It was also in the same position as the later chamber (A/11) believed to be a chapel. The Barentins were now resident at the manor,²⁷² and so would probably require their own private chapel. There was certainly one on the site in 1370 when a licence for an oratory was granted.²⁷³

The chapel was probably on the first floor which would have allowed easy access between it and the solar.²⁷⁴ In this case the doorway into the chapel could have been at the end of the south-east wall of the solar, and may have been approached at an angle through the wall, again as at Old Soar. In that and other examples, an external

stair was provided so that the priest could enter without disturbing the occupants of the solar.²⁷⁵ This may explain one of the two short lengths of wall footing (F213, 240) which project from the south-west side of the chapel (Fig. 9). The longer (2.6 m.) eastern wall (F213) continued the line of the wall of the chapel, and may have been part of a garden wall enclosing a chapel garden to the west, as seems to have been the case in a later phase (see below).

The large porch (A/6) on the southern side of the hall almost certainly represented the main entrance. Once again there was virtually no material dating evidence for the porch's construction, although stratigraphically it belongs to this phase.²⁷⁶ The porch was open-fronted, the foundations of the side walls (F821,822) alone had survived, slightly shallower (c. 0.50 m.) than the foundations of the main building. Where they inturred at the front of the porch only the slightest trace of a trench was found, the thickness of the side walls presumably serving as flanking walls to the entrance. There were the remains of a flagstone floor (F211) in the southern corner of the porch. Considering the depth of the foundations the porch was probably two storied, possibly with a vaulted ceiling supporting a first floor room, over which was set a pitched roof.²⁷⁷ An example of a similar juxtaposition of porch and solar roofs can be seen at Fyfield Manor, Oxfordshire, although in this example the gable end of the solar is flush with the front of the porch.²⁷⁸ Associated with the porch was a small quantity of stone slate,²⁷⁹ and it may have been roofed with that material to provide a contrast with the roof of the manor house.

It is possible, bearing in mind the oriel chamber/porch at the other end of the screens passage, that there was some sort of gallery connecting the two first floor rooms. This would have given access to the room over the porch.²⁸⁰ Since there was no archaeological evidence of any supports for such a gallery it must either have been corbelled out from the internal wall, or have been supported on timber arched braces set into that wall. Alternatively if no gallery existed the room over the porch may have been entered from the western angle of the solar, as was the case at Crowhurst in Sussex.²⁸¹

Within the hall (A/1) the construction of the dividing wall between it and the cross-wing would have meant that the bays were now of uneven length. It seems likely therefore that the opportunity was taken during the building alterations to improve the structure of the hall roof, and to remove the restrictive aisle posts. This was a common practice from the mid 13th century.²⁸² At Harwell, Oxfordshire this process was recognised in a standing timber-framed manor house of the Bishop of Winchester. The removal of the aisle posts and their replacement with a roof of base cruck construction was dated to 1297-8.²⁸³ Although little of the stratigraphy associated with the use of the hall at Hardings Field had survived in this phase, it was clear that the one surviving aisle post (F1045) had gone out of use and it was infilled with flints. The type of roof structure that replaced the aisles was most probably that of the base cruck,²⁸⁴ as was used at Harwell.²⁸⁵ The thrust of the roof, previously taken on the floor, was now transferred to the walls: this was probably why the two small buttresses (F560, 895) were added on either side of the hall. The hall had thus been divided into two equal bays, each of which was the same length as the service bay.

Although there was no archaeological evidence for a screen, the lower bay of the hall was almost certainly divided from the screens passage by some sort of timber partition, normally with two openings.²⁸⁶ The position of this screen may have been indicated by the tiled feature (Fig. 10, F865) in Phase 4/2.²⁸⁷

It is possible that the flints infilling the aisle post (F846) were all that remained of a floor in the hall. Another small area of flints (F1069) lay to the north-west of the aisle post, and a flint cobble surface seems to have been the initial floor in the service area (see above). There may also have been a levelling layer (Section 76, Fig. 14, F866), similar to that laid in the service wing (F745), within the hall, which ran over the thresholds between the rooms. This layer (F866) was, however, extremely difficult to identify in the hall as it was of the same composition as the Phase 2 levelling material.

To the east of the hall building a new detached kitchen (W) was constructed. This was presumed to be contemporary with the construction of the cross-wing, since the whole point of having the buttery and pantry divided by a corridor was to give access to such a kitchen. This building appears to have been a timber-framed structure set on dwarf stone walls with a clay tile roof. Only the north-eastern and part of the north-western wall footings (F537) had survived. The interpretation of its size was based on the kitchen which succeeded it and which was built, in places, directly on top of the earlier wall footing, and also on the fact that to the north-east it was restricted by the moat and to the south-east by Building B. There was evidence of a hearth (F1000) within the building and, given the dimensions of the later kitchen, it would have been centrally placed. There was no evidence that this kitchen was divided as was the later one. Other than the hearth, the only internal feature that appeared to be associated with it was a solitary posthole (F770) located 1.0 m. in from the north-east gable wall in line with the probable ridge of the roof. This may have been associated with the roof structure. Material from the demolition of this building indicates that it was tiled with clay peg tiles. There would presumably have been an entrance to this building opposite the door into the corridor of the manor building.

Between the hall and kitchen a courtyard of flint and gravel (F80, 1142) was laid. This seems to have been a common medieval practice.²⁸⁸ Possibly associated with this was a tile-lined drain (F636) which ran alongside the north-east gable wall of the kitchen and emptied into the moat. It may have served as an eaves drip for the kitchen, if the roof of that building was hipped. A similar drain-like feature was associated with the mid 13th-century kitchen at Wintringham.²⁸⁹

The courtyard also abutted a drain of stone slates (F225) set against the north-east wall of the chapel, and to the north-east it abutted the wall (F656) of what was probably the bakehouse/brewhouse (F). There is documentary and archaeological evidence for the combination of these two functions.²⁹⁰

The structure of this latter building proved somewhat elusive. It comprised two wall footings (F656, 617) which had been largely robbed out, and were set at right-angles to each other so that they walled off the majority of the area enclosed by the cross-wing, kitchen and moat. This structure was unusual in that it was askew to the other buildings. There was no surviving evidence of either the north-east or south-east walls although the position of the north-east wall could be determined by the end

of the cobbles and the beginning of a floor surface (F581). There was also one short length of wall footing (F614) which was perpendicular to the north-west wall. This short wall stopped at the edge of the floor mentioned above. Were it not for the presence of the floor contained by the south-west wall, this area could have been interpreted as an enclosure rather than a building. There was a break in the south-west wall, which was either a door or gateway. The floor could only be traced with any real confidence in the area to the north-east of the south-west wall.

Beneath the floor layer was a thin layer of roof tile fragments (F776) which may have been debris from the construction of the roof. Since there appears to have been only one substantial wall (F656) the implication was that this was a lean-to timber structure c. 8.0 m. square with a flat roof sloping to the north-east and an adjoining walled area.

Within the structure there were three ovens. Two of these (F508, 509) were placed perpendicular to each other and set in the southern corner of the building. They were both covered by a layer of wood ash. One of them (F509) had a well-preserved floor and a rake-back of heavily burnt tiles-on-edge, set into the contemporary floor surface. The remains of a limestone rubble retaining wall surrounded the tile-on-edge. A tile-on-edge oven was excavated at the Manor of the More, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, and a bread oven of similar dimensions was also excavated at Penhallam Manor, Cornwall. The oven (F508) almost certainly served the same function. The juxtaposition of the baking oven with another also occurred at Penhallam and in that case the second oven was a malting kiln.²⁹¹ This was probably also the case at Hardings Field. Although it had been largely robbed out, the second oven (F508) had traces of a stone floor and was sunk into the ground by about 0.25m. The third oven (F503) does not seem to have been such a substantial feature as the second. It survived only as an approximately oval pit, 0.30 m. deep with steep sides. There was evidence that its sides had been lined with wattle-and-daub, for pieces of daub were found within its demolition. Although there was nowhere near as much wood ash associated with this feature, like the two other kilns/ovens it did contain charcoal fragments and there was a spread of burning (F580) adjacent to its north-east side. The proximity of this feature to a possible malting kiln, together with its shape and size, suggest that it may have been a steeping kiln.

To the south of the domestic buildings the irregular scatter of farm buildings of Phase 2 appeared to have been cleared away and a new farmyard established, ranged around an open courtyard. This process of modernisation around a courtyard was a common phenomenon from the 13th century.²⁹² At Weoley Castle near Birmingham, the pre-moat scatter was replaced by a more ordered layout.²⁹³ The moated courtyard plan is perhaps exemplified by Penhallam Manor, Cornwall,²⁹⁴ where in the mid 13th century the domestic buildings totally enclosed the courtyard. However, at Hardings Field, both the domestic and some of the agricultural buildings were to be found enclosing a flint and gravel courtyard (F396), in a similar sort of layout to that at South Witham, Lincolnshire,²⁹⁵ which had reached its greatest extent in the latter half of the 13th century, some 20 or so years earlier than this phase.

The 1336 survey of Beresford's moated manor in Chalgrove also suggested a courtyard plan.²⁹⁶ Around the courtyard at Hardings Field a number of buildings were ranged, more or less enclosing the remaining three sides of the quadrangle left

open by the domestic buildings. Owing to the shape of the moat the courtyard enclosed was far from being a regular shape.

Although this area was believed to be a farmyard, based partly on the interpretation of some of the buildings, and also on its position, one of the buildings at least appears to have been domestic in origin. This was Building J, on the north-west side of the courtyard. This building was only partially excavated, and its walls had been heavily robbed. However, one length of reasonably substantial wall footing (F365) had survived, wide enough to suggest that this might have been a stone walled building. There also appears to have been a buttress set against the south-east wall (F217). There was much limestone rubble associated with its demolition and a layer of red clay peg tiles (F337) on the north-west side of the building indicated how it had been roofed. Contained within it was a floor of pale brown clay silt. It may simply have been a levelling medium within this building, for in its southern corner the floor had subsided considerably.

This building was also the only one in which there was a hearth (F1104) set against an external wall. There was no evidence of a chimney base against the wall, although at this point the wall was robbed out. The hearth itself was of the ubiquitous tile-on-edge construction and had been badly robbed.

This building may have been a Camera, which is defined by Beresford as 'a subordinate chamber attached to, or detached from, a hall'.²⁹⁷ However, its size and position, relative to the hall, were remarkably similar to the c. 1300 building at Wintringham, which was approached from the dais and was interpreted as the lady's bower.²⁹⁸ Alternatively it is possible that it was for the accommodation of the steward, or for the eldest son of the house. It may even have been used as lodgings. Very few sherds of pottery or other finds recovered were associated with this phase of the building. The demolition debris (F337), however, included four sherds of Tudor fine tableware and two decorated sherds,²⁹⁹ together with a bronze buckle.³⁰⁰

If this was a bower then the entrance to this building was probably in the north-east wall, which had been totally robbed out and would have provided access to the 'high' end of the hall. Unfortunately the robbing of the south-west wall of the hall (F993) meant that it was not possible to determine if a reciprocal doorway had existed there.³⁰¹ The juxtaposition of the bower and the hall suggests that the construction of the extension to the hall (A/3) (Fig. 9) took place at the same time as the reorganisation of the farmyard and not a few years later, as was suggested in the chronology.³⁰² As with the hall wall, the later robbing meant that all traces of any doorways had been removed on the south-west side of the extension, which would perhaps have been a more appropriate position if access to the bower was required.

Attached to the south-west side of the bower was a small building (I) apparently sharing its back wall. The slight remains of unfounded dwarf stone walls (F283,341,389) show this building to have been timber-framed, but once again from the demolition debris (F481), it would appear to have been roofed with clay tiles. In the south-west corner of this building was a neatly constructed stone-lined pit c. 0.40 m. deep (F346). Its two internal sides were lined with slabs of limestone. On its north-west side the inside facing of the wall (F341) was carried down to form that side of the pit. Interestingly the south-west side was not lined and the south-west wall

(F283) stopped just proud of the edge of the pit and was carried down to its bottom. The bottom of the pit also sloped to the south-west. This seems to indicate that there was some sort of outlet from the pit at this point which the wall bridged. There was, however, no evidence of a corresponding ditch or gully into which it could have emptied. The building may also have contained a small, central, tile-on-edge hearth (F352) at this date.

The function of this building is difficult to determine, as no pottery or small finds were recovered from it. The presence of the stone-lined pit suggests it might have been used as a larder, that is the place where meat was pickled in salt or potted and preserved with lard.³⁰³ A similar feature was interpreted as a storage pit in a larder of similar size, at Penhallam Manor, Cornwall,³⁰⁴ and also in a townhouse in Lincoln.³⁰⁵ At Wintringham two structures were interpreted as possible larders in periods 3 and 4. Although Building I was smaller than either of the suggested larders at Wintringham, the period 3 larder at that site was located in a similar relative position to that of Building I at Hardings Field.³⁰⁶

Running parallel to the edge of the moat and enclosing the south-west side of the courtyard was Building K, which was believed to be the stable block or possibly a cowshed. This building's walls had been heavily robbed, but in places stretches of relatively wide (0.65m), limestone rubble foundations (F309, 311, 1183) which were set in shallow trenches had survived, indicating that it might have been constructed of stone. There was very little debris associated with the demolition of this building, which may have been the result of the topsoil stripping, for at its southern end the robber trenches had all but disappeared. Also there were not the quantities of clay roof tile in the demolition layers which were found elsewhere. It was possible therefore that the building was thatched or even roofed with wooden shingles. There was one entrance off-centre on the north-east wall and two rooms of c. 4.0 m. in length at either end. These latter two rooms, to judge by the robber trenches, were divided off from the main bay by walls as substantial as the main structure.

This building was almost totally devoid of finds, except an iron staple³⁰⁷ and a piece of lead³⁰⁸ from its demolition. The only clue to its function was the plan of the building itself. Its great length, 41.7 m., and width of 7.5 m., was comparable with that of a building excavated at Owermoigne, Dorset which measured 36.0 m. by 8.0 m. and was interpreted as a stable or cowshed.³⁰⁹ That building had been divided into a number of stalls by wooden partitions. At Elstow Abbey, Bedfordshire, a building 30 m. long by 3.0 m. wide was also interpreted as a stable.³¹⁰

On the eastern side of the courtyard, just to the south of the kitchen (W), and on the edge of the moat was Building B. Where the wall foundations survived they were relatively substantial, up to 0.60 m. wide of rubble limestone in a construction trench c. 0.20 m. deep (F153, 959). In this case it may have been a timber-framed building, or a low stone structure. There were concentrations of clay roof tile in the demolition debris of this building suggesting that once again it had been tiled (F146).

It became apparent during the excavation of this building that its full south-western extent had been lost, probably during machining, and despite intensive cleaning no evidence of the walls could be found. However, a low kite photograph showed the courtyard respecting a line where the north-west wall would have been. It had been

divided internally into bays c. 4.0 m. long. Two of the internal dwarf stone dividing walls survived (F150, 152) indicating that there were a minimum of three bays to this building, which would have made it at least c. 13 m. long, assuming the missing bay conformed to the size of the others.

In its northern bay, and apparently set against the middle of the internal partition wall, was a small tile-on-edge oven (F151) whose surface was heavily burnt. This had apparently been stoked from the bay to the south, since there was a spread of burning (F403) which ran back from the middle of the partition wall to the south, and there was no evidence of burning in the northern bay. There were several examples of ovens stoked from the outside of the buildings at Wintringham although none where they were stoked from another room.³¹¹

It is possible that this building was used as the dairy. A building serving this function would have been necessary, and its position was not incompatible with evidence that Mrs le Patourel has gathered from documentary sources. She also makes the point that they would sometimes have been divided into two or three bays.³¹² The presence of an oven would not contradict its interpretation as a dairy since a late medieval dairy house excavated at Bwlch-y-Hendre, Cardiganshire contained a hearth and bakestone.³¹³

It would also appear that the dairy was not infrequently combined with some other building, in particular with the accommodation for the manor servants, the famuli. As late as 1334 such a combination was documented at Belchamp, St. Paul, Essex.³¹⁴

There were very few finds from either the occupation or demolition of this building and none of the large open pot bowls (patellae) which were apparently used in connection with dairying was found.³¹⁵ In the later Phase 4/2, part of a copper alloy vessel³¹⁶ was found which might have had an association with dairying.

There was no evidence that the courtyard was divided in any way during this phase. It provided a stratigraphic link between Buildings B, I, J, K and the porch A/6, all of which it abutted. It also appeared to stop along a line between the eastern corner of Building J and the western corner of the porch, and along another line between the western corner of the porch and Building B. In a later phase these were marked by walls which probably contained gardens to the north-east, and it is quite likely that this was the case in this phase also. The courtyard did not appear to run right up to the edge of the eastern moat, possibly indicating the presence of a boundary wall there. In the southern corner of the island it simply became lost. The short length of wall (F282) which abutted the south-west side of the 'larder' (I) and which ran for just over 4.0 m. may have represented part of a boundary wall of the court, closing off the area between the 'larder' (I) and the 'stables' (K). This wall ended in a slight intern which might indicate the position of a gate.

The remaining area of the island to the north-west of the buildings appears to have been devoid of structures and could easily have been put down to pasture to provide some grazing for visitors' horses. At an unknown date a pond (F320) was excavated to the west of the 'larder'.

One other building appears to have been part of the farmyard complex at this time. This was the large barn with a porch on its western side (C), which lay to the south of the dairy (B).

Whereas the courtyard had abutted all of the above mentioned structures, this latter building was constructed on top of the flints. As no finds were recovered from this barn it is not possible to date its construction, other than stratigraphically.³¹⁷ Its position, as one of the buildings which enclosed the courtyard, suggests it was built not long after the others. Its construction may have been immediately contiguous with the other structures. It would appear from the narrow rubble stone foundations (F334, 392, 1212) which were laid directly on top of the courtyard, that these were only dwarf stone walls and that the building was timber-framed. Since no evidence for gable end walls was found, the length of this building has to be conjectural. However, the spread of peg clay roof tile (F393) from its demolition, which abutted the western side, was also traced to the north, where it respected the line of what was presumably the northern gable wall. If the porch was located in the centre of the building this would suggest that the original length of the barn was c. 33 m., of which there was evidence for 30.5 m..

There was evidence of a threshold of pitched stone between the porch and the barn and a slightly less convincing threshold into the porch. Internally one substantial post pad (F394) was found suggesting it was an aisled or quasi-aisled structure. At South Witham two aisled barns of the first half of the 13th century were excavated.³¹⁸ Both were of the same width as the Chalgrove barn, but approximately 8.0 m. shorter. One had a porch the same depth as that of Building C, but it was much wider. It is probable that the porch on Building C was not a wagon porch, since it was only 5.0 m. wide. The other aisled barn at South Witham had no porch, but it did have an entrance 5.0 m. wide, and it was interpreted as a granary.

As only one aisle post was discovered it has been suggested that it was not fully aisled. It may have had only the end bays aisled as at Middle Littleton Barn, Worcestershire.³¹⁹ The likelihood of this would depend on whether or not the surviving length of west wall indicated the true length of the building, which seems unlikely. If the estimated length of the building was correct then the end bay would have been nearly 9.0 m. long. It seems more likely therefore that this building was fully aisled and that the other aisle posts either left no trace or were still buried beneath the spoil heap.

→

Phase 3/2 c. 1310-30 (Fig. 9)

This sub-phase comprised mainly the addition of a short bay (A/3) at the high end of the hall, which was added between 10 and 25 years after the alterations of Phase 3/1.320

This bay had an external length of 4.8 m. and was added to the north-west end of the hall. The walls (F64, 640, 861) were of the same construction and dimensions as the Phase 2 hall building, being set on rubble stone foundations: they were not pitched, as the cross-wing extension had been. The walls were bonded into those of the main building and presumably were carried up to the same height. The roofline of this extension would probably have been a continuation of the main roof, covered in the same material.

The internal surface was brought up to the level of the hall by a layer of dump (Section 76, Fig. 14, F850, 851, 881, 883, 1031) which was probably the material excavated from the construction trenches of the walls. The process of levelling up seems to have taken place during the construction of the bay, for sandwiched between the layers of dump was a layer of construction debris (Section 76, Fig. 14, F882).

The position of this extension at the 'high' end of the hall would suggest that this was the parlour, a separate room to which the family would withdraw from the high table. This room was often converted from what had been the solar basement.³²¹ However, since the solar was at the opposite end of the hall, in this case that was not possible, and a new chamber had to be built. Commonly this was divided into a ground and first floor with the result that two domestic blocks were now serving one hall.³²² This does not seem to have been the case at Hardings Field, nor does it appear that in this phase the bay was a separate parlour. Instead of a doorway connecting the hall and this new chamber a 4 m. gap was knocked through the dividing wall (F625) between the two, apparently making this bay an extension of the hall. This idea was further strengthened by the presence, probably in a later phase, of a small central hearth (F796) which indicated that this room was open to the roof. The knocking through would seem to have been concurrent with the construction of the bay, for debris from the demolition of the wall was mixed in with the dump used to level up. The demolition of what was originally the gable end wall of the hall would have resulted in the removal of any 'Great Window' that might have existed. Indeed in the later floor makeup of this new room a fragment of glass was found which may have come from such a window.³²³

Although most of the demolition debris would have been removed, and this may have made up the layer of limestone fragments and mortar (F1206) to the north-west of the house, the smaller fragments were left and formed a layer (Section 76, Fig. 14, F646) which thinned out from the high end of the hall. This debris contained a jetton of 1310-30.³²⁴

Subsequent to the structural alterations, a new hearth (Section 76, Fig. 14, F943) seems to have been constructed in the hall and the old one (Fig. 9, F1077) was robbed out. Some of the debris from its destruction was buried in the resulting hole (F1075, 1076). The new hearth was cut just to the south of the old one. Owing to the disturbance of the later features and also to the presence of the initial machine trench

IA, there remains some confusion as to whether the new hearth represented the first phase of two hearths, or whether it was all part of one large hearth. If there were two separate hearths then the material that was used to backfill them was remarkably similar. There was some evidence in the section (Section 76, Fig. 14) of a cut, indicating that if there were two features the eastern hearth was the earlier. Conversely it is also worth suggesting that as the hall had been enlarged, a larger hearth (c. 2.5 m. square) may now have been necessary to heat it. Whether or not one or two hearths were represented here, stratigraphically they belong to this phase. What form the hearth or hearths took has to be conjectural owing to the later robbing of the feature. However, since the two later surviving hearths in the hall were of tile-on-edge construction set in a shallow pit, flush with the floor, this would seem to have been the preferred method. The presence of burnt limestone in the bottom of the hearth pit suggests that it may have been edged with that material. In the bottom of the hearth's construction pit, on its eastern side, a coin of Edward I was recovered.³²⁵ This coin was probably deposited c. 1320-30, that is in the same date range as the jetton mentioned above, which suggests that it was lost when the hearth was constructed and not when it went out of use.

Unfortunately no floor layer survived that was common to both the extension and the hall. There were the remains of a very patchy occupation layer (F1070) against the north-west wall of the hall and this was overlain by an equally patchy layer of pinkish mortar (F1068), possibly the slight remains of a floor layer. Contained within this was an iron trefoil finial, possibly from a piece of furniture.³²⁶ There was no evidence of a contemporary floor surface in the extension.

Quite how the extension was used in this phase is open to debate. There was no evidence that the 'high table' was moved into this room. If it was intended as a room to withdraw to from the hall there would have been no necessity to demolish the dividing wall. It may have been that it was screened off, or even simply divided by a curtain from the hall: all of which belies the question of why it was treated as if it was an extension to the hall itself. As postulated above, there was probably a side door from this extension to give access to the 'bower' (J).

To the north of the manor house a substantial gravel and flint courtyard (F1086/1) was laid which linked the manor house to the Phase 2 kitchen building (D). There were the slight remains of a wall (F1102) which contained the courtyard, between the north-west corner of the manor extension (A/3) and the kitchen, and another wall (F1086/2) on the north-east edge of the courtyard between the cross-wing and the kitchen. Just to the north of the manor building three small, evenly spaced postholes (F1097-99) had been cut through the courtyard. They were located 1.30 m. out from the hall wall and may have been part of a scaffold used to repair or effect some alteration to that stretch of the wall.³²⁷ Beneath this courtyard a layer of fragments of stone slates (F1148) was observed. The kitchen (D) may have been roofed with these slates. Both the layer of stone slate fragments and the courtyard were stratigraphically part of this phase and there was no stratigraphic reason why the kitchen should have been constructed at an earlier date. However, as outlined above, its function suggests it belonged to Phase 2. With the construction of the new kitchen (W) in Phase 3/1 the old kitchen building may have changed its use, perhaps becoming a workshop, such as was suggested at South Witham.³²⁸ In a feature

nearby (F1088) and in the demolition debris (F700) associated with this building a small amount of blacksmithing slag was found.³²⁹

Phase 3/3 c. 1330-1400 (Fig. 9)

As with 3/2, this sub-phase was mainly concerned with alterations within the hall (A/1) and its extension (A/3): unlike Phase 3/2, no precise date can be given.³³⁰ Since the major alterations seem to have consisted of effectively blocking off the hall from the extension (Fig. 9), it can perhaps be assumed that this did not occur too soon after the demolition of the wall dividing the two chambers.

The blocking was effected by the insertion of a stone bench (F626) of the same construction as the other two in the hall. That this was a bench and not a blocking wall was evident from the fact that its face was 'proud' of the wall by some 0.40m.

The Phase 3/2 hearth went out of use and was backfilled with a white silty clay (Section 76, Fig. 14, F643). It was replaced with another hearth just to its north, of tile-on-edge construction, with a kerb of roof tiles (F1005). The floor area of the 'high' end of the hall, particularly around the hearth, had shown signs of wear immediately prior to this phase and, apparently to level up the surface, a layer of grey clay loam (Section 76, Fig. 14, F816) was deposited, which abutted the comparatively unworn surface at the south-east end (Section 76, Fig. 14, F866). After this, a floor of hard lime mortar was laid (F1017). This had only survived in a fragmentary way and although it could not be traced beyond the south-east end of the benches lining the side walls, it presumably ran up to the screens. There was no evidence that this floor had ever been tiled, and the wear around the hearth in Phase 4/2 (see below p.) would seem to have confirmed this.

Immediately in front of the new bench there was evidence of what appears to have been a 'dais' 1.0 m. wide. Its sides were delimited by limestone blocks (F1064) while the front edge was marked by a line of roof tiles laid flat and end to end (F985). The dais appears to have been as wide as the bench was long.

At both Penhallam Manor,³³¹ and Wintringham,³³² the dais was raised on earth and retained at the front. The arrangement of a dais with a fixed bench was also found at Penhallam and still survives in 'several of the north-west halls'.³³³ The bench at Penhallam had survived for its full height of just over 0.50 m. and the excavator interpreted it as having had a timber top.³³⁴ The benches in the hall at Hardings Field were quite badly robbed but they may well have been finished with timber seats. There was probably some sort of timber screen fixed behind this bench to complete the division of the two chambers. There was no sign of a partition at ground level: the only surviving fragments of floor layers (F1033, 1066) in the parlour abutted the back of the bench. This would suggest that any partition was attached to the stub walls on either side of the bench.

The extension to the hall (A/3) now became a truly separate room and was almost certainly a parlour with access through a side door to the bower (J). Commonly the parlour was provided with its own wall fireplace.³³⁵ However, at Hardings Field there seems to have been a small central hearth (F796) with a base of limestone slabs, indicating, as mentioned above, that this room was still open to the roof.

Virtually no small finds were associated with this phase. All the pottery sherds but one in this phase were found in the hall, and the assemblage was dominated by jug fragments.³³⁶

Between Phases 3/1-4/2 (1300-1458)

Following the structural alterations of Phase 3/3 there was very little evidence for the use of the parlour prior to the demolition of the building, since only very thin and fragmentary layers survived, and these contained little dating material, of an apparently mixed date range.³³⁷ This was probably the result of constant cleaning out of the room.³³⁸

Within the parlour this period was represented by layers of occupation and burning (F596, 808) associated with the hearth. Although very few sherds were recovered, they did include a high proportion of Tudor type tablewares, as might be expected from the lord's dining room. The same can be said of the pottery from the demolition layers associated with this room.³³⁹ The demolition debris also produced evidence of glazed windows³⁴⁰ and plaster³⁴¹ in this room.

The wardrobe (A/4) and the garderobe (A/5) also contained only thin and fragmentary layers, but their date range was if anything wider than the parlour, being from Phases 3/1 to 5. It appeared that at least some of the layers within these last two chambers belonged to the early part of Phase 5, when there was evidence of metal working (see p).

Evidence for the cleaning-out of floors was much more pronounced within the wardrobe (A/4), where it resulted in a definite depression in the middle of the room. This effectively meant that the very thin stratigraphy could not be traced across the room but was separated into islands against the walls.

Fragmentary patches of mortar (F600/10, 1071, 1022/6) may have been part of a mortar floor associated with a layer of occupation debris (F600/11, 600/9, 1022/5). However, all of the subsequent layers which overlay the mortar and occupation were much more reminiscent of construction debris (F507, 599, 600/2, 600/4, 1021, 1028). This would suggest either that the floor layers had been totally lost or that the construction debris was simply trodden into the underlying surface and used as a floor. Intermixed with that debris was a layer of charcoal fragments (F1015). A similar layer of charcoal fragments (F875) was also traced over the threshold into the buttery/pantry (A/9) where it survived as a narrow band of material against the north-east wall (F875). Where the charcoal fragments occurred in the buttery/pantry they appeared to belong to Phase 5, and the abandonment and demolition of the manor (see p). Although this chamber (A/4) may have been used to store charcoal, it seems likely that the charcoal was associated with the post-domestic occupancy of the site, as appears to have been the case with the layer of charcoal in the buttery/pantry (A/9). If this was so, then the charcoal may have been associated with a small hearth (F717) in the garderobe (A/5) (see Phase 5, p).

The thin layers within the garderobe (A/5) were even less informative than those within the other rooms. Similarly layers 633/1 to 633/6, with the exception of 633/4, were probably part of the later use of this room (see Phase 5, p).

The pottery from this phase of the garderobe included material which may have been contemporary with that of Phase 2, that is, of the mid to late 13th century. Two cooking pots, a shallow dish and a face mask (Fig. 19) typical of types found in London, but very abraded, were also recovered.³⁴² The cooking pots, given their context, could well have had a secondary use as chamber pots.

Included within these unphased groups of stratigraphy was an individual feature (F319). This comprised a scatter of material well away from the main concentration of buildings. It was located c. 20 m. to the north-west of the bower (J) and quite close to the edge of the moat, in an area which was devoid of other archaeological features. It may be that this was the remains of a midden, although only 42 sherds of pottery were recovered, among which were a cooking pot, two kitchen ware vessels and a bottle.³⁴³ One small find, a circular iron buckle, was also made.³⁴⁴

[FIGURE 10]

Phase 4 1370-c. 1400 (Fig. 10)

After the considerable improvements to the curia in the early 14th century little change could be detected until the late 14th - early 15th centuries, although the new chapel (A/11) may have been built a little earlier than 1370. Thus Thomas Barentin I does not seem to have been responsible for any detectable structural alterations.³⁴⁵

It was during his tenure of the manor that the Black Death occurred, with the main outbreak in 1348-9, followed by further incidences in 1361 and 1368-9.³⁴⁶ Although the impact that the plague had on Chalgrove is currently unknown, its experience was probably similar to that of the adjacent parish of Cuxham, where in 1349 all 12 of the lord's villeins died within the year. Although new tenants were found within six years for the vacant plots, they were no longer as obedient or prepared to perform labour services as in pre-plague days.³⁴⁷

The effect of the Black Death upon demesne farming seems to have been variable. To many landowners it brought a permanent fall in income. However, the reduction in population also led to a per capita rise in wealth and consumption among labourers and peasants. This seems to have been due to the fact that prior to the Black Death, England was overpopulated and productivity was correspondingly low.³⁴⁸ Some landowners enjoyed a further two decades of prosperous demesne farming when prices kept up with rising wages. However, this delicate balance between prices and wages was upset in 1375 by an exceptionally good harvest which pushed prices down and seems to have hastened the movement away from demesne farming.³⁴⁹ The apparent stagnation on this manor in the mid to late 14th century should be viewed in the light of these events. Although the documentary evidence is limited, rentals for 1405-6 show that by that date the demesne was leased out.³⁵⁰ The archaeological evidence also seems to support the move away from demesne farming. The demolition of the dovecot and the construction of a walled garden (see below) on the

north side of the manor are consistent with an attempt to divorce the manor house from the farmyard, and has been noted on manors elsewhere.³⁵¹

Thomas Barentin's son Thomas II may have instigated the alterations of Phase 4, but since he died in 1400, his son Reynold (1382-1441) could equally well have been responsible.

Phase 4/1 1370 (Fig. 10)

An episcopal licence issued during Thomas II's lifetime confirmed the presence of an oratory on the site in 1370.³⁵² This may have been when the new chapel (A/11) was constructed, and therefore this one building has been given its own sub-phase, 4/1. Equally the licence may simply have been a renewal of an existing licence for the earlier chapel (A/7), and the new chapel could well be contemporary with the other alterations of Phase 4/2.

The timber-framed chapel (A/7) of Phase 3/1 was demolished and was replaced by a stone walled chapel of similar internal dimensions (A/11). The foundations of the walls (F122) were of large rubble limestone, 0.85 m. wide, set in shallow foundation trenches 0.15-0.20 m. deep, bonded in the same way as the other walls. However, although the walls were extant in places for up to three courses they did not step in on the foundations, but were of the same width. There was insufficient wall surviving to indicate where any thresholds may have been.

The debris (F145) from the destruction of the earlier chapel was contained within the new building and appears to have been used to cover up and level over the dwarf stone walls of that structure.

The new chapel appears to have had a floor of decorated clay tiles, which were laid 'square' against the internal walls of the building. A total of 131 stratified whole and fragmentary decorated floor tiles were found, mainly in the demolition layers of the manor house. There were two main concentrations of these tiles, one of which was in the area of this chapel, and the other in the area of a pentice (A/13; see below). The designs found on the tiles in the two areas appear to have been mutually exclusive. There were at least three different designs used in the chapel floor, none of which have been described before (see Fig. 47).³⁵³ One of the designs even appears to feature a monk's head (Fig. 47, No. C).

Unlike in the pentice, the mortar bedding for the tiles did not survive in the chapel. There was however a floor of pale brown sandy loam which contained a high proportion of white clay and mortar fragments (F169), which might have been the bedding for a layer of mortar in which the tiles were set. Alternatively they may have been used in a first floor chapel. It was not possible from the surviving evidence to determine whether or not the chapel was rebuilt as a ground or first floor chapel. In the 14th century ground floor chapels were not unknown. Stonor House, Oxfordshire has a ground floor chapel of c. 1349.³⁵⁴ In the 15th century it was fashionable to have the chapel on the ground floor with a chancel the height of two floors. It was also normal to have a two-storeyed west end with at least a gallery adjoining the great chamber, so that the lord still had access to the chapel.³⁵⁵ A mid 15th-century

example of this arrangement can be found at Champ's Chapel, East Hendred, Oxfordshire.³⁵⁶

Although no window glass was associated with this building one lead came was found in the demolition debris.³⁵⁷ There was also evidence that the walls had been plastered.³⁵⁸

→

Phase 4/2 c. 1400 (Fig. 10)

Within the hall (A/1) the central hearth was once again renewed. Its construction trench cut through the old hearth slightly to its south-west, such that some of the tiles-on-edge of the previous hearth had survived. The new hearth (F563) was of the same construction as the old one, that is of roof tiles on edge c. 1.35 m. by 1.25 m.,³⁵⁹ set at right-angles to the tiles of the earlier hearth and edged with a limestone kerb. Against the south-east side of the hearth was a 'base' of limestone flags some 0.50 m. wide (F885). This was perhaps used to stand vessels on, to keep food warm, or to stack wood ready for the fire. One of the stones that formed this 'plinth' had a conical hole worked through it.³⁶⁰ This hole, together with the burning on the underside of the stone, suggests it may originally have been a tuyere block from a smelting hearth,³⁶¹ and may possibly have come from the demolition of the old bakehouse/kitchen (Building D, see below). It was suggested that that building may have been given over to industrial use in an earlier phase (see above).

The stone had split in situ, but fitting loosely within the conical hole was a 'plug' of iron oxides combined with quartz grains. This 'plug' could have been produced if the hearth that the tuyere block had been associated with was stopped up after its final use, and the building that it was housed in was in a sufficiently derelict state to allow water to enter the hearth. The iron oxides associated with the hearth would then have been washed down into the hole in the stone where they were combined with the quartz grains and silts to produce the plug.³⁶²

Adjacent to the middle of the north-west side of the hearth and still in situ were the remains of an iron upright c. 6 mm. square in section, and sunk a minimum of c. 0.09 m. into the ground.³⁶³ Although there was no direct evidence of an upright on the other side of the hearth it is interesting to note that the worked hole through the stone mentioned above would have corresponded well. It seems likely that the iron upright was part of the andirons (firedogs) used to support the logs on the hearth.³⁶⁴

At the lower end and in the middle of the hall, some 4.3 m. from the dividing wall between the service rooms and the hall, was a substantial limestone packed posthole (F618). Its packing included a piece of millstone grit quernstone.³⁶⁵ The post setting was further strengthened by a packing of broken roof tiles pitched in towards the stones.

The post that was set in this feature almost certainly carried a crossbeam. This would have supported a floor jettied out over almost the whole of the lower end bay of the hall. This is seen as an attempt at modernisation of an old house by reducing the roof space, without the expense of inserting a chimney and fireplace. By flooring over part of the hall an extra first floor chamber was created while the roof space in the hall was reduced effectively to a large smoke bay. This is a process originally thought to begin in the 16th century but for which evidence now suggests a 15th-century date.³⁶⁶

A number of standing examples of this practice have been examined, mainly in Kent and also among the lesser vernacular buildings in Devon. Recently a good example of this was discovered in a house of c. 1500 at Watlington, Oxfordshire.³⁷⁷ It was commonly found among the Kentish examples that the entire lower end bay of the

hall was floored over. It was once thought that the insertion of a floor over the hall was to accommodate a minstrel's gallery. However, evidence from those halls examined suggested that the wall which divided the first floor chamber from the hall was in fact solid, and in some cases was taken all the way down to the ground floor.³⁶⁸ At Hardings Field, the evidence from the hall floor layers (F1017) suggested that the former was the case, with only the upper floor being 'boxed' in.

Often associated with the flooring-over of part of the hall was the addition of a gallery down one of its sides. These were constructed in order to facilitate access to the new first floor. All of the examples of galleried halls examined in Kent had the new first floor inserted at the opposite end to the service wing; and thus also to the existing stairways. A staircase was necessary, or a gallery, to link the new first floor chamber with the existing first floor rooms over the service.³⁶⁹ It was at first thought that the three postholes (F862, 867, 868) on the north-east side of the hall at Hardings Field represented a gallery to give access to a first floor over the parlour. However, their spacing was incompatible with this idea. Nor does there seem to have been any evidence that a first floor was inserted within the parlour (A/3), since the central hearth did not appear to go out of use until the general demise of the house. Neither was there any evidence of an attempt to replace the central hearth with a wall fireplace. Thus the three postholes do not appear to have been part of a gallery. They were each cut through the mortar floor within the hall and stone packed, and would have taken c. 0.14 m. squared posts. There was no sign of any corresponding posts on the opposite side of the hall. Medieval furniture was commonly built into a room, rather than being free standing,³⁷⁰ so the three posts may have represented some sort of elaborate wooden canopy over the bench.

One other feature within the hall requires comment. This consisted of a line of roof tiles laid flat on the floor (F865) which ran from the central post in an arc to the north-east wall of the hall. Although badly disturbed, they were probably originally set into the mortar floor of the hall. In places this feature had a depth of 0.07 m. with a slight 'V' shaped profile. Once again no evidence of a corresponding feature was recorded on the opposite side of the hall. The most likely interpretation of this feature is that it was a drain. A similar curving drain was found at Penhallam Manor in the passageway between the hall and wardrobe;³⁷¹ however, the function of that drain was to take water that collected in the yard and dispose of it via a garderobe. No such function could be claimed for the feature in the hall at Hardings Field, and indeed there seems to be little point in having a drain in the hall. It is possible that the south-eastern extent of this feature also marked the position of the screens between the hall and cross-passage.

It is not clear whether the earlier mortar floor (F1017) was replaced at this date with an earth floor, or whether the layer sealing it (Fig. 10, F1002) was simply the result of accumulated occupation debris. The latter is perhaps more likely considering the number of small finds and the amount of debris recovered from within that rather mixed layer. Merging with this layer was a 'horseshoe' of fine black wood-ash (F548) which curved around three sides of the central hearth, significantly not including the dais side, and was presumably the result of excessive wear as people crowded around the hearth.

It is possible that the dais was renewed at this time, as a slightly raised (c. 0.07-0.10 m.) area (F622) with some evidence of a tile-on-edge revetment (F799) was found to the north-west of the hearth. Its front edge was marked by what appeared to be an incredibly thin robber trench (F863), possibly the result of the later robbing out of the tiles-on-edge.

Although a comparatively large number of small finds were associated with this phase in the hall, only 23 sherds of pottery were recovered, none of which was diagnostic.³⁷² The same was true of the demolition debris associated with the hall.

Within the buttery and pantry (A/9, A/10) there was a sequence of floor layers and occupation debris which provided sufficient dating material to link them with this phase. No floor layers were recorded which had replaced those of the construction phase or pre-dated those of this phase. However, as noted elsewhere, there was evidence of cleaning out of rooms which, together with the fragmentary nature of the floor layers, may well have resulted in the latest pottery sherds contaminating earlier levels. Overlying fragmentary patches of floor make-up (F737, 765, 764, 790, 926), was a floor of redeposited chalk Head (F733, 923, 56, 44, 41) which could be traced throughout both rooms and the corridor of the service bay. In the larger of the two service rooms (A/9) there was evidence that this floor had been repaired (F739, 746) and it was overlain by a patchy layer of occupation debris (F639). This floor was then apparently replaced by another of olive brown silt loam, which was only recorded as a separate floor in this room.

A further example of the attempt to modernise the premises was the demolition of the detached kitchen (W) and its replacement by a rectangular building (A/12). This, although of similar dimensions (6.0 by 9.0 m.), was attached to the manor house by a corridor or pentice (F18, 114) and gave access to the corridor between the buttery and pantry. The new kitchen (A/12) also appears to have been a timber-framed structure. It was constructed on dwarf limestone walls (F3, 538), which were in fact slightly narrower than those of the previous kitchen. An internal wall (F13) divided the kitchen width-ways into two unequal bays. The cooking all appears to have been done in the larger bay since there was no evidence of either hearths or ovens in the smaller northern one.

The larger southern bay was dominated by a tile-on-edge hearth, 2.0 m. by 2.3 m. (F7). Unlike all the other hearths this one had been divided diagonally into quadrants, the opposing quadrants having tiles laid at right-angles to the adjoining quadrants. On the north-west side of this hearth was a heavily burnt limestone base (F30), similar to that associated with the central hearth in the hall. Set into the southern and eastern corners of this bay were two ovens (F4, 177). The southern one had been badly disturbed but seems to have had a diameter of c. 0.80 m. with a floor of tiles laid flat: the ground associated with it was burnt orange and red. The eastern oven was quite well preserved and had an internal diameter of 1.1 m. Its floor was of limestone slabs with rubble limestone walls.

One other feature may have been associated with this phase of use of the kitchen. This was an open rectangular base (1.0 m. by 1.5 m.) of worked stone (F27) which had been located between the two ovens, against the back wall of the kitchen. It had been revealed in an extension to the original machine trench (Ia), and unfortunately it

was destroyed by vandals before it could be properly recorded, although one photograph indicated its shape and relationship to the kitchen wall. There must be some doubt therefore as to whether it belonged to this phase of the kitchen's use, or the post-1458 occupation of the site. Its relationship with the kitchen does, however, suggest that its position was not purely coincidental.

The five voussoirs³⁷³ which appeared to have formed part of this feature were subsequently recovered from the moat! They were all from the same arch, of late 12th-century date (1180), and may originally have been built into the church, which was altered in the early 14th century. Several showed signs of wear, as if they had been used as doorsteps.

The floor of the main bay (F23) was of loam stained black by charcoal with patches of sand and much domestic debris within it. This layer varied from 0.10 m. in the middle of the room, where presumably it had been used to bury the hearth of the earlier kitchen and provided a bedding for the new hearth, to less than 5.0 mm. around the edge of the kitchen. At its thickest point three small areas of successive flint cobbles could be distinguished. Where the floor ran into the corridor it changed to a sandy grey loam (F33), and this difference was sufficiently abrupt to suggest that there was a doorway from the kitchen into the corridor.³⁷⁴ The floor layer (F535) within the northern bay was a sandy loam with small fragments of limestone embedded in it, reminiscent of demolition debris; perhaps from the earlier kitchen. Since there was no evidence of cooking having taken place in this room it may well have been used for storage, possibly of the large quantities of wood that would have been consumed by the hearth and ovens. The presence of a socketed iron axe head³⁷⁵ adds some weight to this suggestion.

Owing to the fragmentary remains of the walls it was not possible positively to determine the positions of any doorway other than that into the corridor. However, on the south-west side of the kitchen there was a spread of occupation material (F155) which appeared to have been swept out from an entrance on that side of the building.

During the use of this building the original central hearth was replaced by another, cut directly into the old one. This new hearth (F6) was 2.4 m. long: its width was indeterminate owing to later disturbance, but it was a minimum of 1.5 m. It was constructed of tiles-on-edge, all running north-east to south-west, but with a kerb of limestone blocks. Abutting its north-east side was a plinth of tiles-on-edge (F31).

Owing to the concentration of the ovens and hearth in such a small area, the kitchen was probably relatively tall and open to the roof, with a louvre over the central hearth, as in the surviving building of c. 1440s at Lincoln College, Oxford.³⁷⁶ The kitchen roof appears to have been tiled. Although the southern side of the corridor shared a common wall with the kitchen, the corridor walls would have been lower, with the gable end of the corridor abutting the north-west wall of the kitchen.

One copper alloy cauldron foot, one other possible vessel foot, and a cauldron handle were found.³⁷⁷ Although it is quite likely that a cauldron was in use in the kitchen, there was evidence that they had been partially melted down and may have been associated with the later metal working on the site (see Phase 5).³⁷⁸

A substantial quantity of pottery was recovered from the kitchen, much of which was used in the preparation of food. Six cooking pots, six kitchenware vessels, a bowl, four jugs, two bottles and a cup were found. Fragments of Tudor-type tablewares, although present, did not dominate the assemblage.³⁷⁹

With the construction of the corridor linking the kitchen and manor house, there was now only a 0.70 m. gap (F115) between its southern wall and the chapel. The limestone slates (F225) which formed a drain down one side, were thought to have belonged to the earlier phase of chapel, whose wall they abutted. However, they may have been put in at this date to carry away the run off from both the corridor and chapel roofs.

A new kitchen courtyard (F519) was laid, enclosed by the cross-wing, kitchen and bakehouse. The northern wall of the new kitchen had been constructed over the drain associated with the earlier detached kitchen. It was apparently replaced by a shallow sump (F504) and gully (F518), to the north of the kitchen. This passed in front of the bakehouse before joining with another drainage gully which ran down the length of the cross-wing (presumably its eavesdrip), emptying into the moat.

The gully appeared to obstruct the entrance to the bakehouse. A drainage gully was similarly located in front of the threshold of the period 3 kitchen at Wintringham.³⁸⁰ In this phase the dovecot (E) and the old kitchen/bakehouse (D) of Phase 2 were demolished and what may have been a walled garden was created to the north of the manor house. The ground to the north of the house had sloped gently to the moat, presumably because of the platform on which the hall building was constructed. The area within the angle of the hall and cross-wing was levelled up by the dumping of a layer of loam (F573) which abutted the walls of the manor house and also sealed the remains of the earlier buildings. Unfortunately the full extent of this layer to the north-west was lost as a result of topsoil stripping. This layer of dump contained a large quantity of pottery.³⁸¹

Running out approximately parallel to the hall from the northern corner of the cross-wing was a stone wall (F751) whose slight foundations were cut into the dump. After about 8.0 m. it turned through a right-angle to the north-east and at this point, owing once again to topsoil stripping, it was totally lost. However, at the very least it would almost certainly have run up to the edge of the moat. It is suggested that it may have joined up with a length of wall (F679) of the same width of foundation which ran out from the western corner of the parlour. This wall turned after 12.0 m. through a right-angle (F697) in the direction of the northern arm of the moat before also becoming totally lost. The lack of any evidence of a return for this wall in the direction of the manor house suggested it might have carried on up to the moat, where a 23m length of wall running along the edge of the moat would have linked the two stretches of wall, enclosing a walled garden.

This may have been a small arbour. Arbours were generally enclosed areas of turf with flowers planted straight into the turf: this was known as a 'flowery mead'.³⁸² However, there seems to have been an extensive area of gravel and flint courtyard (F732) which survived running around the edge of the house. Against the north-east wall of the manor house was a feature which was interpreted as a flower bed. This

consisted of a small rectangular enclosure (F572) which was rather crudely constructed of a single width of limestone rubble. Raised flower beds of this type were a common feature of medieval gardens.³⁸³

The south-east side of the garden was bounded not by the cross-wing but by the construction of a timber-framed corridor or pentice (A/13). This structure rested on a pair of thin (0.20 m.-0.30 m.) dwarf stone walls (F591) which projected perpendicular to the hall. The northern of the two walls abutted the manor: however, its twin, which had been totally robbed out, could not be traced closer to the manor wall than 2.9 m.. Since there could have been no direct access from the manor to the pentice if this wall had also run up to the manor wall, it seems most likely that it turned through a right-angle to join up with the corner of the small porch/oriel chamber (A/8), in the re-entrant angle between hall and solar. The pentice was just over 9.0 m. in length by 2.7 m. wide. At its north-east end it terminated 0.18 m. before the enclosing garden wall, straddling the corner of the wall where it turned to the north-east. This seems a rather curious arrangement and one wonders why it was not moved c. 1.4 m. to the north-west so that it had clear access into the garden. Also running between the end of the pentice and the garden wall was what appears to have been a drain (F998) of upturned ridge tiles. This suggests both that the roof may have been hipped at this end and that the pentice did not abut the garden wall.

Contained within this structure was a 'floor' of hard lime mortar (F589), itself bedded on a layer of sand (F980). At the north-east end of the pentice this 'floor' had a clean edge to it indicating that this was indeed the end of the structure. The south-west extent of the mortar was lost beyond the south-west end of the south-east wall of the pentice. This mortar 'floor' was in fact the bedding layer for a floor of decorated tiles (see above), and although only two tiles survived in situ the impressions which the others left in the mortar showed that they had been laid diagonally.

Four different designs of tile were associated with this building, the majority of which were found in the demolition debris in the immediate vicinity. These were all of known 'Haberly' types,³⁸⁴ of the same manufacture and date as those from the chapel.³⁸⁵

It is difficult to determine from the available evidence whether the pentice with its associated courtyards was a later addition to the garden or an original planned element. Quite what the function of this corridor was is a little uncertain, but it seems to have been quite a splendid walkway giving access to the garden. It was probably roofed with clay tiles. Its construction enclosed a small cloister-like courtyard of gravel and flint (F561). This was clearly deliberate, and it may have been an attempt on a small scale to emulate the monastic cloister. This courtyard was probably entered from a doorway in the north-east facing wall of the pentice, which may help to explain the lack of evidence for a wall at that point. A postern in the boundary wall of the courtyard would have given onto the footbridge (F730) over the moat, and it is possible that the bridge was not constructed until this date.

On the north-west of the parlour and abutting it, another small room (A/14) was added which made use of the garden wall (F679) to form one side of the building. It is interesting to note that where the garden wall corresponded to the wall of this room its foundations were dug approximately 0.30 m. deeper. The other walls of this room

survived only as poorly-defined robber trenches, particularly on the north-west side, probably owing to later disturbance. However, contained within the room was a floor (F673) of brown silt loam, heavily mottled with white clay, and this confirmed the internal width of the room as 3.5 m., with a length of 6.5 m.

Both the width of the room and the fact that it utilized the garden wall suggest that it was a single storey addition. The depth and width of the wall foundations, and again its use of the garden wall, indicate that it was of stone construction. Although two stone slates were found in the demolition of this building, the ubiquitous roof tile debris suggests it was clay tiled. Three lead comes³⁸⁶ were recovered from this structure, although no window glass was found. Although it may have had leaded windows, it is equally likely that the comes may have come from the demolition of the parlour.

There was probably a doorway giving access from the parlour to this room, as it appears to have been part of the domestic range, and this room may have led into the garden. In the western corner of the garden, between the garden wall and the room next to the parlour, was another slight wall foundation running from north-west to south-east, which enclosed an area 2.10 m. by 4.50 m. This rubble stone wall foundation was c. 0.40 m. wide. It might have been another raised flower bed, although it would have been remarkably shady. Alternatively it might have been a lean-to garden shed or perhaps a wood store.

On the south-west side of the manor house, on either side of the porch, there appear to have been enclosed gardens. This would seem quite likely as gardens were commonly designed as extensions to the lady's chamber or bower, and the chapel.³⁸⁷ Documents show that there were usually several gardens among the manorial buildings each with its own fence or hedge.³⁸⁸ Although there was no direct evidence, the gardens on either side of the porch may well have been put down to turf which was then planted with small flowers to make the 'flowery meads' so beloved of the Middle Ages.³⁸⁹

It was suggested above that these gardens may originally have been laid out in Phase 3/1, as there was a gap between the edge of the flint courtyard and the house, which had evidence of a loam infill. There was also some evidence to suggest a contemporary wall dividing the courtyard from this supposed garden. In Phase 4/2 the evidence for the garden walls was much more substantial. A slight stub of a wall (F187) abutted the south-east side of the porch. This wall foundation had a maximum width of 0.30 m. and was constructed on the north-east edge of the courtyard. It appeared to contain a layer of loam (F140) between it, the manor house and chapel, and to judge from the extent of that layer, the garden wall would probably have run up to the side of the dairy (B).

On the other side of the porch the garden wall foundation (F127) was much better preserved. It too was constructed overlying the edge of the courtyard and abutted the eastern corner of the bower, running out to abut the front of the porch. The last 2.25 m. of wall footing had been lost and a posthole (F1054) c. 0.75 m. from the porch wall may well indicate the position of a gate into the garden. These walls also contained a layer of loam (F120).

To the north-west the garden was limited by a small structure (T) which abutted both the bower and the wall of the larger garden to the north-east. Its walls (F271, 1047, 1048) were founded on thin (0.30 m.) rubble foundations. On its south-east side adjacent to the parlour wall were two postholes (F264, 408) which were probably gate posts for an entrance c. 1.0 m. wide. The fact that these were slightly proud of the line of the wall suggests that this structure was an enclosure, rather than a roofed building, associated with the garden. Just over the north-west wall of this enclosure was a dense concentration of oyster and cockle shells (F1049/2).

Two agricultural buildings (H and G) were constructed, apparently as a pair, which effectively divided the farmyard into an inner and outer courtyard. Building H abutted the south-west side of the larder (I) while Building G abutted the north-west side of the large barn (C) thus virtually enclosing the inner courtyard. Although no gatehouse was found to give access to the moated site, the gap between the two structures, which had a well metalled surface (F401) edged on one side with a limestone kerb (F496), almost certainly housed an inner door. There was no evidence that any of the other buildings surrounding the courtyard, with the exception of the larder, were altered in any way during this phase.

Somewhat surprisingly the method of construction of these two buildings appears to have been different. Building G seems to have been of timber-framed construction, resting on narrow rubble dwarf stone walls (F292, 293, 295) which were laid directly on top of the courtyard, as was the case with the barn C. Building H, however, had quite substantial wall foundations (F273, 280, 291, 340) 0.70 m. wide and set in shallow foundation trenches, on top of which the stone wall stepped in to a width of 0.50 m. Although it was conceivable that this latter building replaced an earlier timber-framed structure, there was no evidence to this effect. From the amount of clay roof tile in the demolition debris (F284), both Buildings H and G would appear to have had clay tiled roofs.

Building G contained no floor or occupation levels, the cobbles of the underlying courtyard acting as the internal surface: neither was there any indication of internal partitions. The presence of a pitched-stone hard standing (F294) on the north-east side of the building could indicate that it housed animals. It has also been suggested that the hard standing could have been the base for an external stair giving access to a loft, again implying the presence of animals.

Building H had some internal partitions. The length of wall (F282) which had been constructed in Phase 3/1 and which abutted the larder was retained, and this divided off a bay the same length as the width of the larder, at the north-west end of this barn. There was also a stone-edged and -lined drain (F343) running the length of the bay, which emptied out to the north-west. The presence of this drain indicates that this part, at least, of the building was used to house animals. Two other slight partitions divided the rest of the building into three unequal bays, of 10.8 m., 4.1 m. and 4.8 m. The largest of these may have been subdivided by a timber partition into bays of 4.3 m. and 6.5 m., for two tile packed postholes (F429, 442) were set against the opposite walls of the building. However, the badly disturbed remains of a third posthole (F332) lay 5.5 m. to the south-east of the other two and this would tend to belie the idea that they were partitions.

The north-east wall (F280) of this building was totally lost in front of the two south-east bays and it is possible that it was open fronted at this point. However, part of the side wall was also missing and it may simply have been robbed out. Within this building there was very little evidence of the courtyard that it overlay, unlike the interior of Building G. Only where the north-east wall was missing, and along the inside edge of the south-east wall, did the courtyard encroach into this building. Either the flints were deliberately taken up when this building was constructed or, if it was a byre, the mucking out of the animals over a period of time resulted in the removal of most of them.

Contained within this building was a layer which varied from a light yellowish brown silt loam (F375) at the northern end to an orange sandy loam, with natural iron staining (F417), throughout the rest of the building. The whole building could have been a byre, although if it was really open fronted it may have doubled as a carhouse, as did one of the buildings at Cuxham.³⁹⁰ With the construction of Building H the stone lined pit in the larder (I) probably went out of use, as its opening was now blocked. A floor of grey loam (F350, 380) was laid within the larder which appears to have sealed the backfill of the pit. The small, central tile-on-edge hearth (F352) was possibly constructed at the same time, and this together with the abandonment of the pit could mean that this building was no longer used as a larder.

Phase 5 c. 1458-1485 (Fig. 11)

After the alterations of the late 14th to early 15th century no further changes could be detected archaeologically until Phase 5. The documentary evidence, however, tells us that in 1415 Reynold Barentin inherited the Oxfordshire manor of Haseley Court, Little Haseley, from his wealthy uncle Drew. Within a few decades it had displaced the manor house at Chalgrove as the main Barentin residence. Drew Barentin III, the son of Reynold, was dating deeds from Little Haseley by 1451, and in 1453, the year of his death, he is described as 'of Little Haseley and Chalgrove'. Further evidence of the eclipse of the Chalgrove manor is provided by Drew's will, which implies that services in the chapel there were expected to cease with his widow's death. Drew's son John Barentin may have maintained a household at Chalgrove until his father's death, but by 1458 he was described as 'late of Chalgrove'. Although he was buried in Chalgrove church with his ancestors in 1474, the customary bequest for forgotten tithes was made to Great Haseley church, 'where as I am paryshener'.³⁹¹ Corroborative evidence for the abandonment of the site as a residence was provided by the coinage, none of which was deposited much later than the mid 15th century.³⁹²

Although the site may well have been abandoned as a residence, the farm buildings probably continued to be used. It is possible that some of the domestic buildings were also used for agricultural purposes, as was the case with the timber aisled hall at Church Farm, Lewknor, Oxfordshire which was turned into a barn.³⁹³

Within the manor house there were a few layers which were sandwiched between the limestone rubble of the demolition and the final floor layers, and which may therefore relate to the period 1458-85. In the hall these consisted of a layer of sandy silt loam (F590) with plenty of small mortar, tile and plaster fragments within it, and at the lower end of the hall a layer of redeposited chalk Head (F549). This latter layer

was of interest because it appeared to have been deposited after the removal of the screen, since it was found in both the cross passage and the hall and sealed the 'drain' in the hall. This layer was very similar in composition to a layer (F511, 512) in the adjacent pantry. However, the material in the pantry was piled against the edges of the room rather than laid as a floor layer. It was as if either the existing floor layer had been scraped up and redeposited, or the material intended for a floor layer was dumped and never used. Considering the number of finds that this layer contained, the former is perhaps more likely.

This layer of chalk Head was overlain against the north-east wall of the pantry by a narrow band of carbonised material (F875) which could be traced over the threshold into the wardrobe (see above p). This was the only piece of evidence which suggested that the layer of charcoal fragments which covered the floor area of the wardrobe belonged to the post-residential use of the site.

The majority of the charcoal came from trees aged between 12 and 24 years and appears to have been mainly trimmings from felled standards, too crooked and thin for structural use, in a wood dominated by beech.³⁹⁴ This piece of archaeological evidence is supported by the documentary evidence from Cuxham, which tells us that most of the wood used there came from the Chilterns, and in the four entries where the species was mentioned it was always beech.³⁹⁵ The lack of ash associated with the charcoal within the area of the wardrobe suggests that the material was brought into the room as charcoal, and not as firewood. It may have been used in some small scale metal working on the site after it went out of use as a residence. Fragments of furnace lining material and iron-working slag were found in this phase in the immediate vicinity.³⁹⁶ The hearth or furnace to which they related appears to have been constructed within the garderobe chamber, utilising the partially demolished walls of that structure. Two pieces of worked stone found close by,³⁹⁷ had evidence of burning on them and may have been reused in the construction of a small 'furnace'. The dense concentration of wood ash (F633/6) defined a rectangular area 2.6 m. by 2.0 m. and sealed the robber trench (F641) of the north-east half of the garderobe. There was evidence of what might have been a rake back (F717), which appeared to correspond to the position of a possible outflow from the garderobe. This was the only definite indication that any part of the manor complex was demolished before 1485, because the layer of charcoal in the wardrobe and pantry was later sealed by a layer of limestone rubble (F500, 507).

One structure may have been added in this phase. This was a small rectangular building (Fig. 11, M) which was 4.6 m. by 6.4 m. and of which only the narrow rubble limestone footings (F285, 286, 288, 289) had survived. It was constructed within the north-west end of Building H on the demolition debris from that structure. There was no evidence that Building G was not demolished at the same time as the rest of the curia. Building M was sited in such a way as to suggest that it was built directly after the demolition had occurred. It could be that this timber-framed structure was the culver house or dovecot referred to in the document of 1520 (see below). By the late 15th century the shape of dovecots was changing from round, to square and rectangular structures.³⁹⁸ Evidence of this transition was found at another moated site, Bradwell Bury, Buckinghamshire, and at Waltham Abbey, Essex. At Bradwell Bury, three dovecots were excavated, two of which were circular dating from the 13th to the 15th centuries, while a third was rectangular, 6.0 m. by 4.5 m.

internally, of 16th- to 19th-century date. At Waltham, a circular dovecot of c. 1200 was superseded by a square dovecote in the 15th century.³⁹⁹

Other than Building M there was only one other occurrence of what may have been building work after the demolition of the main structures. This comprised one short length of narrow (c. 0.30 m.) wall foundation (F668) which was constructed on the demolition debris within room A/14 of the manor house, and ran parallel to the garden wall. No other walls or features were associated with this, except for a linear spread of rubble (F592) which ran intermittently northwards and perpendicular to the south-east end of the wall for c. 7.0 m.

The documentary evidence suggests that some or all of the structures may have been dismantled in the early 1480s, with a view to selling the timbers and tiles for re-use to the Abbot of Abingdon.⁴⁰⁰ This incident is one sign of the Barentins' growing financial problems, which culminated in the sale of the old family demesne to Magdalen College in 1485, and the subsequent demolition of the curia.⁴⁰¹

The pottery from the demolition tends to concur with this date. It included a Tudor type mug or jug (P100/0/1), a cooking pot of a style not found before the 15th century in Oxford (P186/1/3), a very narrow necked jug (P518/1/1) and a small bulbous jug (P584/1/1) which may parallel the belly of the 15th-century jug illustrated from the Hamel.⁴⁰²

Phase 6 Post-1485 (Fig. 11)

This phase represents the final activity on the site, and is based largely on the documentary evidence. In 1520 John Quartermain owed 10s rent for a former demesne close 'where the manor stood' and a further 10s for a 'barn and a culver house'. Neither of these two buildings was mentioned in the list of rents of 1485-6, or in 1500 when John Quartermain the elder was paying 10s 'pro claus "voc" Court Close'.⁴⁰³ However, there was no archaeological evidence for the construction of a building as big as a barn after the demolition of the main manorial complex; and while it is possible that such a building could have been lost in the initial machining, equally one of the barns of the curia may have been retained. Of all the structures, the large aisled barn (C) is perhaps the most likely candidate. Its demolition certainly postdated that of the adjacent barn (G). A terrier of c. 1600 includes 'the syte of the manour of Magdalen College in the tenure of Elisabeth Quartermayn, wherapon is a barne, a pigeon house and an orcharde, called Court Hayse'.

When in 1675 Ralph Quartermain surrendered Court Hayes, a customary close of pasture, to the use of Thomas King no mention was made of the two buildings, and they may have been demolished by this date.⁴⁰⁴ While the moats around the edge of the field may have been kept partially clear to act as field drains, those dividing the field were allowed to silt up. Indeed they may have begun to silt up after the house was abandoned for domestic use, as the upper fill of the moats, adjacent to the house, contained much demolition debris among which was a 16th-century skillet. Presumably, fairly soon after the moats silted up, the causeway (F322) was laid across the backfilled moat, near its southern tip, and the stream diverted. By 1822, a map and terrier (Fig. 1) showed no sign of any buildings on Court Hayes, nor of the moats.

→