

THE EXCAVATION OF A POST-MEDIEVAL SITE

AT HERSTMONCEUX CASTLE,

EAST SUSSEX, 1998 - 2003.

NGR: TQ64531037.



Site Code: HC98

Report by Philippa Whitehill MA, PCIFA and David and Barbara Martin; University College London Institute of Archaeology, based on excavations directed by Jenny Compton.

Contributions from Luke Barber (Research Officer, Sussex Archaeological Society), Martin Brown (Principal Archaeologist at WYG Group), Dr. Andrew Woodcock, David Rudling (Sussex School of Archaeology), Lucy Sibun (Archaeology South East), Geoff Egan (Museum of London Archaeology Specialist Services to 2011).

October 2016.

CONTENTS.

List of Figures.

List of Tables.

1.0. Introduction.

2.0. Archaeological and Historical Background.

3.0. Investigative Methodology.

4.0. The Results.

5.0. The Finds.

6.0. Discussion.

7.0. Acknowledgements.

8.0. Bibliography.

FIGURES.

Frontispiece: aerial view of the excavation site from the south west (Monica Pellet and David Mitchell)

Figure 1. Site location

Figure 2. Trench location

Figure 3. Yeakell and Gardner's Sussex: 1778 - 1783

Figure 4. Herstmonceux Parish Tithe Map

Figure 5. 1st Edition Ordnance Survey

Figure 6. 2nd Edition Ordnance Survey

Figure 7. Edition of 1909 Ordnance Survey

Figure 8. Excavation plan

Figure 9. Phase 1 plan

Figure 10. Phase 1a plan

Figure 11. Phase 2 plan

Figure 12. Drain 90/91 plan91

Figure 13. Post Hole sections

Figure 14. Elevations

Figure 15. Elevations

Figure 16. The Pottery

Figure 17. The Polychrome tile and Irish glass

Figure 18. The clay tobacco pipes

Figure 19. The clay tobacco pipes

Figures 20 – 24. The metalwork

TABLES.

1. EAST SUSSEX COUNTY HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RECORD A
2. EAST SUSSEX COUNTY HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RECORD B
3. CONTEXT REGISTER (SEPARATE PDF)
4. POST-MEDIEVAL POTTERY FABRICS
5. QUANTIFICATION OF POTTERY FABRICS FOR CONTEXTS 1, 2 & 129
6. COMPARISON OF SOURCES OF POTTERY FOR CONTEXTS 1, 2 & 129
7. VESSEL FORMS FROM CONTEXT 129
8. BRICK FABRICS
9. TILE FABRICS
10. THE COINS FOUND DURING EXCAVATIONS
11. CHARACTERISATION OF THE METALWORK ASSEMBLAGE
12. QUANTITIES OF NAIL TYPES FROM THE EXCAVATIONS
13. NAIL TYPES FROM CONTEXTS 65 AND 129
14. CHARACTERISATION OF STONE TYPES
15. QUANTIFICATION OF ANIMAL BONE IN TERMS OF NUMBER OF IDENTIFIED SPECIMEN COUNTS (NISP)
16. RELATIVE PERCENTAGE OF THE MAIN DOMESTICATE SPECIES

1.0. INTRODUCTION.

The site, c. 13 metres above sea level is situated on the southern slope of a very shallow valley at the base of a gently sloping field on the western edge of Herstmonceux Castle Park i.e. within the western vale in which Scheduled Monument (1002298) Herstmonceux Castle is located, c. 100 metres to the east (**Figures 1 and 2**).

To the immediate north of the site is a low-lying area which is prone to pooling.

The field is generally used for pasture but once a year is turned into a campsite for the re-enactors participating in the Medieval Fair in the Castle grounds.

The 1:50,000 British Geological Survey, (Sheet 319, Lewes), locates the immediate area of the site and Castle on Tunbridge Wells Sand, at the southern end of a valley stream (indicated by Alluvium), before it feeds into the Pevensey Levels.

In 1996, the Estates department set out to solve the problem of flooding from the field towards the Castle by drain trenching. During this work the remains of brick walling, a section of a brick drain-like feature and an area of demolition rubble were revealed.

As a result of these discoveries, drainage work ceased and subsequent, small scale investigation by consultant archaeologist Peter Leach, on behalf of Stuart Page Architects ensued. Leach (1996), concluded the remains were probably those of a building associated with the Castle. The date of construction could not be determined at that stage however a survey of 1570 recording the presence of an '*old stable, forge and slaughter house*', was thought to relate to these remains. (Leach's full report and accompanying plan forms part of the site archive).

Given this potential and in response to the Leach report, the Estates department invited local archaeologist Jenny Compton to undertake a full excavation of the area in which the remains had been found. With support from the Castle authorities, East Sussex County Council's then County Archaeologist Andrew Woodcock, Castle staff, CCE students and professional archaeologists work began at the site.

Excavations took place between 1998 and 2003 under the directorship of Jenny Compton.

The principal aims of the project can be summarized as follows:

- Prior to excavation, undertake a non – intrusive survey of the area of the previously revealed features to establish their extent.
- Examine, as far as possible the immediate locale of the site to ascertain its role within the landscape.
- Establish the chronology and function of the building and examine any relationship to the Castle itself.

The project was funded through donations from participants and the post-excavation analysis was initiated by Jenny Compton and carried out *gratis* by accepted professionals. Unfortunately, the production of a final excavation report was delayed due to personal reasons.

However, in early 2016 the director of the Herstmonceux Project (www.medieval-environment.com) Steven Bednarski, co-director of medieval studies at St Jerome's University in the University of Waterloo, Ontario reached out to the author with a view to producing a report. Consequently, with help from Jenny Compton and support from colleagues and Steven, this report was made possible.

2.0. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.

The origin and historic development of Herstmonceux Castle and estate has been subject to extensive and detailed consideration since at least the 16th century (William Camden) and more recently by Horsfield, 1834, Calvert and Martin, 1994 and online; www.historicengland.org.uk. As such and until any new information relating to that development comes to light, there is very little to add and need not be discussed in detail here.

However, it is necessary to put the excavations under discussion into an historic and archaeological context and to that end a search was made of the Historic Environment Record and East Sussex Record Office archives, the results of which are discussed below.

2.0.1. The Stable.

There can be little doubt that a manor house of Herstmonceux Castle's standing would have had a stable, along with other buildings providing additional services to those located inside the Castle, from its inception but there is very little evidence as to its location.

It is certain that, prior to drain works revealing brick work and rubble in 1996 there had been no archaeological investigation of the site and indeed, until trial excavations by Leach revealed the north end of the Phase 1 and Phase 1a footprint there was no tangible indication of a building or buildings in the immediate vicinity.

Historical documentation, on the other hand, does offer clues as to the presence of a stable. These originate from early surveys and descriptions of the Castle. The earliest known is from a survey of the estate in 1570: *'there is a lodge covered in with thatch, and a stable very ruinous yn timber and covering, wherein the keeper now lyeth'*, *'There are besides the manor-house of Herstmonceux, other edifices, viz. an old stable, forge and slaughter-house, without the mote'* (excerpts of the account are translated in Parry, 1833).

An inventory made of the castle in 1662 by Francis Lord Dacre (PROB/4/9634), recorded a clock-house, granary, milk-house and a stable along with a list of other service rooms, probably housed within the castle walls.

Further mention of a stable came in 1785 in a description by Francis Grose; *'The left side of the south front, beyond the great gatehouse is occupied by a long waste room, like a gallery in old times, and seems as if intended for a stable'* but as this was written after demolition of the Castle interior in 1777 and (as is interpreted), the demolition of the buildings under discussion in this report, Grose must be referring to another stable.

2.1. The Historic Environment Record locates the site within an area of medieval, post-medieval and modern settlement and (omitting 'monuments' and 'events' predating the medieval and post-dating the 18th century), documents 31 medieval and post-medieval 'monuments' within a 1km radius of the site. The results are briefly described here.

Table 1: The East Sussex County Historic Environment Record A.

HER NO.	GRID REF; TQ	DATE	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION
MES4396	6466 1040	Medieval	Grade I, brick built, crenelated manor-house constructed c. 1441. Guted 1777. Restored 1911 – 1930. Scheduled Monument 1002298
MES31743		Medieval	Designed landscape/ formal parkland. C 12 th century, enlarged 15 th c, reduced 16 th c
MES4398	6427 1018	Medieval	All Saints; 12 th c. parish church of Herstmonceux
MES4399/ MES25441	6393 1107	Post-medieval	Grade I, Herstmonceux Place, c. 1720 country house. Enlarged c. 1777 to designs by Samuel Wyatt
MES4402	6394 1078	Post-medieval	Grade II, late 16 th c. barn at Cherry Croft Farm
MES4412	6408 1070	Post-medieval	Grade II, 18 th century Milland Cottages, Church Road
MES4438	6460 1062	Post-medieval	16 th c. gardens including walled kitchen garden to rear of castle. Grade II*
MES4439	6396 1083	Post-medieval	Grade II, Cherry Croft Farm. House, Church Rd. c. 1735
MES4444	6435 1028	Medieval	Thought to be the deserted medieval Herstmonceux village site (east side of the church), before Roger Fiennes imparked his land.
MES5019	Not given	Post-medieval	Halfway House
MES16725	65111096	Post-medieval/ modern	Quarry called <i>Dry Pond Shaw</i> , formerly <i>Old Pond Shaw</i> of unknown origin but recorded on 1 st ed. Ordnance Survey
MES16726	6500 1082	Medieval(?)	Series of three ponds, possibly header ponds for the castle moat. Called Red Lilly, Snipe and Dry. Appear on Tithe map.
MES20194	6414 1040	Post-medieval	Two parallel, linear features/ crop marks (field boundaries?) at Milland Farm
MES20195	6414 1057	Post-medieval	17 th c. farm complex at Milland Farm. Church Road

MES20196	6413 1062	Post-medieval	Grade II, 17 th c. Milland farmhouse
----------	-----------	---------------	---

MES20197	6422 1051	Post-medieval	Cleavers Lyng, Church Farm; 18 th century building
MES20198	Not given	Post-medieval	Milland farm; earthworks of a possible watermill
MES21190	6406 1066	Medieval	Church Farm; c. 13 th artefact scatter
MES21191	6389 0993	Post-medieval	Church Farm; high concentration of un-stratified roof tiles
MES21192	6547 1005	Post-medieval	Grade II, Well House, Wartling; 17 th c. or earlier timber-framed building
MES22150	6429 1000	Post-medieval	Grade II, c. 16 th century Church Farmhouse, Church Road
MES25259	6407 1071	Post-medieval	18 th century, 1 Milland Cottage
MES29001	6426 1002	Post-medieval	Church Farm Cottage, Church Rd; late post-medieval pit and artefacts
MES29353	646 100	Post-medieval	Site of brickyard to the east of Herstmonceux Castle
MES29533	6426 1001	Post-medieval	Church Farm Cottage, Church Road; building
MES32768	Not given	Medieval	Cherry Croft Farmstead
MES32779	Not given	Post-medieval	Milland Farmstead; partially extant 17 th c
MES32780	Not given	Medieval	Church Farm Farmstead; partially extant

2.2. The East Sussex County Historic Environment Record also documents a total of 16 archaeological ‘events’ within a 1km radius of Herstmonceux Castle. These are tabulated below.

Table 2. The East Sussex County Historic Environment Record B.

HER NO.	GRID REF; TQ	ADDRESS	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION
EES13934	64691012	Grounds of Herstmonceux Castle	Watching Brief; Reed beds Evidence for possible historic clay extraction, prehistoric flint flake and single sherd of post- medieval pot
EES14357	6460010300	Herstmonceux Castle	Desk Based Assessment An architectural and archaeological assessment of Castle
EES16167/ EES16171/ EES16173/ EES14428	65281048	Grounds of Herstmonceux Castle	Evaluation; Geophysical and archaeological Pre-historic flintwork, Romano-British artefacts and features, post-medieval artefacts and plough ruts
EES16168	65201090	Dental Plain; Herstmonceux Castle Estate	Walkover survey Prehistoric flintwork, post-medieval ceramic building material, medieval to modern pottery
EES16170	6536810725	Plantation Wood; Herstmonceux Castle Estate	Standing remains survey and small-scale excavation of rubbish pit at RAF Wartling domestic ‘B’ site Utilitarian ceramic and tableware from 1939 – late 1940s
EES16172	652104	Meteorological Enclosure; Herstmonceux Castle grounds	Evaluation; Geophysical and archaeological No features of archaeological significance Two fragmentary sherds of medieval/ post-medieval pottery
EES17210	64261001	Church Farm cottage	Standing building survey Three 19 th c. buildings, two of which are knocked into one, the third demolished

EES17250	64271016	All Saints Church	<p>Watching Brief</p> <p>Cutting of drain and fuel pipe trench and cesspool tank trench in graveyard.</p> <p>Three un-marked brick vaults revealed.</p> <p>Post-medieval clay tobacco pipe and coffin iron</p>
EES17272	64261002	Church Farm Cottage	<p>Watching Brief</p> <p>Extension footings</p> <p>Nothing of archaeological significance</p>
EES16732	64071071	1 Milland Cottages	<p>Standing buildings survey</p> <p>ROHAS no. 722 (Rape of Hastings Architectural Surveys, HBR archives of D & B Martin, 1967 – 2007. East Sussex Record Office)</p>
EES16916	63921107	Herstmonceux Place	<p>Standing buildings survey</p> <p>ROHAS no. 977</p>
EES9263/ EES4393	65001040	Meteorological Enclosure, Herstmonceux Castle Grounds	<p>Construction of Enclosure in 1950s.</p> <p>Romano-British cremation cemetery</p>

2.3. The Cartographic evidence.

Copies of the following historic maps and plans held at the East Sussex Records Office, Falmer have also been examined.

- Herstmonceux and Old Court Survey by Samuel Crouch, 1683 – 1684. ESRO XA 18/1
- Yeakell and Gardner's Survey of Sussex, 1778 – 1783; 2 inch to 1 mile (www.envf.port.ac.uk (Figure 3))
- Preliminary drawings for the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey, 1805. ESRO AMS 6008 2/1/4, 2" to 1 mile
- Tithe map of the parish of Herstmonceux, 1839. ESRO TD/E39 (Figure 4)
- 25" Ordnance Survey (Sheet 56/15), 1874 (Figure 5)
- 25" Ordnance Survey (Sheet 56/15), 1899 (Figure 6)
- 25" Ordnance Survey (Sheet 56/15), 1909 (Figure 7)

2.3.1. The field in which the site is located and the Castle are recorded on all of the maps listed above apart from the 17th century survey by Samuel Crouch, undertaken for the 8th Lord Dacre, Thomas Lennard; the survey only documents his assets in the manors of Herstmonceux and nearby Wartling, the Castle and grounds are not included, which is unfortunate as it was created when the Phase 1 and 1a buildings were constructed/in use.

Yeakell and Gardner's survey (Figure 3), clearly shows what looks like a range, of some sort leading north from the southwest corner of the Castle and as this survey was undertaken within five years of the demolition in 1777 of the Castle interior, can we conclude that they represent service buildings of a sort?

The preliminary drawings created for the 1st series Ordnance Survey in 1805 are fairly simplistic as far as the Castle and Park are concerned; recording the park pale with the castle and ponds feeding the moat within, along with areas of woodland and a smattering of trees.

A more detailed representation of the castle and its setting is provided by the Tithe map of 1839 (Figure 4). The area of the site is clearly devoid of buildings and its surroundings not so much a field (as it is today), as a series of demarcated portions of land which are described on the Tithe Apportionment as '*Church Hill*', pasture; plot no. 1607, '*Old Hop Garden*', arable; plot nos. 1659 and 1683 and '*Castle Meadow*', pasture; plot no. 1769.

The Tithe partitioning of '*Church Hill*' is not recorded on the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey of 1874 (Figure 5). Instead there are clearly marked, criss-crossing footpaths, of which one is considered to be a principal approach route, from the church to the castle since at least the survey of 1570 (Parry, 1833) and is today known as Flamsted Road. Also recorded is a clump of growth (trees or otherwise) in the broad area of the site.

The same details appear on the following 2nd Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1899 and Edition of 1909.

3.0. INVESTIGATIVE METHODOLOGY.

Following the initial discovery the Estates department placed a fence around the site.

In accordance with recommendations made by Leach in 1996, a geophysical survey was undertaken by Martin Brown (East Sussex County Council's then Assistant County Archaeologist), over a 6 m by 20 m area encompassing the known features. Unfortunately, the survey results were inconclusive but form part of the site archive.

As a consequence, a programme of archaeological excavation was implemented. The turf and topsoil was removed using mattocks and shovels and the removed material was deposited 2 m to 3 m to the east of the excavation area which remained the spoil heap location throughout.

Over the ensuing five years the site was excavated and cleaned using trowels, buckets and hand shovels.

A Temporary Bench Mark was transferred from a Bench Mark at the Estates office at the top of the hill in which the site is located to a drain cover a few metres north of the site.

All revealed deposits, features, cuts and fills were given a separate context number, recorded on individual context sheets and in the main were levelled with respect to the Temporary Bench Mark.

The site was planned at a 1:20 scale and all sections, profiles and elevations drawn to a 1:10 and 1:20 scale on drafting film.

A photographic record was maintained throughout excavations using analogue photography.

A systematic metal detector survey of the field surrounding the site (**Figure 2**), was undertaken in 2001 by Kate Pickering and Mike Smith of the 'Surrey Searchers'. The distribution plots of the objects found and a full listing of them is available as part of the archive.

All the finds were sorted and processed during the winter months and temporarily stored in various estate buildings prior to specialist assessment.

4.0. THE RESULTS.

4.1. Geophysical surveys.

The results of the resistivity survey undertaken before excavation were inconclusive, therefore there is no need to expand on it.

4.2. Metal detector survey.

This survey yielded a mixed assemblage of material from the topsoil only. Whilst a proportion of the finds date from the 18th to 20th century and most probably relate to agricultural activity and more recent use of the field as a campsite, the concentration of 17th century items retrieved undoubtedly relates to activity associated with the excavated buildings.

A particularly prolific area, to the immediate west of the site, possibly a continuation of a midden spread (Context 129, discussed below), produced significant parts of one or more metal bridal fixings of probable 17th century date. These are illustrated on **Figure 23: metal illustrations nos. 16a, 17a, 18a, 19, 20a, 21a, 22a**. A description of these is presented in *THE FINDS*.

4.3. Excavation (Figure 8).

At the start of excavations, the area previously opened during drain works and limited excavation in 1996 was cleared of overgrowth to reveal, in the main, the north end of the Phase 2 building and evidence for the Phase 1 and 1a building below it. The north end of the underlying Phase 1 structure had been scoured out, probably during initial trenching.

Extending this initial 'trench' east, west and southwards led to exposing the complete structures.

By the close of excavation in 2003 a total of 236 contexts had been recorded (**Table 3**), in general below two topsoil overburdens (contexts 1 and 2), with a combined thickness of c. 0.45 m at the north end of the site and c. 0.16 m at the southern end where the overburden consisted solely of topsoil (Context 1).

The remaining contexts included the walls of three phases of loosely north – south aligned buildings, presenting as *in-situ* brick foundations and robbed out trenches and associated cuts, fills, layers, post holes, drains, some above and some cutting into the interpreted 'natural' geology.

The demolition rubble deposits 'sandwiched' between the overburdens and structural contexts comprised shallow spreads/ layers of brick and roof tile, mortar and sparse small finds located in patches across the site (such as Contexts 7 and 42 shown on **Figure 8**). These deposits ranged in thickness between 50 mm to 0.15 m and in general overlay some of the foundations of the excavated buildings.

Four additional deposits not quite falling into the above category were also located below contexts 1 and 2; spreads of burning and ceramic building material (hereafter CBM); Contexts 65, 66, predominantly midden material; Context 129 and discarded CBM/ collapsed masonry; Context 162. These were generally separated from the underlying features and located along the east and west edges of the site, 'outside' the buildings.

All of the spreads produced quantities of late 17th to early 18th century artefacts; both Contexts 65 and 129 produced, in the main, large numbers of nails (**Figure 20, nos. 1a-c, 2a-b, 3a-c**), general equestrian accessories and pottery mixed in with burnt material. Context 66, immediately to the north of (65) and probably a continuation of the latter, but divided/truncated by post hole (67), also produced metal finds. The fourth, fairly extensive spread, Context 162 at the north-west corner of the site, partially overlying walls (144) and (166) produced an assemblage of metal finds. Context 7 consisted of demolition rubble and (42) was a layer of crushed brick.

Contexts 65, 66 and 162 were confined within the excavation trench, Context 129, however, was seen to continue westwards into the surrounding field from the trench baulk. This interpretation of the extent of the latter was based in part on the metal detecting survey revealing, in the vicinity, the remains of a discarded, probable 17th century bridle within an associated 'tight scatter of copper-alloy buckles and leather decorations' (Barber 2003). This context also produced a pottery assemblage dominated by mid – late 17th to early 18th century earthenware jars and German Stoneware (**Figure 16, nos. 1 – 8**) and the bulk of animal bone from the site (**5.8.**).

The remains of five, predominantly brick built drains (**Contexts 4, 11/ 39/14, 90, 110 and 154/ 139**), were also revealed; three within the buildings, one partially within but continuing outside the eastern extent of the site and one to the north of the Phase 2 structure and all are discussed in more detail below. It is presumed that these features would have carried fluids from the interiors of the buildings with the exception of the large east – west aligned drain (90) at the north end of the Phase 2 building which, it has been suggested, may have stored water (**4.4.3.**).

4.4. An Interpretation of the excavated buildings by David and Barbara Martin (with minor additions by Philippa Whitehill). (*The phasing report was produced in 2003 and submitted to East Sussex Record Office (HBR 1/1492). This report is reproduced here, in full by kind permission of the authors David and Barbara Martin.*)

(A more 'technical' description of the excavated foundations and drains, arranged phase by phase by David and Barbara Martin forms part of the site archive).

4.4.1. Phase I (Probably mid/late 17th or early 18th c), (**Figure 8 and 9**).

Measuring c. 19.85 m long by 6.50 m wide, the earliest structure located by the excavations was a rectangular building, in the main represented by the below-ground foundations of three walls; to the east, west and south (Contexts 3, 112/ 113/ 156, 196, 197; **Figures 8 and 9**). Of the north wall nothing remains (**4.3.**) but its alignment can be interpreted by the northern end of the west wall and the north wall of the Phase 1a building.

In order to compensate for the south to north fall of the site, the base of the foundations trenches incorporate brickwork steps, thus the below floor brickwork increased in height towards the north end of the building.

Both the east and west walls (Contexts 3 and 112) survive in part along their course and are fully bonded to the southern wall (Contexts 196 and 197).

The scant remains of a brick partition/ cross wall (Context 26), straight jointed to the east wall and located roughly halfway along the length suggests the ground-floor internal space was divided into two rooms. Midway along the east elevation, issuing from the external wall face immediately to the south of the partition, was found a brick-built drain (Context 4), heading north-eastwards towards the low ground. Whether this drained the interior of the building via a dished gulley in the floor and an outlet through the brick wall, or served a gutter collecting rainwater from the roof is unclear, for the floor and upper levels of the foundation walls had been destroyed at this point. A second drainage channel of similar construction (Context 110), is clearly located within the southern room, aligned parallel to the western wall, draining northwards. The southern end of the drain survives and is located c. 6 metres, to the north of the southern wall's internal face. Although the northern end has all but disappeared, it is possible to see on the ground a faint trace of its progress extending northwards, possibly for the length of the building, where it is presumed it would have issued out through the north wall to the low land beyond.

Little information on the ground survives to indicate doorways but there were two discrete 'breaks' towards the north end of the east and west walls that may point to these being possible locations for them.

Internally the floor levels were at least partially made up in order to compensate for the slope of the site, though whether this was sufficient to give a completely level floor is unclear. Only in the south-western corner of the southern room does anything of the Phase 1 floor survive, and even this is restricted to a small spread of mortar (context 198), presumably the bedding for some form of paved surface.

The below-ground brickwork increases in width towards the base, stepping out on both faces. Although no walls survive above original floor level, parts of the substructure walls do stand above the original external ground surface, giving an indication of the thickness of the ground-floor superstructure walls.

At ground-floor level both the eastern and western side walls measure 380 mm in width, being one-and-a-half bricks thick. Thus the walls are not overly sturdy for a building of this size, though there could be a number of reasons for this. It could be an indication of the late date of the building (the thickness of brick walls tend to be reduced in later periods, or it may indicate that the structure was single storeyed, or that the walls supported a timber frame with its soleplate located either just above floor level or at first-floor level. Which of these was the case is now impossible to tell. That the thickness was not influenced by economy is suggested by the southern end wall (Contexts 196 and 197), which at approximate floor level is twice the thickness of the side walls, measuring three-bricks (820 mm) wide. One explanation for this thickness of the south wall may be that, whereas the side walls were either totally or partially timber framed, the end gable was of brick for its full height - an arrangement seen in some standing buildings of the late 17th – early 18th c. Of particular significance is the fact that the surviving above-ground brickwork in the west elevation is laid in Flemish bond - an expensive bond used for display - whilst that in the east elevation is in English bond. Where this variation in bond is seen in surviving buildings of the period, the more expensive Flemish bond is always found within the principal facade. Thus, although it is the east elevation which faces the castle - albeit the service side of the castle - it would appear that it was the west elevation (and perhaps the south elevation too) which was visible at close quarters by people of status/ importance. There are other indications which reinforce this impression (see Phase 2 below). However, it should be stressed that so little of the above-ground eastern wall survives that it is possible that the wall reverted to Flemish bond at a slightly higher level, and thus the apparent variation may be misleading.

Although the east and south walls met without a buttress, the southern end of the west elevation is scarred where a substantial (610 mm wide) westward projection, was cut off during construction of the Phase 1a additions (**Figure 9**). In all probabilities this projection took the form of a buttress. An alternative interpretation may be that it supported the southern end of a first-floor jetty which extended along the west elevation. Against this is the likely late date of the building - Flemish-bonded brickwork was not introduced until the early 17th century, and was used only occasionally before the late 17th century, which is too late for the use of a jetty. With this in mind, the possibility that the extant brickwork represents later underbuilding and a later added brick gable to a once fully-timber framed building cannot be ruled out - the new brickwork would have totally destroyed the earlier walls upon the same alignment.

4.4.2. Phase 1a (probably early 18th c), (Figure 8, 10 & 14)

Phase 1a represents a period of enlargement at which date the projecting buttress/pier at the southern end of the west elevation of Phase 1 was removed and the building was widened by approximately 4.00 m along the full length of its west elevation. Although the east-west span of the extension is not great, it is nonetheless too wide to represent the addition of a lean-to outshut. Even so, it would seem to be too narrow to be covered by a roof aligned parallel with that of the earlier main range. It would therefore be unwise to suggest a likely period-1a roof layout.

A further modification carried out as part of the Phase 1a works was the 'refacing' or remodelling of the south elevation (Contexts 193, 194 and 195), presumably to give a unified front to the building when viewed from the main entrance road leading to the Castle. However, this new facade to the existing part did not appear to take the form of a simple refacing, but the planting-on of a further two-and-a-half brick (600 mm) thickness of wall. Given that the southern wall of the new addition was even more massive in its construction - being three-bricks or 765 mm wide - and that the overall thickness of the combined Phase 1 and -1a southern wall measures approximately 1.40 m, the likelihood must be that the Phase 1 southern wall was entirely demolished to floor level and the new Phase 1a wall carried through at a consistent 765 mm thickness, partially oversailing the southern edge of the earlier foundation.

Evidence to support this is that along a large part of its length the northern face of the Phase 1 foundation has been roughly hacked away, though it should be stressed that the date at which this occurred is unknown.

As with the Phase 1 south wall, the western end of the Phase 1a south wall (Context 193, **Figure 8 and 10**), likewise projects slightly proud of the west elevation to form a shallow, but wide buttress (also Context 193). With this phase, too there is no corresponding projection at the eastern end of the wall, nor at the north-western corner. There are other similarities between the Phase 1 and Phase 1a work in that there is a similar variation in wall thicknesses - despite the 765 mm thickness of the south wall's superstructure, the surviving upper levels of the west and north foundations measure only 380 mm wide, or one-and-a-half bricks, though as with the south wall they do step out below ground level to give a slightly greater width (as is normal practice in 17th century and later walls). The base of the foundations step down quite steeply towards the north-western corner in order to take account of the rapid fall in ground level at this corner of the building (**Figure 14; elevation 1**). Lying on the low-level ground surface in this area is a tumbled fragment of the superstructure wall from the west elevation (Context 162, **Figure 8**). Rather than one-and-a-half bricks thick, it measures only one-brick thick (240 mm) probably suggesting that it originated from the first-floor level. Walls of this period often reduce in width on the internal face at the level of the first-floor joists, though the one-brick thickness at this level suggests an 18th, rather than an earlier date for this phase. The wall fragment is built in English bond, as too are the fair-faced above-ground external elevations of the north and west foundations. Below the tumbled superstructure walling is a thick destruction layer of tile also Context 162), indicating that the roofs were clad in clay plain tiles.

No information could be recovered regarding the location of doorways giving access to the Phase 1A building but that might be due to the possible doorways of Phase 1 still being in use.

Internally the extension contains two isolated fragments of one-brick internal partition and two fragments of drain (Contexts 139, 157, 131 and 154 respectively, **Figure 8 and 10**). Both sections of partition are aligned north-south and positioned to give a passage-like area to the west, and a stall-like area to the east. They do not, however, align precisely with one another and are therefore unlikely to be fragments of the same wall. A little to the east of, and running parallel with the southern section of partition are the remains of a brick-lined drain (Context 154), with a main fall towards the low ground to the north of the building. Only a relatively short length of drain survives, the sections to north and south having been destroyed by the west wall of the Phase 2 building.

Being a brick-sided drain (rather than a scoop in the floor) it was presumably intended to be covered, perhaps by some form of capping(?), with the floor running over it. To the east are the slight remains of what appears to be a spur drain (Context 131), extending up to the Phase 1 western wall.

4.4.3. Phase 2 (Probably mid. 18th c), (Figures 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15).

Rather than carry out further improvements to the existing building, during phase 2 the entire Phase 1 and Phase 1a structure was demolished down to ground level and rebuilt upon roughly the same site, but displaced slightly to the south and east.

4.4.3.1. Construction of the Phase 2 building.

A number of post holes (coloured pink on **Figure 8**), were revealed aligned north – south on the east side of the site, parallel with the eastern wall of the Phase 2 building at a distance of approximately 900-1000mm from it, east - west along the south side of the site (parallel to Context 201) and north - south alongside the Phase 2 west wall/ Context 118. These are distinct from post holes (28), (30), (32), (34), (43), (61), (101), (105), (107) and (211), interpreted as relating to internal structures (see below). Samples of the two types of post hole are illustrated on **Figure 13**.

The pink coloured post holes typically measured c. 0.5 m by 0.4 m, ranged in depth between 0.20 m to 0.5 m and contained a fill of pink coloured clay; either 'lining' the internal face of /capping the post holes or mixed in with rubble soil. The southern and western groups are fewer in number than those on the eastern side of the building but it is unclear as to why this should be so. The eastern alignment is set at centres which measure on average 2.10-2.40 m apart. It is almost certain all pink post hole alignments relate to scaffolding needed for the construction of the Phase 2 building.

The scaffolding post holes are indicated in **Figure 8**, but bearing in mind that the holes probably relate to the construction (rather than occupation) phase, they are omitted from the outline reconstruction plan of **Figure 11**.

4.4.3.2. The new building took the form of a double-pile rectangular block with the two ends of the west elevation pulled forward in the form of slightly projecting wings. When this building was itself subsequently demolished the foundation of the central spine wall (Context 19/ 51), was retained in situ, but the foundations of all other walls (Contexts, 40, 75, 118, 201), with the exception of fragments of northern buttresses, were totally grubbed up and are thus evidenced today by robber trenches only. It is therefore impossible to obtain precise dimensions. Approximate external dimensions are 20.8 m long north-south, with a south elevation of c. 12.5 m and a north elevation of c. 13.10 m.

The northern and southern wings (located midway along Context 118), which project from the west elevation each measure approximately 6.2-6.4 m wide north-south, with the central set-back section between them measuring c. 8.3 m long. To judge from the robber trenches, the wings did not project the same distance - the southern wing was brought forward of the central section by approximately 600 mm; the northern by approximately 800 mm.

The spine wall running through the building north-south is set centre span of the building's width taken across the recessed central section. Apart from the spine wall, no clear evidence of internal

partitions was found, though two rows of post holes aligned north-south along the centre line of each of the east (Contexts 28, 30, 32, 34, 43, 61 and 211) and west (Contexts 101, 105 and 107), (**Figure 8 and 13: nos. 5 - 8**), parts may indicate posts set beneath spine beams.

Positioned at approximately 1.3-1.6 m (4'3"-5'3") centres, they may have delineated stall divisions. However, it should be stressed that their allocation to phase 2 is based solely upon their relationship to this building - they could date from Phase 1: if so, they are likely to be associated with scaffolding.

Curiously, the spine wall sits upon a foundation made up of two rows of reused sections of Phase 1 or Phase 1a mortar-bonded brick wall (Contexts 168 and 169), mostly one-and-a-half-bricks wide, three- to four-courses high, and ranging in length from 0.4 m to 1 m (**Figure 14; elevation 2**). Overall they give a foundation which measures 750 mm wide, although the western edge is in places very ragged due to the reuse of some one-brick, rather than one-and-a-half-brick wide sections within the western half. The reused sections of wall are neatly laid into the trench, but are not mortar-bonded together. Although this arrangement sounds structurally unsound, the surviving sections of new brickwork which it supports show no signs of settlement or cracking. Sufficient of the superstructure of the Phase 2 spine wall survives to indicate that it measured 650 mm wide at its base. However, being slightly below floor level the faces may have stepped in above this point to give a superstructure wall of slightly less width - even so, it is unlikely to have been less than two bricks in width.

As with the earlier phases, little or no information could be recovered regarding the location of doorways giving access to the Phase 2 building.

The only other sections of Phase 2 brickwork to remain are buried fragments of buttresses built against the northern face of the north wall (**Figure 12**). These were left in situ, but isolated, when the foundation of the northern wall (within robber trench/ context 40), itself was grubbed out to its full depth. At this point a wide drain/ sunken area of paving (Contexts 90 and 91, **Figure 12**) (considered contemporaneous with the Phase 2 building), extended along the external (north) face of the wall. Thus, for more than twelve courses of its height (and perhaps as many as twenty courses) the base of the north wall of the Phase 2 building doubled as a retaining wall for the drain.

No evidence survived to suggest what the primary use of the drain/ sunken area of paving was, but it is possible that it was used as a retainer for liquid (water storage?). If this were the case, the constant state of damp against the north wall and the weight of earth behind it (i.e. below ground level within the building) would have necessitated a method of strengthening: hence the need for the buttresses.

The most complete of the buttresses (Context 184 **Figure 12 and 15: elevation 4**), revealed in full below rubble backfill/Context 55, is located towards the centre of the north wall. It is two-bricks (500 mm) wide and projects by 630 mm at its base. The front face of the buttress steps in slightly at each course, so that thirteen courses above the base (at its greatest extant height) it projects by only c240 mm from the projected face of the wall. Thus, by floor level the buttress would have battered back to nothing. Both this buttress and the remains of that at the north-western corner (Context 205), incorporate a small drainage opening through their base (**Figure 12 and 15; elevations 3 and 4**). The buttresses at the north-eastern end of the wall had been totally robbed, but the system of drainage below them remains in situ, matching that at the north-western end (**Figure 12**).

Prior to demolition of the building, the drain/paved area (90)/(91), had been backfilled up to ground level (Context 55), at which time a narrow drain with stone slab base was formed over the earlier brick paving. This reused the openings in the buttresses. A second method of drainage was noted: a series of small 'gullies' (Contexts 170, 172, 176, 178, 180, 229, 232; **Figure 12**), randomly spaced (north-south aligned) along the bottom of the brick paved area, the most complete of which was located at the north western end of the big drain area, below Context 205. It is unclear whether they were dug in just prior to the backfilling of the drain/ paved area or were there when it was open and in use, but when discovered it was obvious that they had remained open and in use beneath the backfill as they appeared not to have been filled in.

It is interesting to note that one 'gully' (Context 232), abutting the west side of the most complete buttress (Context 184), appeared to be lined with timber (Context 233 **Figure 12**). The timber was concave in section. The other 'gullies' did not contain similar linings, but pieces of timber were excavated from the area around them.

The remains of further drains were found within the building (**Figure 8 and 11**). The principal of these had been entirely robbed out and was only evidenced by its impression in the ground (Context 14). It ran northwards down the centre of the eastern of the building's two halves, slightly offset towards the east of the 'room'. A spur drain (Context 11/39), extends westwards from it, as far as the central spine wall. This survives in far better condition and has a brick base and half-brick side walls which survive to a height of one course only. The internal width of the drain is 280-320 mm. At the extreme western end, hard against the spine wall, the base is formed by a large slab of stone. Whether this was placed here to avoid subsidence of the drain's base where it was laid over the backfill to the foundation trench, or to avoid erosion at the base of a downpipe draining the central valley of the building, is unknown. As with the Phase 1 and -1a brick-built drains, both of these drains were almost certainly capped by cover slabs with the floor running continuously over them. There are likely to have been other drains, but, like the floors, these have not survived.

5.0. THE FINDS.

Nine classes of finds were retrieved during excavation at the site, the largest groups being metalwork and CBM. The majority were dated to the 17th and 18th centuries with background scatters of earlier (pottery) and later (pottery and metal) finds and the best indicator as to the function of the building is represented by a large quantity of equestrian related metalwork.

Very little material was found within 'secure' or 'sealed' contexts, instead most of it originated predominantly from topsoil Contexts 1 and 2 or demolition and rubbish dump layers located above the walls of all phases of buildings.

However, it must be highlighted that, as a consequence of the ruin and subsequent dismantling of the Castle during the latter part of the 18th century, not all the finds will have originated from or relate to the site but could have originated from the Castle instead.

The specialist finds reports are reproduced in full below.

5.1. The Pottery by Luke Barber (Figures 16 & 17).

5.1.1. Introduction

The excavations at the site produced a relatively small assemblage of pottery: 955 sherds weighing just over 7.2kg from 68 individually numbered contexts. The pottery spans the Roman period to the 19/20th century, though most can be placed between the 17th and early 18th centuries.

The condition of the assemblage is poor. The pottery is generally, but not exclusively, present as small abraded sherds. Even the harder-fired wares such as the stoneware, although resistant to abrasion, are usually represented by small sherds, rarely measuring more than 30mm across and frequently measuring less than 20mm across. The assemblage from the site comes mainly from the overburden deposits (Contexts 1 and 2 respectively) or 'loosely' stratified layers and spreads lying directly below the topsoil. The assemblages from cut features are small and difficult to date closely. Many of the groups contain small amounts of intrusive or residual material and few totally secure contexts are present.

The main aims of the pottery analysis were to characterize the assemblage; help date the excavated building and, if possible, shed light on the building's function.

All the studied pottery was divided into fabric groups based on a visual examination, using a hand-lens where necessary, of tempering, inclusions and manufacturing technique. All the fabric groups were allocated a number (see below) to enable ease of recording on pro-forma. The fabrics were also assigned a probable source. These consist of: local (potentially made in East Sussex or just across the county), regional/English (wares coming from further afield, including the south-east and other areas respectively) and imports (wares from abroad). Each fabric was subsequently quantified by sherd count and weight for each context. This information, along with spot dates for all contexts, is housed with the archive. Quantification based on Estimated Vessel Equivalents (EVEs) or form was not considered appropriate due to the small size of the assemblages.

Although associated groups are generally small and the problem of residuality/ intrusiveness significant, the assemblage from the site as a whole is of interest as the first of any size to be studied for the Castle, albeit of the post-medieval rather than late medieval period.

5.1.2. The Fabric Series (Table 4; numbers and weight quoted are combined figures for all contexts)

Romano-British

Only three heavily abraded sherds of Romano-British pottery are present, all residual in post-medieval contexts. All are in East Sussex Ware and probably derive from manuring of the land during this period.

Medieval

Surprisingly only eight medieval sherds were located. As with the Roman material, all the sherds are small and are likely to be the result of manuring. Fabrics include flint, sand and flint and sand tempered wares of the late 12th to 14th centuries. One sherd of harder-fired fine sand-tempered ware may be 15th century. All sherds appear to be residual in post-medieval contexts.

Post-medieval Wares

Table 4: the post-medieval pottery fabrics.

Fabric No.	Description and origin	Date
1	Medium-fired, sandy earthenware (32/335g). Dull orange – brick red, very fine sparse sand and occasional iron ore inclusions. Local	16 th – 17 th
2	Hard-fired, sandy earthenware: reduced (17/124g). Tempered with moderate fine/ medium sand, unglazed. Local	Late 15 th to 16 th / early 17 th
3	Hard-fired, very fine sandy earthenware – oxidised (4/58g). Tempered with very sparse, fine sand giving a slightly rough texture. Unglazed. Local	16 th – 17 th
4	Hard-fired, very fine sandy earthenware – reduced (6/36g). Similar to F3. Local	16 th – 17 th
5	Hard-fired, sand – free earthenware – oxidised (17/190g). Tempered with very sparse/ fine sand. Smooth. Some rare inclusions of chalk to 1mm. Local	16 th – 17 th
6	Hard-fired, sand – free earthenware – reduced (161/1,238g). Similar to F5. Local	Mid 16 th – 17 th
7	Hard-fired earthenware with thin/ patchy green glaze (8/80g). Local	Mid 16 th - 17 th
8	Medium-fired earthenware with green glaze, (19/156g). Good	Mid 16 th – 17 th

	even internal dull glaze. Local	
9	Hard-fired earthenware with clear/ red-brown glaze (Redware), (29/132g). Local	16 th – 17 th
10	Medium-fired earthenware with clear/ red-brown glaze (Redware), (29/132g). Local	Mid/ late 16 th – 17 th
11	Medium-fired earthenware with clear/ red-brown glaze (Redware) (4/78g). Chronological development of F10, better made with good, even, rich glaze. Local	Mid 17 th – 18 th
12	Hard-fired earthenware with thin/ patchy metallic glaze. (22/89g). Local	16 th – 17 th
13	Medium-fired earthenware with thick, even metallic glaze, (16/139g). Generally thicker and more even glaze than F12. Local	Mid/ late 16 th – early 18 th
14	Hard-fired earthenware with thick, even ‘sparkling’ metallic glaze, (44/259g). Similar to F13 but with notable ‘sparkle’ in light. Local	Mid/ late 16 th to early 17 th
15	Medium-fired earthenware with thick, even ‘sparkling’ metallic glaze, (74/357g). Local	Early 17 th to early/ mid 18 th
16	Yellow-glazed Whiteware, (30/334g). Medium-fired fine white to pinkish earthenware without visible temper but rare inclusions of possibly chalk(?). Borderware copy(?). Regional	Mid/ late 16 th – 17 th
17	Borderware; yellow-glazed whiteware (5/27g). Regional	Mid/ late 16 th – 17 th
18	Borderware; green-glazed whiteware, (3/59g). Regional	Mid/ late 16 th – 17 th
19	German stoneware; Cologne/ Frechen (251/2136g). Import	Late 16 th – 17 th
20	German stoneware; Westerwald, (4/20g). Import	Mid. 17 th - mid.18 th
21	English stoneware; London, (4/150g). Regional	Late 17 th – mid 18 th
22	German stoneware; Hessian Crucibles, (3/24g). Hard/vitrified grey warty, unglazed. Import	16 th – 17 th
23	Staffordshire combed slipware (6/109g). English	Mid/ late 17 th – mid. 18 th
24	Tin-glazed earthenware, (146/629g). Mainly plain, some painted.	17 th – mid 18 th

	Regional/ English	
25	Trailed slipware, (1/1g). Similar to Metropolitan slipware. Regional	17 th – early 18 th
26	Refined earthenware with black glaze, (1/8g). Thin walled, dark red earthenware with thick black all-over glaze. English	18 th
27	Saintonge Green and Brown, (1/2g). Probably from a costrel. Import	16 th – 17 th
28	Staffordshire white salt-glazed stoneware (6/23g). English	18 th
29	Creamware, (2/2g). English	Mid 18 th – early 19 th
30	Yellow ware, 2/3g). English	Late 18 th – 19 th
31	Industrial slipware, (1/1g). English	19 th
32	Transfer-printed ware and ‘plain’ china, (5/5g). English	19 th

5.1.3. The Pottery Groups

The site produced only three sizable groups: Contexts 1, 2 and 129. The first two contained material probably relating to the buildings. The latter is from a spread of waste, stratified but not closed, below the topsoil. The groups from Contexts 1 and 2 were combined and the percentages of the different fabrics within them compared with the composition of the group from 129 (**Table 5**).

Fabric	Contexts 1 & 2 combined				Context 129			
	No. of sherds	%	Weight (grams)	%	No. of sherds	%	Weight (grams)	%
Medieval	1	0.4	1g	0.1	-	-	-	-
F1	7	2.9	54g	2.8	2	0.7	14g	0.7
F2	7	2.9	52g	2.7	3	1.1	26g	1.2
F3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
F4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
F5	3	1.3	26g	1.3	5	1.8	54g	2.6
F6	32	13.4	268g	13.8	83	30.6	594g	28.2

F7	-	-	-	-	4	1.5	10g	0.5
F8	7	2.9	40g	2.1	1	0.4	28g	1.3
F9	11	4.6	68g	3.5	5	1.8	14g	0.7
F10	4	1.7	38g	2.0	5	1.8	158g	7.5
F11	4	1.7	78g	4.0	-	-	-	-
F12	3	1.3	24g	1.2	12	4.4	32g	1.5
F13	3	1.3	80g	4.1	-	-	-	-
F14	14	5.9	88g	4.5	9	3.3	62g	2.9
F15	25	10.5	118g	6.1	9	3.3	28g	1.3
F16	6	2.5	34g	1.8	18	6.6	222g	10.5
F17	2	0.8	2g	0.1	-	-	-	-
F18	1	0.4	52g	2.7	1	0.4	1g	0.04
F19	75	31.4	780g	40.2	86	31.8	722g	34.3
F20	2	0.8	1g	0.1	-	-	-	-
F21	1	0.4	44g	2.3	-	-	-	-
F22	-	-	-	-	1	0.4	4g	0.2
F23	2	0.8	4g	0.2	3	1.1	104g	4.9
F24	24	10.0	82g	4.1	20	7.4	18g	0.9
F25	-	-	-	-	1	0.4	10g	0.5
F26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
F27	-	-	-	-	1	0.4	2g	0.1
F28	2	0.9	1g	0.1	-	-	-	-
F29	2	0.8	2g	0.1	-	-	-	-
F30	1	0.4	2g	0.1	1	0.4	1g	0.08
F31	-	-	-	-	1	0.4	1g	0.08

F32	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Totals	239	100	1,939g	100	271	100	2,105g	100

Table 5: Quantification of pottery fabrics by number of sherds and weight (grams) for Contexts 1 & 2 combined and Context 129.

It can be seen that the composition of the assemblage from Contexts 1 and 2 is very similar to that from Context 129 suggesting the material from the topsoil overburdens on the site is indeed related to the excavated buildings. Although there are some differences between the two groups, most of these are due to the small number of sherds involved. It is interesting to note the close correlation between the proportions of the larger fabric groups such as the Frechen stonewares (Fabric 19) and the tin-glazed earthenwares (Fabric 24). The correlation between the two groups is better shown by comparing the sources of the wares (Table 6).

	Contexts 1 & 2 combined				Context 129			
Source	No. of sherds	%	Weight (grams)	%	No. of sherds	%	Weight (grams)	%
Local Fabrics: 1-15	121	50.8	935g	48.2	138	50.7	1,020g	48.4
Regional/ English Fabrics 16-18, 21, 23-26, 28-32	41	16.9	223g	11.5	45	16.7	357g	17.0
Imports: French Fabric 27	-	-	-	-	1	0.5	2g	0.1
Imports: German Fabrics 19, 20, 22	77	32.3	781g	40.3	87	32.1	726g	34.5
Totals	239	100	1,939g	100	271	100	2,105g	100

Table 6: Comparison of sources of pottery as represented by number of sherds and weight (grams) for Contexts 1 & 2 combined and Context 129.

Table 6 clearly shows that although the majority of the pottery being supplied to the site was of local manufacture both regional/English and German imports made up significant proportions of the assemblage. Generally the regional fabrics, such as the Borderwares and London products, are typical of the 17th to early 18th centuries whereas the ‘English’ wares from further afield, such as Staffordshire products, tend to be an 18th- to early 19th- century characteristic.

5.1.4. Context 129

This is by far the largest single group which can be considered truly 'stratified'. However, the presence of sherds of 19th c. Yellow ware and Industrial slipware (Fabrics 30 and 31) show it cannot be considered secure. The fabric breakdown for this context is shown in **Table 5**. The group is dominated by storage jars in Fabric 6 (at least seven different vessels are represented) and Frechen bellarmine (F19: at least 11 different vessels represented) and mugs (at least three represented). The few recognisable forms which can be identified in this group are shown in **Table 7**. Unfortunately most sherds within the group are too small to be diagnostic of form, and fewer still are suitable for illustration.

Vessel Form	Fabrics/Minimum vessel numbers
Storage jars/jars	F6 – x7; F10 – x1; F23 – x1
Tripod Pipkin	F16 – x1
Lid	F1 – x1
Bowl	F9 – x1
Plate	F23 – x1; F24 – x1; F25 – x1
Costrel	F18 – x1; F27 – x1
Mug	F19 - x3
Bellarmino/Bottle	F19 – x11
Tankard	F12 – x1
Ointment pot	F24 – x2
Other	F24 – x1 (shell-shaped handles from serving vessel?)

Table 7: Vessel forms recognised in Context 129 by fabric.

The vessels recognised in Context 129 are predominantly those associated with drinking: Bellarmine bottles, mugs, tankards and costrels account for 17 out of 35 recognised vessels.

Storage vessels appear to account for the majority of the remainder: jars, lids and ointment pots account for a further 12 vessels. Only one definite cooking vessel, the tripod pipkin is present, with the remainder (bowls, plates and decorative shell handles) coming from 'tableware' for the consumption of food. As such, it would suggest that although the deposit contains a little material associated with food preparation and consumption, the group does not represent normal domestic/kitchen refuse. The date of the assemblage would most likely fit within the second half of the 17th century or first couple of decades of the 18th century. The former is considered more likely due to the dominance of the Frechen stoneware and absence of any stoneware sherds from London.

5.1.5. Catalogue (All Context 129 unless stated) Figure 16

- 1-5. All jars/storage jars in Fabric 6. The illustrated sherds show the range of rims encountered within this fabric.
6. Medallion from a Frechen Bellarmine (F19) bottle with mid brown iron wash. The medallion motif has been badly pressed making the design obscure, however, it appears to consist of a cross with floral motifs in the angles.

7. Medallion from a Frechen Bellarmine (F19) bottle with dark brown iron wash. The medallion motif consists of a petalled double-rosette and is very similar to examples from Norwich (Jennings 1981, 122, Nos 826-828) and an example from Rotterdam dated 1650-1675 (Hurst *et. al* 1986, 220, Pl. 44, right).
8. Plain rim from a drinking mug with applied face mask medallion in Frechen stoneware (F19). Similar examples dated to the end of the 16th century have been catalogued elsewhere (Gaimster 1997, 214, Nos 53 and 54) though the slightly cruder face-mask on the Herstmonceux example suggests a 17th century date.
9. Context 120. Bodysherd from a tiered ceramic candlestick. Fabric 1. Similar candlesticks are known from a 17th century pottery site at Cove in Eastern Hampshire (Haslam 1975, 182, No. 114).

5.1.6. Conclusions.

The small and fragmentary nature of the pottery assemblage, together with the nature of the archaeological contexts it was found in, make it difficult to draw any firm conclusions regarding close dating of much of the material and its relationship with the excavated buildings. This is particularly acute when dealing with the high-fired earthenwares such as Fabrics 1 to 5 which could be of 16th- or 17th- century date. As such the presence of residual 16th- century material in later, 17th- century, contexts may not be detectable without more diagnostic sherds. Whatever the case, the bulk of the assemblage from the site would most comfortably fit within a date bracket of 1650-1700/1720. This would be in keeping with the clay pipes from the site.

Very little pottery pre-dating the mid 16th century was found and although some of the assemblage could happily be placed between 1550 and 1650 there is nothing which definitely has to be of this date. There is a little material post-dating 1700/1720, though that which is present appears to range between 1700/1720 and 1760/80. This material is present both in unstratified contexts and also in the fill of the robber trench on the Phase 2 building (ie Context 63). The little bit of 19th- century material would appear to relate to a simple background scatter.

5.2. The Clay Tobacco Pipes by Philippa Whitehill (with comments by D.R. Atkinson), (Figures 18 & 19)

Altogether 903 fragments of clay tobacco pipe, weighing 2.665 kg, 726 of which were stem fragments were recovered from a total of 51 contexts.

The largest groups originated from context 2 and 'stratified' (not closed) Contexts 129 and 162. The remainder were predominantly from layers and fills except one example that came from below 'closed' Context 8; a possible floor surface below Context 7 (**Figure 8**).

Apart from the 726 stem pieces, the remaining examples comprised bowls with partial stem, bowl fragments and complete bowls without stem. One of the bowl fragments was decorated but all the complete bowls undecorated. Approximately 15 different types of pipe bowl were identified, with diagnostic features on the bowl and stem, maker's marks and the general lack of decoration strongly pointing to manufacture in Sussex during the 17th and 18th century.

The range of examples encompassing dates of manufacture before and after the construction and demolition of the stable would indicate activity in the immediate area other than that relating to the buildings. However, the pipe bowl retrieved from below 'stratified' Context 8, which dates to 1680 – 1700 probably relates to activity on site during the life of the Phase 1 – 1a building(s).

Examples of the bowl types, maker's marks/ stamps and the one decorated bowl fragment are summarised below.

5.2.1. Catalogue of clay tobacco pipes from the stable site. (Dates are based on comments from David Atkinson, 2003 and Atkinson, 1977.) **Figures 18 and 19**

Context 2; **1a**: long parallel bowl with initial P/H on heel - early 18th century, **1b**: small bulbous bowl with indecipherable stamp on base of heel – 1640, **1c**: large bowl with milling and forward protruding spur at base – 1660 – 1680s.

Context 8; **2**: typical of Sussex type with spur – 1680 – 1700.

Context 16; **3**: larger, common Sussex type – c.1660.

Context 41; **4a**: common Sussex type with spur – c.1670, **4b**: partial stem with shallow heel bearing moulded initials T/W – 1693 – 1711.

Context 65; **5**: possible west country style, similar to examples from Steyning. Stamp on heel base appears to be the palm of a hand – 1650 – 1660.

Context 76; **6**: London style with small spur – 1640 – 1650

Context 129; **7a**: small bulbous bowl and heel – c. 1640, **7b**: small, less bulbous with heel – 1660 – 1680, **7c-g**: typical Sussex types of varying dimensions – late 17th, **7h**: bowl sherd with raised dot decoration. Probably import of unknown origin and date, **7i**: partial stem with initials H/I on side of heel for John Holcom – pre-1699, **7j**: Sussex type heel fragment with incised R on base – late 17th, **7k**: small bulbous bowl with stamp on base incorporating initials P/C, probably London maker – early – mid 17th.

5.3. The Ceramic Building Material by Philippa Whitehill (Figure 17)

Despite the foundations of both buildings being formed from brick and rubble fills of brick and tile and the high volume retrieved during excavation, there were no official/ specialist reports produced for these classes of material. However, as a result of post-excavation analysis it was possible to identify a fabric reference for each class and it is felt that sufficient data was collated during analysis to enable a more detailed report to be produced at a later date should one be required. The full details are held in the archive.

For the purposes of this report here is a summary of some of that data.

5.3.1. Brick.

A total of c. 7, 220 pieces of brick, weighing c. 1189,269 kg were collected from 120 contexts with the largest numbers coming from layers and fills across the site.

Six brick fabrics were identified and many examples were seen to be partially vitrified i.e. one or more surfaces of the brick appearing glazed; as seen on some of the bricks of the castle itself.

Table 8: brick fabrics.

No.	Description
1	Yellow-brown and red-brown coloured; sandy, soft (smooth to touch) with rare inclusions of ironstone 1mm to 50mm
2	Dark red/ brown and bluish red with ironstone (hard, rough to touch) inclusions 1mm - 10mm
3	Red-brown colour with cream-coloured streaking. Sandy with few inclusions of ironstone 1 – 5mm. Similar to fabric 2
4	Smooth, sandy with cream-coloured streaking. Inclusions of ironstone 10 – 20 mm. Similar to fabric 3
4a	Pale pinkish with cream coloured streaking. No inclusions (hard and smooth to touch)
5	Dark grey-red with inclusions of ironstone flecks to 10mm. Very hard

A number of complete bricks are also present in the assemblage, the dimensions of which vary in size; lengths of 0.18 m - 0.25 m, widths 0.1.m to 0.12 m and thicknesses of 40 mm to 60 mm. This range may be nothing more than the result of production, which would have been by hand during the construction of the Castle and the stable as there was no real standardisation of brick sizes at the time.

The origin of the brick is unknown although the East Sussex County Historic Environment Record lists a brickyard/ brickmaker in the grounds of the castle (MES 29353) and the 1839 Tithe Apportionment lists a house and brickyard (plot 1766) and a portion of land named brickyard field (1767a), to the south of the castle.

Bricks are considered to have been produced on the estate since the 15th century, providing bricks for the construction of the castle (Beswick, 1993). Given that the construction of the stable buildings predates the last brickyard closure in c. 1850, it is highly likely the bricks used for the stables were also manufactured close by. If they were not made on site, there were plenty of brickmakers operating in East Sussex at the time, the closest being at nearby Ashburnham.

5.3.2. Tile.

Upwards of 1,000 tile pieces, weighing 103,166 grams were collected from 57 contexts across the site, the largest numbers retrieved from large, generally demolition rubble/ rubbish spreads/ layers (7), (8), (20), (23), (129) and (162). The majority of tiles had holes punched into one end, indicative of peg/ roofing tiles or cladding i.e. those that would have been applied to the external elevation of a timber-framed building.

Nine fabrics were identified and are tabulated below.

Table 9: tile fabrics.

No.	Description.
1a	Smooth, hard, pink/red with cream coloured streaking
1b	Similar to 1a but harder and grey/ pink
2a	Gritty, hard, orange/ red and brown/red. No obvious inclusions
2b	Similar to 2a but with ironstone inclusions to 1mm
3a	Very hard, poorly fired with black streaks through centre. Rare ironstone(?) inclusions as specks
3b	Very hard red/brown with few cream-coloured streaks. Rare specks of ironstone(?) inclusions
3c	Similar to 2a but higher fired. Grey/ black and orange/brown with inclusions of ironstone to 2mm
4a	Hard, sandy cream/yellow
4b	Rough, hard, highly fired – similar to 4a but grey.

Only a handful of floor tiles were present and included two with glazed surfaces and one bevel-edged. The remainder were ‘undecorated’.

A proportion of the ceramic building material was retained and is held at Herstmoncuex Castle for further analysis to that undertaken and mentioned above.

5.3.3. Polychrome (Delft) Tile.

Two fragments of highly decorated tile were found in the area of Context 119 at the southern end of the Phase 1 building. Both are decorated similarly and although they don’t appear to quite fit together may well be from the same tile (**Figure 17**).

The Dutch were producing tiles with this type of decoration from the late 16th century and these are described as ‘Medallion Tiles’ due to the pattern used which, like the Herstmoncuex examples comprises a central scene of an animal or hunter in a rural setting framed by a roundel. Further decoration includes motifs at each corner of the tile. Examples of the Dutch type were recovered from Basing House, Hants and dated to 1600 – 1645 (Moorhouse, 1970).

Although these tiles were being imported from Holland, they were also being produced in London by the early 17th century and a visual inspection of the Herstmoncuex fragments suggests they are English due to the slightly cruder motif design at the surviving corners.

Whilst it seems unlikely that anywhere within the stable buildings would have been decorated by tiles of this type, it is possible to suppose that the buildings may have contained this sort of decorative element; it has been suggested that these fragments have come from a demolished fire surround. Determining the configuration of the internal space of a stable block of the dates given for the buildings would be a useful exercise. Until such discoveries are made, it must be concluded that the presence of the tile pieces here is either as the result of demolition of the stable or originates from the Castle.

5.4. The Coins by David Rudling.

Excavations and Metal detecting yielded a total of 15 English coins and one 17th c. trade token. An earlier discovery, made in the vicinity of the excavations of a late 16th/early 17th c. Nuremburg Jeton (or reckoning counter) is also recorded here.

Table 10: coins found during excavations (please note Metal Detecting has been reduced to MD in the text.)

CONTEXT NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE
Unstratified	Silver halfpenny of Henry VI (first reign). Annulet issue, London Mint (edge chip at 12 o'clock). (ref: North, 1991, 75), no. 1434	1422 – 1427
Unstratified	Nuremburg jeton of Hans Krauwinckel II: master from 1586 to death in 1635. (ref: Mitchiner, 1988, 444), no. 1568	
Unstratified	Bronze penny of Victoria	1883
1	Silver penny of Edward (1272 – 1307). New coinage: Class 4a-c. London Mint, extremely worn. (ref: North 1991, 29), nos. 1023 – 1025	1282 - 1289
1	Copper halfpenny of William III (1694 – 1702). First issue illegible. In exergue	Illegible
1	Two copper halfpennies of William III. first or second issues	1698 – 1699
2	Copper farthing/ Trader's Token of George Ford, Pevensey. (ref: Williamson, 1967, 1179), no. 148	1658
21 (MD)	Bronze farthing of Victoria. Young head (1860 – 1895)	Illegible
33 (MD)	Silver halfgroat of Henry VI (first reign 1422 – 1461. Annulet issue. Initial crosses: V. Calais Mint. (ref: North, 1991, 74), no. 1429	1422 - 1427
34 (MD)	Two silver groats of Henry VIII (1509 – 1547). First coinage, initial marks: portcullis. London Mint. (ref: North, 1991, 109), no. 1762	1509 - 1526

56 (MD)	Bronze farthing of Edward VII (1901 – 1910)	Illegible
B1 (MD)	Copper halfpenny of George III (1760 – 1820). First issue	1770 – 1775
B1 (MD)	Copper halfpenny possibly of George III. First issue	Illegible
B1 (MD)	Bronze penny of Victoria (1837 – 1901)	1860
B1 (MD)	Bronze penny of Victoria	1900

It would be fair to say that all but four of the coins (namely those of William III and George III), most probably relate to the Castle and not the 'Stable' site, except the silver penny of Edward I, unsurprisingly very worn and clearly predating the construction phase of the Castle and the two coins of Henry VI which may have been in circulation during building or the early occupation phase.

The coins of the 19th and early 20th century most certainly relate to the practice of visiting the castle as a ruin and taking tea there in the grounds before c. 1911.

The two groats of Henry VIII had been curled together to form a hollow/ cylindrical token. One had been curled so that the two edges touched each other; the reverse being outer-most. The other was tightly curled around the first but without the edges touching; the obverse outer-most with the worn portrait of Henry's father Henry VII.

A coin was often given in the past, sometimes as a love token and curled together '*to preserve its amuletic properties and to prevent it being basely used for purposes of trade, it was often bent*' (Chamberlain, 1960).

Jetons/ reckoning counters were used both in England and on the continent for undertaking the calculations of manual arithmetic, especially accountancy, from the late 13th c. onwards. However, their use for accountancy purposes had virtually died out by the end of the 16th c., by which time their major role, especially where the Nuremburg jetons were concerned (due to the numbers manufactured), was as gaming counters (Mitchiner, 1988).

5.5. The Metalwork by Luke Barber (Figures 20 - 24)

5.5.1. Introduction

The excavations produced relatively large quantities of metalwork, particularly non-ferrous items. This was due to the extensive use of metal-detectors for surveying the site and resultant spoil throughout the excavations. This led to the recovery of items from both stratified (89 numbered contexts) and topsoil overburdens/ Contexts 1 and 2 and unstratified contexts (ie u/s spoil). In addition a systematic metal detector survey of the surrounding field yielded a further assemblage. This latter assemblage consists of individually numbered and plotted finds as well as un-numbered metalwork of less interest bagged by survey square. The current report considers the metalwork from both the excavations and metal detector survey. The assemblage is coarsely characterized in **Table 11**.

Source	Nails	Horse-shoes	Iron Objects	Undiagnostic Iron	Copper Alloy	Lead Object	Lead Waste	Other	Totals
Excavation: Contexts u/s, 1-2	375	4	24	23	20	20	28	-	494 3 contexts
Excavation. Contexts 3-196	1,093	3	34	52	34	43	69	Pewter/ Mixed alloy – 4	1,332 89 contexts
Metal Detector Survey Plotted small finds	-	5	4	-	34	28	2	Pewter – 1 Modern – 21	95 All u/s
Metal Detector Survey Bulk finds	-	8	28	-	-	-	25	-	61 All u/s
Totals	1,468	20	90	75	88	91	124	26	1,982 92 contexts

Table 11: Characterization of The Metalwork assemblage

Although the assemblage contains items which may span the later medieval period to the present day, it is dominated by finds which can best be placed within the late 16th/early 17th to mid 18th centuries. This is particularly the case with the metalwork from the excavation and immediately surrounding topsoil deposits and as such the material appears to closely correlate with the usage of the excavated buildings. As virtually all the metalwork from the excavations is in contexts broadly dated by ceramics to the 17th to early 18th centuries the assemblage is considered as a whole. Later material appears predominantly in the assemblage from the metal detector survey, which recovered metallic finds from the topsoil in a wide area of the field. The current report concentrates on the material which spans the 17th to mid 18th centuries only. The whole assemblages from all works at the site is fully listed on Metalwork Record Forms (with notes, sketches and measurements) which form part of the site archive.

The material is in variable condition. Most of the ironwork is heavily corroded though the majority was identifiable to form/function without x-ray, or with only limited cleaning. Despite this, some 120 objects were subjected to x-ray on 21 x-ray plates. The copper-alloy, including the mixed alloy (see below) ranges in condition from poor (usually due to being burnt in antiquity) to very good and only a few pieces have adhering thin corrosion products. Similarly the lead, although coated in white corrosion, is in good condition. The pewter is more fragmentary depending on its tin content.

The aims of the metalwork report were to outline the size and extent of the assemblage, help with context dating where possible, and give an insight into the status and activities at the site.

5.5.2. The Metal Detector Survey

The objects resulting from the metal detecting survey of the topsoil have the widest date range. The distribution plots of these objects, together with a full listing of all, are housed with the archive. The assemblage mainly consists of a thin background spread of late 18th- to early 20th- century material relating to the agricultural use of the land. A notable assemblage of modern material (including modern reproductions of medieval items) was also located. This relates to the field's use for camping by re-enactors during the medieval festival at the Castle.

Of more interest is the concentration of 17th- century items which undoubtedly relate to activity associated with the excavated buildings. A number of these are included in the report below.

5.5.3. The Iron

The ironwork can be divided into one of several groups as outlined in **Table 11**. The dominant grouping consists of nails of various types (see below). A significant assemblage of horse-shoes, or fragments thereof, are present, together with a wide range of recognisable objects/fragments. A selection of the more important ones are described below. A number of pieces of ironwork were undiagnostic of form/function, despite x-ray. Many of these pieces are simply strips or sheeting fragments, many of the former probably relating to bindings from buckets/barrels, strengthening from doors or tyres from the wheels of carts. Other pieces consist of amorphous lumps, which are not even diagnostic of form on the x-ray plates.

Building Construction and fittings

Nails

The excavations produced 1,468 nails or nail fragments. No nails were recovered during the metal detector survey. As such, virtually all the nails can be confidently associated with the excavated buildings, even if many did not come from truly sealed contexts. With the exception of one intrusive machine-made wire nail (Context 82) all are hand-made and consistent with a 17th to mid 18th century date. Five main types of nail were recognised and are quantified in **Table 12**.

Source	General Purpose Nails	Heavy Duty Nails	Headless Nails	L-shaped Heads/ tacks	Farriers' Nails	Unidentified Nail Fragments	Total
Excavation: Contexts u/s, 1-2	208	5	3	-	22	137	375
Excavation. Contexts 3-196	607	45	23	34	27	357	1,093
Totals	815	50	26	34	49	494	1,468

Table 12: Quantities of nail types from the excavations

Type 1: **General purpose nails**. Square-sectioned shank with a round or sub-square flat or low-domed head. A number of examples have low pyramidal/faceted heads suggesting this may have been the most common type but most heads having been flattened or disfigured by hammer-blows. There is a wide range of sizes within this group but most fall within a 40-70mm length range. These nails would undoubtedly have been used for a range of tasks from fixing roof tiles and battens to fixing lathes and other assorted interior needs. Such nails have been recorded from Colonial sites in North America (Noel Hume 1991, 253, No. 1) where they are described as 'rose-headed'. A selection of the better examples from Context 65 is shown in **Figure 20; No. 1a, b, c**.

Type 2: **Heavy duty nails**. These are similar to Type 1 but with square or rectangular heads and much more massive dimensions. Lengths are in excess of 70/75mm. These nails would have been used in structural work and it is somewhat surprising not more were found at the site. However, many of the main joints in the roof timbers may have been undertaken without the need of nails.

Type 3: **Headless nails/sprigs**. These nails are notoriously difficult to isolate from broken Type 1 nails and it is probable more are present in the assemblage. However, 26 definite examples were noted where the shank was clearly seen to intentionally end and where hammering has created a distinct

head/thickening. These nails would have been used where a flush finish was required, such as in flooring (Moorhouse 1971, 50, Nos 103-107). Two of the best examples from Context 65 are shown in **Figure 20; Nos 2a-b**.

Type 4: **Small sprigs/L-shape headed nails**. These are generally small nails with distinct heads formed from either a triangular thickening or from folding over the shank at 90 degrees. Parallels are noted by Noel Hume (1991, 253, No. 4). They would probably be used for lighter work where a flush finish was needed (ie paneling). A selection from Context 65, giving the typical range of head type and size, is shown in **Figure 20; No. 3a, b, c**.

Type 5: **Farriers' nails** – These nails were used for shoeing horses rather than for constructional purposes and are thus discussed below.

In addition, the excavations yielded several studs with large flat pyramidal heads (cf. Moorhouse 1971, 50, No.110) which were used for strengthening doors.

Generally, there is quite a high proportion of complete nails suggesting that many may have deliberately been removed during dismantling and/or have derived from timbers which may have been burnt during demolition. Indeed the largest groups of nails appear to come from areas where burning was taking place (ie Contexts 65 and 129) suggesting bonfires of unwanted/rotted wood being disposed of during dismantling/demolition. Others may have derived from the removal of reusable roof tiles.

The two largest groups of nails are from 65 and 129. These groups are tabulated below in **Table 13**.

Context	Type 1 General Purpose	Type 2 Heavy Duty	Type 3 Headless/ Sprigs	Type 4 Small Sprigs	Type 5 Farriers'	Unidentified
65	172	-	6	30	5	96
129	101	13	4	-	11	73

Table 13: Nail types from Contexts 65 and 129

Fixtures and fittings

A number of pieces of ironwork relate to the fixtures and fittings of the excavated buildings. These include the following:

A heavy duty wall hook with backwardly curving arm and pointed shank. A similar example from London has been dated to the early 18th century (Grew 1984, 93, No. 2). (**Figure 20; No. 4**: Context 2).

A door key with kidney-shaped bow, round-sectioned stem and broken symmetrical bit. Similar to examples from Basing House (Moorhouse 1971, 40, No. 34). (**Figure 20; No. 5**: Context 2).

The remains of another, similar key, also from Context 2, were located together with part of a door bolt (Context 129, not illustrated) which can be closely matched with an 18th century example from Colonial America (Noel Hume 1991, 247, No. 4). In addition, part of a strap hinge from a door was located in Context 157 (not illustrated). This piece is closely paralleled in a similarly-dated post-medieval assemblage at Bolingbroke Castle, Lincolnshire (Goodall 1976, 27, No. 24-25).

Other fittings include part of a lock housing from Context 119, two roves from clenched bolts (Contexts 2 and 129) and several fixing staples and U brackets. Window leads are discussed under the non-ferrous section below.

Other fittings relating to more transportable items include the hinge and lock cover from a box or chest (**Figure 21; No. 6**: Context 20). This is similar, though not exact, to examples from Basing House (Moorhouse 1971, 42, No. 46).

A cylindrical candleholder on the end of a reinforced spike fixing was recovered from Context 162 (**Figure 21; No. 7**). Similar examples are known from Basing House (Moorhouse 1971, 38, No. 17). The base of a rushlight holder in copper alloy was also discovered (see below).

Tools

A sheave of a spade of 17th century type was located in Context 1, not illustrated (cf. Moorhouse 1971 and Goodall 1976); a saw fragment was located in Context 2 and fragments of scissors and small shears were located in Contexts 8 and 15 respectively, not illustrated. Other items include a pointing trowel blade from Context 129 and a tanged chisel from Context 141, not illustrated.

Only three knife fragments were recognized; a tanged blade from Context 41, an undiagnostic blade fragment from Context 129, not illustrated and a fragment of scale-tanged knife (**Figure 21; No. 8**), from Context 55. It is probable the handle to this knife was in wood.

Although the spade, chisel, saw and trowel could represent items broken during construction works they could easily have been broken during routine maintenance of the buildings.

Equestrian equipment

The excavations produced a variety of items of equestrian origin. The most obvious of these are the horse-shoes: in all 20 whole or part examples. The shoes range in size and type and although such items are very difficult to date closely, virtually all from the excavation (numbering seven) would not be out of place in the 17th or early 18th centuries. Two of the best examples are illustrated on **Figures 21 and 22; Nos 9 and 10**. Both appear to be hind shoes, No. 9 with turned up calkins. Despite x-ray the full extent of the nail holes is not certain. The shoes from the metal detector survey consist of both 17th century types as well as a scatter of later 18th to 19th century examples though the earlier shoes tend to concentrate close to the excavated buildings.

The excavations also produced a significant assemblage of farriers' nails for shoeing. All 49 examples came from the area of the buildings and 27 were in 'secure' 17th to early 18th century contexts. Two examples are shown in **Figure 22; Nos 11a-b**. In addition, the badly fragmented remains of a spur were located (**Figure 22; No. 12**) and a 'D'-shaped harness buckle/strap guide (**Figure 22; No. 13**). Further iron harness buckles, either with square or rectangular frames, are also associated with the buildings (seven in total: Contexts 2 (x2), 8, 24, 65, 128 and 129). Two D-shaped buckles/strap guides (Contexts 42 and 78) and a harness ring (Context 65) were also recovered. Several fragments of chain (links and swivel links), one of which appears to be attached to a spherical iron bell (though the x-ray does not make this clear and it could be a spherical padlock) may also be associated with equestrian activity.

5.5.4. Copper Alloy

The site produced 88 items of copper alloy, 34 of which were from the metal detector survey. Most of the items are diagnostic of function even as fragments and can be divided into a number of

groups. In addition, a couple of 'mixed' alloy items were located. Although the appearance of these is very similar to silver or high - quality pewter (smooth grey/silver surfaces) a rapid assessment using XRF analysis has shown them to consist of copper alloyed with small to moderate amounts of tin, arsenic, lead, zinc and nickel. These items have been given the term 'mixed alloy' as they are clearly different from most copper alloy items (which corrode to green) but are a deliberate mix of metals used during the 17th and 18th centuries, particularly for buttons and buckles.

Equestrian equipment

The largest group of copper alloy items can be directly related to fittings and decorations from bridles and other equestrian equipment. A large oval bridle boss with floral patterning and two fixing holes was recorded as being unstratified (**Figure 22; No. 14**). Judging from the apparent burnt condition of this item it is possible it originated from the burnt area, Context 65 but this is conjecture. Such bosses are well known in the 17th century (Bailey 1992, 85). In addition, part of a large heart-shaped horse-brass was recovered from Context 80 (**Figure 23; No. 15**). The front surface is decorated with a raised heart area, while the back has the remains of four bent over fixing lugs.

During the metal detector survey, just to the west of the excavation, a tight scatter of copper-alloy buckles and leather decorations was noted. Judging by their similar form and decorative motifs it appeared that these probably related to a single decorated bridle which had rotted *in situ* but had been partially spread by later ploughing. A small trench dug on the centre of the distribution resulted in the recovery of more related items. It is likely, though not proven that the bridle was originally situated in the spread 129, which clearly extends beyond the limits of the excavation trench in this direction. Further examples of decorative metalwork, matching those from the metal detector work were recovered during the excavations. All the material along with its decorative style suggests a 17th- 18th century date. The bridle appears to contain two sets of matching buckles. The first are roughly rectangular double frame types with iron pins, squared ends and incised line and punched dot decoration on the frames (**Figure 23; No. 16a**: Metal Detector Find (hereafter MD) 35, 16b – not illustrated: MD 36). These buckles can be paralleled elsewhere (Whitehead 1996, No. 443) where they are dated to between 1600 and 1720. The other pair of buckles are cast decorative double looped types, again with vestiges of iron pins and incised line and dot decoration (**Figure 23; No. 17a**: MD 43; 17b – not illustrated: Metal Detector Trench (hereafter MDT). Similar styles are present at Basing House where they are dated to the first half of the 17th century (Moorhouse 1971, 58, Nos 169-170). Whitehead (1996, No. 401) gives a date range of c.1550-1650. A date around the early to mid 17th century would seem appropriate. Six associated decorative strap fittings, all of the same type, were also recovered (**Figure 23; No. 18a**: MD 36; 18b – not illustrated: MD 36; 18c – not illustrated: MD 43; 18d-f – not illustrated: MDT). All six examples are decorated with two zones of incised lines and punched dots flanking a central incised line floral motif (only 18a is illustrated). A further strap decoration, almost certainly from the same set, is decorated in a similar way except the central floral motif has been bungled (or conforms to a different design) (**Figure 23; No. 19**: MDT). Three different types of leather decoration were also found in association, and judging from their similar decorative motifs, are likely to be from the same set. All were fixed to the leather by two folded over lugs on the rear. The first type is represented by two examples (**Figure 23; No. 20a**: MD 43 and 20b – not illustrated: MDT). This has an identical decoration to the leather strap mounts (Nos 18a-f).

The second type, represented by five examples, is heart-shaped and again carries the floral decoration (**Figure 23; No. 21a**: MD 42; 21b-2 – not illustrated: MDT). The final type, represented by two examples, is also heart-shaped, but is somewhat larger, though still with the same floral motif (**Figure 23; No. 22a**: MD 41; 22b – not illustrated: Context 2). The smaller raised heart shape on which the floral motif is engraved is similar to that noted on the larger brass, No. 15, suggesting this

piece is probably also of an early to mid 17th century date. It is unusual to find so many fittings associated with a single harness and it can only be assumed it was discarded as being old and/or broken in the later 17th or perhaps 18th century.

Other equestrian objects include two bridle rings/ strap junctions (**Figure 23; No. 23:** Context 1; not illustrated: Context 66) and several probable leather studs (though some could be from the decoration of wood). Most of these consist of studs with circular hollow-domed heads ranging in diameter from 8-12mm (Context 1; Context 2 (x2); Context 65; Context 120). However, a similar type, but with a lozenge-shaped head was recovered from Context 1 (**Figure 23; No. 24**). A small selection of leather decorations with two folded over fixing lugs was also recovered. These, though of similar general type to **Figure 23; No. 20a** are probably from other 17th to early 18th century bridles. Only one is illustrated (**Figure 24; No. 25:** Context 3) though similar examples, or fragments thereof, were found in Contexts 1, 65 and 73). A further, probably 18th century example, was located during the Metal Detecting survey (MD 65).

Dress Accessories

In addition to the four buckles from the bridle discussed above, the excavations and metal detector survey produced a further six complete copper alloy examples (a mixed alloy example is also discussed in this section for convenience – see below). A number of these buckles are related to equestrian activity as at least two, and quite possibly more, appear to be spur buckles. Two double-framed spur buckles of 17th century date were recovered (**Figure 24; No. 26:** MD 29; **and No. 27:** Context 1). The latter example is markedly bowed with a copper alloy pin. Both are similar to types illustrated by Whitehead (1996, Nos 512-513). A double looped buckle, also with a copper alloy pin, was recovered during the metal detector survey (**Figure 24; No. 28:** MD 32). This type of buckle, with lobed knob at either end of the strap bar is of 16th to mid 17th century type (Whitehead 1996, No. 323). A rectangular double framed buckle, missing its pin, but with a cast suspension loop was located in Context 1 (**Figure 24; No. 29**). This type is frequently referred to as a sword-belt hanger of the 17th century though it may have been used to hang other items from (Whitehead 1996, No. 472). A large early 17th century ornamented double looped buckle with copper alloy pin and traces of black paint on the frame was recovered from Context 9 (**Figure 24; No. 30**). The final two buckles are of a slightly later style (**Figure 24; Nos 31 and 32**): both appearing to date to between 1660 and 1720. Whether they are shoe/knee or spur buckles is uncertain (Whitehead 1996 Nos 616 and 634 respectively). The first example (**No. 31: Context 162**) has a heavily molded frame with some raised areas and incised line decoration. Although the pin is missing the central bar appears to be of iron and the frame of mixed alloy (see above). A folded over copper alloy (tested by XRF analysis as brass) sheet plate, secured together with one iron rivet, is fixed around the central bar. The plate has an aperture for the pin. The final buckle is of identical construction to the last: it has the main frame (in this case 'conventional' copper alloy with molded raised squares/lozenges), with central iron bar (this time with iron pin surviving), around which is secured a copper alloy sheet plate, secured with an iron rivet (**No. 32: Context 129**).

The only other dress accessories consist of three lace ends (Contexts 1 and 23 (x2)) and a small assortment of buttons. The latter are of 18th to 19th century date with virtually all coming from the metal detector survey of the field. Only one early 18th century, mixed alloy example was stratified: from Context 129.

5.5.5. Miscellaneous Objects

Only a small selection of items fall within this group. They consist of six pins with spherical heads (Contexts 82, 119 and 129 (x4)), a late 17th to mid 18th century thimble (Context 168/169), part of

the base of a probable rush-light holder (Context 1: cf Moorhouse 1971, 93, No. 21) and a body-shoulder (MD 14) and angular handle (MD 57) from cast copper-alloy cooking vessels/cauldrons. In addition, there is a small quantity of scrap material. This consists mainly of undiagnostic sheet fragments, but also includes melted waste droplets (ie from Context 65).

5.5.6. Pewter

Only a few items, including a button fragment, were recovered and are listed in the archive.

5.5.7. Lead

Pistol and musket shot

Six lead shot were recovered from the excavation area, while a further 24 examples were recovered from the metal detector survey of the surrounding field. The items from the survey are spread widely across the field with no discernable concentrations. It is probable the bulk of these relate to 18th or early 19th century activity though 17th century examples may well be present too. Of the small assemblage from the excavations only three are from 'sealed' contexts: Context 129 – x2 and 162 – x1. Much of the shot from the site appears to possess some impact damage. Although the shot diameters range from 10mm to 21mm, two groupings are apparent. Ten of the shot, presumably for muskets, range between 18 and 19mm in diameter, while a less defined group, between 12-13mm and presumably for pistols, accounts for a further seven examples. Most of the remainder are spread between diameters of 14 and 17mm. The shot from Context 129 include one of 12mm and one of 18mm. It can only be assumed the material comes from hunting/sporting activities in the field.

Window leads

Lead strips (comes) from windows (commonly used to hold glass panes in place within window frames), accounted for the next largest group of identifiable objects. In all, 52 pieces from 11 individually numbered contexts were recovered. Most consist of badly crushed/folded pieces, the majority of which probably originate from demolition/dismantling events. The largest group, of 17 pieces is from Context 129. Two examples are inscribed (**Figure 24; Nos 33: Context 2 and 34: Context 82**).

The inscribed comes are obviously from the early 18th century, as indicated by the date on the central bar of the 'H' profile. Personal communication with Geoff Egan, Museum of London Specialist Services in 2002 contributed the following.

'From the 17th century, the manufacturing process included hand milling, to further extend the lead strips, which left markings (from the hand mill). Some producers would add their initials and a date to the mill, sometimes changing the date annually so that if the lead failed in its purpose, the maker could be traced. Examples bearing the same initials as those from the site are known from Sussex and Kent; EW 1680: Audley End and EW 1712: Newstead, Kent. If early 18th century estate accounts for works including window refurbishment were available, it might be possible to learn who EW was and where he was based.'

A further interesting thought is that if these examples originate from the site and not the castle, could the date of 1700 indicate the construction date for Phase 1 or 1a? Given the suggestion that the south and west facades were possibly grander/ showier views of the building for passing guests/ visitors to the castle (4.4.1.), would they include glazed windows?

Two further examples bearing the same initials and date, from context 41 came to light after the illustrated examples were submitted to Geoff Egan and form part of the drawn archive.

5.5.8. Miscellaneous

A small assemblage of other lead items was recovered from the site. The most notable of these include a spindle whorl from Context 3 (62g) and two plug fixings to secure an iron nail/hook into a wall.

5.5.9. Scrap

A large assemblage (124 pieces) of scrap lead was located. The material can be divided into two: sheet off-cuts (from roofing etc) and irregular waste (once molten). The latter category is by far the most common. The bulk of this material has almost certainly been generated by small bits of lead (ie window leads or flashings from the roof etc), being burnt with timbers and other unwanted refuse on bonfires during demolition works. Some notable groups of irregular waste are apparent. Contexts 65 and 129, thought to represent an area of burning/rubbish disposal, produced 20 pieces each. In addition a large assemblage was located in Square E4 (just to the west of the excavation area and possibly relating to Context 129) of the metal detector survey which produced 22 pieces (1,836g).

5.5.10. Metallurgical Remains

The excavations produced a very small collection of slag iron smithing slag. The material is listed on the metalwork record sheets in the archive. The small quantity involved clearly demonstrates smithing was not taking place in or near the excavated buildings. Any blacksmith activity must have been set a little way from the excavated area.

5.5.11. Conservation.

Of the metalwork assemblage, seven pieces of iron (**Figure 20 – 22 nos. 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13**) and four copper alloy buckles (**Figures 23 and 24; nos. 16a, 27, 31 and 32**), were sent to Queens University, Canada and subjected to specialist conservation treatment as part of their Master of Arts Conservation Programme in 2004. Although the iron objects were returned to the Castle and displayed in the associated *visitors centre*, it is uncertain whether the copper alloy buckles were returned with them. The resultant reports from the conservation treatment of the objects form part of the site archive.

5.6. The Glass by Philippa Whitehill and Peter Francis (Figure 17)

A large assemblage of glass, c. 2,000 sherds, weighing c. 2 kg, was retrieved from a total of 75 contexts, including overburden Context 2 and spoil (unstratified). Of the assemblage, beer/ wine bottle and green window glass (plus 3 pieces of another colour), dominate. The remainder comprised small vessel sherds, unidentifiable fragments, a cobalt blue bead, globules and the stem with partial bowl and foot of a drinking vessel (see below).

5.6.1. Window glass.

This group was highly fragmented and whether it all originated from the site is difficult to say. Unsurprisingly, the largest concentrations came from Context 2 and robbed out wall fills and a

midden layer, namely Contexts 76, 82, 119 and 129 respectively and are therefore considered to be part of the demolition rubble from the buildings or the Castle.

The case for at least some of it coming from the Castle is that glazed windows at this time were prohibitively expensive for all but the wealthy and would probably have comprised small, square or diamond shaped pieces of flat glass that would have fitted into a lattice of lead strips (comes), window replacement work is documented for the castle during the late 17th century '*narrow casements were enlarged into wide sash windows*' (Venebles, 1851) but most importantly the Castle interior was demolished in 1777 which would account for the high numbers and its fragmented state, the result of it being smashed prior to deposition on site (from a primary demolition area elsewhere?).

5.6.2. Vessel glass

As already mentioned, a percentage of the assemblage represented wine and beer bottles.

The surviving bases were identified as dating to the late 17th - early 18th century based on the 'kick – up' (the upward dome at the centre of the base); a shallow kick-up being prevalent in the late 17th century and a deep kick-up indicative of the early 18th (Leeds, 1941).

More worthy of note is the partial drinking glass (**Figure 17**), recovered from context (119), in the area from which the polychrome tile fragments came (**5.3.3**).

Personal communication from Peter Francis in 1999 concluded the glass is probably Irish and made from lead crystal, matching examples found at Templeogue House, south Dublin, the moat at Dublin Castle and in a pre-1692 context at Port Royal, Jamaica.

Although the lead content of 23% in the glass found on site is considered low for Dublin glass, especially that made for the domestic market, the percentage is considered mid-range for exported ware.

Two producers of this type of glass were active during the 17th century: John Odacio Formica at Oxmantown, Dublin from 1672/5 - 1696 and Capt. John Nicholls glasshouse, near Trinity college around the same time - either one of which may have produced this example.

Although it seems unlikely that a stable building would be using high status glass of this sort, the vessel may well have originated from here; the master having a warming tippie before riding out is perfectly plausible.

The large amount of wine bottle glass is not out of place here. Bottles were mass produced at this time and as a consequence a bottle of wine would cost you around 2 pennies.

When you consider a farm worker in 1700 could earn up to 4 shillings and 7 pennies a week, even the lowest classes could afford to buy wine (pers. Comm. Andy McConnel, 2004).

5.7. The Stone by Philippa Whitehill

Five types of stone were recovered during excavations, characterized in **Table 14**.

Stone	Number	Number of contexts	Weight: gr.
Chalk	7	3	150
Flint	1,390	55	25,825
Upper Greensand	85	25	7,375
Horsham stone	343	42	48,530
Ironstone	275	48	8,975
Sandstone	19	9	2,250
Slate	69	14	1,125
TOTAL	2,188	196	94,230

5.7.1. In the absence of a specialist report, here are some thoughts about the stone:

- The presence of chalk, despite such a small quantity could suggest a number of uses; agricultural marling of the field before or after the construction of the stable, use as a composite building material (although no chalk was observed in the surviving structures), mortar production on or close to the site or, if seen on the ground as a scatter, could be an indication of an earlier building.
- The flint assemblage comprised predominantly of pebbles with only a handful of flint pieces that showed signs of fire damage. It is possible that parts of the stable walls were built of or faced in flint.
- Upper Greensand was evidently used in construction of at least one phase of the stable as evidenced in the fabric of Context 166; at the north end of Phase 1a (**Figure 14: elevation 1**).
- Horsham stone was a common roofing material in Sussex until the late 19th century but its use as such on the stable buildings is uncertain. A small number of slabs were found to be capping a gully in the area of buttress (205) but this would not account for the total number retrieved.
- The 'Ironstone', in this case was a ferruginous sandstone, found locally and probably used, like the Upper Greensand as a composite building material.
- Similarly, the 'Sandstone' could also have been used in construction.
- The meager amount of slate, most of which came from Context 129 may have come from the stable, as roofing? If that was the case one would expect to find a larger quantity, unless it was taken away and re-used elsewhere.

5.7.2. The Worked Stone by Luke Barber

Three pieces of humanly shaped/ worked stone were recovered from the excavations, none of which would be out of place in a 'stable'.

These consist of part of a badly fragmented shale floor tile with traces of mortar on its underside from Context 114, part of a round-sectioned elongated whetstone in non-calcareous micaceous, medium-grained, brown grey sandstone (with one groove sharpening point present) from Context 129 and a smoothed, possibly 'irregular' whetstone of Upper Greensand, also from Context 129.

5.8. The Bone by Lucy Sibun

5.8.1. Introduction.

The excavations produced a total of 1174 identifiable fragments of bone from 69 separate contexts dating from the 16th – 18th centuries. The contexts producing bone included pits, post-holes, layers and walls with the majority containing just a few fragments. Context 129 was the only single large context producing almost half the total assemblage (523 fragments).

The bone was in a reasonable state of preservation with little or no surface erosion. Some larger fragments were present although a large percentage of the assemblage was highly fragmented. The following species were identified: cattle, sheep/goat, pig, horse, red deer, dog, small mammal, fish and bird.

5.8.2. Method.

Full quantification of the material was undertaken. The assemblage was then analysed at a basic level due to the size and nature of the assemblage, as well as financial constraints. This analysis included identification of fragments to species and the skeletal element represented. The resultant data produced NISP (Number of Identified Specimen) counts. Undiagnostic fragments categorized as cattle size or sheep size, have been included in the percentages of identifiable bone. Each fragment was then studied for signs of butchery, burning, gnawing and pathology.

More detailed analysis, which can result in information relating to body part data and age and sex patterns for the main domestic species was not undertaken. An initial examination of the material did also suggest that such analysis would not have been a worthwhile exercise, likely to produce limited results.

5.8.3. The results.

Despite the highly fragmented nature of the bone, it was still possible to identify 10 species represented by the assemblage.

Table 15: quantification of animal bone in terms of NISP.

SPECIES	FRAGMENT COUNT
Cattle	640
Sheep/ goat	440
Pig	39
Horse	2

Red deer	1
Dog	3
Small mammal	3
Bird	43
Fish	2
Human	1
Total	1174

As the table indicates, cattle and sheep dominated the assemblage. The remaining species were only represented by a few fragments each.

The three main domestic species (cattle, sheep, pig).

The relative percentages of the three main domestic species have also been calculated in terms of NISP and are shown in the table below.

Table 16: relative percentage of the main domestic species

Cattle	57.2%
Sheep	39.3%
Pig	3.5%

Cattle is still the dominant species in terms of NISP but sheep are also relatively important. Pig form a very insignificant part of the assemblage.

Cattle.

Are represented by 640 fragments and this included most parts of the skeleton, the skeletal extremities usually discarded during the primary butchery process as well as the meat bearing elements. Evidence for butchery is limited to 40 fragments but suggests that both butchery and kitchen waste are present. There is limited ageing data available but whilst both immature and mature animals are present, the majority appear to be mature.

Sheep.

The assemblage contains fragments from all parts of the skeleton suggesting that sheep were both butchered and eaten close to the site. There was surprisingly little evidence for butchery in the assemblage but marks consistent with skinning, splitting the carcass and jointing are present. There are few immature fragments amongst the assemblage.

Pig.

The evidence is sparse and almost completely limited to teeth and mandible fragments from both mature and immature animals. There was evidence for at least two males and one female. Teeth and mandible fragments usually form the primary discard in the butchery process so perhaps butchery occurred at, or near the site. No evidence for butchery was recorded in the bones.

Other.

Only two horse fragments were present, a tooth and a metapodial and these were from topsoil and subsoil layers (Contexts 1 and 2). Red deer was represented by a single fragment of a shed antler (Context 120).

Three fragments of dog were recovered, a tooth (Context 76), a metacarpal (Context 100) and a phalange (Context 129). However, gnawing marks noted on some bone fragments provides further evidence for their presence.

A total of 43 bird fragments were recovered and these include some domestic fowl. There were no large concentrations, which rather appeared to be scattered throughout a number of contexts. Two of the three small mammal fragments were rabbit (both from Context 129). The other was not identified. Two fish vertebrae were also recovered from Context 129.

5.8.4. Conclusions.

It is not possible to make many firm conclusions with regards to this assemblage. However, the data would suggest that cattle and sheep were both favoured and that pig played a much less significant role.

The body part data available and the limited evidence for butchery on all species suggest that animals may have been butchered as well as consumed close to the site. Domestic fowl, fish and possibly rabbit may have supplemented the diet.

5.8.5. Human Bone.

Context 129 produced a single human tooth. The mandibular canine was from an adult and showed no signs of wear or disease and had not been broken. The reason for its presence in the assemblage is uncertain.

5.9. The Shell by Philippa Whitehill.

The site produced a total of 246 shells (including fragments), weighing 2580 gm from 29 contexts.

As with the bone, Context 129 contained over 50% of the total assemblage (145).

Oyster shell dominates; making up all but 10 of the total number. The remaining shell comprises 6 mussels, 1 scallop and 3 land snails (a full identification and quantification table forms part of the archive).

The presence of abundant oyster shell in a midden context such as (129) is not unusual for a site of the interpreted period, as oysters were a popular food choice for rich and poor alike.

6.0. DISCUSSION.

When attempting to create a picture of the stable site and its immediate environs before and after the construction of the Castle, we can only draw upon the evidence gleaned from the excavation and the information extrapolated from available documentation.

As such, the excavations revealed a complete lack of archaeological evidence on the ground to support the presence of other buildings having ever been on the site prior to the stables. That said, the existence of a timber framed building, pre-dating the stable cannot be discounted; evidence on the ground could be ephemeral and any associated postholes and beam slots easily destroyed by the construction of something more substantial like the Phase 1 building (6.1.2.)

What is clear, however is that the field in which the site is located was subject to agricultural activity either before or after the construction of the phased building and, whilst it cannot be proved that the small assemblage of chalk present was the result of marling (5.8.), a number of plough ruts recorded across the site (Figure 8) and the abraded nature of some of the pottery collected would attest to this, as would the cartographic evidence, at least since the Tithe map of 1839 (2.3.).

The documentary evidence has also been useful in determining a predominantly agrarian economy within the immediate landscape of the site from before the 1440s. The earliest document of an inquisition post-mortem, dated 1360 (National Archives C135/151 (14)), describes the principal buildings and land belonging to the (recently deceased) Lord of the Manor, *William de Feynles* in Herstmonceux at that time, to comprise a '*capital messuage with adjoining garden*', presumably the manor house that became the Castle, '*350 acres of arable land lying in the marsh*', 199 acres of arable land not in the marsh, '*10 acres of meadow*', '*20 acres of woodland*' and so on. The document further lists the buildings held by William's widow, Joan, to comprise a '*hall and the great chamber*' (the manor house?), domestic service buildings, barns, gardens and cowshed forming '*a third of the estate*' (Salzman, 1937).

By combining the information given by the East Sussex County Historic Environment Record (Table 1) and Crouch's survey of 1684 (ESRO, XA/18/1), we can say with certainty that the church of All Saints and a smattering of farmsteads (MES4398, 32768 and 32780), would have been close by during the 14th century and settlement patterns seem to have remained more or less the same up to the late 17th century, with the addition of dwellings (such as MES4402, 20195, 20196, 22150 etc.), cropping up close to the church. The cartographic evidence searched for this report (2.3.) is also useful in illustrating development outside the Park pale from the late 18th century, together with the Sussex Archaeological Society's tenement analysis of Herstmonceux, available at the East Sussex Record Office (P23/2).

That the field has always played a part in the life of the Castle grounds since the 15th century is clear; proximity to the Castle building leaves no doubt. But, it is difficult to determine what that role was before the late 17th – early 18th century. The Park itself would have contained a number of buildings within its boundaries other than the Castle, as illustrated by the survey of 1570, which is the clearest description we have of a layout of the Castle and Park c. 150 years after its (current) inception. Lord Dacre's inventory of 1662 (PROB/4/9634 and ESRO, P2/32), is also useful in its detail but both documents are frustrating in that there is little information given as to the locations of the buildings, gardens and zones of land-use described within the park boundaries.

It is not known why the stable buildings were constructed on this spot but the presence of one of the principal entrances to the grounds, Flamsteed Road c. 85 m to the southwest may be an indication they were built as a statement of wealth, designed consciously to impress. With this in mind, it is probable that at least the first two phases of stable block were likely to have been fairly grandiose (6.1.1.). The extant Flemish bond brickwork of the western elevation of Phase 1 and the substantial foundation of the southern end of Phase 1a (4.4.1. and 4.4.2.), appear to support this. The entrance in question runs past the stable to the Castle's southern gate/drawbridge. In existence possibly since the construction of the Castle, it is described as a principal entrance to the grounds in the survey of 1570. Although there was little remaining of the Phase 2 foundations to tell whether this too was impressive in appearance, the Walpole letter of 1752 describes walking up '*a brave old avenue*' (the same approach) so, unless the stable building was screened off by trees or demolished by 1752, it would also have been seen.

6.1. THE BUILDINGS by David and Barbara Martin.

There seems little doubt that both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 buildings discovered by the excavations probably represent the stable (and possibly a coach house, which was known not to have been housed within the Castle), perhaps incorporating other uses, particularly on the first floor. A Clock House, Granary and Milkhouse, and Stable are all included in the 17th century Dacre inventory.

For an easily accessible and good indication of the size and grandeur of the stable buildings associated with houses of the gentry and aristocracy see Christopher Powell, *Stables and Stable Blocks* (Shire 1991), which also gives a clear indication of the wide variation in plan forms used. They vary from very long, single-pile ranges (often with slightly projecting end wings or broken-forward central pediments), to double-pile blocks and courtyard buildings. Many incorporated a cupola housing a clock, bell or both.

6.1.1. PARALLELS.

Although large, having overall ground-floor areas of 129m² (Phase 1), 215m² (Phase 1a) and 260m² (Phase 2), in comparison to some stable blocks both phases of buildings at Herstmonceux are relatively modest. The larger Phase 2 building is slightly smaller in length and width than the mid 18th century combined coach house and stable serving the lawyer, Thomas Medley's relatively modest (in comparison to Herstmonceux Castle), three-storeyed mansion at Buxted Park, East Sussex. The Buxted coach house and stable has a ground-floor area of approximately 300m². The original internal layout of the ground floor of the Buxted Park building is known from a detailed plan of 1798 - it incorporated space for three coaches and stalls for a total of 20 coach and riding horses [ESRO HBR 1/1243]. The coach house and stable built at Kidbrooke Park, East Grinstead by William Nevill, Lord Abergavenny in c. 1736 is constructed around a small 7.95 metre (26'1") by 8.20 metre (26'10") central courtyard and has overall dimensions of 22.55 metres (73'11") by 22.80 metres (74'9"), giving an overall ground-floor area of approximately 450m². This is almost double the size of the Herstmonceux building, though it does include two entrance areas to the courtyard. As with Buxted, this too included an area for three coaches [ESRO HBR 1/1457].

As a third comparative example, the combined stable and coach house at The Vyne, Hampshire, probably built in the mid 17th century by Chaloner Chute, Speaker of the House of Commons is a single-pile range (originally two storeys high) measuring a very impressive 39.70 metres (130'3") long. Despite its length, being single pile it has an overall ground-floor area of only 267m² - not dissimilar to Phase 2 at Herstmonceux (Wilson, 1998).

Two further local stable blocks, neither of which have been surveyed, are worth mentioning. In Hastings Old Town survives the extensive stables (now a theatre) of John Collier built in the 1740s, whilst in Dallington the stable of the mansion called Herrings likewise still stands (converted into a house) and formerly incorporated stabling for 20 horses as well as a coach house [ESRO ASH 2364-6]. Both are two-storeyed buildings which, like the Phase 2 structure at Herstmonceux, incorporate projecting wings at the ends of their principal facade.

In comparing the size of all these buildings with those excavated at Herstmonceux it should be remembered that, although Herstmonceux Castle is, as far as is known, the largest domestic building to have been constructed in East Sussex during the late-medieval period, the wealth of its owners reduced over time whilst, with the building of Chevening, near Sevenoaks, Kent, by Richard Lennard, 6th Lord Dacre of the South between 1616 and 1630 Herstmonceux became a second home. The wealth of its owners reduced still further when Thomas Lennard, 8th Lord Dacre of the South was forced to sell his Herstmonceux estate due to debts and it was purchased by the lawyer, George Naylor esq. The relevance of this point is that during this period the castle was probably much larger than required by its owners and thus, in comparison, the stables are likely to have been small. The possibility that the building only housed the stable, and that the coach house was a separate structure, must also not be overlooked.

6.1.2. DATING.

A final point which needs to be considered is the likely dates of the two buildings. Although the castle is a brick-built, mid 15th-century structure, there is no doubt that the extant Phase 1 brickwork is of considerably later date. This is well indicated by its use of Flemish bond, a bond not used until the 17th century. However, it should be borne in mind that it is possible that this represents brick underbuilding to an earlier timber-framed structure, and thus may not necessarily indicate the initial date of construction. A good general clue as to the date of a building which utilizes mass walling is to be found in the thickness of its walls (David & Barbara Martin, 1989). However, given that the Phase 1 walls may support timber framing, this is less helpful in this instance. If they were of mass construction throughout their height, then the one-and-a-half brick thickness of the side walls suggests a mid/late 17th century date at the earliest, and a likely date in the early/mid 18th century - entirely consistent with the use of Flemish bond. The fallen section of superstructure wall relating to Phase 1a (context 162), is similarly slender, again suggesting the same date range. It would therefore seem that the Phase 1 and Phase 1a brickwork was either constructed by the Lennard family during the 17th century, or perhaps more likely by George Naylor esq. during his ownership from 1708 until 1730. If so, this Phase 1 building stood for a very short time, for the Phase 2 structure which replaced it must itself have been demolished at the same date as the interior of the castle in 1777, if not earlier, after Dr Robert Hare improved nearby Herstmonceux Place in c. 1720 and moved there, leaving the Castle uninhabitable. This observation may reinforce the possibility that the Phase 1 brickwork merely represented improvements to an already existing timber-framed building. Given the Phase 2 building's double-pile plan, an early/mid 18th century date would be very acceptable for this phase. Such a date is not inconsistent with the artifacts recovered from the wide drain/sunken area of paving (Contexts 90/ 91), against the northern end wall of the Phase 2 building. Clay tobacco pipes suggest c.1660-1720, whilst the pottery/ceramics and metalwork suggest 17th-18th c and late 16th to mid 18th c respectively. It is therefore possible - even likely - that the rebuild was undertaken by George Naylor's nephew, Francis, who was described as 'of St Paul, London, in a settlement of 1734, but as Francis Hare alias Naylor of Herstmonceux, esq in 1743 (ESRO P23/2).

6.2. THE FINDS

The exact source of all the material found on site is uncertain. This is due, in part, to most of it coming from loosely stratified but 'unsealed' topsoil overburdens, demolition layers/spreads and fills. Therefore it is difficult to discuss what more can be said of the established status and economy relating to the stable solely based on the finds. However, we must conclude that some of the material derived from the site as it is unlikely that two buildings, functioning during the periods interpreted would not have accumulated artefact material somewhere within its boundaries.

The lead comes, window glass, small range of metal tools and building fixtures and fittings give a possible insight into the building detail i.e. some of the windows could have been glazed; it is perfectly plausible that a rich household of the period might well have a partially glazed service building, especially within a grand southern elevation seen by those visiting the castle.

The main period pottery assemblage from the site shows a diverse range of fabrics coming from a number of different sources. Unfortunately the assemblage is not large enough to be certain of site status and function. However, the assemblage does not appear to be a normal 'domestic' one and as such it could be suggested a stable/coach-house setting would be a more suitable place for it. Although the vast majority of the assemblage would be just as comfortable on a low or high status site, the presence of such high proportions of German drinking vessels, together with the Saintonge Green and Brown costrel fragment and the shell-shaped handles from the serving vessel would hint at an underlying trend indicative of a generally higher social status. Pottery groups will be needed from the castle itself before proper comparisons can be made between assemblages from truly domestic and 'out-building' contexts.

The nature of the largely equestrian related metalwork, dating to between the 17th and 18th centuries gives us, perhaps the best evidence for the building's usage, despite a questionable provenance and the highly decorated nature of some of the harness fittings, at least in the 17th century, would be in keeping with the known status of a site such as this.

6.3.

Following cataloguing and recording, the majority of the glass, cbm and bone finds were discarded/deposited into the big drain (Context 90/91), at the north end of the site. The remainder and more specifically those mentioned and illustrated here were returned to the castle in 2008 and retained for future study.

6.4. RECOMMENDATIONS

When excavations ended in 2003 the Estates department, with backing from Castle management suggested the excavated site be landscaped; the floor plan of both structures marked out on the ground in gravel, after which time the site would form part of the overall visiting experience. Unfortunately, since then, with a turnover of staff and funding assigned to other, some might say more important and pressing causes this idea was abandoned/forgotten.

Today, the site is predominantly overgrown with brambles, tall grasses and teasles with no indication to those passing by of what lies beneath. In May/June of 2016, the northern end of the site was cleared of overgrowth, in order to facilitate the BISC Field School in British Archaeology's week long training in basic archaeological fieldwork techniques. This work finished in mid June but the site was still open to the elements when the author visited in October. Given the accepted importance of the site and the degraded nature of the brickwork therein it is important that the site be kept covered/ protected when not required for study.

If the Castle so wished, as part of future management of the in-situ/ extant remains, the above landscaping project could be reprised, perhaps by a combined workforce of archaeologists, BISC students and Estates Department staff.

The resultant report from the 2016 exercise should form an addendum to this report if anything other than has been reported came to light.

Whilst the author has tried to place the site within a wider context via the available documentation, a full geophysical survey of the field in which the site is located is strongly advised; the results could establish whether the buildings lie in isolation or not.

Further examination of available documentation would also be useful in trying to establish the origins of the artefactual material retrieved and to perhaps confirm the postulated dates for the phased buildings. For instance, Castle accounts and receipts might offer details as to goods bought in, wage payments and building materials required for alterations and improvements, to the Castle or otherwise (5.6.1.). This might also inform the origin of the brick and tile used in construction.

At present the ceramic building material assemblages remain undated. However, revisiting the assemblage, the fabric series' and associated brick and tile records, as far as is possible, would enable a more rounded brick and tile report than that presented here.

The metalwork sent to Canada for conservation, specifically the copper-alloy, should be located and if not already returned to the Castle, repatriated with the metalwork assemblage.

Further research into the internal layout of surviving stable buildings of the late 17th – mid 18th centuries, associated with grand houses such as Herstmonceux Castle (6.1.1.) might prove useful in establishing what sort of conditions the stable hands/coachmen would have been experiencing and in the process answer the question posed regarding decorative adornments to the rooms, like that of the polychrome tile found on site (5.3.3.).

It is generally considered that service buildings, other than those housed within the Castle walls were located to the west of the Castle (4.4.1.), in the area of the present tea rooms and visitors centre. If that is the case it might be a useful exercise to monitor gardening in this area for possible artefact and ecofact scatters.

A full archive should be collated, retained and deposited in a suitable facility. A full catalogue of the paper and digital written, drawn and photographic records arising from the excavations should be undertaken. This should also include the pottery, metalwork, clay tobacco pipes and glass finds (i.e. those illustrated for the reports and returned to the Castle in 2008) and the fabric series' for the CBM. It must also be stressed that the unique site code, **HC98** attributed to the excavations and relevant context numbers remain present on all packaging (finds bags) and paperwork.

In closing, it should be emphasised that the stable buildings are an important element of the Estate's landscape as they represent a snapshot of life at the Castle during its intended function as home to the Lord of the Manor. As such the site deserves a certain level of care and attention in order to preserve the *in-situ*, extant remains for the future, especially when one considers it is the only known building on the accepted service side of the Castle to have survived, albeit only at foundation level.

7.0. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks must be given to the following for their help and support throughout excavations and beyond: Herstmonceux Castle staff, The Bader International Study Centre, East Sussex County Council's Archaeology Service, students and staff of the Centre for Continuing Education; University of Sussex, Jackie Humphrey, Vic Vidler, Christina Greene *et al*, Sarah Paynter at English Heritage's Centre for Archaeology for the XRF analysis on the 'mixed' alloy items (metal report), Steven Bednarski of St Jerome's University/University of Waterloo; Ontario, Justin Russell and Lauren Gibson for preparing the report illustrations and Christopher Greatorex (C. G. Archaeology) for proof-reading this draft.

8.0. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Atkinson, D.R. 1977. *'Sussex Clay Tobacco Pipes and the Pipemakers'*. Eastbourne: Crain services
- Bailey, G. 1992. *Detector Finds*. Greenlight Publishing Ltd. Chelmsford.
- Beswick, M. 1993. *'Brickmaking in Sussex'* Midhurst: Middleton Press.
- Calvert, D and R. Martin. 1994. *'A History of Hersmonceux Castle'*. International Study Centre, Queen's University, Canada.
- Chamberlain, C.C. 1960. *The Teach Yourself Guide to Numismatics, An A.B.C. of coins and coin collecting*. London: The English Universities Press Ltd.
- Egan, G. 1986. 'Marks on milled window leads'. *Post-medieval Archaeology* **20**, 303 – 309
- Gaimster, D. 1997. *German Stoneware 1200-1900*. British Museum Press. London.
- Goodall, I. 1976. 'Metalwork' in P. Drewett. Excavation at Bolingbroke Castle, Lincolnshire, 1973. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* **10**, 26-33.
- Grew, F. 1984. 'The Small Finds' in A. Thompson, F. Grew and J. Schofield. Excavations at Aldgate, 1974. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* **18**, 91-118.
- Grose, Francis. 1785. *'Antiquities of England and Wales'*. Vol 5. London. Online copy: www.archive.org/stream/antiquitiesofeng05grosvof#page
- Haslam, J. 1975. 'The Excavation of a 17th- century Pottery Site at Cove, E. Hampshire' in *Post-Medieval Archaeology* **9**, 164-187.
- Horsfield, T. W. 1834. *'The History, Antiquities and topography of the County of Sussex. Vol. 1'*. (1974 Edition). Dorking: Kohler & Coombes.
- Hurst, J., Neal, D., and van Beuningen, H. 1986. *Pottery Produced and Traded in North-West Europe 1350-1650*, Rotterdam Papers **6**.
- Jennings, S. 1981. 'Eighteen Centuries of Pottery in Norwich' *East Anglian Archaeology No. 13*. The Norwich Survey, Norwich.
- Leach, P. 1996. 'Archaeological report on features west of the Castle'. Unpublished report for Stuart Page Architects.
- Leeds, E.T. 1941. '17th and 18th century wine bottles of Oxford taverns'. In *Oxoniensia volume XIV*, 44 - 55
- Martin, David and Barbara. 1989. 'Domestic Buildings in the Eastern High Weald, 1300-1750: Part 1, Wall Construction' in *Historic Buildings in Eastern Sussex* **5**, 97 – 100.

- Mitchiner, M. 1988. *Jetons, Medalets & Tokens, The Medieval Period and Nuremburg, Volume One*. London: Seaby.
- Moorhouse, S. 1970. 'Finds from Basing House (c.1540-1645): Part 1' in *Post-Medieval Archaeology* **4**, 31-91.
- Moorhouse, S. 1971. 'Finds from Basing House (c.1540-1645): Part 2' in *Post-Medieval Archaeology* **5**, 35-76.
- Noel Hume, I. 1969. (reprinted 1991). *A Guide to the Artefacts of Colonial America*. Vintage Books, New York.
- North, J.J. 1991. *English Hammered Coinage, Volume 2, Edward I to Charles II, 1272 – 1662*. London: Spink and Son.
- Parry, John Docwra. 1833. '*An historical and descriptive account of the coast of Sussex....*'. London: Wright & Son.
- Powell, C. 1991. '*Stables and Stable Blocks*'. Shire Publications Ltd.
- Salzman. L.F. 1937. *The Victoria History of the county of Sussex*. Vol 9. Oxford University Press.
- Venebles, Reverend E. 1851. 'The Castle of Herstmonceux and its lords'. *Sussex Archaeological Collections* **4**, 125 - 202
- Williamson, G.C. 1967. *Trade Tokens issued in the seventeenth century in England, Wales and Ireland, by corporations, merchants, tradesmen etc.* (1967 reprint) London: Seaby
- Wilson, E. 1998. '*The Stable Block at the Vyne: An Assessment of the Archaeology of the Standing Structures*'. Unpublished National Trust report.
- Whitehead, R. 1996. *Buckles 1250-1800*. Greenlight Publishing, Chelmsford.
- ESRO** ref: P23/2 and P23/76, 1996. Herstmonceux Tenement Analysis, Sussex Archaeological Society.
- ESRO** ref: XA/18/1, 1683 – 1684. A survey of the manors of Herstmonceux and Old Court in Wartling in the possession of Thos. Lord Dacre, made by his servant Samuel Crouch.
- ESRO** ref: HBR 1/1243. Archive of David and Barbara Martin, 1967 – 2007: '*Harcourt Building, Buxted Park*' 1995.
- ESRO** ref: HBR 1/1457. Archive of David and Barbara Martin, 1967 – 2007: '*Clockhouse, Kidbrook Park*' 2002
- ESRO** ref: ASH 2364
- National Archives** ref C135/151/14, 27th May, 1360. Inquisition held at Herstmonceux in Sussex by William de Haton, esheater in the aforesaid County, concerning the custody of the lands of the King.