

EXCAVATION AND RESEARCH AT SHEFFIELD CASTLE 1927-1960



An assessment and project design

Glyn Davies and Hugh Willmott



July 2002

Contents

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Background to this document	5
1.2	Medieval Sheffield and the location of the castle	5
1.3	Previous work	5
1.3.1	Armstrong and Himsworth	5
1.3.2	Butcher	6
1.3.3	Work between 1960s and 1990s	7
1.3.4	ARCUS	7
1.4	Publication and post-excavation work to date	7
1.5	Archive deposition	8
2	Site records	9
2.1	Quantity	9
2.1.1	Plans and sections	9
2.1.2	Note books and correspondence	9
2.1.3	Photographic archive	10
2.2	Work to date	10
2.3	Potential	10
2.4	Work to do	11
3	Pottery	12
3.1	Quantity, provenance and date	12
3.2	Potential	12
3.3	Work to do	12
4	Tile	13
4.1	Quantity, provenance and date	13
4.2	Potential	13
4.3	Work to do	13
5	Clay pipes	14
5.1	Quantity, provenance and date	14
5.2	Potential	14
5.3	Work to do	14
6	Glass	15
6.1	Quantity, provenance and date	15
6.2	Potential	15
6.3	Work to do	15
7	Leather	16
7.1	Quantity, provenance and date	16
7.2	Potential	16
7.3	Work to do	16
8	Metalwork and slag	17
8.1	Quantity, provenance and date	17
8.2	Potential	17
8.3	Work to do	17
9	Animal bone and antler	18
9.1	Quantity, provenance and date	18
9.2	Potential	18
9.3	Work to do	18
10	Wood	19
10.1	Quantity, provenance and date	19
10.2	Potential	19
10.3	Work to do	19
11	Stone objects	20
11.1	Quantity, provenance and date	20
11.2	Potential	20

11.3	Work to do.....	20
12	Architectural stonework and samples	21
12.1	Quantity, provenance and date	21
12.2	Potential	21
12.3	Work to do.....	21
13	Miscellaneous finds.....	22
13.1	Quantity, provenance and date	22
13.2	Potential	22
13.3	Work to do.....	22
14	Structural Stonework.....	23
14.1	Quantity.....	23
14.2	Potential	23
14.3	Work to do.....	23
15	Documentary resource	24
15.1	Quantity.....	24
15.2	Potential	24
15.3	Work to do.....	24
16	Summary of potential	25
16.1	Paper archive	25
16.2	Finds	25
16.3	Documentary Resource	25
17	Aims and objectives	26
17.1	Research aims	26
17.1.1	Establishing the nature and importance of the site	26
17.1.2	Preparation of the archive as a resource	26
17.1.3	Platform for future development on the site	26
17.1.4	Placing the castle in the public domain	26
17.2	Publication.....	27
17.2.1	Academic.....	27
17.2.2	Local.....	27
18	Methods Statement.....	28
18.1	Paper archive.....	28
18.1.1	Plans and sections	28
18.1.2	Notebooks and correspondence	28
18.1.3	Photographs	28
18.2	Finds	29
18.2.1	Pottery	29
18.2.2	Tile.....	29
18.2.3	Clay pipes.....	29
18.2.4	Glass	29
18.2.5	Leather	29
18.2.6	Metalwork and slag.....	29
18.2.7	Animal Bone	30
18.2.8	Wood	30
18.2.9	Stone Objects	30
18.2.10	Architectural Stonework.....	30
18.2.11	Miscellaneous finds.....	30
18.3	Documentary resource.....	30
18.4	Final integration.....	31
18.5	The archive	31
18.6	Management of the project	31
18.7	Insurance	31
18.8	Health and Safety.....	31
18.9	Copyright.....	31
19	Resources and programming.....	32

19.1	Staffing.....	32
19.2	Timetable	32
19.2.1	Project stages for academic report.....	32
19.2.2	Project stages for local publication.....	32
19.2.3	Timetable.....	32
19.3	Task list and costs.....	33
19.3.1	Stratigraphic tasks.....	33
19.3.2	Specialist Tasks.....	33
19.3.3	Production Tasks Academic Report.....	34
19.3.4	Production Tasks Local Report	34
19.4	Carriage, materials and archive costs.....	34
19.5	Summary of project costs.....	34
20	References.....	35
	Appendix 1 Catalogue of plans and sections by Armstrong and Butcher	36
	Appendix 2 Documents in Sheffield Museum relating to Sheffield Castle.....	38
	Appendix 3 Finds from Sheffield Castle by Excavator	39
	Appendix 4 Potential documentary sources for Sheffield Castle.....	40
	Appendix 5 Gantt chart of proposed project timetable	41

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to this document

This document seeks funding to publish the backlog excavations that have taken place at Sheffield Castle over the last eighty years. Excavations primarily took place in the 1920s and 1950s, and consequently fall outside of current PPG16 regulations. In February 2002 the authors of this document submitted a preliminary proposal, and in April ARCUS were commissioned by English Heritage to produce this document as a full proposal for the potential publication of previous excavations at the castle.

This document has been written and laid out following *Management of Archaeological Projects* guidelines (MAP2) published in 1991. The previous excavations at the castle are outlined in **Section 1**, and the current state of the site records and artefacts outlined in **Sections 2-16**. The project aims and objectives are outlined in **Section 17**, followed by method statements in **Section 18** and details of resources and programming in **Section 19**.

1.2 Medieval Sheffield and the location of the castle

Sheffield Castle is located on a small hill, or precipice, at the confluence of the Rivers Sheaf and Don. The first castle on the site was made of timber and constructed c.1100 by William de Lovetot. This was burnt down during Simon de Montfort's rebellion in 1266. Following this, Thomas de Furnival built a stone castle and was given a licence crenellate in 1270. Documentary evidence shows that various alterations were made to the castle over subsequent years. The granting of a charter in 1296 by Edward I to the 3rd Lord Thomas Furnival for a market was a vital impetus to starting the development of Sheffield as a commercial and urban centre.

At the outbreak of the English Civil War, Sheffield Castle was held for the King by the Duke of Norfolk, but was taken in 1642 by the parliamentary army. It was retaken by royalist forces in 1643 and finally recaptured by parliamentary forces in 1644. In 1647 Parliament passed a resolution for it to be dismantled and slighted, and this appears to have taken place in 1648-9. The site of the castle was redeveloped soon after its demolition and became the location of Sheffield Markets from the 1920s.

Unfortunately, no contemporary plans or illustrations of the castle survive, but documentary records give some indication of its form. There was an Inner Court surrounded by a great ditch (moat). This contained the principal buildings of the castle, including a gatehouse, great tower, great hall, a chapel, a kitchen and a bakehouse. An Outer Court to the south, contained barns, stables, and a granary as well as other structures.

1.3 Previous work

1.3.1 Armstrong and Himsworth

The first archaeological investigations at the Sheffield Castle took place between 1927 and 1929 and were conducted by A.L. Armstrong, with the assistance of J.B. Himsworth. The work was carried out during the construction of Sheffield Market Hall and the Brightside and Carbrook Co-operative Society store. This took the form of a watching brief, with Armstrong and Himsworth making occasional visits to the site. Recording was concentrated in areas where they could gain access, mainly on the south side of the site over the moat, the castle entrance and in the north east corner.

However, they also made observations of many of the pile holes that were excavated across the site.

Armstrong recorded parts of the moat, the castle entrance with round bastion towers, drawbridge pier, courtyard surfaces, part of a stone building and the remains of a wooden building in the courtyard. Armstrong thought the wooden building was Saxon and predated the castle, however, his description and the dating of pottery suggests that he was probably incorrect. A cellar was constructed around the remains of the stone building in the courtyard, by the market architects, so it could be put on permanent display.

Artefacts recovered included pottery, structural wood and wooden objects, leather shoes, coins, keys, knives, pins and a crucifix.

Armstrong left Sheffield while construction was still in progress and did not observe all the work. Himsworth did continue visiting the site and recorded what he saw in his diary. However, Armstrong did not include Himsworth's later observations in his paper on the work. Armstrong (1930) reported the results of the work in the *Transactions of the Hunter Archaeological Society*. The report described the main features of the castle. Some of the finds were illustrated, but full artefact reports were not included.

Some of the finds, including some of the more unusual items, were put on display in the Co-op once it was built. Unfortunately these were lost during World War II, when the Co-op was destroyed by a bomb.

1.3.2 Butcher

Following the destruction of the Co-op by bombing, the markets were extended over the site in the 1950s. This work was observed by L. Butcher, a local amateur archaeologist who worked for the City Architects Department. Although there is no record that he was commissioned to undertake the work, his own notes in Sheffield City Museum suggested that he was instructed to observe construction on the site with a view to preserving as much of the castle as was possible. The only publication of this work was a short note in the news section of *Medieval Archaeology* (Hurst 1959).

Butcher was able to observe the re-exposure of all of the stonework previously recorded by Armstrong as well as other new features. The gateway bastion towers and drawbridge pier were re-exposed, as was the stone building in the castle courtyard. A new piece of stonework was seen in the south west corner of the market, which might have been part of the curtain wall. A further piece of walling was observed on the northern edge of the site on the precipice overlooking the Don. This had been noted by Himsworth in the 1920s, but had not been reported by Armstrong (1930).

Most of Butcher's work was on the former Co-op site, where he oversaw the excavation of many pile holes and recorded their sections. These were primarily over the moat and provided a series of stratigraphic sequences through it. Butcher was assisted in this work by Bartlett (Sheffield City Museum) who made visits to the site to collect finds, which were recorded to pile hole and depth below surface.

Butcher did not produce a publication and the finds were never studied. No notebooks, diaries or original site plans survive, but Butcher inked up numerous sections, site plans and interpretive plans. These are of a very high quality.

1.3.3 Work between 1960s and 1990s

Over the course of the 1960s and 1970s various alterations and additions were made to the Castle Market, but archaeological recording does not generally appear to have been undertaken.

During the early 1970s, when a large concrete retaining wall was constructed along the line of the precipice, Pauline Beswick (Sheffield City Museum) photographed the remains of the wall Butcher had first recorded, although only two fragments of wood were recovered during this work and no report produced.

By 1994 the remains of the courtyard building in the market cellar were in poor condition, and the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service were contracted by Sheffield Markets Department to clean and record the remains. This was undertaken with the aim of improving their display. As well as recording the stonework two soil sections on display were also recorded. An unpublished archive report was produced by the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (Latham & Atkinson 1994).

1.3.4 ARCUS

Since 1997 ARCUS have undertaken various pieces of work on the site of Sheffield Castle funded by both Carrillion Development Ltd and Sheffield City Council. ARCUS was commissioned to undertake the work, as part of the planning process, prior to the proposed redevelopment of the Markets area. A desk top assessment (Belford 1998) and two pieces of field evaluation, both involving trial trenching, have been carried out (Davies 2000; 2002).

The first trial trench (Davies 2000) was placed to examine the moat on the east side of the castle. This identified the location of the moat and recovered medieval and post-medieval pottery, tile and other finds, though not in large quantities.

Two further trial trenches were located in the area of the upper loading bay of the markets, on top of the precipice overlooking the River Don (Davies 2002). Both of these trenches found the remains of substantial stonework. The first trench was located near to the courtyard building in the markets cellar. This revealed a wall with a doorway, steps down to an undercroft and three courtyard levels. This wall was on the same alignment as the wall in the market's cellar and might be part of the same building or range of buildings. Finds associated with this building included pottery, ceramic floor tiles, clay pipes, metalwork, animal bones, window glass and window leads. The second trench was on the edge of the precipice. It contained one small stone wall, the foundations for a substantial stone structure and two pits. The finds, which included pottery, tile and metalwork, showed that all of these features dated to the medieval period, with the pits possibly relating to the wooden Norman Castle.

The two pieces of field evaluation undertaken by ARCUS have been reported in unpublished client reports deposited with the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service Sites and Monuments Record and with Sheffield City Museum (Davies 2000, 2002).

1.4 Publication and post-excavation work to date

The only publication of pre-ARCUS work on the castle is Armstrong's short paper of 1930. This briefly described some of the structures and history of the castle, but did not include any finds analysis, save a few illustrations of some of the finer pieces. Relatively few finds survive from Armstrong's work and it is known that some were lost in the war, when the Co-op was destroyed.

None of Butcher's work has been published and no analysis has been undertaken on the finds recovered. The archives in Sheffield Museum contain rough drafts on some aspects of the work Butcher undertook, but these are very incomplete. Most of the artefacts from Butcher's work still survive. This material was re-boxed in the early 1990s, due to the decay of the original boxes, and although some finds had lost their contextual information prior to this, particularly the leather and animal bone, most can be located three dimensionally within the excavated areas.

As noted in **Section 1.3.3**, an archive report has been produced on the stonework recording by the SYAS (Latham & Atkinson 1994). This includes plans and sections of the surviving stonework of the courtyard building in the cellar under the market.

Client reports have been produced on all the ARCUS work undertaken, these are illustrated with plans and sections of all archaeological features, phases and analysis of finds.

As part of this assessment a catalogue has been produced of all the surviving finds from the site with the exception of the leather (summarised in **Appendix 3**). This covers all the work undertaken by Armstrong, Butcher and ARCUS.

1.5 Archive deposition

Sheffield City Museum contains all the known surviving records and finds from archaeological work undertaken on the castle since the 1920s. This includes the work of Armstrong, Himsworth, Butcher and Beswick. The archive of ARCUS's work is currently being prepared for deposition with the Museum.

Since there was once a display in the old Co-op building, Sheffield Co-operative Society has been contacted to determine whether any records survived relating to the work on the castle. No records were found suggesting that they were either lost in the war or subsequently destroyed.

Sheffield City Council has been approached to see if their architects department held any material relating to Butcher's work in the 1950s but again no documents were discovered.

2 SITE RECORDS

2.1 Quantity

The records of Armstrong's and Butcher's work are held in a number of plan chests, box files and slide boxes in Sheffield City Museum. This material has become jumbled since their original deposition, although recent work by volunteers from the Hunter Archaeological Society has resulted in much of it being re-sorted into separate Armstrong and Butcher archives.

2.1.1 Plans and sections

The majority of the surviving plans are from Butcher's fieldwork. None of the plans of Butcher's work are original field drawings, but consist of inked-up versions of archaeological and architect plans. The only plans from Armstrong's work are the final illustrations prepared for his publication. The plans and sections in the collection include;

- architects drawings of 1920s market construction and 1950s redevelopment,
- plans of pile locations,
- plans of the archaeology,
- sections of piles,
- plans of stonework,
- sections/elevations of stonework,
- isometric reconstructions of the moat and entrance stonework.

There are a total of ninety-one sheets of drawings. These include thirty-nine plans, thirty-one sheets of sections/elevations and twenty-one isometrics (a full list is in **Appendix 1**). Of the fifty pile holes, excavated in the 1950s in and around the moat on the southern side of the castle, sections survive for twenty-nine. Often all four sides of the pile holes have been drawn. Although soil descriptions are not always present for each context in the pile holes, there are keys to the sections which provide a basic description of all the stratigraphy.

There are also several small interpretive sketch plans of parts of the castle, mainly of the moat on the southern side or of the entrance area.

2.1.2 Note books and correspondence

There are extensive records of correspondence relating to Armstrong's work on the castle, but only a few field notes survive. One small notebook of Armstrong's remains, and this contains some measurements taken during a period of a few weeks in 1920. This is of limited value as no plans relating to the measurements survive. There are no field descriptions of the site from Armstrong's work. However, Himsworth's diary does describe much of what he saw on the site, particularly the stonework. This diary has been typed up and illustrated with photographs taken by Himsworth. Dozens of letters survive to and from Armstrong, many of which include discussions of the archaeology and thoughts on some of the finds, including those which have been subsequently lost. There are also the notes for a number of lectures given by Armstrong and Himsworth on the archaeology and history of the castle. There is also an unfinished draft of a paper on the history of Sheffield Castle by Drury (a local amateur historian). On Drury's death Armstrong agreed in correspondence with his wife to finish the work. However, it appears that he never did this.

No field notes survive for Butcher's work. However, there are several letters to and from Butcher relating to the excavations and a series of lecture notes. There are also

extensive notes relating to aspects of the archaeology and history of Sheffield Castle. These appear to be notes for the preparation of a publication on the castle but these are very incomplete and make no reference to the finds.

There are a number of newspaper cuttings on the castle that date from the 1920s to 1960s. These are of limited value, but some of them do include descriptions of finds from Armstrong's work that have since been lost. There are also odd notes in the files on other work, notably by Beswick, particularly on what she saw when the concrete retaining wall was constructed along the precipice.

2.1.3 Photographic archive

The museum archives contain numerous photographs of the site. The earliest of these are three prints dating from 1914. The prints show fragments of stone walls incorporated into buildings stood on the site, but it is unclear if these are *in situ* remains of the castle or later reused stonework.

There are hundreds of black and white prints. However, these are mixed-up and include photographs by Armstrong, Himsworth and Butcher. Some of the photographs are marked with dates and descriptions, but not all. Some of the prints show artefacts recovered by Armstrong and possibly by Butcher. Careful analysis may be able to untangle and utilize these pictures. Some negatives survive for the prints.

The best images of the site are provided by a number of slides. There are eight large glass slides taken by Himsworth showing Armstrong's work, but no slides by Armstrong himself. The majority of the slides are of Butcher's work. There are 124 35mm slides of these in all and they come from a total of eleven different films. There are also seven large glass slides of drawings made by Butcher. There are ten later slides by Beswick of work on the precipice and a further eight glass slides that cannot yet be credited to anyone, but were probably taken by Himsworth.

2.2 Work to date

The assessment of the documentary archive has identified the presence of substantial numbers of plans, photos and other documents relating to archaeological work on the castle since the 1920s.

A catalogue has been produced of all the plans and sections from Armstrong's and Butcher's work held by Sheffield City Museum (**Appendix 1**). All other documents relating to work on the castle have been catalogued. The types of documents involved and their numbers are summarised in **Appendix 2**.

The photographic archive of Armstrong's and Butcher's work has been examined. This identified that the two archives have been collated over the years. All the slides have been separated out and resorted into their original films. This has identified that the majority of pictures relate to Butcher's work and that these are a valuable addition to the drawn record, particularly with respect to the castle stonework.

2.3 Potential

The extensive drawn records and photographs, particularly of Butcher's work, can be used to construct profiles across, and the depositional sequence within, the moat on the south side of the castle.

The stonework, particularly the gatehouse and bastions, have been well-recorded over the years and the drawn and photographic record can be used to understand this element of the castle.

From the records available of Butcher's and Armstrong's work, allied with the analysis of the finds, it is possible to reconstruct and date the depositional sequence in the moat on the southern side of the castle and the structure of the castle entrance.

Some of the records show features that may relate to the defence of Sheffield Castle during the Civil War. Continued examination and analysis of these may reveal further post-medieval activity.

2.4 Work to do

Study of the documentary archive will produce detailed information for the interpretation of the site and analysis of the finds (a methods statement is outlined in **Section 18.1**). The tasks fall into several areas;

- producing a plan of the whole site, showing all known and recorded archaeological features,
- examination of all notes, diaries, letters and lecture notes for information on any otherwise unrecorded archaeological features,
- using Butcher's sections key to identify the character of the moat deposits,
- reconstructing the stratigraphic sequence/phasing in the moat,
- extracting all records or information of lost artefacts,
- relating the photographs to specific archaeological features,
- identifying phasing/alterations within any recorded stonework,
- identify those features which may relate to the siege of Sheffield Castle in the Civil War.

3 POTTERY

3.1 Quantity, provenance and date

Just over 2,000 sherds of pottery have been recovered in the excavations undertaken by Armstrong, Butcher and ARCUS at the castle. To date only a brief scan of the Armstrong and Butcher collections has been carried out by Christopher Cumberpatch. This showed that the assemblages consist largely of later medieval, post-medieval and early modern coarse and finewares. Also present is a small assemblage of shell-tempered wares, which might be earlier in date, and will require separate specialist consideration (see **Section 18.2.1**).

3.2 Potential

The Armstrong collection appears to have suffered considerable reduction over the years and it is unclear how representative the surviving material is of that originally found. However, the Butcher collection, which forms the vast majority of the assemblage, appears to be substantially complete and retains all its contextual information.

The pottery from the castle is the largest assemblage of medieval and early post-medieval material to have been excavated within the City of Sheffield. Its full publication will add to a growing corpus of South Yorkshire ceramics and it will supplement the regional ceramics reference collection (Cumberpatch in prep.).

Furthermore, most of the sherds derive from identifiable archaeological contexts. This offers the opportunity to relate them to the excavation records and establish relationships with the excavated archaeological strata. This will not only allow for the more accurate dating and phasing of many contexts, and may also reveal the pattern of consumption and discard of ceramics throughout the life of the castle.

3.3 Work to do

All the ceramics from the castle will require full examination, recording and cataloguing (as outlined in **Section 18.2.1**). The majority of this work will be carried by Christopher Cumberpatch, with specialist analysis of the shell-tempered wares being undertaken by Jane Young.

4 TILE

4.1 Quantity, provenance and date

Four groups of tile are present in the assemblage. The first are three or four plain-glazed Netherlandish imports of the fifteenth or early sixteenth century. The second group of tiles, which forms the majority of the assemblage, are locally made plain-glazed examples, imitating the more fashionable imported ones. The third are a small group of unglazed or only partially glazed tiles, again of local manufacture. Finally there are three pieces of tiles modified into circular pieces, possibly for use as weights or counters (see **Section 11.1** for similar stone examples).

4.2 Potential

The research potential lies in two areas. Firstly the context of the tiles is very significant. There are few extant assemblages of floor tiles from castles in northern England, particularly from inland sites, and most castles known to have had them are located to the east of the country. The assemblage from Sheffield would extend the known range of distribution and use, as well as contributing to what is known about sources and lines of supply.

Secondly, the distinctive fabrics of some of the tiles, particularly the locally made ones, indicates that they could form the basis of a fabric series for the South Yorkshire region. ICP (inductively-coupled plasma) techniques would generate profiles of the chemical constituents that could be comparable with other regional data sets and provide an invaluable starting point for future studies of the ceramics and clays of the Sheffield area.

4.3 Work to do

The tiles require full cataloguing and reporting (as outlined in **Section 18.2.2**), to identify the styles, provenance and fabrics present. This work is to be undertaken by Jennie Stopford, and ICP analysis will be undertaken by Alan Vince, to establish a regional profile of clay and ceramic types.

5 CLAY PIPES

5.1 Quantity, provenance and date

A small, but significant number of clay pipes were recovered by both Armstrong and Butcher. It seems possible that only the earlier forms were retained, as there are very few later pipes in the assemblage. Twenty-one of the fragments are bowls, with the majority being sixteenth and seventeenth century in date, and they are of probable local origin. There are also eight fragments of stem. Approximately two thirds of the clay pipes can be related to specific archaeological contexts.

5.2 Potential

The clay pipes are important for two reasons. Early pipe forms (dating to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) are rarely found in Sheffield and this assemblage is one of the largest to come from a stratified context in the region. Consequently it will compliment and expand to the growing corpus of Sheffield pipes. Furthermore those pipes from stratified contexts will provide valuable dating evidence for the later phases of the castle's occupation.

5.3 Work to do

All the pipe fragments will be comprehensively measured and recorded (methods outlined in **Section 18.2.3**) and a full report produced. The work will be undertaken by Susie White.

6 GLASS

6.1 Quantity, provenance and date

A small assemblage of glass was recovered from both the Armstrong and Butcher excavations. This includes forty-five fragments of window glass, of which half are from secure contexts, and fragments from eight different vessels. All the glass is a domestically produced potash metal and primarily dates to the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

6.2 Potential

The potential for the glass lies in three areas. First, the distribution of the window glass will assist in the identification and interpretation of the archaeological features in which it is found. The presence of window glass is indicative of buildings, and it should be possible to suggest the locations of some of these by its distribution. Second, the vessel glass will compliment the pattern of consumption observable in the ceramic assemblage (see section 3.2) and show the range of vessel types in use. Finally, the glass will provide valuable phasing evidence, due to its close typological dating, to the contexts in which it is found.

6.3 Work to do

Both the window and vessel glass will require cataloguing and full reporting, with comparison to other appropriate assemblages. The work will be undertaken by Hugh Willmott (methods outlined in **Section 18.2.4**).

7 LEATHER

7.1 Quantity, provenance and date

A large number of leather finds have survived in a good condition, having apparently received some level of unrecorded conservation. The majority of fragments are parts of shoes dating from two periods, the late medieval and seventeenth centuries. There are also fragments from other, as yet unidentified, leather garments or objects. Unfortunately much of the leather is without contextual information.

7.2 Potential

Despite much of the leather being unstratified, it does represent a significant assemblage. It contains the largest group of medieval and early post-medieval shoes to have been found in the Sheffield region thus far, and the presence of other leather objects is also important as these are very rarely found. Despite its limitations the assemblage will provide valuable evidence for the early use of shoes and other leather items in Sheffield.

7.3 Work to do

All the leather requires comprehensive study (methods outlined in **Section 18.2.5**). The individual pieces of leather will be sorted, catalogued and fully reported on, with reference to other comparable urban assemblages. The work will be carried out by Jane Cowgill.

8 METALWORK AND SLAG

8.1 Quantity, provenance and date

A small, but important, collection of metal finds survive from the excavations that include iron, copper-alloy and precious metals. Most dates from the late medieval to seventeenth centuries, and includes knives, pins, keys and other small items. Unfortunately much of the original assemblage was destroyed during World War II bombing (see **Section 1.3.1**), although illustrations and photographs of some of these still survive. Only a very little slag and metal-working debris was recovered and it is unlikely to be a representative group. Most of the slag is now without contextual information.

8.2 Potential

The metal finds form a very significant group, containing a number of rare items. The metal objects are informative of the domestic life of the castle, as well as contributing to the growing corpus of late medieval to early modern material culture in the Sheffield region. Given the limited quantities and lack of contextual information, the slag has very little research potential.

8.3 Work to do

Although some of the metalwork has previously been published (Armstrong 1930) all of it will require a full re-evaluation (method statement outlined in **Section 18.2.6**). Given the lack of research potential of the slag, no further recording will be undertaken, save for a brief note in the site archive. Work on the metalwork will be undertaken by Jane Cowgill.

9 ANIMAL BONE AND ANTLER

9.1 Quantity, provenance and date

A relatively small assemblage of animal bone and antler was recovered from the castle, suggesting that it was only selectively retained. Much of the material is unstratified, or contains incomplete contextual information. The majority of the bone is mammalian and probably results from general domestic occupation. However, some of the bone and the antler is worked, and in a few cases this is clearly the result of knife-handle manufacture.

9.2 Potential

There is very little potential in the unworked bone and antler, given the small nature of the assemblage and the lack of contextual information. The worked material has a greater research potential and seems to be some of the earliest evidence of handle making for Sheffield's cutlery industry.

9.3 Work to do

The unworked material will be sorted and then only a brief note made for the site archive. The worked bone and antler will be catalogued and discussed with its relevance to the wider industry in Sheffield drawn (method statement in **Section 18.2.7**). The work will be undertaken by Glyn Davies.

10 WOOD

10.1 Quantity, provenance and date

Wood was recovered from several areas of the castle and this can be divided into three types. Four complete pointed stakes, probably part of the Civil War defences, and part of a pile in a medieval context were retained. Two wooden objects were also found, a possible saddle-making palm-board and weaving paddle. Finally small samples of wood were taken from a number of waterlogged contexts.

10.2 Potential

The small samples taken from some contexts have little further research potential, but will be catalogued for the site archive and their species identified. The two wooden objects will fully recorded to publication level and illustrated. The section of medieval pile still retains a complete sequence of tree rings from the heartwood through to the sapwood. Consequently, it will be possible to gain an accurate dendrochronological date for the felling the pile and the context in which it was found (see **Section 18.2.6** for a methods statement). The four wooded stakes are too small for similar treatment, but retain well-preserved tool and working marks. These and the dimensions of the pile will be recorded and drawn in detail for the publication.

10.3 Work to do

A brief assessment of the dendrochronological potential of the wood has already been made. A sample needs to be taken from the medieval pile and analysed. The other wooden objects will require recording and cataloguing. All dendrochronological and wood analysis will be undertaken by Ian Tyers.

11 STONE OBJECTS

11.1 Quantity, provenance and date

Twelve artefacts of worked stone were recovered from both Armstrong's and Butcher's excavations. Only half come from secure contexts, and these include a spherical cannon ball, spindle whorl and whet stone. The most common stone artefacts are flat or domed circular discs. As with the modified tiles (see **Section 4.1**) it is most likely that these are either weights or counters.

11.2 Potential

Although some of the stone objects are unstratified, they all reflect aspects of daily life at the castle. The stone discs are also probably for similar functions to the tile examples, so will be considered together. Consequently all the worked stone objects should be catalogued and reported to full publication level.

11.3 Work to do

A full catalogue and report will be made of all the stone objects (method statement in **Section 18.2.9**). Comparisons between similar stone objects and those from tile will also be made (see **Section 4.1**). This work will be carried out by Hugh Willmott.

12 ARCHITECTURAL STONWORK AND SAMPLES

12.1 Quantity, provenance and date

A number of fragments of architectural stonework, which were from secure archaeological contexts but divorced from their original buildings, were recovered by the Armstrong, Butcher and Davies excavations. These include mullions, plinths, column drums and tracery.

12.2 Potential

Despite having no direct contextual connexion with identifiable structures, the architectural fragments help demonstrate the date, range and style of buildings present within the castle. However, as they are not from *in situ* contexts the potential value of their study in isolation is limited.

12.3 Work to do

To maximise their potential, the fragments of architectural stonework will be studied in conjunction with the free-standing structural stonework (outlined in **Section 14**), and not as individual small finds (methodology statement in **Section 18.2.10**). This work will be undertaken by Christopher Constable.

13 MISCELLANEOUS FINDS

13.1 Quantity, provenance and date

A number of finds were recovered that do not fit into defined categories. Nineteen pieces of plaster, a small number of shells, two flints and fragments of a platted vegetable fibre were found.

13.2 Potential

The potential of the plaster is very slight, most has no contextual information and none can be positively related to any structure. Likewise, the shell has little archaeological potential. The flint and vegetable fibre have more potential for further study.

13.3 Work to do

No further work will be undertaken on the plaster or shell, save for a brief mention in the site archive. The flint and vegetable fibre will be identified and briefly noted in the full publication (methods statement in **Section 18.2.11**). The flint will be identified by Mark Edmonds and the fibre by Jane Gowgill.

14 STRUCTURAL STONEMWORK

14.1 Quantity

There are two small sections of structural stonework surviving *in situ* that can be accessed. One is the courtyard building first uncovered by Armstrong that lies in a cellar under the north east corner of the market. The second piece is a small section of the castle entrance which lies under the 1950s extension to the market, which is more difficult to access, as entrance is gained via a trap door in the floor of the market hall.

14.2 Potential

As the only surviving stonework these have the potential to inform our understanding of the quality and condition of stonework on the castle (methods statement in **Section 18.2.11**). The assessment of the structural stonework will enable the quality and accuracy of surviving records of the stonework to be ascertained.

14.3 Work to do

Both pieces of stonework have been drawn; the courtyard building by the SYAS in the 1990s and the castle entrance by Butcher in the 1950s. These drawings will be used as the basis for an assessment of the surviving stonework. The drawings will be annotated with any alterations following the assessment of the structural stonework. This work will be undertaken by Christopher Constable.

15 DOCUMENTARY RESOURCE

15.1 Quantity

There are a large number of published and unpublished documents that potentially contain information relating to the castle (a full list is summarised in **Appendix 4**). The published records consist of Charter, Close and Fine Rolls held in the Public Record Office (PRO), as well as Calendars of Inquisitions and Patent Rolls. Unpublished documents, held at the PRO in Kew, are contained within the Chancery, Crown Estate and Exchequer collections.

15.2 Potential

Both the published and unpublished records have the potential to provide a historical background to the castle. Not only will they form the basis of a narrative history, but they will also help in understanding the phased development of the castle. When combined with the known archaeological features they will supply a broader contextual background.

15.3 Work to do

Both the published and unpublished documents will be studied for references to the castle (methods statement in **Section 18.3**). All relevant information will be collated and written up, with reference to possible archaeological remains. The work will be undertaken by Tim Cooper.

16 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL

16.1 Paper archive

The paper archive is the primary source for understanding the character, layout and stratigraphy of the castle. It contains details of all excavation and recording work to have been undertaken on the site since the 1920s, and includes a large number of plans, sections, photographs and other contextual information, which are particularly detailed for the southern half of the site.

This wealth of stratigraphic information has the potential to contribute to a number of archaeological aims. First, it will enable the complete reconstruction and interpretation of the southern half of the site, including the moat area, gatehouse and buildings within the courtyard. Second, it will allow the nature and academic significance of the site to be assessed and placed within its regional and national context. Finally the paper archive is the primary information resource on the castle. Through its interpretation and presentation, the presence, importance and role of the castle can be presented to a wider audience. Study of the paper archive will enable an accessible publication to be produced to heighten public awareness of a little known local monument (see **Section 18.1.4**).

16.2 Finds

The potential for the finds lie in three areas. Firstly, many of the specific assemblages are important within their own individual areas of artefact study. Many, such as the pottery (**Section 3**) and the tile (**Section 4**), represent important groups on both a regional and national scale, and provide an increased understanding of the typological sequences for the Sheffield region. Secondly, most of the stratigraphic dating and phasing relies on the typological sequence provided by the pottery and other artefacts. Without the full study of the material culture, it will be hard to interpret many aspects of the archaeological record. Finally, the material culture is important to a wider understanding of the life and use of the castle. The different assemblages illustrate many of the activities that occurred at the site, and the changing nature of the castle from its construction to its slighting.

16.3 Documentary Resource

The documentary resource has the potential to further the archaeological understanding of the castle. The identification and collation of specific references to the castle will provide a historical and chronological framework along side which the archaeological features can be placed. Furthermore, there is the possibility that specific references within the documents, such as records of building and repair works, might be directly related to known archaeological features.

17 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

17.1 Research aims

The aims of this project fall into four areas, important to the academic and wider community.

17.1.1 Establishing the nature and importance of the site

Although some partial studies previously have been undertaken on the castle, all have been incomplete and limited in scope. No study has fully incorporated the whole stratigraphic, documentary and finds archive. As a consequence it has been impossible to characterise the nature and importance of the castle on both a regional and national scale. The unpublished state of the castle archive and finds has resulted in it being an under-utilised archaeological and historical resource.

The importance of the site to the town and region is further emphasised by the nature of its excavation. It is important nationally as a result of having been one of the few castles in a large urban conurbation that has been subject to well-recorded archaeological study, instead of large-scale unrecorded clearance. The only comprehensive examination of castles in the urban environment has highlighted their importance as a resource. Where castles have not escaped redevelopment "their archaeological potential must be established and their preservation ensured" (Drage 1987, 131). This has been an approach successfully applied at Bristol and Nottingham, and Sheffield Castle provides a similar opportunity.

17.1.2 Preparation of the archive as a resource

Although the finds and paper archive held by Sheffield Museum are available for consultation, the lack of work on the site has left them little known and difficult to access. There is no comprehensive record of the finds, and the paper archive has become jumbled (see **Section 2.1**). With comprehensive work on, and publication of, the site it will not only become better known to archaeologists and the public, but also it will be a resource can be better utilised in the future.

Further study would also produce an important finds sequence for later medieval and post-medieval Sheffield. This would become the primary reference collection on which further material culture study for the period and region would be based.

17.1.3 Platform for future development on the site

The site of the castle lies at the heart of Sheffield, a commercially important area that already has seen significant redevelopment over the last century (see **Section 1.3**). The buildings (primary the Castle and Sheaf Markets) that currently occupy the site are due to be demolished or significantly redeveloped in the near future. Although the castle has been the subject to recent PPG16 trial trenching (Davies 2000; 2002), a comprehensive publication and analysis of all past excavations and fieldwork would greatly enhance further assessment of the castle in the future development plans for the area. The comprehensive analysis and publication of the castle archive is outside of PPG16 requirements, and yet it would allow the historical importance and context of the area to be reflected and incorporated into developer-funded designs for the area.

17.1.4 Placing the castle in the public domain

Recent work on the castle by ARCUS has highlighted the interest of the media and public in Sheffield Castle (see list of press articles in **Section 20**). This study would enable knowledge and understanding of Sheffield Castle to be more widely

disseminated to the public (outlined in **Section 17.2.2**). It would also provide an opportunity to improve the display on Sheffield Castle in Sheffield Museum at a time when the museum is undergoing a major refurbishment .

17.2 Publication

Two levels of publication, to suit different interest groups, are envisaged.

17.2.1 Academic

It is proposed that a full academic publication on the castle be produced. This would be a site monograph published as a British Archaeological Report within the new *ARCUS Studies in Historical Archaeology* series. The main advantages of publishing in this format would be;

- a wide circulation through BAR's existing distribution network;
- a cheap means of publication, requiring only a small publication grant;
- a larger A4 format, compared with many academic fora, more suited to the reproduction of plans and sections.

17.2.2 Local

It is proposed that a guide to the archaeology and history of Sheffield Castle is produced in conjunction with Sheffield City Museum. This will be aimed at the general public and amateur historians, with a projected age range of 15+. A local history publisher, Wharncliffe Publishing Ltd, has been approached and the envisaged format would be;

- a compact A5 format
- 32-45 pages
- extensive black and white, as well as selected colour, photographs and illustrations.

18 METHODS STATEMENT

18.1 Paper archive

The nature and potential of the paper archive is outlined in **Sections 2.1-2.3**. There are several tasks will be undertaken to aid in the analysis and interpretation of the site. All work on the paper archive will be undertaken by Glyn Davies, in conjunction with Hugh Willmott, co-ordinator of the post-excavation phase.

18.1.1 Plans and sections

All of the plans and sections of the site will be examined and the following tasks undertaken:

- information will be extracted from all relevant plans to produce the most complete plan possible, showing all previously identified archaeological remains,
- all pile sections will be examined to identify the depositional sequence in the moat,
- the major depositional units in the moat will be identified and traced these between pile holes to produce composite sections across the moat,
- the information from the composite sections across the moat will be combined with the finds and details of sections to determine the phasing of deposits in the moat,
- all the plans/sections/elevations showing stonework will be collated to determine any alterations in the stonework, this will be undertaken in conjunction with the photographic record,
- the plans of the site will be examined to determine if any of the features previously identified relate to the siege of the castle during the Civil War,
- selected plans and sections crucial to interpreting the site will be redrawn in a standard house-style.

18.1.2 Notebooks and correspondence

All of the written paper records will be read to extract information on the following topics;

- references to any archaeological features (and their location) not shown on any of the surviving maps or plans,
- all references to artefacts, so that they can be compared with the surviving assemblages and a record produced of those known to have been lost,
- all descriptions/notes describing the nature and date of deposits that can be used in aiding the interpretation of the site,
- to compare Butcher's key to the pile sections and any written description of deposits to the sections to describe the depositional sequence,
- to examine any written descriptions of the siege of Sheffield Castle to identify the nature of the defensive alterations made during the English Civil War.

18.1.3 Photographs

The first stage of photographic analysis will be to produce a catalogue of all the photographs, slides and prints. This will identify what the photograph shows, when it was taken and its potential interpretive value. Following the production of the catalogue the photos will be examined for information in the following areas:

- evidence of phasing within or alterations to the stonework, this will be undertaken in conjunction with the plans and sections;

- determine which show lost artefacts to aid in the production of the catalogue of lost finds, this will be undertaken in conjunction with the written record;
- identify all photographs of potential use in the publication of the site.

18.2 Finds

18.2.1 Pottery

The nature and potential of the pottery is outlined in **Sections 3.1-3.3**. The assemblage from the excavations of Armstrong and Butcher will be recorded, and fully catalogued with reference to the regional medieval ceramics reference collection (Cumberpatch in prep.) and to standard published accounts of local post-medieval pottery. This data will be integrated with the pottery from more recent excavations which has already been fully reported (Cumberpatch 1999; 2002), so that a comprehensive archive is achieved. The full pottery report will be presented in tabular format together with interpretive text and full references. The final report will conform to the standards recently set out by the Medieval Pottery Research Group (MPRG 2001). A number of vessels, around fifty, will be selected for illustration and photography

18.2.2 Tile

The nature and potential of the tiles is outlined in **Sections 4.1-4.3**. The group will be fully catalogued, discussed and compared with other regional assemblages. The various fabric groups will be identified and selected examples illustrated. Thirty-five samples, from representative fabric types, will be sent of ICP analysis to determine the exact chemical compositions, thus forming the basis for a regional profile.

18.2.3 Clay pipes

The nature and potential of the clay pipes is outlined in **Sections 5.1-5.3**. The assemblage will be fully catalogued, bowl forms, bore diameters and stamps recorded. All relevant data will be registered with the National Tobacco Pipe Stamp Catalogue, which is held by the National Clay Tobacco Pipe Archive (NCTPA) at the University of Liverpool. Any dating information derived from the pipes will be used to aid the phasing of the site stratigraphy. Selected examples will be illustrated.

18.2.4 Glass

The nature and potential of the glass is outlined in **Sections 6.1-6.3**. The assemblage will be fully catalogued, recorded and a discussion placing the glass in both its regional and national context produced. Comparison with the pottery and other finds will be made if appropriate and items selected for illustration.

18.2.5 Leather

The nature and potential of the leather is outlined in **Sections 7.1-7.3**. Most of the disparate pieces of the separate shoes have not been bagged together so time will be needed to reconstruct the shoes that have more than one element present. The range of shoe styles, and other objects, will then be recorded, dated and compared with other urban assemblages. Representative styles of shoes and other leather artefacts will be selected for illustration.

18.2.6 Metalwork and slag

The nature and potential of the metalwork and slag is outlined in **Sections 8.1-8.3**. The ironwork, although conserved, will require x-raying before it can be studied, particularly the knife blades which may have makers marks. All the surviving metal finds will be catalogued, dated and related to similar finds from urban and castle excavations. This catalogue and discussion will be added to and extended by a

thorough examination of the original photographs and drawing of finds lost during World War II (see section 1.31). Any objects which are now lost and that can be positively identified will be added to the catalogue and discussion. Suitable objects will then be selected for photography and illustration.

18.2.7 Animal Bone

The nature and potential of the animal bone is outlined in **Sections 9.1-9.3**. The worked bone will be catalogued and the species identified. Where possible the evidence for modification will be noted and nature of its working characterised. From this it will be possible to identify the intended final products and comment on the scale of the industry. Any bones with particularly indicative worked features will be selected for photography and illustration.

18.2.8 Wood

The nature and potential of the wood is outlined in **Sections 10.1-10.3**. Finished artefacts will be catalogued and reported, and comparisons drawn with other equivalent assemblages. The other worked wood objects, such as the pile and stakes, will have their species identified and any tool-marks noted. A single sample will be taken from the pile, by cutting a transect along a previously existing split in the wood. This sample will be sent for dendrochronological analysis. The result of this will not only provide a date for the felling of the tree and indicate whether it came from an *in situ* primary context (related to the first phase timber castle) or had been subsequently reused.

18.2.9 Stone Objects

The nature and potential of the stone objects is outlined in **Sections 11.1-11.3**. The assemblage will be fully catalogued, recorded and a discussed. The individual artefacts will be compared with comparable items from other sites and examples selected for illustration.

18.2.10 Architectural Stonework

The nature and potential of the architectural stonework is outlined in **Sections 12.1-12.3**. Although the fragments are informative, their potential is best maximised if they are studied conjunction with the *in situ* building remains. The potential and methodology for this exercise is outlined in section 14.1-14.3.

18.2.11 Miscellaneous finds

The nature and potential of the miscellaneous finds is outlined in **Sections 13.1-13.3**. Only the flint and vegetable fibre will receive further analysis. They will be identified, catalogued and illustrated.

18.2.12 Structural stonework

The nature and potential of the structural stonework is outlined in **Sections 14.1-14.3**. Plans made by Armstrong, Butcher and the SYAS will be compared with the surviving remains, and redrawn to a consistent house style. A full narrative discussion, including the fragments of architectural stonework (**Section 12.1**), will be produced and any conclusions concerning the nature of the surviving remains and their possible phasing drawn.

18.3 Documentary resource

The nature and potential of the documentary resource is outlined in **Sections 15.1-15.3**. All the sources, both published and unpublished, will receive thorough examination (see **Appendix 4** for complete listing). It is not intended that every reference to the castle be collated, but only those that fall into two categories. The

first are those that are related to the specific phasing of the castle, such as licences to crenellate or further building works. The second type of historical reference to be examined will be accounts that refer to specific elements of, or structures within, the castle. Once the most appropriate references have been identified, they will be collated into a brief historical narrative and description of the castle's development and final destruction. Any specific document that can be associated with known archaeological features will also be integrated into the stratigraphic text and interpretation.

18.4 Final integration

During the analysis and reporting of the finds and site stratigraphy there will be a programme of information exchange and integration between all the specialist. This will be a staged programme (as outlined in **Section 19.2**).

18.5 The archive

Sheffield Museum will retain the site archive. The majority of the finds were re-boxed in 1995 and do not need any new packaging. The only exception is the metal work, which is currently stored in a sensitive environment, but will require suitable long-term packaging (cost outlined in **Section 19.4**). This project will produce computerised catalogues of the finds and paper archives which will be given to the museum to aid in the management of the archive for future study and use.

18.6 Management of the project

Management of the project will be undertaken by ARCUS. The Project Manager will be James Symonds, ARCUS executive director, the Project Officer for the project will be Glyn Davies whilst management and co-ordination of the finds and specialist studies will be lead by Hugh Willmott.

18.7 Insurance

ARCUS is fully insured as part of the University of Sheffield. The University currently maintains insurance cover as follows:

- Employers Liability £25 million
- Professional Indemnity £5 million
- Public Liability £25 million

18.8 Health and Safety

ARCUS adheres to the University of Sheffield Health and Safety Policy, and observes the recommendations of the SCAUM (Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers) Health and Safety manual. A copy of the ARCUS Health & Safety Manual for Archaeological Fieldwork is available on request.

A detailed Risk Assessment of Health and Safety issues will be prepared before the project commences. This will take into account the provisions of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 and subsequent legislation and guidance.

18.9 Copyright

ARCUS will assign copyright to English Heritage upon written request, but retains the right to be identified as the author of all project documentation and reports as defined in the *Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988* (Chapter IV, s.79).

19 RESOURCES AND PROGRAMMING

19.1 Staffing

The first named authors will be Glyn Davies and Hugh Willmott, whilst James Symonds will be overall project manager and editor (outlined in **Section 18.6**). Individual specialists will be responsible for each artefact report, and they are outlined in **Section 19.3**.

19.2 Timetable

As outlined in the *Aims and Objectives* (**Section 17.2**) there will be two end products. The first, and largest, is a full academic report, whilst the second is a more accessible publication intended for local distribution.

19.2.1 Project stages for academic report

The main project stages are outlined below, whilst a provisionally timetable is outline in **Section 19.2.3**.

- i. Davies to produce provisional stratigraphy and determine plans and sections required for illustration,
- ii. finds sent to specialists wit provisional stratigraphy,
- iii. specialists produce draft specialist reports and assess illustration requirements,
- iv. Davies to revise stratigraphy in light of the specialist reports,
- v. revised stratigraphy issued and specialist reports circulated to all,
- vi. finalise specialist reports and prepare finds illustrations,
- vii. draft full report and prepare final illustrations,
- viii. edit full report with appropriate specialist consultation,
- ix. send report for publication.

19.2.2 Project stages for local publication

This will take place following the preparation of the academic report, with a provisional time outlined in **Section 19.2.3**).

- i. meet with Gill Woolrich, Curator of Archaeology and Ann Clayton, Education Officer (Sheffield City Museum) to agree format and content of local publication;
- ii. prepare draft of text and assess illustration requirements;
- iii. circulate text to Sheffield City Museum staff for comment;
- iv. edit report and prepare illustrations;
- v. agree final text and illustrations with Sheffield City Museum staff,
- vi. send report for publication.

19.2.3 Timetable

On funds becoming available it is anticipated that work on the first tasks (outlined in **Section 19.2.1**) can commence shortly afterwards. A provisional timetable for all subsequent tasks has been provisionally drafted (see Gantt chart in **Appendix 5**). It is planned that within nine months of the start of the project that a full draft of the academic report be finished, and that within twelve months the final edited version will be sent for publication. After this the work on the booklet for the general public will commence, and be produced within eighteen months of the initiation of the whole project.

19.3 Task list and costs

The tasks and costs can be divided into three types, stratigraphic, specialist and production.

19.3.1 Stratigraphic tasks

Task		Personnel	Days	Rate	Sub total
1	Production of provisional stratigraphy	G. Davies	15		
2	Finds sent to specialists	H. Willmott	1		
3	Revision of stratigraphy on receipt of specialist reports	G. Davies	5		
4	Circulation of revised stratigraphy and all reports to specialists	H. Willmott	1		
5	Draft full report	G. Davies	15		
6	Select plans & sections for illustration	G. Davies	2		
	Overall management of stratigraphic tasks	J. Symonds	1		
				Total	

19.3.2 Specialist Tasks

Task	Material		Personnel	Days	Rate (p/d)	Sub Total
7	Pottery	Main report	C. Cumberpatch	16		
		Shell temper report	J Young	0.5		
8	Tile	Tile catalogue	J. Stopford	3		
		Tile ICP analysis	A. Vince	35 samples		
		Integrated report	J. Stopford	2.5		
9	Pipes	Full report	S. White	2		
10	Glass	Full report	H. Willmott	1		
11	Leather	Full report	J Cowgill	7		
12	Metals	Full report	J Cowgill	5		
13	Bone	Partial report	G. Davies	2		
14	Wood	Dendro date	I. Tyers	1 sample		
		Wood ID & report	I. Tyers	0.5		
15	Stone	Full report	H. Willmott	1		
16	Misc finds	Partial report	H. Willmott	1		
17	Stonework analysis	Full report	C. Constable	4		
18	Historical research	Analysis & report	T. Cooper	10		
		Overall management of specialist tasks	J. Symonds	1		
					Total	

19.3.3 Production Tasks Academic Report

Task		Personnel	Days	Rate	Sub total
19	Illustration of plans & sections	J. Mincher	20		
20	Illustration of selected finds	J. Mincher	10		
21	Photography of finds		3		
22	Scanning and reproduction of selected photographs/slides	J. Mincher	2		
23	Edit final specialist reports	H. Willmott	5		
24	Full editing of final report to house style	J. Moore	5		
	Publication cost				
	Overall management of academic publication	J. Symonds	2		
				Total	

19.3.4 Production Tasks Local Report

Task		Personnel	Days	Rate	Sub total
25	Meeting re content	G Davies	0.5		
		H Willmott	0.5		
		G Woolridge	0.5		
		A Clayton	0.5		
26	Draft text	G Davies	5		
		H Willmott	5		
27	Produce Illustrations	J Mincher	10		
28	Review Text	G Woolridge	2		
		A Clayton	2		
29	Edit Text	J Moore	3		
	Overall management of local publication	J. Symonds	1		
				Total	

19.4 Carriage, materials and archive costs

Cost	Total
Carriage of finds to specialists	
Travel costs	
8 x-rays of the metalwork (@ £ p/s)	
New specialist boxing for metal finds	
Illustrative & photographic materials	
Other office materials	
Total	

19.5 Summary of project costs

Stratigraphic tasks	
Specialist tasks	
Production of academic report	
Production of local report	
Other costs	
Subtotal	
25% overheads	
Total	

20 REFERENCES

Armstrong, AL, 1930 Sheffield Castle. *Transactions of the Hunter Archaeological Society* 4, 7-27.

Belford, P, 1998 An Archaeological Desk-based Assessment of the Sheffield Markets site, Sheffield, South Yorkshire. Unpublished ARCUS Report 413.

Cumberpatch, C, 1999 Medieval and later pottery from Castlegate, Sheffield. Unpublished archive report, ARCUS University of Sheffield.

Cumberpatch, C, 2002 Medieval and later pottery from excavations at Sheffield Castle. Unpublished archive report, ARCUS University of Sheffield.

Cumberpatch, C, in prep. South Yorkshire and North Derbyshire regional medieval ceramic reference collection.

Davies, G, 2000 An Archaeological Evaluation Sheffield Markets: Phase 1B Trial Trenching of Sheffield Castle, Castlegate, Sheffield. Unpublished ARCUS Report 413c

Davies, G, 2002 Archaeological Evaluation of the Upper Loading Bay, Castle Market Sheffield. Unpublished ARCUS Report 413h.1

Drage, C, 1987 Urban Castles, in Schofield, J & R. Leech, R, *Urban Archaeology in Britain*. Council for British Archaeology Research Report 61, 117-132.

Hurst, JG 1959 Note on Sheffield Castle, in 'Medieval Britain in 1958: Post-conquest.' *Medieval Archaeology* 3, 308.

Latham, ID, & Atkinson, S, 1994 Report on an Archaeological Investigation of Some Structural remains of Sheffield Castle, Castle Market, Sheffield. Unpublished South Yorkshire Archaeology Field and Research Unit Report.

MPRG, 2001 *Minimum standards for the processing, recording, analysis and publication of post-Roman ceramics*. Medieval Pottery Research Group Occasional Paper 2.

Recent Press Articles on Sheffield Castle

Sheffield Telegraph 7/12/01 Remains of Sheffield's 'lost' castle unearthed
Sheffield Telegraph 15/2/02 New plans for the old castle

Sheffield Star 12/12/01 Markets Full of History
Sheffield Star 12/12/01 City's History sees light after 800 years

Yorkshire Post 11/12/01 Experts thrilled as castle walls see light of day again

Derbyshire Life June 2002 Rediscovering Sheffield's Castle

History Today May 2002 Digging up the Past: Sheffield

Appendix 1 Catalogue of plans and sections by Armstrong and Butcher

Type	Showing
drawing	pots
elevation	through tower, original inked
isometric	construction of moat (x3)
isometric	construction, around the market
isometric	construction, gateway
isometric	construction, gateway
isometric	construction, gateway (x4)
isometric	construction, moat
isometric	construction, unknown
isometric	construction, unknown
isometric	gateway
isometric	internal ditch
isometric	moat
isometric	moat
isometric	moat and gate
isometric	moat from s/w corner to gatehouse and outer defences
isometric	pile holes H23 J24a J23 J24 H24 G24
isometric	pile holes s/w corner of moat (only H23 marked)
isometric	pile sections, F21 G21 F20 Ea 19a
isometric	piles containing stakes and horizontal boards
isometric	rough-out
isometric	rough-out, unknown
isometric	rough-outs for gate construction
plan	4" boreholes plus random profiles
plan	Armstrong original photos of plans 1 & 3
plan	Castle Hill Castlefolds (x2)
plan	Castle hill contours (construction)
plan	castle markets and notes on urban archaeology conference
plan	construction, gatehouse
plan	construction, pile layout and moat
plan	contour survey of castle hill
plan	contour survey of moat
plan	council plan, line of Sheaf
plan	council plan, sheaf culvert
plan	east side of Co-op, markets and sections through pile lines
plan	Exchange Street (x3)
plan	gate
plan	gatehouse
plan	gatehouse, moat, Butcher & Armstrong piles
plan	hypothetical contour, unknown
plan	inked showing moat, piles and grid
plan	location of ALA
plan	location of section AA & BB
plan	lower loading bay
plan	moat and extrapolation of moat and outer defences
plan	moat and piles, no grid
plan	moat showing line of section five
plan	moat, piles and grid
plan	original Ave Orup plans of piles and grid (x3)
plan	pile holes with Butcher notes on line of moat
plan	pile location
plan	piles in moat
plan	piles, grid and photo direction (2 copies one with photo directions)
plan	pre-market construction

plan	rough-out of gateway area
plan	Shambles & proposed new road elevation
plan	sheaf market
plan	upper loading bay and Castlegate stonework
plan	upper loading bay, carport and slope
plan & section	gatehouse, moat and piles
plan & section	inked, section through moat
plan & section	stone foundation on Castlegate
section	across Castlegate retaining river wall
section	across moat F23-H22
section	along moat
section	Beswick section of stone on Castlegate
section	boreholes 67 68 70 71 72
section	construction drawing, E facing section
section	construction moat depths from boreholes
section	construction of mega section through J23-H24
section	construction, Castlegate profile from lost Himsworth photographs
section	construction, moat (x2)
section	construction, section across castle (x2)
section	construction, through moat
section	Co-op pile construction
section	E section, unknown
section	E side of castle hill
section	E17 E22 F23 H5, along 1929 building, wall in s/w corner, original market building
section	extrapolated section between pile holes G5-J23
section	F22 F20 F11 E13 F13
section	hypothetical schematic section based on pile data and possible finds
section	J23 H2-4 H 24 G7 J24 H23 G23 G5 Manhole 3 G-H24 G22 G9 E19 E15 F21 F9
section	mega section through J23-H24 (x2)
section	pile pit 55 (big size)
section	schematic section across castle from Castlegate to Exchange Street
section	section on gridlines 2-9 across moat
section	stonework and gatehouse
section	through gate
section	unknown

Appendix 2 Documents in Sheffield Museum relating to Sheffield Castle

	Armstrong	Himsworth	Butcher	Beswick/Hart
Field notes				1
Diary		1		
Notes	10	5	7	2
Letters/memos	38	4	5	4
Lecture notes	2	3	1	
Interpretive notes/drafts	5	1	10	2
News paper cuttings	13		4	1
Sketch plans/drawings	10	2	9	1

There are numerous other pieces of paper with odd notes on them relating to different aspects of the castle and the work undertaken on it over the years.

Appendix 3 Finds from Sheffield Castle by Excavator

	Armstrong	Butcher	ARCUS 2000	ARCUS 2002
Pottery	222	1567	45	72
Tile	4	5 bags	26	36
Glass	6	25	2	10
Metalwork	14	0	22	7
Clay pipes	12	16	13	4
Stone	8	9	1	7
Animal bones	0	21 bags	74	283
Wood	5	11	0	0
Leather	0	56 bags	0	0

The figures are for material recovered from castle deposits or castle destruction deposits.

Appendix 4 Potential documentary sources for Sheffield Castle

In addition to the Arundel Castle MSS. and related collections now deposited in Sheffield Archives, the indexes of the following published and unpublished documents will be consulted for references to the castle

Public Record Office, Kew

Chancery

C54 Close Rolls
C60 Fine Rolls
C66 Patent Rolls

Crown Estate Commissioners

CRES 35 Files
CRES 38 Title Deeds
CRES 39 Surveys and other records

Exchequer

King's Remembrancer

E123 Entry Books of Decrees and Orders, series I
E126 Entry Books of Decrees and Orders, series IV
E142 Ancient Extents
E150 Inquisitions post mortem, series II
E178 Special Commissions of Inquiry

Augmentation Office

E317 Parliamentary Surveys

Special Collections

SC6 Minsters' and Receivers' Accounts
SC11 Rentals and Surveys, rolls
SC12 Rentals and Surveys, portfolios

Published Government Records

Calendar of the Charter Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office (HMSO 1903-27)
Calendar of the Close Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office (HMSO 1892-1963)
Calendar of the Fine Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office (HMSO 1911-62)
Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous (Chancery) preserved in the Public Record Office (HMSO 1916-68)
Calendar of Inquisitions *post mortem* preserved in the Public Record Office (HMSO 1904-95)
Calendar of Inquisitions *post mortem*, Henry VII (HMSO 1898-1955)
Calendar of the Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office (HMSO 1891-1986)
Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III preserved in the Public Record Office (HMSO 1902-75)
Placita de Quo Warranto in Curia Receptae Scacarii Westm. asservata, ed. W. Illingworth and J. Caley (Record Commission, 1818)

Other Published Records

Yorkshire Hundred and *Quo Warranto* Rolls 1274-94 (Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series, vol. cli)