

**Archaeological Investigations in
The Vicarage Garden, Causeway,
Horsham, West Sussex**

NGR 517110 130292

**HORSHAM: Horsham
Planning Application ref. HU/163/03**

**Project No. 2569
ASE Report No. 2008085**

Simon Stevens BA MIFA

**with contributions by
Luke Barber, Sue Pringle
Elke Raemen and Lucy Allott**

May 2008

**Archaeology South-East
Units 1 & 2
2 Chapel Place
Portslade
East Sussex
BN41 1DR**

**Tel: 01273 426830
Fax: 01273 420866
Email: fau@ucl.ac.uk
website: www.archaeologyse.co.uk**

Summary

Following the archaeological evaluation of the Vicarage Garden, Causeway, Horsham, West Sussex in June 2006, an open area was excavated during July and August 2006, and a subsequent watching brief was maintained during groundworks elsewhere at the site, ending in February 2007. Encountered features included medieval and early post-medieval ditches, pits and possible quarry pits. Finds included pottery, ceramic building material and stone, and a range of other artefacts, including worked bone used in the manufacture of pins.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Planning Background
Site Location and Geology
Historical and Archaeological Background
The Town of Horsham
Archaeological Investigations
Summary of Historical References

ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

THE SITE

Introduction
The Medieval/'Transitional' Features
The Post-Medieval Features
Undated Feature
The Gravestones

ARTEFACTUAL EVIDENCE

The Pottery
The Ceramic Building Material
The Geological Material
The Accessioned Finds

ENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE

The Environmental Samples

DISCUSSION

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appendix 1: The Gravestones

REFERENCES

SMR Summary Sheet

OASIS Form

Tables

Table 1	Characterisation of the Pottery Assemblage
Table 2	Quantification of the Building Material by Context
Table 3	Building Material by Type

Figures

Fig. 1	Site Location
Fig. 2	1841/2 map overlay with archaeological features (after Hughes 2006)
Fig. 3	Excavation plan
Fig. 4	Pottery
Fig. 5	Tile
Fig. 6	Worked Bone

INTRODUCTION

PLANNING BACKGROUND

Planning permission was granted by Horsham District Council for the construction of new dwellings with associated access road, car parking and services in the Vicarage Garden, Causeway, Horsham, West Sussex (Planning ref. HU/163/03). Owing to the archaeologically sensitive nature of the area, and after consultation with West Sussex County Council (Horsham District Council's advisers on archaeological issues) a planning condition (No.13) was attached to the consent requiring archaeological work at the site.

Archaeology South-East (a division of University College London Centre for Applied Archaeology) was commissioned by Chalvington Barns to carry out an archaeological evaluation of the site in June 2006. The mechanical excavation of trial trenches revealed the presence of buried archaeological deposits across the site (Stevens 2006).

Subsequently, a Written Scheme of Investigation was issued outlining further archaeological work at the site, namely the excavation of an area corresponding to the available 'footprint' of the new dwellings, and the maintenance of a watching brief during the other groundworks at the site (Griffin 2006). The area excavation was undertaken in late July and early August 2006, and the watching brief was maintained during visits to the site between December 2006 and February 2007.

SITE LOCATION AND GEOLOGY

The site lies within the settlement of Horsham, on the eastern side of Causeway, at a height of c.40m AOD (NGR 517110 130292) (Fig. 1). Prior to the commencement of the archaeological work, the site consisted of an open lawn, with no obvious earthworks. According to the British Geological Survey, 1:50000 map of the area, (Sheet 302, Horsham), the underlying geology at the site is Upper Tunbridge Wells Sand.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Town of Horsham

The site lies in the heart of the medieval town, adjacent to the church of St. Mary (Fig. 1). Causeway formed one of the principal streets of the medieval town (Harris 2004, 11), leading from the triangular market-place at Carfax to the church, which appears to have been founded by the late 12th century (*ibid.*, 22). The origins and topographical development of the settlement are somewhat unclear, with suggestions that Horsham began as a late Anglo-Saxon settlement at the crossing point of the River Arun (Aldsworth and Freke 1976, 33-5), or that it originated as a Post-Conquest new town founded c.1200 (Hudson 1986). Harris (2004, 24) suggests that the town grew up around a '*focal place*' on a routeway close to a river crossing, which developed into a market-place, following a model developed for Wealden settlements by Gardiner (1997).

Whatever the process of foundation and development, Horsham had gained borough status by 1235 (Bleach and Gardiner 1999, 42-43), and prospered through the

medieval period, the town's wealth based at least partly on the ironworking industry (Harris 2004, 15).

Archaeological Investigations

There have been a small number of archaeological projects in and around the medieval core of the town, but few have identified significant archaeological remains. Investigations close to the site include a recent watching brief at St. Mary's Church during which c.50 burials were recorded (Butler and Knight 2004). There have also been small-scale investigations in Causeway itself (Kirby 1978; Beresford 2001), but only single sherds of medieval pottery were recovered in each case.

More substantial evidence of medieval and post-medieval occupation has come from elsewhere in the town. A small-scale excavation at the King and Barnes site, Bishopric produced pottery assemblages ranging in date from the 11th to the 19th centuries (Stevenson in prep). Material of a similar date was also recovered from a site at No. 42, North Street (Stevens in prep). However, the available archaeological data for the town is still somewhat limited.

Summary of Historical References

There is a documentary reference to a vicarage in Horsham in 1231, which describes the endowment of lands including '*a manse....with part of a garden*' (Hughes 2006, 3). By the early 17th century the vicarage lay directly to the north of the church (Hudson 1986, 190), i.e. within or partially within the current site, and there is no reason to believe that the medieval building was not in the same convenient location. An inventory of 1642, compiled after the death of vicar John Collins gives details of a substantial house, gardens and orchard, and by 1664 the house was rated at seven hearths (Hughes 2006, 6-7), suggesting the presence of a substantial building.

However, by 1724, the property was described as '*a Mansion house, old and ruinous*' (Windrum 1978, 20). Clearly some attempts must have been made to maintain the structure as it was still standing in 1822, when a further survey listed a range of defects (Hughes 2006, 9). The exact date of the demolition of this structure remains unclear, although the land on which it stood appears to have been sold in 1840 to help fund the construction of the current vicarage (Hudson *op cit.*, Windrum *op. cit.*). A plan completed in 1841/2 shows both buildings (Fig. 2, after Hughes 2006, fig. 4)

ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

The methodology used during the evaluation phase has been detailed elsewhere (Stevens 2006), but to summarise, five trial trenches were mechanically excavated at the site in areas which were likely to be disturbed during groundworks associated with the redevelopment. Archaeological remains were encountered, excavated and recorded in all of the trenches and a range of artefacts was also recovered from the overburden.

During the excavation phase, an area corresponding to the footprint of the new building was mechanically stripped of c.500mm to c.600mm of garden soil, [13], down to the surface of the underlying Upper Tunbridge Wells Sand, which was found to consist of outcrops of laminar sandstone between areas of silty clay. A varied assemblage of artefacts was again recovered from the overburden (see below). A baulk was left in the centre of the site owing to the presence of tree stumps that could not be safely removed with the available plant.

A watching brief was maintained during further groundworks at the site, including the removal of the central unexcavated baulk, excavations for the laying of services, and during work on the footings of the structure, some of which lay outside of the original excavated area.

THE SITE

INTRODUCTION

The dating of the features encountered at the site proved difficult owing to the small size of the assemblages of datable pottery that were recovered. However the features have been placed into broad phases based on the ceramic evidence, although some caution is necessary, as outlined below. The environmental evidence was also extremely limited.

THE MEDIEVAL AND 'TRANSITIONAL' FEATURES

Features dated to the medieval period were encountered in four of the five evaluation trenches (Fig. 3). Those found in trenches 3 and 4 were re-investigated during the excavation phase and are described below, but those in trenches 1 and 2 fell outside of the building footprint, and were not re-exposed or disturbed during the watching brief.

A shallow gully, [4], was encountered in trench 1, with two small sherds of early to mid-14th century pottery recovered from the fill, [3]. This was the only feature dated to the medieval period found in this evaluation trench, and given the presence of only two sherds of pottery, the dating evidence is far from conclusive. Likewise a single feature of potential medieval date was found in trench 2. Ditch [9] ran north to south across the trench. A single sherd of late 12th to mid-13th century pottery was recovered from the single fill, [10]. The feature had been truncated/re-cut by ditch [11], which was post-medieval in date. The ditch continued to the west and was re-investigated in the excavation area to the south-east (see below).

The re-investigation of the intercutting features was somewhat hampered by the presence of the central baulk, which appears to have shielded the terminal or a turn in the medieval ditch (recorded as ditch [100] in the excavation area). However, one sherd of 12th century pottery and two sherds of 14th century pottery recovered from one of the ditch fills, [101] suggest a medieval date for the feature. Fragments of a roofing slab formed from local stone were also recovered from the ditch, from fills [101] and [102].

Ditch [100] was truncated by a later feature, ditch [103]. Pottery with a date range of the 14th to the early 16th century was recovered from the ditch fills [104] and [105]. The later ditch also truncated pit [106]. An assemblage of late 14th to mid-15th century pottery was recovered from the pit fill, [107].

Parallel to ditch [100], ran a second medieval ditch [108], which had been cut through an area of particularly robust sandstone, resulting in an irregular profile. The feature continued underneath the central baulk to re-emerge on the southern side, where it appeared to be truncated by another feature, [112], and then to have been entirely removed by the excavation of a later ditch on the same alignment, ditch [114] (see below). Three sherds of 14th to mid-15th century pottery were recovered from ditch [108] from fill [109].

Another linear feature, ditch [29] was encountered in trench 5, but could not be traced in the excavation area, despite extensive hand cleaning. It ran east to west, before apparent removal by a large feature in the centre of the site, pit [125]. A mixed group pottery dating from the 13th to the early 16th century was recovered from the ditch fill, [30].

Pit [125] was the largest feature encountered at the site, and was a possible quarry pit of indeterminate size, which was initially encountered in evaluation trench 4, and was then partially excavated during the main excavation phase as pit [125]. Mechanical excavation showed that the feature was in excess of 1.2m in depth, and after due consideration, the majority of the feature was left *in situ* on grounds of Health & Safety. A large percentage of the feature was left undisturbed by the planned building work. A range of artefacts including mid-15th to early 16th century pottery, brick, tile, stone, animal bone and ironwork were recovered from the fill, [126]. The feature was truncated by pit [116], which contained pottery and other artefacts of a similar date,

An equally varied assemblage of medieval material was recovered from pit [31]. Pottery of late 14th to early 15th century was recovered from the single fill, [32], mostly sherds from a single glazed jug. Small assemblages of animal bone, shell, metalwork and iron-working slag were also recovered from this feature, although the environmental evidence was limited.

THE POST-MEDIEVAL FEATURES

Of the intercutting ditches encountered in trench 2, the latest was ditch [11] which was dated to the mid-16th to the 17th century from a single sherd of pottery recovered from its fill, [12]. Blast furnace slag and brick were also recovered from the feature, confirming a broadly post-medieval date.

A group of features backfilled in the 16th and 17th centuries was located in the eastern corner of the excavation area. The medieval ditch [108] was completely removed by ditch [114]. Seven sherds of mid-16th to 17th century pottery was recovered from one of the ditch fills, [115], and a mixed group of pottery included 14th, 15th and 16th century examples, but with 17th century material predominating, was retrieved from another fill, [120]. A late date in the sequence was confirmed by the presence of 17th century clay pipe stems. Gully [112] partially truncated ditch [114], and five sherds of 17th century pottery were recovered from the fill [113].

Ditch [114] was truncated by pit [121], a possible quarry pit of indeterminate extent, which occupied the eastern corner of the excavated area, and clearly ran beyond the boundaries of the examined part of the site. More than 30 sherds of predominantly 17th century pottery were recovered from the three fills, [122], [125] and [129], from which 17th century clay pipe was also retrieved. Pit [127] truncated pit [121]. Six sherds of predominantly 17th century pottery and contemporary fragments of clay pipe were recovered from the fill, [128].

Another, somewhat enigmatic feature was located in an isolated position at the extreme southern end of the site, pit [110]. This was a small feature from which a small, but bewildering group of pottery spanning the 12th to the 19th centuries was recovered from the fill [111]. However, the presence of clay pipe and glass in the assemblage does perhaps suggest a post-medieval date is likely.

The only other feature positively dated to the post-medieval period was a stretch of wall footing, [2] recorded in evaluation trench 1. It consisted of pieces of Horsham Stone and brick, [1] set within a 420mm wide construction trench. There was no evidence of any surviving bonding material. The footing ran due north across the trench, probably turning eastwards under the trench baulk. The brick was dated to the period, c.1450-1700. A feature of similar character and width, [118] was excavated and recorded during the excavation phase. The masonry consisted entirely of Horsham Stone, and in the absence of any datable material it has been presumed that this feature was also of broad post-medieval date, although this is far from certain.

UNDATED FEATURE

Only one archaeological feature was noted during the watching brief at the site. Cut [1005], was encountered in a footing trench on the northern side of the excavation area. Full investigation of the feature in the 600mm wide trench was impossible, and its full extent and date remain unclear.

THE GRAVESTONES

In addition to the undated feature, ten gravestones were encountered and recorded during the watching brief at the site. The stones, which appear to be footstones rather than headstones, had apparently been removed from the adjacent churchyard and redeposited among the line of trees, which had been left *in situ* as the central baulk during the excavation (see above). Monitoring of the mechanical removal of the tree stumps resulted in the identification and recording of the stones, which were left at the site. The stones were recorded using the standard ASE system, which is based on the Council for British Archaeology guidelines (Mytum 2000)

All of the stones were of local geological origin, with no discernable decoration. The full recorded details of the gravestones are housed with the archive, including digital photographs of all of the stones.

A number of stones with legible inscriptions were recorded, and following research by Sue Djabri of Horsham Museum Society it has been possible to identify some of the individuals who had had their memorials redeposited in the garden (see Appendix 1)

THE ARTEFACTUAL EVIDENCE

THE POTTERY by Luke Barber

Introduction

The excavations recovered 552 sherds of pottery, weighing just over 13.4kg, from 32 individually numbered contexts. On the whole the material is in good condition with no, or limited, signs of abrasion suggesting the assemblage has not been subjected to repeat re-working. Sherd sizes vary greatly from small (20mm across) to large (over 150mm across). Unfortunately no large stratified context groups are present – most contain under 10 sherds, with the largest group consisting of unstratified material. Residuality and intrusiveness in stratified contexts is usually low and the sherds easily isolated. The size and nature of the assemblage is fairly typical of those previously excavated from the town: the King and Barnes site produced 354 sherds (Barber in prep a) and the North Street site produced 212 sherds (Barber in prep e).

Pottery from several periods was recovered from the site. The whole assemblage is characterised in Table 1. The majority of the assemblage is of the ‘Transitional’ period spanning the later 14th to early/mid 16th centuries. The assemblage has been quantified by general fabric groups by period during the spot dating process with this information being housed with the archive. Fabric codes in brackets are those of the West Sussex medieval and SE post-medieval fabric series though common names are used where possible. Most of the fabrics have been noted from the town before (Barber in prep a) though a few new ones have been noted.

Period	No.	Weight	% of assemblage by sherd count	Average sherd weight
Mid/late C12th – mid 13th	14	185g	2.5%	13.2g
Mid C13th – mid/late 14th	35	580g	6.3%	16.6g
Later C14th – early/mid 16th	281	8,094g	50.9%	28.9g
Mid C16th – 17 th /early 18th	121	2,934g	21.9%	24.2g
C18th	42	768g	7.7%	18.3g
C19th	58	753g	10.5%	13.0g
Crucible	1	130g	0.2%	-
Totals	552	13,444g	100	24.4g

Table 1: Characterisation of the Pottery Assemblage

Mid/late 12th Century – Mid 13th Century

The earliest material consists of nine sherds (150g) from shell-tempered (WS: S/M1) cooking pots. Although the fabric may be of 11th/early 12th- century origins (Barber in prep a and e) the current assemblage has produced a few rim sherds indicating it must have continued into the early 13th century. A cooking pot from [3] (fill of gully [4]) has a developed club rim with internal bead and oblique thumb applied strips suggesting a late 12th- to early 13th- century date (Fig. 4 no. 1). Other fabrics of this general period consist of abundant multicoloured fine flint (2/9g) and coarse sand with iron oxide inclusions to 2mm (3/26g), again, presumably from cooking pots. These fabrics have not been noted before in the town, but the sherds are too small, undiagnostic and residual to closely classify them. However, these earliest sherds,

despite generally being low fired, are notably fresh, strongly suggesting occupation from at least this period though not on an intense scale.

Mid 13th Century – mid/late 14th Century

There is slightly more pottery from the mid 13th to mid/late 14th centuries though much of this shows some signs of abrasion and very few feature sherds are present. The majority of the sherds are residual in later contexts. The absence of sand- and shell-tempered wares, usually so common on Wealden sites of the 13th century in East Sussex such as Battle (Streeten 1985) is interesting. Such wares have been noted at Crawley (Barber in prep b, Fabrics 10, 11 and 14) though not in any quantity but they were absent at Pulborough (Barber in prep c). This suggests the West Sussex sites moved straight/quickly to purely sand-tempered wares during this century and that Crawley may mark the western edge of this tradition. Larger assemblages from the West Sussex Wealden towns will be needed to test this. The current assemblage consists mainly of medium/coarse sand-tempered cooking pots (e.g. WS: Q/M16) though a few glazed jugs are also represented. A number of these are well fired suggestive of a 14th- rather than 13th-century date. Finer sand-tempered wares are also present (10 sherds/222g), including a few West Sussex Ware jugs (Barton 1979. WS: Q(f)/M5). A 14th- century jug bodysherd from [19] has white painted decoration below a sparse green glaze. A single unstratified unglazed French whiteware jug sherd (UWW/M6 – probably Saintonge) with red painted decoration is the only import for this period. On the whole the majority of the assemblage of this period is likely to be of 14th-century date.

Later C14th – Early/Mid 16th Century

The late medieval/'Transitional' period constitutes just over 50% of the overall assemblage (just over 60% by weight). The later 14th- to 15th-century material includes a number of fine/medium sand tempered Surrey-type whitewares (94/1,941g) (WS: Q(f)/M15 and Q(f)/M14) and Coarse Borderware (9/168g) (WS: Q/M10) (Pearce and Vince 1988). A large proportion of these came from pit fill [32] (Fig. 4, nos. 2 & 3). This context produced 89 sherds (1,893g), the majority of which were from a narrow-mouthed jar with thickened squared rim with a patchy external green glaze (WS:Q(f)/M14). The same context also produced a bowl with a wide hammer-head rim with spots/drips of green glaze (WS:Q(f)/M15). Surrey-type whitewares have been noted as significant in Crawley (Barber 1997, in prep b and Timby 1998) and Coarse Borderware has previously been noted in Horsham (Barber in prep a). These central Wealden towns are clearly within the sphere of influence of the Surrey production centres from an early date. The bulk of the assemblage of this period comprises 'locally' produced well-fired oxidised fine/medium sand tempered wares of the 15th- to early/mid 16th-century 'Painted Ware' tradition (Barton 1979) (119/4,892g) (WS:Q(f)/M20a). Cooking pots/jars, large deep bowls and pitchers make up the bulk of the vessels and most have widely spaced simple decoration with white painted lines. Large parts of the lower sections of such vessels, albeit without decoration, were recovered from [104] and [107].

The Painted Wares are joined, probably around the middle of the 15th century, by the hard-fired earthenwares (37/675g) which continue into the 16th century where they develop into the typical post-medieval glazed red earthenwares. These wares usually consist of unglazed, or sparsely glazed jars and pitchers, often with deliberately reduced surfaces. Imports during this period are all from the Rhineland and consist of a single sherd of probable Langewehe bottle (82g) and Raeren tankards (13/278g). Examples of the latter include frilled base sherds from [120] and [126].

The assemblage from [126] is the best from the site. This group was dominated by four different Painted Ware (WS:Q(f)/M20a) vessels (27/2,771g). These include two large deep bowls (one, represented by 20 sherds is approximately 50% complete) with white slip painted crosses on their rims and green glaze on their base interiors (Fig. 4, no. 4). The more fragmentary vessel appears to have additional white slip painted circular patterning on its interior. The other Painted Ware vessels consist of a strap handle from a jug and the rim of a lid-seated jar with a line of white slip around the neck (Fig. 4 no. 5). Other vessels include the foot from a Coarse Borderware tripod cauldron (Pearce and Vince 1988 Nos. 487-9) (91g); a Langewehe-type jug/bottle (82g) and a Raeren mug and jug/bottle (6/237g).

Mid 16th Century – 17th/Early 18th Century

The early post-medieval pottery from the site shows continuous occupation into the 16th century though unfortunately much is from unstratified deposits. Hard-fired earthenwares are superseded by the local early post-medieval glazed red earthenwares at around the start of the period (82/2,168g). These are difficult to date closely due to their longevity and gradual development. However, the deliberately reduced surfaces, dull green internal glazes and generally heavy nature of most suggest the majority belong to the second half of the 16th or early 17th centuries. Despite this, more refined mid/late 17th-century examples are also represented. Jars are by far the most common vessel type but a dripping pan/ bed-pan handle is also present (unstratified). A single sherd of unstratified trailed slipware is likely to be of 17th- to early 18th-century date. Surrey products are still present in the assemblage in the form of a number (10/116g) of yellow, green and brown glazed Borderware vessels (Pearce 1992), including a brown glazed mug bodysherd with encrusted decoration [12]. A number of more buff coloured whitewares are likely to be Wealden copies of Borderware, some potentially from the Graffham industry (Aldsworth and Down 1990) (2/16g: WWB3 and WEALD 1). Fourteen sherds of London tin-glazed earthenware are present, most are of 17th- century type with blue/purple painted decoration but some 18th- century examples, with blue-tinged tin-glaze, are also present. The largest group of tin-glazed earthenwares came from [122] (6/28g). Imported material is again totally dominated by Rhenish stoneware with Cologne/Frechen (9/424g) and Westerwald (3/91g) bottles and tankards being represented. As such some occupation appears to have continued into the second half of the 17th century.

The 18th Century

As with the 19th- century material, this period is represented virtually exclusively from the unstratified assemblage suggesting the area was still receiving domestic waste but by now as a surface spread rather than in dug features. Despite this, most of the material, which consists of a high proportion of 'fine/table wares', is not heavily abraded. A variety of wares are represented: local glazed red earthenwares (10/172g), Staffordshire combed slipware (3/389g), London stoneware (5/52g), Staffordshire white salt-glazed stoneware (8/64g), creamware (15/80g) and basalts (1/11g). The finewares would be in keeping with a 'middle class' household.

The 19th Century

An assemblage of unstratified material spans the whole of the 19th century. This includes unglazed earthenware flower pots (8/96g), local glazed redwares (included in 18th- century total), yellow ware (1/64g), pearlware (26/311g), transfer-printed

china (10/133g), plain china (10/115g, including preserve jars) and low-grade English porcelain (2/24g). Although the majority of this assemblage can be attributed to the first half of the 19th century pieces such as the preserve jars probably belong to the second half of the century. The assemblage is similar in composition to 'working class' assemblages from Shoreham (Barber in prep d) though too little material is present to be certain of status.

In addition, there is a probable crucible fragment (Trench 4 u/s) in a hard grey sandy fabric. Similar crucible fragments were found at the North Street site in Horsham (Barber in prep b) where they were thought to be of post-medieval date, possibly used for glass manufacture.

THE CERAMIC BUILDING MATERIAL by Sue Pringle

Introduction

The building materials assemblage consists of 147 fragments of medieval and post-medieval tile and brick weighing 17.4kgs. This total includes a small quantity of stone slab, lime mortar and concrete. The date range of the building materials is from the 13th century to the 19th century with the majority of the assemblage dating from the 14th to 17th centuries. Early post-medieval brick was found in all five evaluation trenches and in the second stage trench. Only four contexts, in trench 2 [10], [13] and trench 5 [30], [32], contained no brick.

Summary

The earlier material is likely to represent the remains of ceramic roofing and flooring tiles from unidentified medieval buildings on or close to the site. The two-colour decorated floor tiles, made at Penn in Buckinghamshire in the mid to late 14th century, are of particular interest as their dimensions suggests that they may belong to the early, pre-Black Death, phase of production at Penn. They are likely to have been used in an ecclesiastical setting, probably the Church of St Mary. The 16th/17th century bricks are from a later building phase, possibly the vicarage, which was extant in the 17th century.

Dating

The dates for the building materials in each context are set out in Table 2.

Context	Material and date	Wt grams	Count
0	Early post-medieval brick, decorated Penn floor tile c. 1340-80, medieval peg and glazed crested ridge tile	3992	13
1	Early post-medieval brick, c. 1450-1700	1362	1
10	Medieval peg tile	18	1
12	Early post-medieval brick, medieval peg tile	982	8
13	Glazed Flemish floor tile, c. 1450-1550	300	1
30	Glazed crested ridge tile, c. 1250-1500	266	5
32	Medieval peg tile	18	1
102	Early post-medieval brick	82	4
104	Early post-medieval brick, medieval peg, ridge and glazed crested ridge tile, decorated Penn floor tiles c. 1340-1380	3030	30
105	Early post-medieval brick, medieval peg tile	1196	29
107	Early post-medieval brick	430	10

109	Unidentified and undated	2	1
111	Early post-medieval brick, medieval roof tile, 19th/20th century glazed tile and concrete	345	9
116	Early post-medieval brick	1040	1
117	Early post-medieval brick, medieval(?) floor tile, stone roof tile	226	14
120	Early post-medieval brick, medieval peg tile	126	6
122	Early post-medieval brick, medieval peg tile	324	4
126	Early post-medieval brick, decorated Penn floor tile c. 1340-80, glazed Flemish floor tile c.1450-1550, medieval peg and glazed crested ridge tile	3542	8
128	Early post-medieval brick	82	1

Table 2: Quantification of the building material by context, with approximate date range.

The Material

Table 3 sets out the weight and fragment count for the types of material present in the assemblage.

Material	Weight (grams)	% of total weight	Number of fragments	% of total number
Early post-medieval brick	10216	59%	83	56%
Medieval/early post medieval floor tile	4338	25%	11	7%
Medieval roof tile	2263	13%	42	29%
Stone roofing	368	2%	2	1%
Early modern glazed tile	116	<1%	1	<1%
Concrete	34	<1%	1	<1%
Lime mortar	14	<1%	4	3%
Unidentified	14	<1%	3	2%
Totals	17363		147	

Table 3: Building Material by Type

The Medieval Assemblage

Roofing tile

T1: orange fabric with cream lenses; moderate inclusions of red clay and sparse quartz. Peg tile.

T2: orange with abundant fine quartz and moderate light brown clay streaks and lumps. Visible with a microscope are common fine black iron oxides, moderate fine to coarse red iron-rich clays and well-rounded medium quartz grains. Crested ridge tile, thin sparse glaze.

T3/T4: orange with fine background quartz and common inclusions of medium to very coarse red clay(?). Some examples have fine cream lenses. Peg and ridge tile.

T5: orange fabric with moderate poorly sorted quartz, distinctive very coarse (<10mm) platy inclusions of dark orange or reduced mudstone, some reduced, and sparse white blocky inclusions (fine sandstone or limestone?). Reduced core in sample. Peg tile.

T6: light pinkish orange with common inclusions of medium to coarse rose quartz. Crested ridge tile, thin sparse glaze.

Ridge tiles

Fragments of least four glazed crested ridge tiles dating probably to the 14th-15th centuries are present in contexts [30], [104] and [126]. The most complete example, RF<24> from pit fill [126], is in fabric 2 and has a thin, patchy green glaze (Fig. 5, no. 6); other crested tiles are in fabrics T3 and T6. Fragments of unglazed ridge tile in fabrics T2 and T3 were also seen in [104] and [111]; these could be from plain or glazed tiles.

Peg tiles

Peg tiles (also known as plain tiles) account for the majority of the roof tile. Most are in fabric T3/4 with the remainder in fabric T1 and a single occurrence in fabric T5. None of the tile fragments retains measurable dimensions, but those in fabric 1 average 13.25mm thick and in fabric 3, 13mm. The tile in fabric T5 is exceptionally thick at 17-18mm. This could suggest an early medieval date for the material, as late medieval and post-medieval tiles tend to be thinner. No glaze, nail holes or other distinctive features have been noted in the material with the exception of painted slipped decoration on a tile in fabric T3, RF <25> from pit fill [126], (Fig. 5, no. 7). A crested ridge tile with very similar slip decoration is displayed in Horsham Museum.

The Floor Tiles

Penn Tile (mid to late 14th century)

FT2: orange fabric with common inclusions of medium quartz (0.25-5mm), sparse light brown or dark orange clay bands or coarse rounded inclusions, and sparse white calcium carbonate. MoL fabric 3076.

Seven fragments of the two-colour decorated tiles made at Penn in Buckinghamshire in the mid to late 14th century were recorded (contexts [104], [126] and unstratified). The Penn industry was one of the most successful in southern England at this time and provided large quantities of tiles for royal buildings and ecclesiastical foundations (Keen 2002, 233-4). The four tiles with measurable dimensions are all from the same size group with sides ranging from 117-122mm, median 118mm, and are 24-30mm thick, median 26mm. Most of the tiles are very worn and on only two can the design, E2467/P99, be identified (Hohler 1942; Eames 1980) (Fig. 5, no. 8). This design also occurs on tiles from Merton College Chapel, Oxford and from London (Eames 1980; DUA).

The dating of this group of tiles is uncertain. The dimensions of the group are consistent with those of Eames' first phase, thought to represent the earliest production at Penn in the period immediately pre-dating the Black Death in c. AD 1348 (Eames 1992, 55-6). However, the published examples of design E2467/P99 are all on slightly smaller tiles with sides between 108 mm and 113 mm, as is the London tile at 111 x 113 mm. These belong to Eames' second phase, which is dated

to the main period of production at Penn, from c. 1350 to 1380. It is therefore not clear whether the Vicarage Garden tiles are part of the pre-Black Death group of larger tiles or of the slightly later series to which the other tiles with design E2467/P99 belong. Penn tiles have been recorded from St Mary's Church in Horsham, and this is a likely source for the Vicarage Garden tiles (Keen 2002, 234).

Imported Flemish tiles (14th century onwards)

FT1: red fabric with fine background quartz and common fine to medium quartz grains; moderate inclusions of dark red iron-rich material and fine white calcareous grains; sparse white shell. Near MoL 2504 and 2497.

Two green-glazed Flemish tiles are present in contexts [30] and [126]. Plain glazed floor tiles were imported from the Low Countries between the later 14th and mid-16th centuries. Although they cannot be closely dated, the later tiles are usually larger and thicker than earlier examples. No complete dimensions survive on the Vicarage Garden tiles, but they are 35mm and 40mm thick which suggests they were made in the late 15th to early 16th centuries (Crowley 1997, 198–9). One of the tiles, RF <27> from pit fill [126], has a nail 20mm long and 1.5mm thick embedded in the glaze; this is probably one of the nails used in its manufacture, a Flemish technique which leaves characteristic small holes in the corners of the tiles.

Unidentified Tile Industries

FT3: orange fabric with fine background quartz, poorly mixed with very coarse platy inclusions of orange clay or siltstone <c.5mm and bands of coarse rose quartz, also used as moulding sand. Near MoL fabrics 3080/3082 but with less quartz.

Fragmentary tiles in two other fabrics were noted; one in fabric FT3 has bevelled, knife-trimmed sides but has lost its upper surface ([104]); the other, a 29 mm thick unglazed tile in a fabric similar to fabric T1, has bevelled sides with an additional chamfer at the base ([117]). The source of both these tiles is unknown, but they are likely to be local products.

The Post-Medieval Assemblage

Bricks (late 15th to late 17th century)

B1: smooth light orange-red fabric with cream marbling; silt-sized background quartz, sparse inclusions of darker orange clay, rose quartz and calcium carbonate.

B2: similar to B1 with more and coarser inclusions of dark orange/red iron rich clay.

B3: light red/orange fabric with very coarse inclusions of blocky siltstone.

B4: red fabric with common quartz sand. MoL fabric 3033.

The bricks from the site fall into two main fabric groups: fine orange fabrics with variable quantities of darker orange or red clay and siltstone (Fabrics B1, B2 and B3), and sandy red fabric (B4). All the stratified bricks are in the orange silty group; the B4 bricks are unstratified. Most of the bricks have indented borders on the upper bed face and are unfrogged, and these features suggest similar date ranges of late 15th to late 17th century. This dating is consistent with their having been used in the construction of the 16th/17th century vicarage.

THE GEOLOGICAL MATERIAL by Luke Barber

Introduction

The excavations recovered 49 pieces of stone, weighing a little over 15.5kg, from 12 individually numbered contexts. A further ten stone samples were collected from the gravestones. The material has been fully quantified by context and stone type on geological material forms that are housed with the archive. The majority of the assemblage comes from unstratified deposits or contexts with mixed dating.

The Assemblage

Unsurprisingly, the main stone type represented consists of local Horsham stone from the Weald Clay (26/10,842g). Three variants are present (grey/brown/purple banded, grey and purple banded). Though the first is the most common all could have come from differing strata in the same general outcrop. Most of the material almost certainly derives from roofing slabs (an example from [126] has an 11mm diameter fixing hole) though two thick pieces mortared together and weighing 8,300g (Evaluation Trench 5, U/S) are most likely from walling. Where datable the Horsham stone appears to be in later 14th- to mid 16th- century contexts.

Nine pieces (just over 4kg) of more friable brown/orange ferruginous non-calcareous sandstone roofing slab were also recovered. These have similarities to Horsham stone; however, they are suitably different (i.e. friable and non-calcareous) to suggest they possibly derive from a distinct bed within the Tunbridge Wells Sand. Some 47 roofing slab fragments of similar material were noted at Crawley in mid 13th- to mid 14th- century contexts (Barber in prep c) and the current site is only the second to isolate roofing slabs of this stone type.

At the current site this stone type was recovered from only [101], [102] and [105] dated to between the 14th and early 15th centuries. Most of the assemblage is composed of three conjoining pieces (3,632g) from an incomplete tapering roof slab from [101]. This has a width of 200mm at its upper edge, widening to 380mm at the break and with a thickness of 20mm. It would have been well in excess of 340mm long when complete. Two 10mm diameter fixing holes are set 55mm down from the upper edge and spaced 100mm apart, central to the slab. It is possible that the use of suitable beds in the Tunbridge Wells Sand for roofing may have been the forerunner for the exploitation of the more suitable Horsham stone. Further dated assemblages will be needed to see if this suggestion is correct.

Some 13 pieces (435g) of other Wealden sandstone were recovered (three varieties ranging from fine to coarse), some of which are burnt. It is probable that most of these may have originated from walling material derived from more massive beds within the Tunbridge Wells Sand. A single weathered piece of chalk (12g) was recovered from mixed deposit [30], possibly the remnant of soil dressing or lime burning. The only object recovered consists of the simple beaded rim from a c. 220mm diameter Purbeck limestone grinding mortar (234g). Although probably of later 13th- to 15th- century date it was unstratified.

THE ACCESSIONED FINDS by Elke Raemen

Introduction and Methodology

A total of 23 accessioned finds was recovered from the excavations. Most of the material is unstratified and/or not diagnostic of close dating. Nine accessioned metal objects were recovered. In addition, 12 bone tools were recovered, all of which are in good condition. The other accessioned finds include a decorated clay pipe stem and the fragment of grinding mortar.

Overview of the Accessioned Finds

Most metalwork pieces have a household or domestic function. The ironwork includes three knife blade fragments: RF <3>, RF <5> and RF <7>. Only RF <5> from pit fill [32] is securely dated to the late 14th-15th century, although too little remains to classify its form. An unstratified pair of swivel chain-links (RF <4>) and a small cupboard key (RF <9>) are the only other iron accessioned objects present. The key was recovered from quarry fill [126], which is dated to the mid 15th to early 16th century by the pottery.

The copper-alloy objects include a hollow sheet-formed wall hanging or curtain ring of probable 18th to 19th century date (RF <2>) and a sheet book clasp (RF <8>) which was found in ditch fill [120], dated to the 17th century. In addition, a copper-alloy 'horse' ring (RF <6>) was recovered.

The only piece of lead consists of a cut disc weight (RF <1>), probably of 18th to early 19th century date.

A total of 12 bone pin-making tools were recovered (RF <12> to <23>). In London, these have usually been found in 16th century deposits, particularly on the sites of post-Dissolution religious houses (Egan 2005, 138). Presumably they were also used in the medieval period, continuing into the 17th century (Margeson 1993, 177). The tool-type consists of a cattle or horse metapodial, which is trimmed to a sub-rectangular section at one end, probably to provide better grip on the tool, and in a lozenge-sectioned shape at the other end. This lozenge-sectioned end contains longitudinal grooves on which the pin shafts probably rested while they were being filed sharp (Egan 2005, 138). The bones show lateral file marks, produced during the pointing of the pins. Some examples show deeper lateral grooves which were probably also used to hold pin shafts, as seen on RF <21> (Fig 6, no. 11) and RF<23> (Fig 6, no. 10). All identifiable tools are made from cow metapodial.

Only four of these tools are from stratified contexts. Context [111] contained three examples (RF <20> to <22>) and one tool (RF <23>, Fig 6, no. 10) was recovered from [126]. Context [111] could not be securely dated by pottery, but [126] is of mid 15th to early 16th century date and it is likely all these pinner's bones, whether stratified or not, are of this period. Pit fill [32] contained a single pin fragment. No other pins or wire have been recovered.

Discussion

The accessioned assemblage is too small for detailed analysis and most finds are not datable or not stratified. However, the relatively large number of pin-making tools, even though the majority of these are not stratified, is significant. As yet, no early documentary evidence of needle or pin-making in Horsham has been discovered (Annabelle Hughes *pers. comm.*), but the archaeological evidence unearthed here

clearly shows the presence of a cottage industry in pin manufacture situated in Horsham. Similar local industries have been documented in West Sussex, for example in Chichester, where the needle industry is thought to have begun in the 16th century (Morgan 1981, 78-79).

Catalogue

RF <1> Lead weight

Unstratified.

Complete. Cut disk weight dating to the 18th to 19th century. The disk is of some 3mm thick with a diameter of 32 to 36 mm.

RF <2> Copper-alloy wall hanging or curtain ring

[111]

Complete. Copper-alloy hollow ring formed of sheet with suspension loop. 18th to 19th century.

RF <3> Iron knife

Unstratified.

Incomplete. Scale-tang knife with broken blade and tang.

RF <4> Iron chain-links

Unstratified.

Complete. Pair of oval swivel rings coupled together (similar to: Goodall 1993, 140, Fig. 16, no. 972). These are identified as possible swivels for horse harnesses or carts by Egan (2005, 185, Fig. 173).

RF <5> Iron knife

[32]; Late 14th to 15th century

Incomplete. Knife blade fragment, probably whittle tanged. Tang and blade broken.

RF <6> Copper-alloy ring

Unstratified.

Complete. 'Horse' ring, with a diameter of 23 mm. These rings can potentially be associated with horse harness, though other functions are likely as well (similar to: Margeson 1993, 223, Fig. 224, no. 1818).

RF <7> Iron knife

[111]

Incomplete. Fragment of knife blade.

RF <8> Copper-alloy book clasp

[120] Slot B; 17th century

Incomplete. Sheet book clasp with raised central boss and rouletted decoration near edge. The plate is broad without a 'serrated' end. Though the end is worn off, it is unlikely there was a 'serrated' end. Moderately corroded, however, due to the thin nature of the clasp, this resulted in some complete disintegration of the plate.

RF <9> Iron key

[126]; mid 15th to early 16th century.

Complete. Small cupboard key with kidney-shaped bow and hollow stem.

RF <10> Stone mortar

Unstratified.

Incomplete. Rim of medieval grinding mortar with squared club rim in Purbeck limestone.

RF <11> Clay Pipe

Unstratified.

Incomplete. Stem fragment with rouletted diamonds with central circles dating to the second half of the 17th century.

RF <12> Bone tool (Fig. 6, no. 9)

Unstratified.

Complete. Pin-making tool made from the distal end of a cow metacarpal. Distal end unmodified. The proximal end is trimmed into a lozenge-sectioned shape. Longitudinal grooves on lozenge-shaped part. Length 115mm (similar to: Egan 2005, 139, Fig. 131, no. 722).

RF <13> Bone tool

Unstratified.

Incomplete. Lozenge-section shaped fragment of pin-making tool, made from a cow metatarsal. Thick longitudinal grooves. Length 37mm (similar to: Egan 2005, 139, Fig. 131, no. 722).

RF <14> Bone tool

Unstratified.

Incomplete. Pin-making tool made from cow metacarpal. Distal end missing. Length 65mm (similar to: Egan 2005, 139, Fig. 131, no. 722).

RF <15> Bone tool

Unstratified.

Incomplete. Pin-making tool made from cow metatarsal (shaft only). Incomplete end with lozenge section. Other end trimmed in sub rectangular shape. Length 80mm (similar to: Egan 2005, 139, Fig. 131, no. 722).

RF <16> Bone tool

Unstratified.

Complete. Pin-making tool made from right cow metacarpal (proximal end). Lozenge-sectioned end. No trimming of the proximal end. Length 78mm (similar to: Egan 2005, 139, Fig. 131, no. 722).

RF <17> Bone tool

Unstratified.

Incomplete. Pin-making tool made from cow metatarsal. Lozenge-sectioned end. Distal end missing. Length 37mm (similar to: Egan 2005, 139, Fig. 131, no. 722).

RF <18> Bone tool

Unstratified.

Complete. Pin-making tool made from right cow metatarsal. Lozenge-sectioned end. No trimming of the proximal end. Length 53mm (similar to: Egan 2005, 139, Fig. 131, no. 722).

RF <19> Bone tool

Unstratified.

Incomplete. Pin-making tool made from cow metacarpal. Lozenge-sectioned end. Distal end missing. Length 48mm (similar to: Egan 2005, 139, Fig. 131, no. 722).

RF <20> Bone tool

[111]

Incomplete. Pin-making tool made from cow metacarpal. Incomplete lozenge-sectioned end with longitudinal grooves. Distal end is missing. Length 42mm (similar to: Egan 2005, 139, Fig. 131, no. 722).

RF <21> Bone tool (Fig. 6, no. 11)

[111]

Incomplete. Pin-making tool made from cattle or horse metapodial (shaft only). Ends sawn off. Lozenge-sectioned end with longitudinal grooves. Towards the other end there are a few lateral grooves, one of which is particularly deep (5mm). Length 60mm (similar to: Egan 2005, 139, Fig. 131, no. 722).

RF <22> Bone tool

[111]

Incomplete. Pin-making tool made from cow metatarsal (shaft only). One end is lozenge-sectioned with longitudinal grooves. Length 55mm (similar to: Egan 2005, 139, Fig. 131, no. 722).

RF <23> Bone tool (Fig. 6, no. 10)

[126]; mid 15th to early 16th century.

Incomplete. Pin-making tool made from cow metacarpal (shaft only) with distal end sawn off. Lozenge-sectioned end with longitudinal grooves. Some lateral grooves as well. Length 83mm (similar to: Egan 2005, 139, Fig. 131, no. 722).

RF <24> Bone tool

Unstratified.

Incomplete. Pin-making tool made from cow metacarpal. Lozenge-sectioned end. No trimming of the distal end, though slight damage to sides. Length 145mm (similar to: Egan 2005, 139, Fig. 131, no. 722).

THE ENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE

THE ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLES by Lucy Allott

Bulk environmental samples taken during evaluation and excavation have confirmed the presence of small amounts of environmental remains including charred botanicals, bone and molluscs. All samples were processed using tank flotation and the residues (heavy fraction) and flots (light fraction) were retained on 500µm and 250µm meshes respectively. Flots were sorted under a stereozoom microscope at magnifications of 7-45x and where possible identifications were made through comparison with reference texts (Martin & Barkley 2000, Jacomet 2006, Cappers *et al.* 2006) and comparative material held at the Institute of Archaeology, UCL.

Charred cereal grains (indeterminate) and weed seeds of *Polygonum/Rumex* (Smartweed, Knotweed / Dock) were present in samples <1002>, Context [03] and <1005>, Context [32]. A charred Poaceae (grass) seed (sample <2002>, Context [102]) and charred *Triticum* sp. (wheat) cereal grains (sample <2003>, Context [105]) were also noted. Residues contained mammal and fish bone, oyster shell fragments, ceramic and stone building materials, pottery, slag, an iron nail, a copper 'pin' and some charcoal. Ceramic building materials similar to hand collected examples were present in moderate quantities in samples <2003> and <2002>.

Charred botanical remains were poorly represented in each of the samples and unfortunately sampling also highlighted small levels of modern disturbance within the soils. Charcoal fragments were perhaps best represented however these were too few to merit further analysis (especially in light of the evidence for modern disturbance). The environmental remains are too limited to enable any interpretations relating to past vegetation or economy of the area.

DISCUSSION

Given the paucity of archaeological work in Horsham, the archaeological investigation of the Vicarage Garden offered a rare opportunity to examine a site close to the medieval centre of the Wealden town. Although the number of features, the quantity of artefacts, and the quality of the environmental evidence was disappointing, and despite the fact that the largest finds assemblages were unstratified, the information gathered at the site is of some significance.

It seems likely that the site had ecclesiastical connections from an early date. If the 13th century reference to a '*manse*' (see above) does refer to a building partially within the boundaries of the site, then the vast majority of the deposited material belongs to a period when much of the excavated area was probably part of the garden mentioned in 1231.

The presence of structural remains is given added significance by this and subsequent references to buildings at the site. Unfortunately the remains were far too scant to allow close dating, and the creation of a plan of the building(s). One stretch of wall footing appears to lie within the footprint of the standing building shown as the '*old House*' on the 1841/2 plan, a structure which may date back as far as the 17th century or beyond (Fig. 2). The other short stretch of wall remains somewhat enigmatic, and may predate the building shown in the 1840s. It may equally have been part of this structure that had fallen down or been demolished given the repeated reports on the poor state of the building (see above).

Although the exact date of the individual elements represented by the structural remains is still unclear, there can be little doubt that the footings encountered at the site are likely to be associated with a building that dated back in part to at least the 17th century. The presence of the redeposited gravestones highlights the proximity of the churchyard, which was expanded after the demolition of the '*Old House*'. However, the exact circumstances and date of their placement in the garden remains unclear.

The finds assemblages recovered mirror the hypothesis that the site was occupied from early in the town's development. The presence of pottery potentially dating as earlier as the late 11th or 12th centuries does not entirely dispel the idea that Horsham was a 12th century new town (Hudson 1986, 190). Single sherds of pottery of a similar date have been found in North Street (Barber, L. in prep e.), at the King and Barnes site (Barber, L. in prep a.) and closer to the site, 12th century sherds have been recovered in Causeway (Kirby 1978, Beresford 2001). Nor does it prove the more evolutionary approach favoured by Gardiner and Harris (2006, 24). However, the ceramic evidence is far too thin to support any firm conclusions.

The absence of large medieval pits is perhaps a result of the use of much of the site as a tended garden from an early date. The re-cut ditches are a survival of a system of land division that predated the garden layout shown on the plan of the 1840s (Fig 4). These features were clearly too far away from any structures to have attracted much domestic refuse (the only feature to contain a sizeable assemblage of medieval pottery was a pit which lay close to the building remains). The recutting of the ditches is clear evidence of the longevity of the boundary, which may have divided plots fronting onto Causeway, or might have been part of a previous garden layout.

The possible quarry pits all appear later in the site sequence. These features seem to provide evidence of periodic rebuilding, repair and/or re-roofing with locally available

materials in the mid-15th to early 16th century, and then again in the 17th century. The presence of the local stone used as roofing tile is only the second such positive identification of this practice in Sussex (cf. Barber in prep f.), and the recovery of tiles with a broad date range, and also of post-medieval bricks, supports the view that the buildings at the site were regularly repaired or extended. Although it is possible that large 'hole' in the centre of the site ([125]) was originally dug as a pond and later infilled, there is little doubt that the removed stone would have been put to use.

Although the quarry pits and the locally produced stone roofing materials cannot be put forward as evidence of organised industrial activity in this part of the town, other artefacts did offer some clues. The presence of ironworking slag suggests that ironworking was undertaken in the general area, and this is supported by documentary sources (see above). Clearly the level of slag does not suggest ironworking within the boundaries of the site, or even in the vicinity (cf. in Crawley: Cooke 2001: Stevens in prep.), but the presence of both bloomery and blast furnace slag suggests a continuity not seen in the more thoroughly investigated Wealden town of Crawley. (*ibid.*, Stevens in prep.). The recovery of a fragment of crucible also hints at a local glass-making industry, an activity known to have been undertaken in the town in the medieval and post-medieval periods (Hudson *op. cit.*, 175)

However, the most interesting, and completely unexpected evidence of industrial activity was the presence of the bone pin-making tools. There are no known documents alluding to pin-making or needle-making in Horsham in the medieval or post-medieval periods (Dr Annabelle Hughes, *pers. comm.*). Perhaps the absence of documentary references is understandable given the status of pin-making as '*initially localized craft manufacture in English towns*', which went into decline in the 16th century owing to foreign imports (Caple 1991, 241). Although close dating proved difficult, it appears that the southern end of Causeway was the location of this 'cottage industry' in the 15th and 16th centuries. A fragment of a pin was also recovered from the site.

While it was disappointing that the results of the excavation added little information regarding the probable '*manse*', the limited range of features identified and investigated at the site have added to the restricted corpus of archaeological data relating to medieval and post-medieval Horsham, and have highlighted a hitherto unsuspected element of the town's industrial past.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The input of John Mills, Archaeologist, West Sussex County Council at every stage of the project is gratefully acknowledged, as is that of Dr. Annabelle Hughes, whose knowledge of relevant documentary sources was invaluable. The author would also like to thank Sue Djabri of Horsham Museum Society for her research on the gravestones, and the specialists whose work appears in this report, namely Luke Barber, Sue Pringle, Elke Raemen and Lucy Allott. Elke Raemen would like to thank Gemma Driver for the species identification of the worked bone. Thanks are also due to the ASE staff that worked on site during the evaluation, excavation and subsequent watching brief: Rosie Cummings, Diccon Hart, Andi Margetts, Clive Meaton, Caroline Russell, Jeremy Webster, Deon Whittaker, Dan Wray and David Yates. The project was managed on behalf of ASE by Neil Griffin (Project Manager), and by Louise Rayner (Post-Excavation Manager) who also edited the publication text. The work was funded by Chalvington Barns.

Appendix 1 – The Gravestones

ASE Memorial Number	Lettering	Year	Grave number	Comment
500	IK	1786	599	The gravestone of William and his wife Jane Kempshall says that they were buried in 1787 and 1786 respectively, but the burial record for Jane is dated 1741, which is confusing.
501				No inscription
502	ME	1797	762	Martha Elliott, wife of John
503	TC MC	1814 1813	645	Thomas and Mary Cragg (he was a clockmaker in West Street)
504	EW	1845	45	Emma Wood, wife of John
505	MB	-	?692	?Mary Brown (undated)
506	TM SM SM	1817 1806 1813	574	Thomas and Sarah Marchant are mentioned on the gravestone, and it seems likely that his wife Mary , who died in 1806, was buried here, and an error made in the initials.
507	JC	1814	632	John Cragg (gardener who lived at 11/12 The Causeway)
508	WP EP	1809 1805	571	William and Elizabeth Price, although the burial record says that she was buried in 1803 not 1805
509	MP	1851	570	Mary Price

REFERENCES

- Aldsworth, F. and Down, A.** 1990. The Production of Late Medieval and Post-Medieval Pottery in the Graffham Area of West Sussex, *Sussex Archaeological Collections* (hereafter SAC) **128**, 117-139.
- Aldsworth, F. and Freke, D.** 1976. *Historic Towns in Sussex: an Archaeological Survey*. London, Institute of Archaeology
- Barber, L.** 1997. The Pottery, in S. Stevens, Excavations at the Old Post Office site, 15-17 High Street, Crawley, West Sussex, SAC. **135**, 200-204.
- Barber, L.** in prep a. The Pottery in J. Stevenson, Excavations at the King and Barnes Site, Horsham (SAC)
- Barber, L.** in prep b. The Pottery, in S. Stevens
- Barber, L.** in prep c. The Pottery, in N. Griffin, Excavations at London Road, Pulborough (SAC)
- Barber, L.** in prep d. The Pottery, in S. Stevens, *Archaeological Investigations at the Ropetackle Site, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex* (Monograph)
- Barber, L.** in prep e. The Pottery, in S. Stevens, An Archaeological Investigation at No. 42, North Street, Horsham (SAC)
- Barber, L.** in prep f. The Geological Material, in S. Stevens, Archaeological Investigations at the Asda site, Crawley (SAC)
- Barton, K.** 1979. *Medieval Sussex Pottery*. Chichester: Phillimore.
- Beresford, G.** 2001. *Manor House, Causeway, Horsham: An Archaeological Trial Excavation*. Unpub. Report
- Bleach, J. and Gardiner, M.** 1999. Medieval Markets and Ports, in Leslie, K. and Short, B. *An Historical Atlas of Sussex*. Chichester: Phillimore
- Butler, C. and Knight, S.** 2004. *An Archaeological Watching Brief at St. Mary's Church, Horsham, West Sussex*. Unpub. Archaeology South-East Report No. 1679
- Caple, C.** 1991. The Detection and Definition of an Industry: The English Medieval and Post Medieval Pin Industry, *Archaeological Journal* **148**, 241-55
- Cappers, R. T. J., Bekker, R. M. & Jans, J. E. A.** 2006. Digital Seed Atlas of the Netherlands. Groningen Archaeological Series 4. Barkhuis Publications
- Cooke, N.** 2001. Excavations on a late medieval ironworking site at London Road, Crawley, West Sussex 1997, SAC **139**, 147-67
- Crowley, N.** 1997. Ceramic building material, in *Excavations at the priory and hospital of St Mary Spital London* (eds. C. Thomas, B. Sloane and C. Phillpotts) MoLAS Monograph Series **1**, 195-201

Department of Urban Archaeology Museum of London: *Newgate Street, GPO site, middle area, EC1 (POM79) site archive.*

Eames, E. S. 1980. *Catalogue of medieval lead-glazed earthenware tiles in the Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities.* London: British Museum Press

Eames, E. S. 1992. *English Tilers.* London: British Museum Press

Egan, G. 2005, *Material culture in London in an age of transition. Tudor and Stuart period finds c.1450-c.1700 from excavations at riverside sites in Southwark*, MoLAS Monograph 19. London

Gardiner, M. 1997. Trade, Rural Industry and the Origins of Villages: some Evidence from South-East England, in de Boe, G., & Verhaeghe, F., (eds.), *Rural Settlements in Medieval Europe: Papers of the Medieval Europe Brugge 1997 Conference* **6**, 63-73.

Goodall, I. H. 1993, *Iron chains, links and chain fittings*, in Margeson (ed.), 140-142.

Griffin, N. 2006. *The Vicarage Garden, Causeway, Horsham, West Sussex Archaeological Excavation and Watching Brief (Stage 2) Written Scheme of Investigation.* Unpub. ASE Document

Harris, R. 2004. *Horsham Historical Character Assessment Report.* Sussex Extensive Urban Survey Document

Hudson, T. P. (ed.) 1986. *The Victoria County History of Sussex*, Vol. **VI**, pt. 2, 129-203

Hughes, A. 2006. The Vicarage at Horsham and some of its Occupants, *Horsham Heritage* **15**, 3-13

Hohler, C. 1942. Medieval paving tiles from Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **14**, 1-49, 99-132

Jacommet, S. 2006. Identification of cereal remains from archaeological sites. 2nd ed. Unpublished manuscript.

Keen, L. 2002. Windsor Castle and the Penn tile industry, in *Windsor. Medieval Archaeology, Art and Architecture of the Thames Valley* (eds. L. Keen and E. Scarff), British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions **25**, 219-237

Kirby, J. 1978. Excavations in Horsham 1975-1976: Interim Report, SAC **116**, 396-8

Margeson, S. (ed.), 1993, *Norwich households: the medieval and post-medieval finds from Norwich survey excavations 1971-8*, East Anglian Archaeological Report No. **58**

Martin, A. C. & Barkley, W. D. 2000. *Seed Identification Manual.* The Blackburn Press, New Jersey.

Morgan, R. 1981. A note on the Chichester needle industry, in Down, A (ed.) *Chichester Excavations V*, 78-79, Chichester

- Mytum, H.** 2000. *Recording and Analysing Graveyards*. York: CBA
- Pearce, J.** 1992. *Post-Medieval Pottery in London, 1500-1700, Volume 1: Border Wares*. London: HMSO.
- Pearce, J. and Vince, A.** 1988. *A Dated Type-Series of London Medieval Pottery: Part 4: Surrey Whitewares*. London & Middlesex Archaeological Society, Special Paper No. 10.
- Stevens, S.** 2006. *An Archaeological Evaluation (Stage 1) in The Vicarage Garden, Causeway, Horsham, West Sussex*. Unpub. Archaeology South-East Report No. 2149
- Stevens, S.** in prep. Archaeological Investigations at the Asda Site, Crawley (SAC)
- Streeten, A.** 1985. The Pottery, in J. Hare, *Battle Abbey: the eastern range and excavations of 1978-80*. HBMCE Archaeological Report **2**, 103-126.
- Timby, J.** 1998. The Pottery, in M. Saunders, Archaeological Investigations on the route of the Crawley High Street Relief Road, Crawley, West Sussex SAC **136**, 89-92.
- Windrum, A.** 1978. *Horsham. An Historical Survey*. Chichester, Phillimore

SMR Summary Sheet

Site Code	CAU 06					
Identification Name and Address	The Vicarage Garden, Causeway					
County, District &/or Borough	Horsham District, West Sussex					
Full 12 Fig.. OS Grid Refs.	517110 130292					
Archaeology South-East Proj. No.	2569					
Type of Fieldwork	Eval.	Excav. ✓	Watching Brief ✓	Standing Structure	Survey	Other
Type of Site	Green Field	Shallow Urban ✓	Deep Urban	Other		
Dates of Fieldwork	Eval.	Excav. July 2006 —	WB. Dec. 2006 —	Other		
Sponsor/Client	Chalvington Barns					
Project Manager	Neil Griffin/Louise Rayner					
Project Supervisor	Simon Stevens					
Period Summary	Palaeo.	Meso.	Neo.	BA	IA	RB
	AS	MED ✓	PM ✓	Other		
<p>100 Word Summary.</p> <p><i>Following the archaeological evaluation of the Vicarage Garden, Causeway, Horsham, West Sussex, an open area was excavated and recorded, and a subsequent watching brief was maintained during groundworks elsewhere at the site. Encountered features included medieval and early post-medieval ditches, and medieval and post-medieval pits and possible quarry pits. Finds included pottery, ceramic building material and stone, and a range of other artefacts including worked bone used in the production of pins.</i></p>						

OASIS ID: archaeol6-38312

? Project details

Project name	The Vicarage Garden, Causeway, Horsham
Short description of the project	Evaluation and subsequent excavation of building 'footprint' showed evidence of medieval and post-medieval activity. Finds included pottery, CBM and stone as well as a small group of bone tools used in pin manufacture.
Project dates	Start: 28-07-2006 End: 26-02-2007
Previous/future work	Yes / No
Any associated project reference codes	CAU 06 - Sitecode
Any associated project reference codes	2569 - Contracting Unit No.
Type of project	Recording project
Site status	Conservation Area
Current Land use	Other 5 - Garden
Monument type	Ditch Medieval
Monument type	Ditch Post Medieval
Significant Finds	Bone pin-making tools Post Medieval
Significant Finds	Pottery Medieval
Investigation type	'Open-area excavation'
Prompt	Direction from Local Planning Authority - PPG16

Status **Complete**

? Project location

Site location	WEST SUSSEX HORSHAM HORSHAM Vicarage Garden, Causeway
Postcode	RH12 1HE
Study area	300 Square metres
Site coordinates	NGR - TQ 17110 30292 LL - 51.0594655299 -0.328696098826 (decimal) LL - 51 03 34 N 000 19 43 W (degrees) Point

Height OD Min: 40m Max: 41m

Status **Complete**

**? Project
creators**

Name of Organisation Archaeology South-East

Project brief originator West Sussex County Council

Project design originator Archaeology South-East

Project director/manager Neil Griffin

Project supervisor Simon Stevens

Type of sponsor/funding body Developer

Name of sponsor/funding body Chalvington Barns

Status **Complete**

**? Project
archives**

Physical Archive recipient Horsham Museum

Physical Contents 'Ceramics','Environmental','Glass','Industrial','Metal','Worked bone'

Digital Archive Exists? 'No digital archive'

Paper Archive recipient Horsham Museum

Paper Contents 'other'

Paper Media available 'Context sheet','Correspondence','Diary','Miscellaneous Material','Notebook - Excavation, Research, General Notes','Photograph','Plan','Report','Section'

Status **Complete**

**? Project
bibliography 1**

Publication type Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)_1



Title Archaeological Investigations at The Vicarage Garden,
Causeway, Horsham, West Sussex

Author(s)/Editor(s) Stevens, S.

Other
bibliographic
details Report No. 2569


Date 2008

Issuer or
publisher Archaeology South-East


Place of issue or
publication Sussex

Description Standard A4-sized ASE client report with cover logo.


Status **Complete**




© Archaeology South-East		The Vicarage Garden, Causeway, Horsham		Fig. 1
Project Ref: 2569	May 2008	Site Location		
Report Ref:	Drawn by:JLR/FEG			




© Archaeology South-East		The Vicarage Garden, Causeway, Horsham	Fig. 2
Project Ref: 2569	May 2008	Site Plan	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: JLR/FEG		




© Archaeology South-East		The Vicarage Garden, Causeway, Horsham	Fig. 3
Project Ref: 2569	March 2008	Trench Location incorporating 1841/2 plan	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: FEG		



© Archaeology South-East		The Vicarage Garden, Causeway, Horsham	Fig. 4
Project Ref: 2569	May 2008	Pottery	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: HF		



© Archaeology South-East		The Vicarage Garden, Causeway, Horsham	Fig. 5
Project Ref: 2569	May 2008	Worked Bone	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: HF		



© Archaeology South-East		The Vicarage Garden, Causeway, Horsham	Fig. 6
Project Ref: 2569	May 2008	Tile	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: HF		