

---

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS LTD**

**SHIRE HALL, RAINGATE STREET, BURY ST EDMUNDS, SUFFOLK**

**POST EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT AND  
UPDATED PROJECT DESIGN**

Authors:	Andrew A.S. Newton MPhil PIFA (Report) Antony R.R. Mustchin MSc (Editor)	
NGR: TL 858 639		Report No: 4244
District: Bury St Edmunds		Site Code: BSE 365
Approved: Claire Halpin MfA		Project No: P4241
Signed:		Date: January 2013 Revised: 13/10/2014

*This report is confidential to the client. Archaeological Solutions Ltd accepts no responsibility or liability to any third party to whom this report, or any part of it, is made known. Any such party relies upon this report entirely at their own risk. No part of this report may be reproduced by any means without permission.*

---

Archaeological Solutions is an independent archaeological contractor providing the services which satisfy all archaeological requirements of planning applications, including:

*Desk-based assessments and environmental impact assessments*  
*Historic building recording and appraisals*  
*Trial trench evaluations*  
*Geophysical surveys*  
*Archaeological monitoring and recording*  
*Archaeological excavations*  
*Post excavation analysis*  
*Promotion and outreach*  
*Specialist analysis*

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS LTD**

**98-100 Fore Street, Hertford SG14 1AB  
Tel 01992 558170**

**Unit 6, Brunel Business Court, Eastern Way,  
Bury St Edmunds IP32 7AJ  
Tel 01284 765210**

**e-mail [info@ascontracts.co.uk](mailto:info@ascontracts.co.uk)  
[www.archaeologicalsolutions.co.uk](http://www.archaeologicalsolutions.co.uk)**



[twitter.com/ArchaeologicalS](https://twitter.com/ArchaeologicalS)



[www.facebook.com/ArchaeologicalSolutions](https://www.facebook.com/ArchaeologicalSolutions)



**INVESTORS IN PEOPLE | Silver**

## **CONTENTS**

### **1 INTRODUCTION**

#### ***PART I POST EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT***

### **2 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 Project Background
- 2.2 Geological, archaeological and historical background
- 2.3 Summary of the results of the project to date

### **3 STRATIGRAPHIC ASSESSMENT**

- 3.1 Methodology
- 3.2 Provisional phasing
- 3.3 Summary of the archaeology by phase

### **4 FINDS ASSESSMENT**

- 4.1 Methodology
- 4.2 Specialist Assessments and reports

### **5 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

- 5.1 Methodology
- 5.2 Specialist Assessments and reports

### **6 STORAGE AND CURATION**

#### ***PART II UPDATED PROJECT DESIGN***

### **7 UPDATE OF AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

### **8 SUGGESTED BIBLIOGRAPHY**

### **9 PUBLICATION SYNOPSIS**

- 9.1 Summary
- 9.2 Estimated breakdown of report

### **ASSESSMENT AND UPD BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## **SHIRE HALL, RAINGATE STREET, BURY ST EDMUNDS, SUFFOLK**

### **POST EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT AND UPDATED PROJECT DESIGN**

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

This document provides for a Post Excavation Assessment (Part I) and Updated Project Design (Part II) for archaeological work undertaken by Archaeological Solutions (AS) at Shire Hall, Raingate Street, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk (TL 858 639) during September 2012. The work was commissioned by M & D Developments.

The site lies in an area of Archaeological Importance within the Anglo-Saxon and medieval settlement core of Bury (BSE 242), and adjacent to the precinct of the Abbey of St Edmund (BSE 010, SAM SF2).

### ***PART I POST EXCAVATION ASSESMENT***

## **2 BACKGROUND**

### **2.1 Project Background**

2.1.1 In September 2012 Archaeological Solutions Limited (AS), conducted an archaeological excavation and monitoring at Shire Hall, Raingate Street, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk (NGR TL 858 639). The excavation and monitoring were required in compliance with a planning condition attached to planning approval for the addition of a new wing onto the former Shire Hall Building (St Edmundsbury Ref. SE/11/0481). The requirement followed a trial trench evaluation of the site carried out as part of a Heritage Statement in support of the planning application (Dyson & Adams 2011).

2.1.2 The project was undertaken in compliance with a brief issued by Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Conservation Team (SCC AS-CT; dated 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2012), and a specification prepared by AS (dated 8th August 2012). It adhered to appropriate sections of Gurney, D, 2003, 'Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England', *East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper* 14. The excavation was also conducted according to the Institute of for Archaeologists' *Code of Conduct and Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Excavation* (revised 2008).

2.1.3 An archaeological evaluation of the site was carried out by AS in March/ April 2011 (Dyson & Adams 2011). The site lies within the early settlement core of Bury St Edmunds and it is considered that it is in the approximate location of the Sacrist's Yard of the medieval Abbey of St Edmund. This would have contained the hall, domestic buildings, offices, stables and workshops.

## 2.2 Geological, Archaeological and Historical Background

### 2.2.1 Topography, Geology and Soils

The Shire Hall site lies at c. 35m OD, on the edge of a gravel terrace sloping down to the River Lark, some 150m to the east. Recent work at BSE 375 has shown a relatively steep slope down to riverine deposits (Gill 2011, 57). The adjacent flood plain is the product of attempts, since the medieval period to engineer this landscape (*ibid.*).

The local soils have not been surveyed due to the urban setting. However, Bury St Edmunds is in a region dominated by typical argillic brown earths which are clay loams derived from chalky boulder clay. The presence of the nearby rivers Lark and Linnet, and the position of the site on the flood plain of the Lark, also suggests the presence of alluvial deposits. An Environmental Desk Study conducted for a nearby site on Maynewater Lane (located at TL 8583 6356) describes the subsoil as alluvium and head deposits (EPS 2011). The soils of the wider area surrounding Bury St Edmunds are classified by the Soil Survey of England and Wales (SSEW 1983) as the deep, well drained fine loamy and coarse loamy over clayey fine loamy soils, with some calcareous clayey subsoils, of the Melford Association. To the east and west of the town are pockets of soils of the Newport 2 and Newport 4 Associations, which are associated with glaciofluvial drift. Immediately adjacent to the river Lark, alluvial soils of the Thames Association have been recorded (SSEW 1983).

The site lies on a solid geology of upper Cretaceous Chalk of the White Chalk subgroup, the lithological description given by the British Geological Survey for which is chalk with flints, with discrete marl seams, nodular chalk, sponge-rich with flint seams throughout ([www.bgs.ac.uk](http://www.bgs.ac.uk)).

### 2.2.2 Archaeology and History

#### Prehistoric

Little evidence of prehistoric activity has been recorded in the immediate vicinity of the Shire Hall site. However, Suffolk is one of the richer English counties for Palaeolithic remains which mainly comprise worked flints found in river gravels, and Bury St Edmunds is classed as a major Lower Palaeolithic site. The Grindle Pit (BHER 65a), located to the south, has revealed more Palaeolithic implements, including a handaxe and Levallois flake, than any other location in the town, and it is likely that some of these artefacts were *in situ*. A handaxe and two "cleavers" have been found at the Kings Brewery site at the north end of Maynewater Lane (BHER 347) and a third handaxe came from the Old Sword in Hand, on Southgate Street (BSE 049).

There is little evidence for a human presence in Suffolk during the Mesolithic period and this may partly be due to very cold periods prohibiting the presence of hunter gatherers. Around 6500 BC rising sea levels severed the land bridge connecting East Anglia with the Continent and by c. 5500 BC the Suffolk landscape was dominated by mixed oak forests. Human activity is largely identified from flint

scatters showing changes in tool technology towards wood working and hunting more solitary forest dwelling game (Wymer 1999, 34). Most sites are confined to north-west Suffolk, although a worked object of probable Mesolithic date has been recovered from the vicinity of St Edmund's Nursing Home (BHER 127a).

The Neolithic is represented by a polished axehead, knife and pottery found at St Edmund's Nursing Home (BHER 127a). Another prehistoric handaxe and worked flints were recovered from a gravel pit at Bury Rugby Ground (BHER 061b). Excavations within the abbey precinct near the river Lark have recovered pollen and organic deposits from the floodplain dating to the Late Neolithic (BHER 332).

### Bronze Age and Iron Age

Evidence of these periods is lacking in the immediate vicinity of the current site but it is noted in the surrounding area; Bronze Age and Iron Age pottery (BSE 026 - 1378) was found during an excavation close to Vinefields Farm, which lies off Eastgate Street, to the north. Artefacts of Iron Age date (BSE 010 - 15054) have also been found during archaeological excavations (ESF15388) within the grounds of the Abbey itself.

### Roman

Like the preceding Iron Age, evidence for the Romano-British period in the immediate vicinity of the site is limited. However, 21 sherds of redeposited Roman pottery were recorded during an excavation at nearby East Close conducted between 1991 and 1994 (BSE 026-MSF16658; Anderson 1994).

Slightly further afield, A scatter of 1<sup>st</sup> century and 3<sup>rd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> century coins (BSE 057 – MSF 3443) has been discovered at Moreton Hall School, to the east, and the line of a possible Roman road (BRG 052 - MSF25442) is recorded to the north, running between Eastgate Street and Great Livermere. To the south, three Roman coins and several possible Roman tile fragments have been recovered during an excavation at St Edmund's Nursing Home (BSE 127b).

### Anglo-Saxon and medieval

The town of Bury St Edmunds has its origins in the Anglo-Saxon period; the complex of the Abbey of St Edmunds has been demonstrated to overlie several phases of Saxon occupation, which represent the precursor of the present town. Late Saxon sources refer to it as *Beodricsworth* (Carr and Gill 2007). In 633, King Sigebert of the East Angles 'retired' to *Beodricsworth* and founded a small religious community here. 10<sup>th</sup> century documents indicate that it had the status of a 'villa regia' from the mid Saxon period. Archaeological evidence confirms a mid Saxon date for the earliest occupation here.

A sherd of early Saxon hand-made pottery (BSE 026 – 16659; Anderson 1994) has been recovered from East Close, to the north-east of the Abbey complex, where a ditch of late Saxon date (BSE 026 – MSF6727) was also revealed. Within the area of the Abbey itself, a significant quantity of mid to late Saxon pottery (Ipswich and

Thetford ware), blue glass (BSE 120) and structural remains have been discovered (BSE 010 – MSF15053, BSE 120 & BSE 241 – MSF2227; Gem & Keen 1981).

In the autumn of 869, an invading Danish army, which had spent the previous three years in Mercia, York and the north, descended on East Anglia, establishing their winter quarters at Thetford. Within three weeks of their arrival they met and defeated the army of the East Anglian King, Edmund at Hoxne, in Suffolk. Either in battle, or more probably as a captive, Edmund was killed (Stenton 2001, 248). The contemporary West Saxon author of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* records his death without any sign of interest (Stenton 2001, 248) but Hindley (2006, 188) reports that certain literary sources document a brutal execution, in which he was first flayed, then bound to a tree and shot repeatedly with arrows. He was then decapitated and his head was discarded in neighbouring woodland. His subjects, discovering his body bound to the tree, interred his remains in a wooden chapel at Hoxne

In 903, Edmund's remains were transferred to, and enshrined at, the church of St Mary at *Beodricsworth*. Following the King's martyrdom, six priests devoted themselves to a monastic life under the patronage of the royal saint and founded a monastery in the early 10<sup>th</sup> century (BSE 010 – MSF437, SAM35556). Edmund's shrine became the focus of reputed miracles, so attracting pilgrims and visitors. In 1014, the new Danish King Swein Forkbeard demanded tribute money with threats from the religious community, and his sudden death led to rumours that St Edmund had caused his demise.

In 1020, King Canute (Swein's son) was quick to grant the abbey at St Edmundsbury, as it was now known, a charter freeing it from episcopal control and giving it jurisdiction over much of the surrounding countryside. At this time Aelfwine, Bishop of Elmham, replaced the secular clergy with 20 Benedictine monks brought in from the abbey of St Benet of Hulme (Butler & Given-Wilson 1979). Edward the Confessor enriched the abbey further by creating the Liberty of St Edmund. In the 11<sup>th</sup> century, William the Conqueror increased the monastery's privileges and the number of monks increased to 50 in c.1081.

So far, there is no archaeological evidence for the ancillary buildings associated with the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> century church, or the area covered by the pre-Norman ecclesiastical complex but there is some evidence for the late Saxon lay settlement. This appears to have been located to both the north and the south of the abbey complex (Carr and Gill 2007).

The church of St Mary (BSE 010 - MSF437) was demolished and re-built under Abbott Baldwin in the late 11<sup>th</sup> century. It was under Baldwin that the planning and construction of the Abbey complex and the town, on its irregular grid plan, as they are recognisable today began (Carr and Gill 2007). Either Baldwin or his predecessor placed Edmund's remains in an elaborate stone rotunda, and his cult attracted even more tourists until he effectively became patron saint of England. The development brought about Baldwin included two market places and the road from Northgate Street to Raingate Street doglegging around the front of the abbey at Angel Hill. In the 12<sup>th</sup> century Abbot Anselm (1121-1148) enlarged the town grid and by 1200 the Abbot of Bury St Edmunds was one of the most powerful lords in the Kingdom. Samson (1182 – 1211), the best documented prelate of his rank in the

country, is recorded being present in full armour at the siege of Windsor Castle in 1193.

The medieval town of St Edmund's Bury (BSE 241) comprised the urban settlement including the Abbey complex with land to the east comprising agricultural land. Mid-12<sup>th</sup> to mid-13<sup>th</sup> century pottery and tiles were discovered in the southern part of the Abbey complex (BSE 291) during archaeological test pitting (ESF20343; Carr & Gill 2007). An archaeological evaluation (ESF20810) in the Abbey Gardens has revealed a flint bonded wall and a robbed wall trench (BSE 332) representing structural remnants of the Abbey buildings (Gill 2009).

To the north of the Abbey (BSE 010), an archaeological evaluation to the rear of Thingoe House revealed ditches and pits dated from the 12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> centuries. A layer of clay was discovered, possibly indicative of the presence of a building in this area. The two early 13<sup>th</sup> century hospitals of St Nicholas (BSE 025) and St Stephen (BSE 134), to the north-east, were possibly associated with the monastery. Archaeological investigations at East Close (ESF 16121) revealed a 12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> century metalworking site (BSE 026 – MSF6727) with finds including pottery, jewellery, silver coins, bronze and iron tools, bone implements, stone architectural fragments (Anderson 1996).

### Post-medieval

The abbey was dissolved in 1539 and is now a Scheduled Monument (BSE 010, SAM SF2). Surviving remains include the 14<sup>th</sup> century Great Gate, built after the riot of 1327, along with most of the precinct wall and West Front, whilst the plan of the abbey church survives inside. To the south is the Great Churchyard (BHER 090) containing the Scheduled early 14<sup>th</sup> century Chapel of the Charnel (BHER 040). The Great Churchyard extends as far south as the Suffolk County Council archaeology buildings, and includes the now built over Cemetery of the Monks (BHER 092 & 291). The Norman Tower at the foot of Churchgate Street is also scheduled as part of the abbey (BHER 174).

St James Cathedral (elevated so in 1913), is another scheduled element of the abbey. It was founded in the 11<sup>th</sup> century and stands on the site of the earlier Church of St Denise (BHER 118). The church was rebuilt in 1503 and was not finished until 2005 with the completion of the tower. The Church of St Mary is located within 400m of the site and stands on the site of a 12<sup>th</sup> century predecessor. It was rebuilt in the late medieval period and houses the remains of Mary Tudor, sister of Henry VIII. There are a large number of churches, chapels and hospitals within the medieval town. The nearest to the assessment site was St Botolph's Chapel which was located in the yard of the "White Hart" Inn, approximately 80m to the east.

The Abbey Gardens became an early Town Walk and a botanic garden and has been a registered park since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century (BHER 010b). Bury is known for its brewing industry most notably Greene King founded in 1799 (BSE 225). The town was re-fashioned in the Georgian and Victorian periods with impressive public buildings and elegant facades (St Edmundsbury Council 2007). Bury railway station opened on Northgate Street in 1846, and between 1865 and 1909 a second station was located at Eastgate Street with a line to Sudbury.



### 2.2.3 Previous archaeological work

#### Archaeological Assessment of the Shire Hall complex

An archaeological assessment of the Shire Hall complex has previously been conducted (Carr and Gill 2007). In summary:

Existing remains of Bury St Edmunds Abbey (BSE 010) include the 12<sup>th</sup> century Norman Tower and the 14<sup>th</sup> century Great Gate along with most of the precinct wall, whilst the plan of the abbey church survives inside along with the West front. The whole monastic complex is a Scheduled Monument (SAM SF2). The abbey was dissolved in 1539 and the interior has been a registered park since the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The current St James Cathedral was founded in the early 11<sup>th</sup> century and stands on the site of the earlier Church of St Denise. The cathedral was rebuilt in 1503 and was not finished until 2005 with the building of the tower. St Mary's Church is within 300m of the site and stands on the site of a 12<sup>th</sup> century church. It was rebuilt in the late medieval period and houses the burial of Mary Tudor, sister of Henry VIII. Between the two churches is the Great Churchyard dating from the medieval period which contains a 13<sup>th</sup> century chancel house, and burials reached at least as far south as the modern Suffolk County Council archaeology department buildings.

The Shire Hall complex is within the urban core of the town and approximately 10-12m of the southern boundary of the mortared flint abbey precinct wall which includes a 12<sup>th</sup> century turret. Research carried out by the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service suggests that there may be extensive archaeological deposits buried within the area of the site.

An abbey school, perhaps a music school, occupied the site of the former Shire Hall, from which the name of Schoolhall Lane originates. The area to the rear of the Shire Hall, south of the precinct wall, is the location of the Sacrist's yard. This area has potential to include the offices and homes of the Sacrist's staff and a possible gatehouse. It is also possible that further abbey buildings occupied this area, whilst pottery finds suggest that the site lies within the vicinity of the middle to late Saxon settlement.

Ryland's *East View of the Town* (published 1791) depicts a return to the precinct wall running parallel to the river Lark; a tower was also shown at the junction with the extant wall. Ryland's engraving is also notable for the absence of a dividing wall between the churchyard and the area of the modern county council car park. Another early cartographic source, Warren's 1741 Map, depicts this area as gardens with a boundary marking the postulated line of the north-south wall.

The Great Churchyard, occupying the area immediately to the south of the Abbey church was documented in the post-medieval period (16<sup>th</sup>/17<sup>th</sup> century). Likewise, the *Monk's Cemetery* is marked on the 1880 Ordnance Survey map. A botanical garden, the precursor of the current Abbey Gardens, occupied the area of the modern car park from 1820, and was relocated to its current site, under the patronage of the Marquis of Bristol, in 1831.

## Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation

An archaeological evaluation of the current site was carried out by AS in March and April 2011 (Dyson & Adams 2011). This comprised the excavation of a single evaluation trench. The work revealed archaeological features and layers of medieval and post-medieval date.

In summary, the evaluation revealed features (of 12<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> century date) comprising predominantly pits and postholes. At the northern end of the trench the remains of a structure may have been partially revealed (F1008, F1010, F1012, F1014, F1016, F1018, F1046, F1048 and F1050). The medieval features contained small quantities of pottery (between one and two sherds) and animal bone. Three features (1008, 1010 & 1018) contained struck flint suggestive of prehistoric activity

The features divide into two phases; those which cut Levelling Layer L1002 (F1006, F1052 and F1056), and those which cut the natural (L1004) and were overlain by Subsoil L1003 (the remaining features). The features which cut L1002 were post-medieval, and the features overlain by Subsoil L1003 were dateable to the medieval period (12<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> century) or earlier.

The medieval features were predominantly pits and postholes. At the northern end of the trench the remains of a structure may have been partially revealed (F1008, F1010, F1012, F1014, F1016, F1018, F1046, F1048 and F1050). The form and fills (mid to dark grey brown loose, silty sand with frequent small & medium flint) of the postholes were directly comparable.

The medieval features contained small quantities of pottery (between one and two sherds) and animal bone. Three features (F1008, F1010 & F1018) contained struck flint suggestive of prehistoric activity

### **2.3 Summary of the results of the project to date**

The brief (SCC AS-CT, 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2012) required the formal single-context archaeological excavation of the area within the footprint of the foundations of the new building (an area of c.300m<sup>2</sup>) and archaeological monitoring of any additional groundworks. The excavated area incorporated, and widened, the area previously investigated during the trial trench evaluation (Dyson and Adams 2011).

The results of the excavation (Barlow 2014) indicate that three phases of archaeological activity were identified. The earliest phase represents activity in the medieval period. This was followed by a phase of activity dated as post-medieval and, ultimately, a phase of 19<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> century activity.

The stratigraphically earliest features recorded during the archaeological work undertaken at the site were those that cut the natural sand and flint gravel substrate L2007 (recorded during the preceding evaluation as L1004). These features comprised 30 postholes, 21 pits and three linears. Where dateable artefactual evidence existed, these features were shown to be of predominantly medieval date, with a small number of later post-medieval features also present. It is possible that

the later features had been cut from higher up, and only appeared to be part of this earliest phase because of subsequent truncation.

Cutting deposits dateable to the medieval period were numerous discrete features which, despite the presence of residual medieval finds, have been identified as being of post-medieval date. These features comprised four pits, one of which may have been a well, seven postholes, and a trackway, which was cut by one of the four pits.

The modern (19<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> century) features were mostly recorded cutting a compact silty clay levelling layer and contemporary deposits. These features comprised four pits, a trackway, and a sequence of four large ditches.

### 3 STRATIGRAPHIC ASSESSMENT

#### 3.1 Methodology

Due to the stratigraphy of the site, investigation was undertaken through the mechanical stripping of the site in three stages. The first stage of stripping was carried out to the level of levelling layer L1002 (as identified during the preceding trial trench evaluation) at 0.56 – 0.60m below the existing ground level. Following this, mechanical stripping was undertaken to the level of layer L1003 at 0.80 – 1.12m below the existing ground level. The final phase of mechanical stripping was undertaken to the level of the natural substrate L1004 at 1.00 – 1.47m beneath the existing ground level.

The mechanical stripping was undertaken under close archaeological supervision using a tracked mechanical 360° excavator fitted with a toothless ditching bucket. Following each stage of mechanical stripping, each phase of archaeological investigation was undertaken by hand. Exposed surfaces were cleaned as appropriate and examined for archaeological features and finds. Deposits were recorded using *pro forma* recording sheets, drawn to scale and photographed. Excavated spoil was checked for finds.

#### 3.2 Provisional phasing

Phase	Date	Principal features
1	Medieval	30 postholes, 21 pits, 3 linear features
2	Post-medieval	3 pits, a possible well, a trackway, 7 postholes
3	Modern	4 pits, 4 large ditches, trackway

Table 1: The phases and associated features present at Shire Hall, Raingate Street, Bury St Edmunds

#### 3.3 Summary of the archaeology by phase

##### 3.3.1 Phase 1: Medieval

The Phase 1 features comprised 30 postholes, 21 pits and 3 linear features. These features were all recorded cutting the natural substrate L2007 (recorded as L1004 in the preceding trial trench evaluation).

The postholes were mostly discrete features, although Postholes F2081 and F2083 were observed to cut each other and Posthole F2074 cut the southern end of linear feature F2072. Although there were several alignments of postholes (e.g. F2103, F2105 and F2115; F1008, F1010, F1044, F1046, F1048 and F1050) none of these displayed any clear structural configurations.

The pits were fairly evenly distributed throughout the excavated area. A concentration of intercutting pits (F2125, F2127, F2129, F2131 and F2139) was observed at the western edge of the excavated area. With the exception of the intercutting F2160 and F2162, the remaining pits were mostly discrete features. The character of the finds assemblages recovered from many of these features suggests that many may have functioned as refuse pits.

All three of the linear features assigned to this phase were present in the southern half of the excavated area. F2099 was the most northerly of the linear features; this was a very straight, regular feature running from east to west and extending beyond the limits of excavation at both sides. It cut L2006, a deposit considered to represent a metallated surface and was the only one of the three medieval linear features to contain dateable finds. At the south-eastern edge of the excavated area lay the north to south aligned F2072. The eastern half of this feature lay beyond the limits of the excavation. It measured c. 3.5m in length and had steep sides and a flat base. Its southern end was cut by posthole F2074. The third medieval linear feature, F2091, was represented only by its tapering terminal end. It appeared to run on a north-east to south-west alignment, though it is conceivable that the portion of it not revealed by excavation changed course at some point.

Overlying the medieval features were overlain by two occupation layers or layers of made ground. For the most part L2043 was present at the northern end of the excavated area while 2005 was its equivalent at the southern end. However, there was some overlapping of these deposits in the central part of the excavated area with L2005 being stratified beneath L2043. Spot dates derived from the pottery assemblages from these deposits were mid 12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> century and 13<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> century respectively. L2043 was recorded as L1003 in the preceding trial trench evaluation.

### *3.3.2 Phase 2: Post-medieval*

The features assigned to Phase 2 comprised 3 pits, a possible well, a trackway and 7 postholes recorded cutting/ truncating the medieval made ground/ occupation layers L2005 and L2043.

The majority of features belonging to this phase were present towards the southern end of the excavated area. With the exception of F2066, which was located in the north-western corner, the postholes were present as a loose cluster in the south-western corner of the excavated area. Like the postholes of Phase 1, these displayed no convincing structural configuration; any structure that these features may have formed part of would appear to have been asymmetric in form.

The three pits assigned to this phase varied greatly in form. Pit F2026 was small in comparison to the other pits in this phase and at 0.76 x 0.60 x 0.33m was scarcely

bigger than the largest postholes. In contrast, Pit F2053, which lay to the south-west of F2026 and extended beyond the limits of the south-western corner of excavated area was in excess of 2.4m in length and 1.45m in depth. It was, however, only slightly deeper than F2026 at 0.33m. The third pit assigned to Phase 2, F2070, was recorded cutting Trackway F2068.

Trackway F2068 extended beyond the eastern edge of excavation and that portion of it that was recorded within the excavated area represents the apparent terminus of the trackway. Like the Phase 3 trackway (see below), this feature was aligned east to west. It comprised a shallow cut filled with a mid yellow brown, compact, silty clay with moderate flint and gravel.

F2036 was a large (3.00 x 2.50m), deep (in excess of 2m) feature. Its depth suggests that it may have functioned as a well, although no evidence of directly associated structures or linings was present. It contained four silty clay and sandy silt fills from which residual medieval pottery, medieval and post-medieval CBM, animal bone and shell was recovered.

The post-medieval features were, for the most part, overlain by a series of broadly contemporary layers (L2028, L2029 and L2034) which were cut by the modern (Phase 3 features). These layers were contiguous with the levelling layer L1002 recorded during the preceding trial trench evaluation.

The dating of several of the post-medieval features will require further scrutiny. Pits F2026 and F2053 each contained apparently residual medieval pottery. Whilst the material from these features may be residual, it is also possible that these features dated to the later medieval period. No diagnostically later material was recovered from the pits to confirm a post-medieval origin. The same is true for Postholes F2061 and F2066 and Trackway F2068. Although these features cut the subsoil, finds from the latter date to the 12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> centuries AD. It is possible that truncation associated with the levelling layers (described above) resulted in a stratigraphy where medieval and post-medieval features appear at the same level.

### 3.3.3 Phase 3: Modern

Towards the southern end of the excavated area were three oval-shaped pits of varying size. The smallest of these, F2047, contained residual medieval pottery along with very small quantities of CBM, animal bone and shell. The significantly larger F2045, which was located close by to the west, and which was cut by Track F2033, contained a similar but slightly larger assemblage, with the exception of the pottery. F2024, which lay further to the west contained 20<sup>th</sup> century pottery and fragments of a plastic comb. These three pits cut layer L2034.

To the immediate north of these pits was trackway F2033. This extended beyond the western edge of the excavated area. The portion of the feature revealed in the excavation would appear to represent its terminus. A slight flaring in width may indicate that space was allowed to accommodate unloading of vehicles or turning. This feature contained two fills; the basal layer, a patchy, compact, layer of cream/white chalky clay with moderate gravel (L2044), was overlain by a mottled mid yellow brown and mid brown, firm, clayey silt with occasional gravel (L2004).

The northern edge of F2033 was cut by the large Pit F2051, which also cut the edge of Ditch F2010. F2010 was the most substantial feature in a sequence of large, very regular ditches (F2010, F2012, F2014 and F2035) that ran on a similar alignment to Trackway F2033 and which extended beyond the excavated area to both the east and the west. The most recent feature in this sequence was Ditch F2012, which cut Ditch F2014. F2035 was a re-cut of Ditch F2014, and F2014 cut Ditch F2010.

The only Phase 3 feature to lie to the north of these ditches was F2008, a small sub-circular pit that cut L2029 and was found to contain 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> century pottery and residual medieval pottery.

## 4 FINDS ASSESSMENT

### 4.1 Methodology

Find were recovered from the site by hand and were therefore subject to the usual biasing factors. A metal detector was used to enhance finds recovery.

### 4.2 Specialist assessments and reports

Assessment Report	Nominated Specialist	Status
Pottery	<i>Peter Thompson</i>	<i>Final report complete</i>
Struck flint	<i>Andrew Peachey</i>	<i>Final report complete</i>
Ceramic Building Material	<i>Andrew Peachey</i>	<i>Final report complete</i>

*Table 2: Specialist assessment reports and status*

#### 4.2.1 Pottery

*Peter Thompson*

The excavation recovered 220 medieval and post-medieval sherds of pottery weighing 2.654 kg. Out of these, three quarters (76.3%) are medieval, although many of these are residual in later features. The pottery has been recorded by context in an MS Excel spreadsheet which is included with the archive. The sherds present have been described and tabulated below.

#### The Fabrics

##### Medieval Pottery

STNE St:	Neots ware 9 <sup>th</sup> -12 <sup>th</sup> c. Soft fabric containing crushed shell with black, brown or red surfaces (Hurst 1956)
THET:	Thetford ware 10 <sup>th</sup> -mid 12 <sup>th</sup> c. Hard reduced grey sandy fabric (Hurst 1957, Dallas 1984)
BSFW	Bury Fine Sandy ware mid 12 <sup>th</sup> -14 <sup>th</sup> c. Fine sandy fabric with medium sparse to moderate sub-rounded quartz. Dark grey fabric sometimes with orange-brown margins
BMCW	Bury medieval coarse ware mid 12 <sup>th</sup> -14 <sup>th</sup> c. Grey or brown surfaces with fabric containing coarse white rounded quartz

BCSW	Bury coarse sandy ware mid 12 <sup>th</sup> -14 <sup>th</sup> Buff sandy fabric with sparse to moderate very coarse white and red quartz and occasional chalk and flint inclusions
GRCW	Grimston Coarse ware 12 <sup>th</sup> -13 <sup>th</sup> Grey sandy are with grey or brown surfaces (Little 1994)
HOLL1	Hollesley type fine coarseware 13 <sup>th</sup> -14 <sup>th</sup> c. abundant fine sand with mica and clay pellets. Usually pale grey but can be buff to orange (Anderson 2012)
HOLL2	Hollesley type medium coarseware 13 <sup>th</sup> -14 <sup>th</sup> c. As HOLL1 but a little coarser (Anderson 2012)
MCW1	Medieval coarse ware1 12 <sup>th</sup> -14 <sup>th</sup> c. mid grey, fine sandy fabric with sparse medium to coarse quartz and burnt organics
MCW2	Medieval coarse ware2 13 <sup>th</sup> -15 <sup>th</sup> c. hard fired orange throughout, possibly overfired, medium sandy fabric with occasional lumps of red iron mineral
HCFW	Heddingham coarse fine ware mid 12 <sup>th</sup> -mid 14 <sup>th</sup> c. Pale orange-brown fabric containing sparse to moderate medium to coarse white, clear and grey, quartz and occasional black and pink mineral inclusions. Yellow-orange glaze
HFW1	Heddingham fine ware mid 12 <sup>th</sup> -14 <sup>th</sup> c. Fine slightly micaceous oxidised ware with green, yellow or clear glaze, sometimes white or red slip (Cottar 2000)
GRIM	Glazed Grimston ware late 12 <sup>th</sup> -15 <sup>th</sup> c. Grey sandy fabric with green glaze, sometimes with brown iron trailed slip (Little 1994)
COLC	Colchester-type ware13 <sup>th</sup> -mid 16 <sup>th</sup> c. Oxidised sandy fabric containing coarse white quartz (Cottar 2000)
UPG2	Unprovenanced glazed ware2 13 <sup>th</sup> -14 <sup>th</sup> c. Oxidised red throughout, medium sandy with fine voids from dissolved calcareous. White calcareous on surfaces and patchy clear glaze

### Post-medieval Pottery

GRE	Glazed red earthenware 16 <sup>th</sup> -19 <sup>th</sup> c.
TGW	Tin glazed earthenware late 16 <sup>th</sup> -18 <sup>th</sup> c.
LONS	London type stoneware late 17 <sup>th</sup> -19 <sup>th</sup> c.
STMB	Staffordshire type marbled slip ware Late 17 <sup>th</sup> -18 <sup>th</sup> c.
SWSG	Staffordshire type white salt-glazed stoneware 18 <sup>th</sup> c.
ENGS	English stoneware 18 <sup>th</sup> -20 <sup>th</sup> c.
ENPO	English porcelain mid 18 <sup>th</sup> -20 <sup>th</sup> c.
TPW	Transfer Printed ware late 18 <sup>th</sup> – 20 <sup>th</sup> c.
RWE	Refined white earthenware late 18 <sup>th</sup> -20 <sup>th</sup>
UPG1	Unprovenanced glazed ware probably modern. Light very coarse white earthenware with brown glaze.

<i>Ware</i>	<i>Sherd Number</i>	<i>Fabric weight (g)</i>	<i>% of sherd total</i>	<i>Average sherd weight (g)</i>
SNEOT	2	2	0.9	1
THET	6	53	2.7	8.8
BSFW	6	30	2.7	5
BMCW	68	591	30.9	8.7
BCSW	18	231	8.2	12.8
GCRW	22	224	10	10.2
HOLL1	7	36	3.1	5.1
HOLL2	2	25	0.9	12.5
MCW1	3	8	1.4	2.6
MCW2	1	4	0.5	4
HCFW	2	5	0.9	2.5
HFW1	14	154	6.4	11
GRIM	14	211	6.4	15
COLC	2	14	0.9	7

UPG2	1	1	0.5	1
GRE	35	728	15.9	20.8
TGW	1	5	0.5	5
LONS	2	60	0.9	30
STMB	3	99	1.3	33
SWSG	1	22	0.5	22
ENGS	2	49	0.9	24.5
ENPO	1	2	0.5	2
TPW	4	71	1.7	17.7
RWE	2	23	0.9	11.5
UPG1	1	6	0.5	6
	220	2654		

Table 3: sherds present by number, weight, percentage and average size

## The Medieval Pottery

### Saxo-Norman wares

Eight sherds of Saxo-Norman pottery (55g) were present; six in Thetford ware and two tiny fragments of St Neots ware, while no Stamford ware was present. Two forms were identifiable, a Thetford hollow cooking pot rim 14cm in diameter from L2005 and the shoulder and part of the neck of a probable Thetford-type pitcher, or possibly a bottle, with horizontal bands of wavy line decoration from L2006 E. Similar decoration is known from jugs and jars in early medieval sandy ware of similar date, and Bury medieval coarse ware fabrics are similar to Thetford-type ware, but the fabric is in keeping with Thetford ware and decorated pitchers have been recovered from there (Rogerson & Dallas 1984, 133 & 166).

### Medieval Coarse Wares

The 127 medieval coarse ware sherds (1,149g) as might be expected are dominated by Bury wares (92/852g). Sixty-eight sherds (591g) are Bury fine sandy ware and consequently provided the most rims. The commonest are thickened, everted rims (4) including a squared rim of 24 cm diameter, with a channel or groove along the top. Two flanged rims, and two rounded or beaded rims were also present including the upper profile of a cooking pot from Pit F2145 (L2148). Only one sherd contained decoration comprising incised wavy lines. Eighteen sherds (231g) of Bury coarse sandy ware were present including a heavy strap handle with random, dispersed stab decoration from Ditch F1010 (L2011 B). Six sherds of Bury finer sandy ware were present, but these sherds were very small (21g). Nine sherds of Hollesley-type ware were present in fine sandy slightly micaceous fabric sometimes with occasional clay lenses or pellets, although it is possible that they might be local products of a similar fabric. This included a rim with everted lip to a small cooking pot with a 10cm diameter rim. The bowl rim was residual in a post-medieval ditch but its exterior contained comb decoration and sooting. A further 22 sherds in Grimston coarse ware fabric (224g) were recovered including a thickened, everted shallow bowl rim from Ditch F2010 (L2011), and a thick sherd from a storage jar with an applied clay strip probably for strengthening as well as decoration (L2005).



## Medieval Glazed Sherds

Thirty-three sherds (20.6%) of the medieval sherds were glazed with Hedingham and Grimston wares fairly evenly represented with 14 Hedingham fine ware sherds and 2 Hedingham 'coarse fine ware' sherds in comparison to 14 Grimston. This percentage of glazed wares is lower than recorded at nearby Honey Hill (Antrobus & Craven 2011, 30), where 38% of the medieval assemblage (by sherd count; 45% by weight) was glazed. The higher percentage at Honey Hill may have indicated the high status of the site during the medieval period (*ibid.*), however. At Shire Hall a sherd containing a decorative stamp came from Layer 2000; such stamps were usually applied to early rounded and squat jugs (Cottar 2000, 91). The layer contained another highly decorated sherd comprising an applied white slip line indicative of Early Rounded 'Scarborough Style' jugs (Cottar 2000, 77 & 85). Ditch F2010 (L2011) contained a jug rim with patchy clear/orange glaze, and Pit F2008 (L2009 F) contained a patchy green glazed strap handle with an incised wavy line running down the centre. Ditch F2010 (L2011) contained remains of a face in plastic relief from a Grimston jug, and three more glazed sherds were highly decorated with brown iron slip lines. Pit F2036 (L2037) contained a fragment of a small rod handle with green glaze on the outer surface and a deep groove on the unglazed underside. The remaining glazed sherds are two Colchester-type wares containing white slip, and a fragment of un-provenanced jug neck cordon, in an oxidised sandy ware containing dissolved shell, which was residual in post-medieval Pit F2127 (L2128B).

## Post-medieval Pottery

Thirty-five sherds (728g) of post-medieval red earthenware ware were recovered.

The other wares identified include tin glazed earthenware, Staffordshire slip ware, London-type stoneware, Staffordshire-type white salt-glazed stoneware, English stoneware, English porcelain and refined white earthenwares.

## Description and Dating of the Diagnostic Sherds from the main Features

Some of the earliest potential features on the site were those containing only Saxo-Norman pottery suggesting a 10<sup>th</sup>/11<sup>th</sup>- mid 12<sup>th</sup> centuries date. Layer L2006 E, overlying Gully F2072, contained the large moderately abraded fragment of Thetford type pitcher or bottle with wavy line decoration, and adjacent Post-hole F2074 (L2075) also contained a small sherd (3g) of Thetford-type fabric. The large straight sided pit or ditch F2168 (L2169) in the south-east corner contained a tiny fragment of St Neots ware (1g). A Thetford-type sherd (3g) came from Pit F2166 (L2167), but this feature was also located in the evaluation (as F1054) and yielded a Bury coarseware making the Thetford type sherd either residual, or right at the end of its production date (i.e. c. mid-late 12<sup>th</sup> century). Three Thetford-type sherds and one of St Neots ware were residual in medieval layer L2005. Stratigraphically Ditch F2099 contained a small fragment each of Bury ware and Grimston coarseware suggesting a date between the mid 12<sup>th</sup> and mid 13<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Medieval layer L2005 yielded 48 sherds (304g), one sherd in medieval coarseware fabric may be an over-fired early post-medieval red earthenware, and a small amount of post-medieval CBM was also recovered. However, the remaining 47

sherds suggest a disturbed medieval layer and include a glazed highly decorated Grimston ware with trailed iron slip providing a broad date of 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> century. The Hedingham stamp decorated sherd indicates a date range of c.1225 – 1300/1325 when stamped jugs were in currency, while the Scarborough-style applied white slipped strip sherd suggests a manufacture date range of 1175/1200-1250 (Cottar 200, 31). This indicates a first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century date which is supported by the Grimston coarse ware storage jar fragment, as manufacture of coarse wares is thought to have ceased at Grimston around the mid 13<sup>th</sup> century (Little 1994, 91).

Pit F2036 contained 14 sherds (150g) recovered from three fills. L2037 contained two glazed Grimston sherds including a rod handle with a deep groove on the underside. L2040 contained a similar handle fragment that could have come from the same vessel, although this sherd was more abraded, a glazed Colchester sherd with patterns of white slip was also present. L2039 contained a glazed Hedingham sherd with a line of red slip which suggests 'Rouen style' decoration indicating a date of first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, although the other glazed sherds could be later, (and the presence of some CBM might indicate the whole pottery assemblage is residual). Pit F2010 (L2011) also contained 14 medieval sherds (214g) including a Grimston coarse ware bowl rim and an abraded fragment of glazed Grimston face jug most of which date to the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries. Pit F2053 (L2054) contained 11 sherds (56g) including a sherd each of Hedingham, Grimston and Colchester ware suggesting a date between the early 13<sup>th</sup>-mid 14<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Pit F2127 (L2128) yielded 13 sherds (201g) including three residual medieval sherds and five post-medieval red earthenwares. The presence of three Staffordshire marbled slip ware sherds probably all from the same pie crust decorated plate, indicate a late 17<sup>th</sup> to late 18<sup>th</sup> century date for the pit. The date is supported by association with a sherd each of London-type stoneware and white tin glazed earthenware. Made Ground layer L2003 which contained 15 sherds (451g) was of late 18<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> century date whose pottery included Staffordshire-type salt glazed stone ware and Transfer Printed 'Willow Pattern' ware. Twenty-six sherds (269g) came from F2008 (L2009) of which 14 were residual medieval sherds as the feature also contained early modern to modern pottery including English stoneware and porcelain, and Transfer Printed Ware

## Discussion

The Shire Hall site, as might be expected from its location, has been disturbed by successive stages of building and so it is likely that much of the pottery is disturbed and residual in nature. The eight earliest sherds are indicative of Saxo-Norman occupation, and it is possible that the pottery from three or four features including Pit F2074 and Layer L2006 E which contained a sherd each of Thetford-type ware, are in a primary state of deposition. The medieval pottery forms a typical assemblage of late 12<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> century date that might be expected in Bury St Edmunds. Bury wares form at least 72% of the medieval assemblage from Shire Hall although the location of the kilns is not known. It is now thought that Bury coarse sandy wares derive from the Newmarket area, and so it is possible that other Bury fabrics were also manufactured at locations away from the town. Hedingham and Grimston wares form 91% of the imported glazed/fine ware component and it has been demonstrated from

other sites within the town and its environs that Hedingham ware was predominant in the first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century but was superseded by Grimston glazed ware during the latter part of that century (Anderson 2005, 31).

### Bibliography

Anderson, S. 2005, 'The Pottery' in Craven, J. (ed.) *Moreton Hall East, Great Barton, Bury St Edmunds BRG 027. A Report on an Archaeological Excavation, 2000-2002.* SCCAS Report 2005/101

Anderson, S. 2012, 'Medieval Pottery' in Woolhouse, T. (ed.), *Medieval Dispersed Settlement on the mid Suffolk Clay, Stowmarket* East Anglian Archaeology Report forthcoming

Cottar, J. 2000, *Colchester Archaeological Report 7: Post-Roman Pottery from Excavations in Colchester, 1971-85*, English Heritage

Dallas, C. 1984, Excavations in Thetford by B.K. Davison between 1964 and 1970 *East Anglian Archaeology Report 62*

Hurst, J.G. 1957, Saxo-Norman Pottery in East Anglia Part II. Thetford Ware *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 49, 43-70.

Hurst, J.G. 1956, Saxo-Norman Pottery in East Anglia Part I. St Neots Ware *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 50, 29-60.

Little, A. 1994, 'The Pottery' in Leah M. (ed) *The Late Saxon and Medieval Pottery Industry of Grimston, Norfolk: Excavations 1962-92.* *East Anglian Archaeology Report 64*, 84-100

MPRG, 1998 A Guide to the Classification of Medieval Forms. *Medieval Pottery Research Group Occasional Paper No. 1*

Rogerson, A. and Dallas, C. 1984 *Excavations in Thetford 1948-59 and 1973-80* East Anglian Archaeology Report No. 22

### Web site

Spoilheap Archaeology

#### 4.2.2 *The Struck Flint* *Andrew Peachey*

Excavations recovered a total of 5 pieces (37g) of struck flint as residual artefacts in medieval contexts (Table 4). This small group includes a blade and side scraper in a slightly patinated condition, which are characteristic of earlier Neolithic technology

Struck flint type	F	W
Scraper	1	20
Blade	1	6
Debitage	1	11
<i>Total</i>	3	37

Table 4: Quantification of struck flint implements and debitage by frequency (F) and weight (W, in grams)

### Methodology & Terminology

The flint was quantified by fragment count and weight (g), with all data entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet that will be deposited as part of the archive. Flake type (see 'Dorsal cortex,' below) or implement type, patination, colour and condition were also recorded as part of this data set, along with free-text comments.

The term 'cortex' refers to the natural weathered exterior surface of a piece of flint, and the term 'patination' to the colouration of a flaked surface exposed by human or natural agency. Dorsal cortex is categorised after Andrefsky (2005, 104 & 115) with 'primary flake' referring to those with cortex covering 100% of the dorsal face; 'secondary flake' with 50-99%; 'tertiary' with 1-49% and 'un-corticated' to those with no dorsal cortex. A 'blade' is defined as an elongated flake whose length is at least twice as great as its breadth, often exhibiting parallel dorsal flake scars (a feature that can assist in the identification of broken blades that, by definition, have an indeterminate length/breadth ratio). Terms used to describe implement and core types follow the system adopted by Healy (1988, 48-9).

### Commentary

The side scraper and blade, along with a single debitage flake, were contained in medieval Pit F2036 (L2039). The side scraper was manufactured by the application of abrupt retouch to a straight lateral edge of a regular, un-corticated flake, while the blade was soft-hammer struck from a prepared core platform. The debitage flake also appeared to be struck from a blade core. These characteristics are indicative of earlier Neolithic technology, and suggest that despite the residual context these limited flakes form a homogenous group. The remaining struck flint comprises small un-corticated debitage flakes or chips contained as residual material in Made Ground L2003 and Layer L2004 that have no further diagnostic value.

### Bibliography

Andrefsky, W. 2005 *Lithics: Macroscopic Approaches to Analysis* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Healy, F. 1988 *The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Spong Hill, North Elmham, Part VI: Occupation during the Seventh to Second Millennium BC*. East Anglian Archaeology No. 39

### 4.2.3 The Ceramic Building Material

Andrew Peachey

Excavations recovered a total of 358 fragments (16308g) of medieval and post-medieval CBM, and seven fragments (600g) of post-medieval mortar in a moderately to highly fragmented condition. The assemblage is dominated by peg tile, with occasional fragments of post-medieval brick, and a notable isolated occurrence of medieval nibbed tile (Table 5). The medieval CBM, almost certainly derived from the Abbey or associated buildings and appears to be residual as it almost entirely occurs, with the exception of isolated small fragments, in association with post-medieval fragments.

CBM Type	Fragment Count	Weight (g)
Medieval nibbed tile	2	379
Medieval peg tile	184	6882
Post-medieval peg tile	147	4014
Post-medieval brick	15	5033
Post-medieval mortar	7	600
<i>Total</i>	<i>365</i>	<i>16908</i>

Table 5: Quantification of CBM form types by fragment count and weight (in grams)

### Methodology

The CBM was quantified by fragment count and weight with fabrics examined at x20 magnification and all data entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet that will be deposited as part of the archive.

### Fabric Descriptions

The medieval nibbed tile and peg tile occurred in a single sand-tempered fabric (Fabric 1), as did the post-medieval peg tile (Fabric 2). The bulk of the post-medieval brick occurred in an oxidised sand-tempered fabric (Fabric 3), with the exception of a single brick in a cream, iron-free fabric (Fabric 4):

- Fabric 1: Orange to red surfaces with slightly paler margins and a dark grey core. Inclusions comprise poorly-sorted common quartz, sparse red/black iron rich grains and chalk (all 0.2-1mm). Slightly abrasive to pimply surfaces (*medieval tile*)
- Fabric 2: Orange-red throughout, with inclusions of common-abundant fine quartz (0.1-0.25mm) and sparse iron rich grains (0.1-0.5mm) (*post-medieval peg tile*).
- Fabric 3: Mid-dark orange-red to red throughout. Inclusions comprise common medium quartz (0.1-0.5mm) with sparse flint and black iron rich grains (both generally 0.5-3mm, occasionally larger) (*post-medieval red brick*).
- Fabric 4: Cream to pale yellow brown fabric. Inclusions comprises abundant fine quartz (<0.25mm), sparse quartz, red and black iron rich grains (0.25-0.75mm) (*post-medieval Suffolk white brick*).

### The Medieval CBM

The presence of nibbed tile (in Fabric 1) in the assemblage is limited to two cross-joining fragments (379g) contained in Occupation Layer L2005 (Seg.A). Early roof tiles were generally large and hung by the means of projecting nibs (Drury 1981, 131), with the example in this assemblage being 18mm thick with one of two applied nibs extant at one end of the tile. Nibbed tiles were introduced in the late 12<sup>th</sup> or early

13<sup>th</sup> century and were in general use by the mid 13<sup>th</sup> century, but were superseded by peg tiles whose use had become near universal by the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Drury 1981, 131). The isolated presence of nibbed tile in this assemblage may hint at an earlier roof structure in the vicinity than that represented by the medieval peg tile, which during this period would almost certainly have to be associated with a significant building of the Abbey.

The medieval (Fabric 1) peg tile is 12mm thick, with slightly irregular surfaces and edges, and 14mm wide circular, tapering peg holes. Approximately 9% of the medieval peg tile fragments exhibited a splashed, dark green lead glaze that was probably applied to the lower (exposed) part of tiles, therefore the glazed fragments probably formed part of the same tiles as the unglazed fragments. The highest concentration of peg tile, comprising 56 fragments (3489g) was contained in the multiple fills of Pit F2036 in association with a single fragment of post-medieval tile. The remaining medieval peg tile generally comprised relatively small fragments contained in layer, pit and posthole features, almost always in association with post-medieval CBM. Peg tiles were introduced in the 13<sup>th</sup> century but had become near universal by the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Drury 1981, 131). This type of tile was the prevalent type of CBM recovered from 13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> century layers previously recorded in test pits within the Shire Hall Complex (Carr & Gill 2007, 12), and probably formed part of a roof associated with the Abbey or with an adjacent high status building.

### The Post-Medieval CBM

Peg tile in Fabric 2, a finer and more highly fired fabric than that of the medieval peg tile, were probably introduced in the 15<sup>th</sup> (late medieval) or 16<sup>th</sup> centuries, possibly to repair or replace medieval structures. These peg tiles have a similar thickness of 12-14mm to their medieval counterparts, but have a smoother surface often with lengthways striations, and may have become slightly warped during firing. The highest concentration of post-medieval peg-tile comprises 66 small fragments (1665g) contained in Pit F2127, but fragments are near ubiquitous in features that contained CBM.

The presence of post-medieval brick in the assemblage is generally limited to a scarce distribution of small abraded fragments. The bulk occurs as Fabric 3 fragments that, where extant, have a thickness of 60mm, suggesting these red bricks could have been manufactured between the late 16<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. The only exception to this is approximately half of a Suffolk White brick (Fabric 4) contained in Made Ground L2003 (Seg.C), a type that was produced in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries.

### Bibliography

Carr, R. and Gill, D. 2007, *Shire Hall Complex BSE291: A Report on the Archaeological Assessment 2007*, Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service Report 2007/23

Drury, P. 1981, 'The production of brick and tile in medieval England' in Crossley, D. (ed) *Medieval Industry*, Council of British Archaeology Research report 40, 126-142

Ryan, P. 1996, *Brick in Essex: From the Roman Conquest to the Reformation*, Privately Published, Colchester.

## 5 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

### 5.1 Methodology

Bulk soil samples were taken for archaeological environmental analysis and these were processed by water floatation. Animal bone and shell were recovered by hand; the assemblages are therefore subject to the usual biases of manual excavation and recovery.

### 5.2 Specialist assessment and report summaries

The following section provides a detailed MAP2 assessment of potential for the site's animal bone assemblage and environmental samples.

Assessment Report	Nominated Specialist	Status
Animal Bone	<i>Julie Curl</i>	<i>Assessment complete</i>
Molluscs	<i>Julie Curl</i>	<i>Assessment complete</i>
Environmental Samples	<i>John Summers</i>	<i>Final report complete</i>

*Table 6: Specialist assessment reports and status*

#### 5.2.1 The Animal Bone

*Julie Curl*

##### Introduction

A total of 5399g of bone was recovered. A range of mammal and bird species were seen, including the relatively rare Great Bustard, which suggests high status waste. Remains of a skeleton of a small breed of dog were also identified.

##### Methodology

The assessment was carried out following a modified version of guidelines by English Heritage (Davis 1992). All of the bone was scanned to determine range of species and elements present. A note was also made of butchering and any indications of skinning, hornworking and other modifications. When possible a record was made of ages and any other relevant information, such as pathologies. Counts and weights were noted for each context with additional counts for each species identified, counts were also taken of bone classed as 'countable' (Davis 1992) and measurable bone. All information was recorded directly into an Excel database for quantification and assessment.

## The bone assemblage

### Quantification, provenance and preservation

A total of 5399g of animal bone, consisting of 481 elements, was recovered from this excavation. Over 70% of the assemblage was yielded from pit fills, with just over 50% of the assemblage recovered from a variety of pit fills, with a further 21% from a single cess pit. The remaining 30% of the bone assemblage came from ditch fills, a gully, levelling, a trackway and postholes. Quantification (by weight) of the animal bone by feature type and spot date is presented in Table 6 and quantification by species and species NISP can be seen in Table 7.

The remains were generally in good, sound condition, although a good deal of fragmentation had occurred as a result of butchering. A small amount of canid gnawing was noted from pit fills, suggesting some scavenger activity or food for domestic dogs disposed of with other household waste.

Spot date	Feature type and fragment count										Spot date Total
	Cess Pit	Ditch	Gully	Levelling	Made ground	Occupation layer	Pit	Posthole	Test Pit	Trackway	
12th-14th							428g				428g
L12th-14th						347				90g	437g
M12th-14th		478g					133g	38g		4g	653g
M12th-M14th							297g				297g
M13th-14th							1002g				1002g
13th-14th	1109g				309g		380g				1798g
13th-15th							153g				153g
13th-18th									102g		102g
17th-18th/19th							112g				112g
17th-19th				16g							16g
18th-19th		83g									83g
L17th-18th							47g				47g
L18th-E20th		24g									24g
20th							97g				97g
Undated		14g	1g				103g	32g			150g
Feature Total	1109g	599g	1g	16g	309g	347g	2752g	70g	102g	94g	5399g

Table 6. Quantification of the animal bone by feature type, spot date and fragment count

### Species range and modifications and other observations

Remains of medium to large mammals and birds were seen throughout, with sparse numbers of small mammal, herpetofauna and fish recorded, with at least twelve species were noted during the assessment scan. Overall, the assemblage appears to be dominated by the main domestic food mammals, along with a good deal of bird bones. Several bones of a small, bow-legged dog were seen in a cess pit.



A range of bird bone was noted throughout the assemblage, with remains including wild and domestic species, including goose, fowl, partridge, swan/crane, and other wild species. One bone in particular was of note, a tarsometatarsus from L2003 which is from a Great Bustard. There are other fragments of a large bird in this fill which may also be from Bustard, but they need further comparison with comparative reference material for more positive confirmation of species. The Great Bustard is relatively rare in archaeological assemblages and therefore of great interest; such remains are usually an indication of high status waste.

Butchering was noted throughout, with a range of process indicated, including skinning and meat production. A couple of bird bones have cut marks that may suggest fletching waste.

Species	Feature type and NISP										Species Total
	Cess Pit	Ditch	Gully	Leveling	Made ground	Occupation layer	Pit	Posthole	Test Pit	Trackway	
Bird							1				1
Bird - Goose							4				4
Bird - Needs ID		1					23		8	2	34
Bird - Partridge							1				1
Bird - Swan/Crane							7				7
Cattle	8	5			1	4	22			1	41
Dog	23										23
Fish						1					1
Herpetofauna							3				3
Mammal	49	25	1	3	22	31	122	7	16	13	289
Pig		3			5	7	20		1		36
Sheep/goat	6	9			3	4	17			1	40
Small Mammal							1				1
Feature Total	86	43	1	3	31	47	221	7	25	17	481

Table 7. Quantification of the animal bone by feature type, species and species count (NISP)

Although butchering has resulted in a good deal of fragmentation of the elements, there are many bone sufficiently complete to allow metrical data to be obtained to further identify species, breeds, stature and ages.

Initially, pathologies seem to be relatively low, perhaps indicating younger ages of the main animals and a primary use for good quality meat.

#### Initial conclusions and recommendations for further work

Initial observations suggest this assemblage is dominated by the disposal of butchering and meat waste, along with the disposal of a pet or working dog.

Despite being a relatively small assemblage, it contains a large range of species, including a variety of birds that suggest some high status waste.

It is recommended that this assemblage is fully recorded, with full identification of the range of species wherever possible. Measurements should be taken where possible to allow full species identification and the estimation of breeds and stature.

### Bibliography

Davis, S. 1992. *A rapid method for recording information about mammal bones from archaeological sites*. English Heritage AML report 71/92

Hilson, S. 1992. *Mammal bones and teeth*. The Institute of Archaeology, University College, London.

Von Den Driesch, A. 1976. *A guide to the measurements of animal bones from archaeological sites*. Peabody Museum Bulletin 1, Cambridge Mass., Harvard University.

### *5.2.2 The Molluscs*

*Julie Curl*

### Introduction

A total of 4402g of shells were recovered from this excavation. Three species were identified, with the Common Oyster the most frequent. These remains appear to be from food waste.

### Methodology

All of the shell was identified to species where possible using a variety of comparative reference material. The molluscs were recorded by group (bivalve or univalve), general habitat (land, freshwater or marine) and by species; counts were taken for all. Bivalves were also counted and recorded according to the half present, recording top and base shells which would allow an estimation of the number of individuals present. Counts were made for the number of pieces with the apex present and for the number of body fragments. All molluscs in the assemblage were briefly scanned for any modifications such as drilling (for use in decoration), burning or for traces of pigments (where they have been used as painters palettes).

### The mollusc assemblage

A total of 4402g of mollusc remains, consisting of 388 pieces, was recovered from these excavations. Most of the remains are in good condition, with many complete shells; some fragmentation has occurred, probably as a result of disturbance. Almost 42% of the mollusc assemblage (by weight) was produced from pit fills, with a further 31% from the occupational layer L2005, the remaining 27% of the assemblage was distributed amongst ditch fills, a cess pit, a posthole and trackway. Quantification of the mollusc assemblage by feature type, spot date and weight can be seen in Table 8 and by fragment count in Table 9.

Spot Date	Feature Type								Spot date Total
	Cess pit	Ditch	Levelling	Made Ground	Occupation Layer	Pit	Posthole	Trackway	
10th-12th						46g			46g
M12th-14th		211g				153g	1g	9g	374g
L12th-14th								545g	545g
12th-14th					1355g	335g			1690g
12th-20th						56g			56g
13th-14th	126g			26g					152g
13th-15th						1135g			1135g
13th-19th			41g						41g
17th-18th						61g			61g
17th-19th		188g	42g						230g
Undated			17g			43g	12g		72g
Feature Total	126g	399g	100g	26g	1355g	1829g	13g	554gg	4402g

Table 8. Quantification of the mollusc assemblage by feature type, spot date and weight.

Date	Feature Type								Spot date Total
	Cess pit	Ditch	Levelling	Made Ground	Occupation Layer	Pit	Posthole	Trackway	
10th-12th						7			7
M12th-14th		11				28	2	5	46
L12th-14th								51	51
12th-14th					85	49			134
12th-20th						23			23
13th-14th	9			5					14
13th-15th						62			62
13th-19th			9						9
17th-18th						3			3
17th-19th		14	14						28
Undated			2			3	6		11
Feature Total	9	25	25	5	85	175	8	56	388

Table 9. Quantification of the mollusc assemblage by feature type, spot date and count of pieces.

Three species of mollusc were identified, all of which are of marine origin. Quantification of the mollusc species, by fragment count, is presented in Table 10. Oyster shells (*Ostrea edulis*) amounted to 94% of the assemblage (by fragment count). A total of 6% of the remains were from Whelk (*Buccinum undatum*), with <1% identified as Cockle (*Cerastoderma edule*).

Species	Type								Species Total
	Cess pit	Ditch	Levelling	Made Ground	Occupation layer	Pit	Posthole	Trackway	
Cockle		1							1
Oyster	9	24	23	5	83	157	7	56	364
Whelk			2		2	18	1		23
Feature Total	9	25	25	5	85	175	8	56	388

Table 10. Quantification of the mollusc assemblage by feature type, species and species count.

The minimum number of individuals (MNI) were calculated based on apexes or reasonably complete columella for the whelk and counts of top and base shells for the oyster. The largest deposits of individual molluscs were made into pits, with a MNI of 79 oysters and 18 whelks. At least 48 individual oysters were present in the occupational layer L2005. Counts of MNI for all species and feature types can be seen in Table 11.

Species	Type and minimum number of individuals (MNI)								Species MNI Total
	Cess pit	Ditch	Levelling	Made Ground	Occupational layer	Pit	Posthole	Trackway	
Cockle		1							1
Oyster	5	12	8	3	46	79	4	26	183
Whelk			2		2	18	1		23
Feature Total	5	13	10	3	48	97	5	26	207

Table 11. Minimum number of individuals counts for the mollusc assemblage

The oyster shells were examined for traces of pigments, which would indicate their subsequent use as painter's palettes, but no pigments were seen on any of the remains.

## Conclusions

All of the molluscs in this assemblage are commonly used for food. The remains in the pit fills and the occupational layer, with the large numbers of oysters in particular, certainly suggest food waste and a preference for oysters to supplement the diet. Other remains are relatively sparse and probably represent food debris, some perhaps disturbed from the original place of dumping.

All of the species in this assemblage would be readily available around the local coastline. Although Bury St Edmunds is some distance from coastal waters, such foods would have been readily available at market in the medieval and later periods. Larger numbers of such shells are not surprising, given the close proximity of this

site to the monastic sites in Bury St Edmunds and the popularity of these foods in the fasting diet.

### Recommendations for further work

Further study of the mollusc assemblage is not considered worthwhile as little more information would be forthcoming.

### Bibliography

Bar-Yosef, D (ed.) 2005, *Archaeomalacology: Molluscs in Former Environments of Human Behaviour*, Proceedings of the 9<sup>th</sup> ICAZ Conference, Durham 2002, Oxbow Books, Oxford.

Graham, A. 1988, *Molluscs: Prosobranch and Pyramidellid Gastropods. Synopses of the British Fauna, No. 2 (Second Edition)*, The Linnean Society of London and The Estuarine Brackish-Water Sciences Association

### *5.2.3 The Environmental Samples*

*John Summers*

### Introduction

A total of 31 bulk soil samples for environmental archaeological analysis were taken during excavations at Shire Hall, Bury St. Edmunds. The sampled features included pits, ditches and postholes, many of which are spot dated to the medieval period (c.12<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> century). Although a number are un-dated, it is likely that most also relate to the medieval occupation of the site. This report presents the results from the analysis of bulk sample light fractions

### Methods

The bulk samples were processed by water flotation using a Siraf-type flotation tank at the Archaeological Solutions Ltd facilities in Bury St. Edmunds. The light fractions were captured on a 250µm mesh, while the heavy fractions were retained in a 500µm mesh. Once dry, the light fractions were sorted under a low power stereomicroscope (x10-x30 magnification) and any carbonised plant macrofossils, charcoal and terrestrial molluscs were identified and recorded. Where necessary, reference literature (Cappers *et al.* 2006; Jacomet 2006; Kerney and Cameron 1979) and a reference collection of modern plant tissues were consulted to refine identifications. Modern contaminants, such as rootlets, seeds and invertebrate fauna were recorded using a semi-quantitative scale in order to assess the potential biological disturbance of the deposits.

### Results

The data from the analysis of the bulk sample light fractions are presented in Table 12. As noted above, most of the features are likely to relate to the medieval occupation of the site, with the exception of L2112, which is spot dated to the 17<sup>th</sup>-

19<sup>th</sup> century. As such, the results and discussion will treat the remains as a single assemblage (excluding L2112).

#### Charred plant macrofossils

The majority of the remains recovered from the samples were in the form of carbonised macrofossils, with cereal grains being the most commonly encountered. The cereals present were free-threshing type wheat (*Triticum aestivum/ compactum* type), hulled barley, probably of a six-row type (*Hordeum vulgare* var. *vulgare*) based on the presence of asymmetric grains in L2163 and L2150, oat (*Avena* sp.) and rye (*Secale cereale*). Wheat grains were most numerous overall, followed by oats, barley and rye.

A small number of non-cereal taxa were also present, the majority of which could be considered arable weeds. These included goosefoot (*Chenopodium* sp.), dock (*Rumex* sp.), vetch/ wild pea (*Vicia/ Lathyrus* sp.), medium legumes (Fabaceae), plantain (*Plantago* sp.), knapweed (*Centaurea* sp.), stinking chamomile (*Anthemis cotula*), brome grass (*Bromus* sp.) and other large grasses (Poaceae). The large seeded nature of many of these plants and the fact that non-cereal taxa account for only 13% of the assemblage suggests that predominantly processed grain is present. These seeds could have remained with the crop when used (cf. Kenward and Hall, 758; Bakels 2012, 26) or been removed by hand sorting prior to food preparation.

#### Pit F2149 (L2150)

The sample from L2150 was the richest from the entire site. All four cereal types were represented. Wheat was the dominant cereal (62%), followed by oats (26%), with barley and rye making a minimal contribution (7.5% and 4.5% respectively). One of the oat grains had germinated, which may indicate spoilage whilst in store. Arable weeds made a minimal contribution, with stinking chamomile (*Anthemis cotula*), vetch/wild pea (*Vicia Lathyrus* sp.) and wild grasses (Poaceae) present. Stinking chamomile is characteristic of heavy, fertile soils. A single bramble seed (*Rubus* sp.) could reflect gathered fruits or fruits burned with gathered fuel resources. Non-cereal taxa accounted for only 10% of the sample, indicating that the cereals are likely to have been present as fully processed grain.

#### Cess pit deposit L2011 (F2010)

Both the light and heavy fractions from this deposit were analysed with the hope of recovering dietary indicators, such as mineralised plant remains. Unfortunately no such material was present, indicating that the conditions in the deposit were not favourable towards this kind of preservation. A few small bone fragments and fish bones were the only material present which could have entered the deposit with human or animal waste. Small amounts of heather charcoal, fuel ash slag and a single wheat grain are likely to represent small amounts of hearth waste which entered the feature.

## Charcoal

The concentration of charcoal was not sufficient to merit further analysis. However, some fragments were fractured during the assessment and all were found to be of oak (*Quercus* sp.). This indicates the use of oak as fuel but it is not possible to comment further about fuel wood selection.

## Terrestrial molluscs

Only a small number of mollusc shells were encountered in the samples. Most taxa are either catholic (*Oxychilus* sp. and *Trichia hispida* group) or characteristic of open habitats (*Helicella itala*, *Pupilla muscorum* and *Vallonia* sp.). The shade-loving taxon *Discus rotundatus* was also present. It is difficult to make further comment about this assemblage due to the generally low numbers of shells present.

## Contaminants

Biological disturbance of the deposits appears to have been limited. Modern rootlets and burrowing molluscs (*Cecilioides acicula*) were recognised but only in very small numbers.

## Discussion

The cereal assemblage from the Shire Hall excavations was dominated by the grains of free-threshing type wheat. This was the principle food crop of medieval England and widely cultivated (e.g. Ballantyne 2005; Straker *et al.* 2007; Fryer and Summers forthcoming). It seems likely that wheat was used as the main cereal food by the occupants of the site.

The status of the other crops is less clear. Oats and rye are often considered to represent fodder crops although their presence in these mixed deposits makes this issue difficult to pursue further. Oats occurred in numerous samples and outnumbered barley overall. This could imply some use for human food or that oats grew as weeds and were picked from the wheat crop and discarded prior to use. During the medieval period, rye was also often used as cheap grain for farm servants (Campbell and Overton 1993). The status of the site and the likely presence of stables in the Sacrist's Yard (Carr and Gill 2007) suggests that some of the oats and/or rye could very well have been used to feed horses kept on the site.

The density of material was generally quite low and most likely the remains represent mixed debris from numerous activities. This probably includes daily processing and food preparation. None of the deposits represent discrete dumps of material from specific activities.

In general, the weed assemblage was limited and the majority of the taxa present were large seeded types, predominantly medium legumes (Fabaceae) and large grasses (Poaceae), including brome grass (*Bromus* sp.). Large seeded weeds often stay with the crop during processing due to their similarity in size to the cereal grains. This means that the grain from the samples probably represents a fully processed crop with low-level weed contamination. There is no evidence of cereal processing

from the site, although some final hand sorting may have taken place before food preparation.

Although grain is likely to have been grown locally, it is unlikely that the site itself was agricultural in nature. The presence of stinking chamomile in L2132 and L2150 indicates cultivation on rich, heavy soils, which raises the possibility that at least some of the grain may have been imported from the claylands east of Bury St Edmunds. If associated with the cereals, Cyperaceae seeds may also represent grain from heavy soils prone to waterlogging.

### Conclusions

The material from the bulk sample light fractions indicates that the cereal remains represent general refuse from the day-to-day use of cereals. Wheat was the principal cereal, probably used for food, with some other cereals, such as oats and rye, perhaps representing grain kept for animal feed. It seems likely that the grain was brought to the site in a processed state and that some may have come from farms set on the claylands east of Bury St Edmunds.

### References

Bakels, C. 2012, 'The early history of the cornflower (*Centaurea cyanus* L.) in the Netherlands', *Acta Palaeobotanica* 52, 25-31

Ballantyne, R. 2005, 'Plants and seeds', in Mortimer, R., Regan, R. and Lucy, S. *The Saxon and Medieval Settlement at West Fen Road, Ely: The Ashwell Site*, East Anglian Archaeology 110, Cambridge Archaeological Unit, Cambridge, 100-112

Campbell, B.M.S. and Overton, M. 1993, 'A new perspective on medieval and early modern agriculture: six centuries of Norfolk farming c.1250-c.1850', *Past and Present*, 141, 38-105

Cappers, R.T.J., Bekker R.M. and Jans J.E.A. 2006, *Digital Seed Atlas of the Netherlands. Groningen Archaeological Studies Volume 4*, Barkhuis Publishing, Eelde

Carr, R. and Gill, D. 2007, *Shire Hall Complex BSE291: A Report on the Archaeological Assessment 2007*, Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service Report 2007/23

Fryer, V. and Summers, J.R. Forthcoming, 'Charred plant macrofossils and other remains' in Woolhouse, T. *Medieval Activity on the Suffolk Clay at Stowmarket*, East Anglian Archaeology

Jacomet, S. 2006, *Identification of Cereal Remains from Archaeological Sites* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn), Laboratory of Palinology and Palaeoecology, Basel University

Kenward, H.K. and Hall, A.R. 1995, *Biological Evidence from Anglo-Scandinavian Deposits at 16-22 Coppergate*, York Archaeological Trust, York



Kerney, M.P. and Cameron, R.A.D. 1979, *A Field Guide to Land Snails of Britain and North-West Europe*, Collins, London

Straker, V, Campbell, G. and Smith, W. 2007, 'The charred plant macrofossils', in Gerrard, C. and Aston, M. *The Shapwick Project, Somerset. A Rural Landscape Explored*, The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 25, Leeds, 869-889



Cyperaceae indet. - Sedge family	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Bromus</i> sp. L. - Brome grass	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poaceae indet. - Grass (large)	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poaceae indet. - Grass (small)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seeds indet.	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Charcoal:</b>											
Charcoal >2mm	-	X	XX	-	XX	X	XX	X	-	-	-
Heather charcoal	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Other:</b>											
Fish bone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fish scales	-	-	-	-	XX	-	-	-	-	-	-
Small mammal bone	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	X	-	-	-
Small mammal/ amphibian bone	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amphibian bone	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fuel ash slag	X	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Molluscs:</b>											
<i>Discus rotundatus</i>	-	-	-	-	X	-	X	-	X	-	-
<i>Helicella itala</i>	-	X	X	-	X	-	X	-	-	-	-
<i>Oxychilus</i> sp.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Pupilla muscorum</i>	X	-	-	-	X	-	X	-	-	-	X
<i>Trichia hispida</i> group	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-
<i>Vallonia</i> sp.	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-
<b>Contaminants:</b>											
Modern roots	X	X	X	X	X	X	XX	X	X	-	X
Modern mollusc	-	X	X	X	X	-	XX	X	-	-	-
Modern seeds	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Modern insect	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-

Table 12: Data from the analysis of bulk samples from Shire Hall, Bury St. Edmunds. X=Present; XX=Common; XXX=Abundant.

Site Code	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365
Sample number	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
Context number	2080	2086	2088	2094	2096	2098	2108	2112	2124	2136	2138	
Feature number	2079	2085	2087	2093	2095	2097	2107	2111	2123	2135	2137	
Feature type	Posthole	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit	Posthole	Pit	Posthole	Posthole	Pit	
Phase	-	-	-	-	-	12th-14th	12th-14th	17th-19th	-	-	-	
Volume (litres)	10	10	10	10	10	20	10	10	10	10	10	
<b>Cereal grains:</b>												
Cereal NFI	2	-	-	-	2	3	3	2	2	5	-	
Cereal NFI/Large Poaceae	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	
<i>Hordeum</i> sp. - Barley	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	
<i>Hordeum vulgare</i> - Hulled barley	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
( <i>Hordeum vulgare</i> - twisted grain)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<i>Triticum</i> sp. - Wheat	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	4	-	
<i>Triticum aestivum/compactum</i> type - Bread wheat type	-	1	2	-	1	3	-	2	1	3	-	
cf. <i>Avena</i> sp. - Oat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	
<i>Avena</i> sp. - Oat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	
( <i>Avena</i> sp. - germinated grain)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(1)	-	
<i>Avena sativa/strigosa</i> - Common/black oat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<i>Triticum/Secale</i> sp. - Wheat/ rye	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
cf. <i>Secale cereale</i> - Rye	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<i>Secale cereale</i> - Rye	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>Wild taxa:</b>												
<i>Chenopodium</i> sp. L. - Goosefoot	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<i>Montia fontana</i> L. - Blinks	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<i>Rumex</i> sp. L. - Dock	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Polygonaceae indet. - Knotweed family	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<i>Rubus</i> sp. L. - Bramble	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<i>Vicia/Lathyrus</i> sp. L. - Vetch/ wild pea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Fabaceae indet. - Pea family (medium)	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	
<i>Plantago</i> sp. L. - Plantain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<i>Galium</i> sp. L. - Bedstraw	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
<i>Centaurea</i> sp. L. - Knapweed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<i>Anthemis cotula</i> L. - Stinking chamomile	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Cyperaceae indet. - Sedge family	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Bromus</i> sp. L. - Brome grass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poaceae indet. - Grass (large)	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poaceae indet. - Grass (small)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seeds indet.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Charcoal:</b>												
Charcoal >2mm	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-
Heather charcoal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Other:</b>												
Fish bone	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fish scales	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-
Small mammal bone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Small mammal/ amphibian bone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amphibian bone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fuel ash slag	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Molluscs:</b>												
<i>Discus rotundatus</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Helicella itala</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Oxychilus</i> sp.	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Pupilla muscorum</i>	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Trichia hispida</i> group	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Vallonia</i> sp.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Contaminants:</b>												
Modern roots	X	X	XX	X	X	X	XX	XX	XX	XX	X	X
Modern mollusc	-	-	-	X	-	X	-	X	-	-	X	-
Modern seeds	-	X	-	X	X	-	-	X	X	-	-	X
Modern insect	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 12 continued

Site Code	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365	BSE365
<b>Sample number</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Context number</b>	<b>2150</b>	<b>2134</b>	<b>2165</b>	<b>2152</b>	<b>2163</b>	<b>2100B</b>	<b>2132</b>	<b>2126A</b>	<b>2169</b>
<b>Feature number</b>	<b>2149</b>	<b>2133</b>	<b>2164</b>	<b>2151</b>	<b>2162</b>	<b>2099B</b>	<b>2131</b>	<b>2125A</b>	<b>2168</b>
<b>Feature type</b>	<b>Pit</b>	<b>Pit</b>	<b>Posthole</b>	<b>Pit</b>	<b>Pit</b>	<b>Ditch</b>	<b>Pit</b>	<b>Pit</b>	<b>Pit</b>
<b>Phase</b>	-	-	-	-	-	12th-14th	12th-14th	12th-14th	10th-12th
<b>Volume (litres)</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Cereal grains:</b>									
Cereal NFI	31	1	-	6	2	4	2	2	-
Cereal NFI/Large Poaceae	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Hordeum</i> sp. - Barley	3	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
<i>Hordeum vulgare</i> - Hulled barley	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
( <i>Hordeum vulgare</i> - twisted grain)	(1)	-	-	-	(1)	-	-	-	-
<i>Triticum</i> sp. - Wheat	16	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
<i>Triticum aestivum/compactum</i> type - Bread wheat type	25	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
cf. <i>Avena</i> sp. - Oat	6	-	-	2	3	-	-	-	-
<i>Avena</i> sp. - Oat	11	-	-	3	2	-	2	-	-
( <i>Avena</i> sp. - germinated grain)	(1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Avena sativa/strigosa</i> - Common/black oat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Triticum/Secale</i> sp. - Wheat/ rye	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
cf. <i>Secale cereale</i> - Rye	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Secale cereale</i> - Rye	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Wild taxa:</b>									
<i>Chenopodium</i> sp. L. - Goosefoot	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Montia fontana</i> L. - Blinks	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<i>Rumex</i> sp. L. - Dock	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Polygonaceae indet. - Knotweed family	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
<i>Rubus</i> sp. L. - Bramble	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Vicia/Lathyrus</i> sp. L. - Vetch/ wild pea	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fabaceae indet. - Pea family (medium)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Plantago</i> sp. L. - Plantain	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Galium</i> sp. L. - Bedstraw	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Centaurea</i> sp. L. - Knapweed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Anthemis cotula</i> L. - Stinking chamomile	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-

Cyperaceae indet. - Sedge family	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
<i>Bromus</i> sp. L. - Brome grass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poaceae indet. - Grass (large)	5	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-
Poaceae indet. - Grass (small)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seeds indet.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Charcoal:</b>									
Charcoal >2mm	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Heather charcoal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Other:</b>									
Fish bone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fish scales	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Small mammal bone	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Small mammal/ amphibian bone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amphibian bone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fuel ash slag	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Molluscs:</b>									
<i>Discus rotundatus</i>	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Helicella itala</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Oxychilus</i> sp.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Pupilla muscorum</i>	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	-	-
<i>Trichia hispida</i> group	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Vallonia</i> sp.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Contaminants:</b>									
Modern roots	X	X	-	X	XX	X	X	X	X
Modern mollusc	X	-	-	X	X	-	-	-	-
Modern seeds	X	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-
Modern insect	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-

Table 12 continued

## **6 STORAGE AND CURATION**

Archive records, with an inventory, will be deposited at SCC County Store, Suffolk. The archive will be quantified, ordered, indexed, cross-referenced and checked for internal consistency. In addition to the overall site summary, it will be necessary to produce a summary of the artefactual and ecofactual data.

## **PART II UPDATED PROJECT DESIGN**

### **7 UPDATE OF AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

The original academic aims and objectives of the project, as specified in the brief issued by Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Conservation Team (SCC AS-CT) (dated 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2012), and a specification prepared by AS (dated 8th August 2012), were primarily to preserve the archaeological evidence contained within the site by record and to attempt a reconstruction of the history and use of the site. Specific research aims were to:

- Place the medieval and post-medieval activity in context with the known activity of these dates in the surrounding area
- Characterise the activity present within the site
- Identify topographical/geological/geographical influences on the layout and development of the activity present within the current site and in the surrounding area
- Environmental reconstruction

Following the completion of fieldwork, these aims remain valid. The original aims and objectives are incorporated into, and expanded upon, by the Updated Aims and Objectives set out in Section 8, below. These are derived from the assessments of the stratigraphic, artefactual and environmental evidence from the site, presented in Part I of this document. They have been developed with the updated regional research framework for Eastern England (Medlycott 2011). The suggested bibliography, comprising material for comparison and reference, is presented in Section 9.

### **8 UPDATED AIMS AND OBJECTIVES.**

#### **The character of the medieval activity**

##### Research objectives

##### *The known history of the site*

- It is considered that the site lies in the approximate location of the Sacrist's Yard. Therefore, the first step in understanding the character of the medieval activity



will be to develop a predictive model of the kinds of activity that may be expected in this part of a religious house.

- Through comparison with sites of similar date and function (e.g. Hobley 1971; Goode 1993; Scott 2001; Hall & Strachan 2001) and through other literature on the layout and architecture of medieval religious houses (Hogg 1972; Keevis *et al* 2001; Morant 2004; Butler 1987), identify what the layout of the sacrist's yard may be expected to be and what activities may be found therein.
- From work previously conducted on the Abbey (e.g. Carr and Gill 2007; Gilyard-Beer 1969; Gransden 1998; Gransden 2007), identify what is currently known about the sacrist's yard at the Abbey of St Edmund in order to provide a context within which the findings of the excavation may be understood.
- A review of recent investigations by Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service to the east of the current site (i.e. BSE 375; Gill 2011) would help to place it within its immediate environs. The flood plain of the River Lark was heavily engineered by the builders of the Abbey and once included fish ponds and a mill leat (*ibid*). A steep drop-off from the surrounding gravel terrace to the water's edge was identified at BSE 375 (*ibid.*); the current site may occupy the edge of the terrace.

#### *The structural evidence*

- Due to the limited scope of the investigation there is little merit in further pursuing the structural evidence. However, comparison with other sites of similar date and function (e.g. Hobley 1971; Goode 1993; Scott 2001), may cast light on the type of structure represented by the medieval postholes.

#### *The artefactual and environmental evidence*

- Through the use of specialist data and analysis and to examine what the artefactual and environmental evidence reveals about the nature of the activity conducted in this part of the site.
  - Is it possible to distinguish between food preparation and food consumption waste?
  - Is it possible to identify specific activities conducted in this part of the Abbey complex from these assemblages or do they just relate to refuse disposal?
  - If specific activities can be identified, can these be tied to the building types of functions identified from analysis of the structural evidence?
  - Through comparison with similar sites of similar date (e.g. Hobley 1971; Goode 1993; Scott 2001), is it possible to predict the kinds of activities to which these assemblages may be related? This will be particularly pertinent if no conclusions are reached from the examination of the assemblages themselves. Information regarding daily activities within institutions such as this may be found in Knowles & Hadcock (1953), Platt (1984), Morant (2004) and Patrick Greene (2005).

## **The layout and architecture of the medieval abbey**

### Research objectives

#### *Buildings within the Sacrist's yard*

- To identify from the available evidence and through comparison with similar sites the likely form of the buildings within the Sacrist's yard (Hall & Strachan 2001; Green & Whittingham 1969; Greene 2004).
  - Are these likely to relate to a similar architectural tradition as the more important buildings of the Abbey complex? Urban religious houses in the medieval period are discussed by Butler (1987). Comparison may be drawn with similar sites (e.g. Greene 2004).
  - Are they comparable to other local or regional architectural traditions?

#### *Evidence relating to other parts of the Abbey complex*

- To identify the extent to which the medieval CBM assemblage is representative of the architecture of the Abbey complex
  - Is it possible to identify elements of the medieval CBM assemblage to particular buildings within the complex or buildings of particular status? Carr & Gill (2007), Gilyard-Beer (1969), Gransden (1998), Drewett & Stuart (1975) and McAleer (1998) discuss the form, layout and architecture of the Abbey complex.

#### *The position of the Sacrist's yard in comparison to the rest of the Abbey complex*

- To identify the reasons behind the choice of this location in the Abbey complex for the represented activity
  - Are there any clearly identifiable geological or topographical factors influencing the choice of this location for this activity? Geological/topographical factors influencing the siting of religious houses are identified as a research subject for the eastern region by Medlycott (2011). The layout and morphology of the Abbey complex are discussed by Carr & Gill (2007), Gilyard-Beer (1969), Gransden (1998) and Gransden (2007). Examination of the local geology and topography, examination of the relationship with the morphology of the surrounding medieval town and comparison with similar sites may reveal information on this subject.
  - An understanding of other archaeological deposits in the immediate area (e.g. BSE 375, Gill 2011) would contribute to any synthetic study of the Abbey complex and assist in understanding the encountered deposit model (within the current site and its environs).

## **The role of the Abbey in the development of the surrounding town**

### Research objectives

#### *The Sacrist's yard, the Abbey and the economy of the surrounding town*

- To identify what the evidence recovered during the excavation reveals about the economy of the surrounding lay settlement.
  - Through the use of specialist environmental reports, what evidence is revealed about consumption within the Abbey complex? Is their evidence of high status diet? How does this compare to similar sites?

- What evidence is there of supply? Is it possible to identify where goods being used at the Abbey originated? Pottery and CBM typologies are likely to reveal significant information on this subject but work carried out elsewhere in the town may provide information regarding the supply of foodstuffs. Analysis of plant macrofossils will provide information on likely sources of cereals.
- Is it possible to identify the extent to which the Abbey was reliant on the surrounding lay settlement for consumable goods?
- How would this have affected the economy of the town? Information on the medieval economy is present in Hinton (1990), Holmes (1974), Platt (1978), Dyer (2000). Information specifically on the economy of medieval towns is presented by Schofield & Vince (2003), Hilton (1985), Platt (1976). Medieval towns are discussed by Paliser (1987).
- What does the economy suggest about the site and the town as an important local/regional hub? Social aspects of medieval religious houses are discussed by Hibbert (1989).

## **Character of the post-medieval activity**

### Research objectives

#### *The known history of the site*

- To assess how the post-medieval activity recorded within the excavation site relates to the known history of the Abbey and the surrounding town.
  - Can the recorded activity be identified to known events in the history of the Abbey site or the wider town? The history of the Abbey is summarised by Carr & Gill (2007) and Gransden (2007). The known history of the town is summarised by Meeres (2010).
  - Can the post-medieval activity be directly related to changes to the Abbey complex as a result of or following the dissolution of the monasteries? The social background to the dissolution is presented by Hibbert (1989), Duffy (1992), Marshall (1997). The effect of the dissolution on Benedictine religious houses is analysed by Dogget (2002), Hawkins & Phillpotts (2005), Thomas (2006).
  - Inclusion/ consultation of historic cartographic sources would be useful in understanding the level of development of the site and surrounding area during the post-medieval period.

#### *Artefactual and environmental evidence*

- To assess, through the use of the specialist analyses, what the artefactual and environmental evidence indicates about the activity carried out within the site in the post-medieval period.
  - Does the artefactual and environmental evidence indicate domestic activity?
  - Do the finds and food waste assemblages indicate any degree of status?
  - What do the environmental remains indicate about the local environment, agricultural activities and the food procurement strategies practiced at or in association with the site?

## **Layout and form of the post-medieval site and the structures within it**

### Research objectives

#### *Geological, topographic, historic and other factors influencing the layout of the site*

- To identify factors influencing the layout of the site in the post-medieval period
  - Are there any clearly identifiable geological or topographical factors influencing the choice of this location for the identified activity? Geological/topographical factors influencing the siting of religious houses are identified as a research subject for the eastern region by Medlycott (2011). The layout and morphology of the Abbey complex are discussed by Carr & Gill (2007).
  - Do the prevailing geographical and topographic conditions at the site support the interpretation of F2036 as a well?
  - Can the trackway feature F2068 be linked to the known road network/urban layout of Bury St Edmunds in the post-medieval period? Examination of early cartographic sources may assist with this and the known history of the town is summarised by Meeres (2010).

## **Economic evidence**

### Research objectives

#### *The economy of the Abbey site in post-medieval period*

- To assess what the environmental information and artefactual evidence indicates about the economy of the site.
  - Does consumption and diet continue to be of high status following the dissolution? The possible Great Bustard remains are particularly noteworthy; the remaining animal bone assemblage only merits brief treatment.
  - Is it possible to identify the extent to which the Abbey site was reliant on the surrounding lay settlement for consumable goods?

## **Character of the modern activity**

### Research objectives

#### *The known history of the site*

- To assess how the modern activity recorded within the excavation site relates to the known history of the Abbey and the surrounding town.
  - Can the recorded activity be identified to known events in the history of the Abbey site or the wider town? The history of the Abbey is summarised by Carr & Gill (2007) and Gransden (2007). The known history of the town is summarised by Meeres (2010).

#### *Artefactual and environmental evidence*

- To assess, through the use of the specialist analyses, what the artefactual and environmental evidence indicates about the activity carried out within the site in the modern period.
  - Does the artefactual and environmental evidence indicate domestic activity or activity of a different nature?

- What do the environmental remains indicate about the local environment, agricultural activities and the food procurement strategies practiced at or in association with the site?

## Layout and form of the modern site

### Research objectives

#### *Geological, topographic, historic and other factors influencing the layout of the site*

- To identify factors influencing the layout of Trackway F2033
  - Can the trackway feature F2033 be linked to the known road network/urban layout of Bury St Edmunds in the early modern period? Examination of early cartographic sources may assist with this and the known history of the town is summarised by Meeres (2010).

## 9 SUGGESTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Borsay, P. 2003, 'The landed elite and provincial towns in Britain 1660-1800', *The Georgian Group Journal* 13, 281-293

Butler, L. 1987, 'Medieval Urban Religious houses' *in* Schofield, J. & Leech, R. (eds.) *Urban Archaeology in Britain*, Council for British Archaeology research report 61, 167-176

Carr, R. & Gill, D. 2007, *Archaeological Assessment Report, Shire Hall Complex Assessment, Bury St Edmunds, BSE 291*, SCC AS unpublished report 2007/023.

Davey, P. J. 1987, 'The post-medieval period' *in* Schofield, J. & Leech, R. (eds.) *Urban Archaeology in Britain*, Council for British Archaeology research report 61, 69-80

Drewett, P. L. and Stuart, I. W. 1975, 'Excavations in the Norman gate tower Bury St. Edmunds abbey (with notes by J. G. Hurst, S. E. Rigold, and R. T. Jones)', *in* *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology* XXXIII.3, 241-252

Duffy, E. 1992, *The Stripping of the Altars - Traditional Religion in England, c.1400-c.1580*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT

Dyer, A. 2002, 'Small Towns in England, 1600-1800' *in* Borsay, P. and Proudfoot, L., *Provincial towns in early modern England and Ireland: change, convergence and divergence*, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 108, 53-67

Dyer, C. 2000, *Everyday Life in Medieval England*, Hambledon & London, London

Gilyard-Beer, R. 1969, 'The Eastern arm of the Abbey Church at Bury St Edmunds', *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History* 31 (3), 256-262

Goode, V. 1993, 'Coventry's Benedictine Priory – what did it look like?', *Coventry and District Archaeological Society Bulletin*, 297

Gransden, A. 1998, *Bury St. Edmunds: medieval art, architecture, archaeology and economy*, British Archaeological Association

Gransden, A. 2007, *A history of the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds, 1182-1256: Samson of Tottington to Edmund of Walpole*, Boydell Press, Woodbridge

Green, C. and Whittingham, A. B. 1969, 'Excavations at Walsingham Priory, Norfolk, 1961' *The Archaeological Journal* 125, 250-90

Greene, J. P. 2004, *Norton Priory: the archaeology of a medieval religious house*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge

Hall, J and Strachan, D. 2001, 'The precinct and buildings of Tilty Abbey', *Essex Archaeological History* Vol, 32, 198-208

Hawkins, D & Phillpotts, C. 2005, 'The Priory of St Leonard, Stratford-at-Bow and parish church of St Mary, Bromley-by-Bow', *London Archaeologist* 11 (2)

Hibbert, C. 1989, *The English: a social history 1066-1945*, Guild Publishing, London

Hilton, R. H. 1985, 'Medieval market towns and simple commodity production', *Past & Present* 109, 3-23

Hinton, D. A. 1990, *Archaeology, economy and society: England from the fifth to the fifteenth century*, Seaby, London

Hobley, B 1971 'Excavations at the Cathedral and Benedictine Priory of St Mary, Coventry', *Transactions of the Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeological Society* 84, 1967-70 (1971) 45-139

Hogg, G. 1972, *Priories and Abbeys of England*, Drake Publishers, New York

Holmes, G. 1974, *The Later Middle Ages 1272-1485*, Cardinal, London

Keevill, G., Aston, M. and Hall, T. A. 2001, *Monastic archaeology: papers on the study of medieval monasteries*, Oxbow, Oxford

Knowles, D. & Hadcock, R.N., 1953, *Medieval Religious Houses*, London

Marshall, P. 1997, *The Impact of the English Reformation 1500-1640*, Arnold, London

McAlear, J. P. 1998, 'The west facade-complex at the Abbey Church of Bury St Edmunds: a description of the evidence for its reconstruction', in *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History* XXXIX.2, 127-150

Meeres, F. 2010, *A History of Bury St Edmunds*, History Press, Stroud

Morant, R. W. 2004, *The medieval abbeys and priories of England and Wales*, Trafford Publishing, Victoria, British Columbia

Paliser, D. 1987, 'The medieval period' *in* Schofield, J. & Leech, R. (eds.) *Urban Archaeology in Britain*, Council for British Archaeology research report 61, 54-68

Patrick Greene, J. 2005, *Medieval Monasteries*, Continuum, London

Platt, C. 1976, *The English Medieval town*, Secker and Warburg, London

Platt, C. 1978, *Medieval England*, Book Club Associates, London

Platt, C. 1984, *The abbeys and priories of medieval England*, Secker & Warburg, London

Schofield, J. & Vince, A. 2003, *Medieval towns: the archaeology of British towns in their European setting*, Continuum, London

Scott, I. R. 2001, 'Romsey Abbey: Benedictine nunnery and parish church', *Monastic Archaeology* 150-160

Thomas, J. 2006, 'Evidence for the dissolution of Thorney Abbey: recent excavations and landscape analysis at Thorney, Cambridgeshire', *Medieval Archaeology* 50

## 10 PUBLICATION SYNOPSIS

### 10.1 Summary

Due to the small size of the site, the most appropriate vehicle for publication will be the *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History*. The publication report will comprise a discussion of the background of the project, a selective description and analysis of features and finds, and a synthesis of the site's structure and development, with local and regional comparisons. Specialist reports will be integrated into the text and included inline with the requirements of publication, as set out by the agreed publishers.

### 10.2 Estimated breakdown of report

#### ABSTRACT

**c. 175 words**

- Contents Summary of phasing, features, finds and interpretation
- Tables -
- Figures -
- Plates -

#### INTRODUCTION

**c. 200 words**

- Contents Circumstances of the project and summary of background information.
- Tables Phase numbers and date ranges
- Figures Site location and detailed site location plans
- Plates -

**GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY**

**c. 150 words**

- Contents Description of the situation of the site
- Tables -
- Figures -
- Plates -
- Specialist -

**PHASE 1**

**c. 300 words**

- Contents Synthetic description of the medieval features and their distribution, description of the medieval deposits. Interpretations. Comparisons with other sites in the area.
- Tables -
- Figures Phase plans, feature sections, sample sections.
- Plates -
- Specialist Information taken from the pottery, CBM, animal bone and environmental reports.

**PHASE 2**

**c. 150 words**

- Contents Description of the major post-medieval features and deposits Interpretations. Comparisons with appropriate sites.
- Tables -
- Figures Phase plans, feature sections, sample sections.
- Plates -
- Specialist Information taken from the pottery, CBM, animal bone and environmental reports.

**PHASE 3**

**c. 150 words**

- Contents Brief, synthetic description of the modern features and deposits. Interpretations. Comparisons with appropriate sites.
- Tables -
- Figures Phase plan and selected sections.
- Plates -
- Specialist Information taken from the pottery, CBM, animal bone and environmental reports.

**DISCUSSION**

**c. 500 words**

- Contents Overview of the archaeology. The key focus of the paper will be the economy of the medieval/post-medieval site and the contribution of the project to our understanding of the general deposit model in the area (Abbey complex).
- Tables -
- Figures Where necessary for comparison with other sites recorded in the area
- Plates -



- Specialist Specialist data will be introduced where they contribute to the discussion.

## CONCLUSION

**c. 200 words**

- Contents A statement outlining the key findings of the excavation and post-excavation analysis.
- Tables -
- Figures -
- Plates -
- Specialist -

## ASSESSMENT AND UPD BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, S. 1994, 'East Close, Bury St Edmunds: A Report on the Archaeological Excavations 1991-94', SCCAS unpublished report

Anderson, S. 1996, 'East Close, Bury St Edmunds', SCCAS unpublished report 96/21.

Barlow, G. 2014, *Shire Hall, Raingate Street, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk. An Archaeological Excavation and Monitoring Interim Report*, Archaeological Solutions Ltd Report No 4160

Butler, L. and Given-Wilson, C. 1979 *Medieval Monasteries of Great Britain*, London

Carr, R. & Gill, D. 2007, *Archaeological Assessment Report, Shire Hall Complex Assessment, Bury St Edmunds, BSE 291*, SCC AS unpublished report 2007/023.

Dyson, A. & Adams, M. 2011, *Shire Hall, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk; An Archaeological Evaluation*, Archaeological Solutions Ltd unpublished report no. 3778

EPS 2011, *Linnet Service Station, Bury St Edmunds: An Environmental Desk Study*, Environmental Protection Strategies unpublished report UK11.1019

Gem, R. and Keen, L. 1981, 'Late A'-Saxon finds from the site of St. Edmunds Abbey', *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History*, 35 (1), 1-30

Gill, D. 2011, Shire Hall Car Park and Weymed Centre, Bury St Edmunds BSE 375 and 376. Archaeological Evaluation Report, SCCAS Report No. 2011/171

Gurney, D. 2003, *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England*, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper no. 14

Hindley, G. 2006, *The Anglo-Saxons: the beginnings of an English nation*, Constable & Robinson Ltd, London

Institute of Field Archaeologists 1994 (revised 2008), *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation*

Medlycott, M. (ed.) 2011, *Research and Archaeology revisited: a revised framework for the East of England*, ALGAO East of England Region, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 24

SSEW 1983a, *Soil Survey of England and Wales: Soils of South East England (sheet 4)*, Rothamsted Experimental Station/Lawes Agricultural Trust, Harpenden.

SSEW 1983b, *Legend for the 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales*, Harpenden

St Edmundsbury Council 2007, *Bury St Edmunds Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal Draft for Consultation*, St Edmundsbury Council, Bury St Edmunds

Stenton, F. M. 2001 (reissue), *Anglo-Saxon England*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

Wymer, J. 1999, 'Late Glacial and Mesolithic Hunters' in Dymond, D. & Martin, M. (eds.) *An Historical Atlas of Suffolk*, Suffolk County Council

Wymer, J. 1999a, 'The Neolithic' in Dymond, D. & Martin, M. (eds.) *An Historical Atlas of Suffolk*, Suffolk County Council

**APPENDIX 1      OASIS DATA COLLECTION FORM**

# OASIS DATA COLLECTION FORM: England

[List of Projects](#) | [Manage Projects](#) | [Search Projects](#) | [New project](#) | [Change your details](#) | [HER coverage](#) | [Change country](#) | [Log out](#)

## Printable version

**OASIS ID: archaeoi7-195852**

### Project details

Project name	SHIRE HALL, RAINGATE STREET, BURY ST EDMUNDS, SUFFOLK
Short description of the project	This document provides for a Post Excavation Assessment (Part I) and Updated Project Design (Part II) for archaeological work undertaken by Archaeological Solutions (AS) at Shire Hall, Raingate Street, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk (TL 858 639) during September 2012. The work was commissioned by M and D Developments. The site lies in an area of Archaeological Importance within the Anglo-Saxon and medieval settlement core of Bury (BSE 242), and adjacent to the precinct of the Abbey of St Edmund (BSE 010, SAM SF2).
Project dates	Start: 01-09-2012 End: 30-09-2012
Previous/future work	Yes / Not known
Any associated project reference codes	P4241 - Contracting Unit No.
Any associated project reference codes	BSE 365 - Sitecode
Type of project	Research project
Site status	Area of Archaeological Importance (AAI)
Current Land use	Other 15 - Other
Monument type	PITS Medieval
Monument type	POSTHOLES Medieval
Significant Finds	ASSEMBLAGES Medieval
Investigation type	"Full excavation"
Prompt	Research

### Project location

Country	England
Site location	SUFFOLK ST EDMUNDSBURY BURY ST EDMUNDS SHIRE HALL, RAINGATE STREET, BURY ST EDMUNDS, SUFFOLK
Study area	300.00 Square metres
Site coordinates	TL 858 639 52.2414133168 0.721645273131 52 14 29 N 000 43 17 E Point
Height OD / Depth	Min: 31.00m Max: 31.00m

**Project creators**

Name of Organisation	Archaeological Solutions Ltd
Project brief originator	SCC AS Conservation Team
Project design originator	Jon Murray
Project director/manager	Jon Murray
Project supervisor	Gareth Barlow
Type of sponsor/funding body	M and D Developments

**Project archives**

Physical Archive recipient	Suffolk County Archaeological Store
Physical Contents	"Ceramics"
Digital Archive recipient	Suffolk County Archaeological Store
Digital Contents	"Survey"
Digital Media available	"Images raster / digital photography", "Survey", "Text"
Paper Archive recipient	Suffolk County Archaeological Store
Paper Contents	"Survey"
Paper Media available	"Drawing", "Photograph", "Plan", "Report", "Survey "

**Project bibliography 1**

Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	SHIRE HALL, RAINGATE STREET, BURY ST EDMUNDS, SUFFOLK
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Mustchin, A
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Newton, A
Other bibliographic details	Archaeological Solutions Report No. 4244
Date	2014
Issuer or publisher	Archaeological Solutions Ltd
Place of issue or publication	Bury St Edmunds
Entered by	Sarah Powell (Info@ascontracts.co.uk)
Entered on	20 November 2014

# OASIS:

Please e-mail [English Heritage](#) for OASIS help and advice

© ADS 1996-2012 Created by [Jo Gilham and Jen Mitcham, email](#) Last modified Wednesday 9 May 2012

Cite only: <http://www.oasis.ac.uk/form/print.cfm> for this page