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SUMMARY

In March 2008, Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out an archaeological investigation at the Queen’s College, Oxford (NGR SP 5179 0635) on behalf of BGS Architects and the College. The work took place in advance of proposals to construct a new below-ground basement north of the existing kitchen building, specifically to determine whether piled foundations would encounter below-ground structural remains associated with the medieval college.

The work revealed layers of construction/demolition debris cut by the foundation trench and wall forming the NE corner of the medieval West Range depicted on historic views. The northern end of West Range was equipped with a hearth, and later a possible doorway inserted within the wall leading to the yard outside. A narrow garden wall and a path were identified leading to the building, and these are probably of later medieval/early post-medieval date. The northern line of the medieval North Range, identified in a previous excavation, was confirmed in service trenches and trial pits by its robber trench. Demolition debris above the structures and the robber trench dates to c 1719, when the present North Quadrangle circuit was completed with a new North Range.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 In March 2008, Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out an archaeological investigation at the Queen’s College, Oxford (NGR SP 5179 0635) on behalf of BGS Architects and the College.

1.1.2 The work was carried out as part of the pre-planning stage for a below-ground basement extension to the existing kitchen, and was designed to determine whether below-ground structures would affect piling operations for the new building. The development site is situated north of the existing kitchen within the North Quadrangle of the College (Figs 1 and 2).

1.1.3 Following discussions between Joelle Derby of BGS, Brian Durham (Oxford City Council Archaeologist) and the College, OA prepared a Project Design for an Archaeological Investigation (OA 2008) for a watching brief to be conducted during the excavation of service trenches, and also the excavation of shallow test pits and an archaeological evaluation trench.

1.2 Geology and topography

1.2.1 The site lies on the second river gravel terrace at 62 m OD. The area of archaeological investigation was level and grassed with paving at the time of the investigation.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

General

1.3.1 Prehistoric and Roman evidence has been identified at nearby sites (e.g. Logic Lane in University College). The site lies within the walled medieval town, but in the eastern part that may have been a secondary addition to the primary Saxon town.

1.3.2 The medieval town plan in this area has been changed by the impact of the foundation of the Queen’s College and New College. Thorald’s Lane (now New College Lane) continued through the churchyard of St Peter in the East and extended as far as the east town wall, with a turning into Queen’s College Lane. The medieval tenements fronting High Street (presumably established before the Norman Conquest) were long and narrow, extending back from the street for just over half the length of Queen’s Lane (as they still do to the west of the College). The individual tenements are well known from College records and have been mapped by Salter. These buildings survived in truncated form until the 18th century. The tenements on Thorald’s Lane are less well understood and their boundaries have not been identified, though there is little reason to suppose that there were not a continuous series of houses there in the 12th-13th century. These included what may have been large town houses belonging to Peter Torold and the Stockwell family, and near to St
Peter’s Church was a one-time academic hall where the monks of Canterbury lived (Salter, *Survey of Oxford*, 1960, 151-2).

1.3.3 The site immediately to the west of the College Library was evaluated by OA in 1998 and remains of late Saxon occupation were identified; at about 61 m OD (Oxford City Urban Archaeological Database #407). A subsequent watching brief on test pits here produce no further significant information (OA 2001). Excavations and observations around the perimeter have also produced evidence of earlier street levels at various depths (UAD ##230, 250, 1157, 1424).

**Medieval Queen’s College**

1.3.4 Like many Oxford colleges, the process of the notional or actual foundation becoming a coherent collection of buildings was a gradual one. The site was mostly acquired between 1340 and 1347 and the fellows of the new college (founded in 1341) must first have occupied the existing houses. Building of the gatehouse fronting Queen’s Lane began in 1352, and by the end of the century a quadrangle with a chapel and a hall was completed, but did not yet encroach upon the High Street.

1.3.5 The medieval college buildings are well depicted in views drawn by Agas (1577/88) and Loggan (1675) and in more detail in Loggan’s view of the east front (1675 - Fig. 3), while the chapel plan was drawn by Loggan’s pupil, Michael Burghers. James Green also drew the last remaining buildings in 1751 as a conscious antiquarian record (*VCH Oxon iii*, pls at 125 & 139). These all show that the space between the north range of the quadrangle and New College Lane was used for orchards and gardens (open in 1577 and subdivided by 1675), and outbuildings on New College Lane.

1.3.6 The lost college buildings can be generally located by the presence of the Williamson Building on Loggan’s view, which still exists. Two key archaeological discoveries have enabled a more precise location. In 1887 the chapel foundations were observed during pipe laying (UAD #1350) and these were further investigated in 1903. In 1987 a trench in the north quadrangle located the outer wall of the medieval north range, and a resistivity survey outlined the west quadrangle and the library (Blair in *Queen’s College Record*, VI.4 - Dec.1988).

1.3.7 The 1987 trench showed that the north range had a cellar, while the chapel and library siting must mean that the return from north range to west range must have passed through the present kitchen and hall.

**Post-medieval Queen’s College**

1.3.8 The 18th-century rebuilding of Queen’s College swept away all previous buildings except the Williamson Building, and gave the college a rectilinear layout based on the new High Street frontage. The new buildings were partially cellared, with a narrow wine cellar down the middle of the hall, and a cellar in the space between the hall and kitchen, but no cellar beneath the kitchen itself (as confirmed by recent...
explorations). The cellarage is linked to the cellars below the west range (buttery), and there is one short return to the north (just west of the kitchen) which may have given access for coal or other goods. The cellars are stone vaulted, but with minimum architectural features of note. There is also a crypt beneath the chapel, and this was uncovered in 1976 when the coffins of former provosts were noted (UAD #743).

Recent archaeological observations

1.3.9 A series of geo-technical test pits (Fig. 2) were excavated in September 2007 to investigate the foundations for the existing College Kitchen (built 1715). Two of the test pits, excavated adjacent to the outside face of the northern wall of the kitchen, were observed and recorded by OA on the 7th and 10th September. The test pits extended to the base of the foundation which lay 2.3 m below current ground level (bgl).

1.3.10 The eastern test pit revealed the east-west aligned construction trench for the kitchen wall, which was cut 0.4 m to the north of the foundation itself and through a sequence of earlier deposits. This sequence consisted of a silty clay, overlain by a compacted gravel layer, overlain by another silty clay, overlain by a possible mortar surface, overlain by another silty clay, overlain by a mixed deposit of gravel and brown clay.

1.3.11 This sequence, found between 1.8 m and 1.2 m bgl, was provisionally interpreted as floors and occupation deposits which may be associated with (and were probably within) the medieval cellar mentioned above (see Section 1.3.7). However, the recent works (see Section 4 below) indicate that these deposits are more likely to comprise possible surface deposits below dumped deposits within the robbed out remains of the western range. Between 1.2 m bgl and the current ground level there was a loose, mortar rich soil and rubble deposit which appeared contiguous with the backfill of the construction trench and might be interpreted as an infill of the cellar, or may be a general levelling-up deposit associated with the late-17th/early-18th century building programme at the college.

1.3.12 The sequence in the western test pit was not recorded in as much detail but appeared broadly consistent with that seen to the east. Towards the base of the sequence was a structure consisting of three limestone blocks (0.5 m thick, 0.3 m wide, length undetermined), possibly representing a floor surface or fireplace within the western range. Excavation ceased in both test pits before the base of the sequence was established.
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2 INVESTIGATION AIMS

2.1.1 The aims of the investigation were to establish the presence/absence of archaeological deposits (e.g. stone floors/walls) that might impede piling work during construction of the new basement;

2.1.2 To identify any robber trenches associated with the 18th century demolition of the medieval college;

2.1.3 To monitor any below ground work likely to reveal archaeological deposits of all periods and to make available the results of the investigation.

3 INVESTIGATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 Scope of fieldwork

3.1.1 In 2007 geotechnical test pits were excavated against the wall of the existing north range kitchen. Contexts revealed within these were supplemented by the excavation of the 2008 trench (see below).

3.1.2 A watching brief was maintained during the excavation by contractors (Beard) of deep service trenches (Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5) aligned N-S and E-W.

3.1.3 An evaluation trench was excavated at the suspected junction of the medieval north and west range walls (Trench 3).

3.2 Fieldwork methods and recording

3.2.1 Topsoil and overburden was removed by mini-excavator. The trenches were cleaned by hand and the revealed features/structures were recorded and sampled as appropriate in order to determine their extent and nature and to retrieve finds and environmental samples.

3.2.2 Finds were recovered by hand during the course of the excavation and bagged by context. Finds of special interest were given a unique small find number. Palaeo-environmental material was sampled from appropriate contexts. All archaeological features were planned and where excavated their sections drawn at scales of 1:10 or 1:20. All features were photographed using colour slide and black and white print film. Recording followed procedures detailed in the OA Fieldwork Manual (OAU 1992, ed. D Wilkinson).
4 RESULTS

4.1 Test Pits (2007)

4.1.1 Two Test Pits excavated against the north face of the present kitchen wall are reported in the background section at the start of this report (sections 1.3.9 to 1.3.12 - not illustrated).

4.2 Service trenches

Trench 1 (Figs 2 and 4)

4.2.1 The trench was aligned N-S leading away from the north-facing wall of the present kitchen (Figs 2 and 4, section 2). Soil layer 5, containing pottery of late 17th century date, lay beneath limestone debris (4). This layer contained 17th-18th century pottery, CBM dated from the 13th-15th centuries and clay pipe dated c 1690-1720.

4.2.2 Both layers were cut by a robber trench (6) that was 1.95 m wide and 0.6 m + deep. The trench was filled by sandy gravel and small limestone pieces (3), CBM with a broad date range of the 14th-17th centuries, and 17th-18th century clay pipe fragments.

4.2.3 The robber trench represented the line of the northern wall of the medieval north range, and continues westward of the basement window splay and wall located in Blair’s excavation of 1987 (Blair, 1988). Turf and topsoil overlay fill 3.

Trench 2 (Figs 2 and 4)

4.2.4 The trench was excavated to the east of Trench 1 and was aligned N-S. Layer 5 seen to the west was cut by a robber trench (6), a continuation of the medieval north basement wall alignment (Figs 2 and 4, section 3).

Trench 4 & 5- E-W service trench to east of library and N-S return (Figs 2 and 4)

4.2.5 The trench was aligned east - west and dug to a depth of c 1.1 m, returning to the south as Trench 5 (Figs 2 and 4, sections 103 and 104). The earliest deposit in the trench was a dark grey silty clay, with a occasional mortar fragments (16) that was overlain by a layer of white-yellow mortar and stone chips (15), to a depth of 0.1 - 0.24 m. Layer 15 was overlain by a 0.3 m -0.4 m thick layer of dark brown silty clay with mortar flecks and stone chips (14). Over this lay a 0.25 m thick layer of light yellow-brown mortar and stone chips (20), in turned overlain by a probable gravel path (13). The path was overlain by topsoil (10) in the east of the site, and in the west end of the trench the path lay beneath a make-up layer (19) for a paved path (16/17).
4.3 Evaluation trench: description of deposits

General

4.3.1 Prior to the excavation of the main trench, Trench 3 (Fig. 2) was excavated to the west of Service Trench 2, so as to locate the point where the medieval north and west ranges met. The robber trench (6) seen to the east continued westward into this trench, cutting soil layer 5.

Medieval: the West Range, internal (Figs 5 and 6; Plate 1)

4.3.2 The main evaluation area measured 3.15 m (E-W) by 4.05 m (N-S). The earliest deposit at the base of the trench was a mixed layer of compact yellow sandy gravel (133) overlain by a red-brown silty sand with charcoal flecks and gravel inclusions (132). Both deposits may have been natural in origin, but were disturbed by later building work.

4.3.3 A single auger hole was drilled in order to establish the depth of the natural gravel from the level of layer 133. Clean natural gravel was identified 0.2 m below the level of layer 133 - the gravel was 0.3 m in thickness. Below this was a 0.2 m thick layer of grey sandy clay that overlay compact natural sand.

4.3.4 In the centre of the trench at the base of the excavation, was a layer of silty clay with stone inclusions including parts of stone roof tiles (119); probably construction debris or demolition material from a previous structure on the site. This deposit was cut by 117, an east-west aligned construction trench for a large limestone and sandstone wall (101). The wall was revealed in plan to return to the south, forming the corner of the west range. The wall measured between 0.82 m and 0.93 m in width, with an offset course of stone at the base. A possible recess, a chimney base or small doorway, was noted at the internal corner of the structure (Fig. 4; Plate 1). The construction trench for the wall was backfilled with soil and stones (118) and included OXAM fabric pottery with a date range from the 13th-16th centuries (see Section 4.4.3).

4.3.5 Within the NE corner of the west range, abutting wall 101, was a compact red-brown sand layer with mortar flecks and sandstone pieces (137) some 0.23 m thick, possibly the remains of a beaten earth floor or make up for later flooring structures and deposits. Layer 137 was cut by a shallow construction trench (136) into which had been built an arrangement of pitched sandstone blocks (134). The surfaces of the stones were worn and blackened by fire; a fine sooty deposit filled the voids between the pitched stones. The structure is interpreted as a hearth or part of a fireplace. Layer 137 had also been cut by an intrusion of unknown function (138 filled by 139).

4.3.6 The hearth (134) was overlain by a thin soil layer (135) that contained fine ash and charcoal, which had spread into a void at the edge of the hearth where there may once have been edging stones for the structure. A thin soil layer (126) overlay the soils below and the remains of the hearth.
4.3.7 Soil 126 was overlain by a 0.12 m thick yellow-brown mortar layer (116) that acted as a bedding for two stone slabs (125), which abutted wall 101; small stones filled the void between the two slabs. A possible slab at the same height was seen in section, and it may have represented a continuation of a slab floor.

Medieval, west range: external yard/garden (Figs 5 and 6)

4.3.8 Soil horizons 115, then 111 and 114 accumulated against the external face of wall 101 to the north. These are presumably cultivation soils or old turf lines; layer 114 contained pottery of OXY fabric, dated from the 11th to the 13th centuries. Layers 114 and 111 were cut by a north-south aligned construction trench (120) for a 0.3 m wide sandstone wall (102). The stones were roughly hewn and bonded with reddish brown clay. Wall 102 abutted 101 and appears to have functioned as a yard divide, constructed while the north-east corner of the west range building was still in use.

4.3.9 To the west of garden wall 102 a series of shallow clay soil layers accumulated; 113, with pottery of 13th-15th century date, which lay beneath 112; then 121 (containing CBM dating from the 12th-18th centuries) below 108 and 110. Mortar and stone were mixed with these layers, which perhaps was a result of repairs to the main building. Layer 108 was predominately charcoal, formed by either the burning of garden waste or possibly the remnants of a cooking fire. Burnt flints were included in this deposit.

4.3.10 East of wall 102, soil horizon 129 was cut by a shallow construction trench (127). Trench 127 was filled with sand (128), into which had been set small pitched and tightly packed sandstones (100). This appears to have been a footpath extending alongside garden wall 102, extending northwards, and arguably leading to the possible doorway at the corner of the medieval building.

18th century demolition evidence (Figs 5 and 6)

4.3.11 Within the west range, stone slab floor 125 was overlain by a succession of interleaved red-brown sand layers with varying amounts of mortar and stone inclusions (layers 140-144). These deposits infilled the NE corner of the former range at the time of its demolition.

4.3.12 Outside the west range, path 100 was overlain by a layer of mortar and stone debris (107 - containing CBM dating from the 12th-18th centuries). Layer 107 was cut by wall robber trench 131 (fill 130), which truncated garden wall 102. The rubbley fill was overlain by demolition deposits 105 and 106, layer 105 comprised numerous lenses of material and contained 19th-century pottery, CBM and 17th- to 18th-century clay pipe pieces.

4.3.13 At the level of layer 143 within the west range and at the level of layer 105 within the garden, the robber trench removing the main wall 101 was identified. Robber trench 122 was at least 2 m wide and removed the corner of the building to the south and west. The backfill of the robber trench comprised stone and mortar (123 and 124) to
a depth of 0.95 m. 124 contained pieces from a 14th-century Penn/Chiltern decorated floor tile.

Post-demolition (Figs 5 and 6)

4.3.14 A thick layer of limestone chippings/waste (104) covered the excavation area and was probably formed during construction of the new college buildings in the early-middle part of the 18th century. This was overlain by the present topsoil (103) of the North Quadrangle.

4.4 Finds Summaries

General

4.4.1 The following comprise summaries of the full finds reports, which can be found as Appendices 2 to 5

The Pottery by John Cotter (OA)

4.4.2 A total of 12 sherds of pottery weighing 234 g. were recovered from six contexts. This is all of medieval and post-medieval date. The earliest piece in the assemblage is three joining sherds from the sagging base of a jar/cooking pot in Medieval Oxford ware (OXY) dating to c 1075-1250 (dumped soil 114).

4.4.3 Medieval Brill/Boarstall ware (OXAM) occurs in two dumped deposits (113 and 118) including a dripping pan profile in (118). This would have been used for collecting fat or dripping from spit-roasts. Although this ware has a broad date range (c 1200-1600), it is unlikely that the pieces here belong to the latter part of this range.

4.4.4 The post-medieval wares comprise types commonly known from Oxford during the 17th-18th centuries.

The Building Material by John Cotter (OA)

4.4.5 A combined total of 16 pieces of ceramic (CBM) and stone building material (BM) weighing 9,820 g were recovered from seven contexts. Two pieces of worked stone were also recovered. The assemblage as a whole potentially spans the late 12th century through to the 19th or early 20th century. Apart from a medieval decorated floor tile, which has yet to be exactly paralleled in the region, none of the CBM is particularly remarkable for a site in central Oxford.

4.4.6 Perhaps the most significant and interesting item is a large piece of medieval decorated floor tile from the fill of a wall robber trench (124). This has an eagle design in white slip under a clear glaze and a sandy salmon-pink fabric (Plate 2). It is probably of 14th century date and a product of the Penn/Chiltern tileeries in Buckinghamshire, the design appears to form part of the Queen’s College crest and is not exactly matched in the extensive published typologies of these types (Hohler 1942; Haberly 1937).
The Clay Pipe by John Cotter (OA)

4.4.7 The largest number of pieces (including four bowls) are from make up deposit 105, which includes mid and later 17th-century bowl types but also a stem fragment with a prominent spur suggesting a late 17th or early 18th century date. The fairly cohesive date and fresh condition of these pieces is puzzling considering the only pieces of pottery and tile from this context are of definite 19th century date. The pieces from the other two contexts are also likely to be of late 17th or early 18th century date.

The Flint by David Mullin (OA)

4.4.8 A total of twenty-three pieces of burnt flint were recovered from a dumped charcoal deposit (108). The material recovered consists of waste flakes from the latter stages of the reduction sequence. The material is not diagnostic, but illustrates prehistoric (Neolithic to Bronze Age) activity on or near the site, which has been redeposited in a later medieval context.

4.5 Palaeo-environmental remains

General

4.5.1 The following comprise summaries of the full environmental reports, which can be found as Appendices 6 and 7

Charred plant remains by Wendy Smith (OA)

4.5.2 Charcoal layer 108 to the west of garden wall 102 was analysed. Only charcoal, much of which was clearly roundwood, was observed in the flot and heavy residue fractions. No charred plant remains (e.g. seeds, fruits, nuts) or other ecofacts (e.g. bone and molluscs) were noted. Those larger fragments that were sufficiently dry to work with were all tentatively identified as hawthorn group/cherry (POMOIDEAE/Prunus spp.) type. Drawings of the college by James Green (VCH Oxon iii, pls 125 and 139) clearly show parts of this area were in use as orchards and gardens in 1751.

The animal bone by Rachel Scales (OA)

4.5.3 Three animal bone fragments were identified with the aid of the Oxford Archaeology bone reference collection and published texts. One chicken (Gallus gallus) femur (114), a cattle (Bos taurus) metatarsal and a fragment of sheep/goat (Ovis aries/ Capra hircus) maxillus (3) were recovered from medieval soil deposits associated with the construction of the yard/garden walls at Queens College.
5 DISCUSSION

5.1 Archaeology

5.1.1 Natural sand and gravel was identified by auger at a depth of 60.06 m, a depth of 2.11 m below the present ground level of the North Quadrangle. The small area of mixed gravel exposed at the base of the main excavation area could be disturbed natural material, possibly a mixture of gravel and the natural reddish-brown loam subsoil that usually caps the gravel on Oxford sites. No deposits dating to the prehistoric, Roman or Saxon periods were identified, however, flint materials found within a much later garden deposit (108) must be re-deposited and therefore hint at prehistoric occupation in the vicinity.

5.1.2 The NE corner of the medieval west range was identified during the works, and the foundations were seen to cut a layer containing stone roof tiles. Properties would have fronted the High Street prior to the construction of the college, and it is likely that the roof tiles derive from an early tenement.

5.1.3 The substantial stonework forming the corner of the NE corner of the medieval west range, is certainly forward of the line of the medieval north range as extrapolated by the alignment of the robber trench and the length of wall found in the 1987 trial trench. This matches all the historic views of this part of the college (see Fig. 3 and also Fig. 7, conjectural reconstruction). The college was founded in 1340 and pottery, dating from the 11th to 13th centuries, from an early soil layer outside the building supports this date. Unlike the north range, the west range appears to have had no basement or cellar.

5.1.4 The earliest evidence within the west range indicates that there was a hearth in the NE corner, possibly associated with a beaten earth floor, although little of either structure was fully exposed to confirm this. Dating for these events is scarce, though the presence of 14th-century decorated floor tile on site might suggest that the floors were tiled in the early days of the building (Plate 2). The hearth appears to have gone out of use and been overlain by deposits laid for a stone slab. It is unclear whether this indicates that the whole of the building had a stone floor, though traces of a continuation of stone slabs at a comparable level were seen in the opposite section of the investigation trench (Fig. 4).

5.1.5 There is a suggestion of a recess in the stonework at the NE corner, very probably for a doorway, and here a floor slab (or a step?) remained in situ. The doorway could have been narrow, perhaps only 0.75 m wide, and was possibly punched through the west range wall after the hearth had gone out of use. The date of this operation is unclear. A possible context for this is the construction of the Library building that was added on the west of the North Quadrangle between 1692 and 1695. This building might have closed off access to the gardens at the end of the west range, requiring a new exit on the east corner.
5.1.6 A stone path was laid against the corner of the west range wall (101) and also beside a narrow garden wall (102) extending away from the main building. The path may have led to the doorway, or possibly continued around the perimeter of the north range.

5.1.7 It is also possible that the stone slabs and recess formed the base of a chimney breast, however Loggan’s view of the west range (Fig. 7) shows a single chimney in the central part of the western range’s gable end. Due to the distance involved, it is unlikely that an eastern chimney base would have linked up with this structure.

5.1.8 The conjectured western extent of the medieval west range is shown on Fig. 7, which is based on the present investigations, the results of the 2007 test pits, Blair’s 1987 trench and work in 1903 that located the west end of the medieval chapel. This plan is based on Blair’s interpretation (Blair, 1988).

5.1.9 Historical records tell us that in c 1719 the medieval north range was swept away, presumably with the west range. A new north range was constructed on a slightly different alignment and the Williamson Building enlarged to complete the North Quadrangle circuit as it appears today.

5.1.10 Thick layers of fine limestone, towards the top of the sequence, noted in the service trenches and in the larger excavation area, could be debris left by masons working stone on site for the new college buildings in the early part of the 18th century (Brian Durham pers comm.).

5.2 **Depth below ground of structural remains**

5.2.1 The top of the west range wall 101 was revealed between 0.8 m and 1.2 m below the present ground level, given the varying height levels of the surviving stonework after demolition. The adjacent path structure (100) and garden wall (102) survive at a comparable level, and in places higher (c 0.7 m below ground level).

5.2.2 The limited nature of the investigation means that it is unclear whether the demolition and robbing of the structures, was carried to this depth consistently over the area where the planned basement is to be constructed.

5.2.3 Further investigation would be required to identify whether the west range was equipped with a stone floor, or for any further evidence of the medieval tiles recovered from later demolition deposits. However, any floor would survive above the base of the proposed new kitchen basement.
### APPENDIX 1  ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT INVENTORIES

Table A.1.1  Service trenches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Service trench 1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Sandy gravel beneath topsoil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Service trench 1</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Broken limestone and sand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Service trench 1, 2</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6+</td>
<td>Fill of robber trench 6</td>
<td>CBM/clay tobacco pipe</td>
<td>17th-18thC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Service trench 1, 2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Broken limestone and sand</td>
<td>Pot/CBM/clay tobacco pipe</td>
<td>1690-1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Service trench 1, 2</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.22+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil layer</td>
<td>pot</td>
<td>1650-1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Service trench 1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.6+</td>
<td>Robber trench, continuation of Blair’s trench, 1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Trench 3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.4+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil cut by robber trench 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Trench 3</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.3+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limestone fill of 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern service trench</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravel surface/path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paving stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make up for 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make-up for 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Trench 4</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.1.2 Main trench

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ctx</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Thick/Depth (m)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Pitched stone path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>NE corner wall west range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Yard wall, sandstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>Topsoil in N. Quad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Mortar construction debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Make up layer</td>
<td>Pot/CBM/tobacco pipe</td>
<td>19thC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Mortar demolition/construction debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Construction material over wall 110</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>L12-18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Charcoal fire debris flint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Void</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Clay material from wall construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Garden soil, cut by wall 102/120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Mortar btw walls 101 &amp; 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Soil layer btw walls 101/102</td>
<td>Pot/CBM</td>
<td>13-15thC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Soil layer btw walls 101/102</td>
<td></td>
<td>1075-1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Soil layer btw walls 101/102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Mortar and sand bedding for slabs 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Foundation trench for wall 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Fill of trench 117</td>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>13th-16thC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Clay layer incl. Stone roof tile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Construction cut for wall 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Clay layer incl. Stone roof tile</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>L12-18thC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Robber trench from C14 college wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>Fill within 122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Primary infill of robber trench 122</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>14thC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Stone slab floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Soil and charcoal over 135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Foundation cut for pitched stones 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Bedding for 100, in 127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Soil over 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Fill of robber trench 131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Robber trench from C14 college wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Soil at base of excavation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?redeposited natural gravel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Pitched stones, blackened - probable hearth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Soil over stones 135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Construction cut for hearth 134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Floor make up butting wall 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Cut of unknown function through 137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Fill of 138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Demolition material C18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Demolition material C18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Demolition material C18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2  POTTERY

by John Cotter (OA)

Introduction and methodology
A total of 12 sherds of pottery weighing 234 g. were recovered from six contexts. This is all of medieval and post-medieval date. All the pottery was examined and spot-dated during the present assessment stage.

For each context the total pottery sherd count and weight were recorded on an Excel spreadsheet, followed by the context spot-date which is the date-bracket during which the latest pottery types in the context are estimated to have been produced or were in general circulation. Comments on the presence of datable types were also recorded, usually with mention of vessel form (jugs, bowls etc.) and any other attributes worthy of note (eg. decoration etc.).

Date and nature of the assemblage
The pottery assemblage is in a fresh but fragmentary condition. A dripping pan profile was recovered from context (118). Ordinary domestic pottery types are represented. The pottery is described in detail in the spreadsheet and summarised below.

The earliest piece in the assemblage is three joining sherds from the sagging base of a jar/cooking pot in Medieval Oxford ware (OXY) dating to c 1075-1250 (context 114). Medieval Brill/Boarstall ware (OXAM) occurs in two contexts (113 and 118) including a dripping pan profile in (118). This would have been used for collecting fat or dripping from spit-roasts. Although this ware has a broad date range (c 1200-1600) it is unlikely that the pieces here belong to the latter part of this range.

Likewise the post-medieval wares comprise types commonly known from Oxford during the 17th-18th centuries. The composition of the assemblage as a whole is typical of many sites in Oxford and is fairly unremarkable. The dripping pan suggests a connection with cooking areas but otherwise the assemblage is too small to draw any wide-ranging conclusions. In view of the small size and mixed nature of the assemblage, no further work is recommended.
### Table A.2.1  Pottery by context and spot date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ctx</th>
<th>Spot-date</th>
<th>Sherds</th>
<th>Wt (g)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>L17-18C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bs English tin-glazed earthenware dish with int horiz blue line. Yellow fabric. Fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>c1650-1700</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Bs brown-glazed Border ware mug - post-1650? Bs Brill redware or more likely Border redware jar/jug with ext copper-green glaze. Rim green-glazed Border ware dish. Bs Frechen German stoneware jug. All fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>19C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Base Staffs white blue transfer-printed dish (WHEW). Fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>13-15C?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>OXAM Brill/Boarstall jug pad base w copper-green glaze. Fresh. Full date range c1200-1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>c1075-1250</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>OXY Medieval Oxford ware. 1 vess. Joining sherds from sagging base of cook pot. Sooted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>13-16C?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1 vess. OXAM dripping pan profile. Smooth dense fabric with yellow glaze on floor &amp; lower walls int. Fresh. Slight sooting ext &amp; partly over break. Full date range c1200-1600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOT** | **12** | **234** |

**APPENDIX 3  CERAMIC BUILDING MATERIAL AND STONE**

*by John Cotter (OA) and Ruth Shaffrey (OA)*

**Introduction and methodology**

A combined total of 16 pieces of ceramic (CBM) and stone building material (BM) weighing 9820 g were recovered from seven contexts and submitted for identification. These are of medieval and post-medieval date. All this material was examined and spot-dated during the present assessment stage in a similar way to the pottery. Complete dimensions and other useful measurements were recorded when present. As usual, the dating of broken fragments of building material is an imprecise art and spot-dates derived from them are necessarily broad and should therefore be regarded with caution. The manufacturing date of a roof tile, for example, may be several centuries earlier than the context it was eventually discarded in, depending on how long the tile remained in use.

**Date and nature of the assemblage**

Most pieces are fairly large and fresh. Only one of the ceramic pieces (context 113) shows considerable wear. The assemblage as a whole potentially spans the late 12th century through to the 19th or early 20th century. Individual objects are described in some detail in the spreadsheet and summarised below within their material group.

**Ceramic Building Material (CBM)**

This comprises 6 pieces weighing 895 g. The assemblage is divided into types of floor tile and types of roof tile. The low presence of plain roof tile is notable. Perhaps the most significant and interesting item is a large piece of medieval decorated floor tile from context (124). This has an eagle design in white slip under a clear glaze and a sandy salmon-pink fabric. It is probably of 14th century date and a product of the Penn/Chiltern tileworks in Buckinghamshire. The design is part of the Queen’s College crest, and it is not exactly matched in the extensive published typologies of these types (Hohler 1942; Haberly 1937). The only other notable thing about it is its surprisingly fresh condition. The other two pieces
of floor tile are plain unglazed quarry tiles. One is of uncertain medieval or early post-medieval date (context 3) while the other is of 19th or early 20th century date (context 105) in keeping with the single sherd of pottery from this context. Roof tiles comprise two pieces of medieval ridge tile (contexts 4 and 105), one glazed and one unglazed, and one worn piece of medieval plain flat roof tile (113).

**Stone Building Material (BM)**

This comprises 10 pieces weighing 8925 g from two contexts (107 and 121). These represent a minimum of nine stone roofing tiles that are present as large fresh pieces, in one or two cases complete or nearly complete. None shows evidence of mortar although some show limey percolation deposits from years of exposure and weathering, although none shows evidence of marked exposure or wear. They are mostly of grey or yellowish limestone of various grades, roughly hewn, although one appears to be in fine grey sandstone. Most appear to be of rectangular or sub-rectangular shape, probably with a rounded upper end with a centrally placed, neatly bored, circular nail hole. Measurable widths are in the range 160-200 mm. Lengths are in the range 180-290+ mm, but the longest examples are incomplete. Thicknesses vary from 11 to 25 mm with the latter thickness being fairly common. Nail holes are 9-11 mm in diameter. One smaller tile is roughly teardrop-shaped with the nail hole at the narrower end. This had a length of 210 mm, width of 160 mm and is 20 mm thick. Size variability is common in stone tiles as different sized tiles were made for different areas of the roof, with the smallest at the top and the largest at the bottom. Traditionally stone roofing tiles or ‘slates’ of this type are said to come from the Stonesfield quarries in north-west Oxfordshire. Their use in Oxfordshire is documented from the late 12th up until the early 19th century.

**Recommendations**

Apart from the medieval decorated floor tile, which has yet to be exactly paralleled in the region, none of the CBM is particularly remarkable for a site in central Oxford. The decorated floor tile has been adequately recorded and photographed and should be published at some future date.
### Table A.3.1 Ceramic Building Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ctx</th>
<th>Spot-date</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Sherds</th>
<th>Wt (g)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13-15C</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Apex angle from a glazed ridge tile - apparently of simple angled form. Fresh. Light orange sandy fabric (Fabric IIIB?) with ext clear glaze with dark green streaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>19- E20C?</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Edge frag modern-looking grey overfired floor/quarry tile. Unglazed. Industrial-looking with modern-looking white mortar adhering. Fresh. 18mm thick. Also 1x frag end-edge early-type ridge tile in unglazed oolitic limestone-tempered brown fabric (Fabric IB) prob 13C, fairly fresh. Trace of 'pinched' depression from base of crest just visible. 15mm thick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>L12-18C</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2968</td>
<td>Fresh frags min 3 stone roof tiles. 2 in yellowish limestone &amp; 1 in fine grey sandstone or fine sandy grey limestone. Latter tile with complete small sub triangular/trapezoidal outline Length 180mm, Width (at lower end) c160mm (est), at top c110mm, Thick 25mm, with single circular bored nailhole at top centre, diam 9mm. Second tile (2 joining) = complete lower end in granular limestone Width 243mm, Thick 20mm. Third tile in coarse shelly limestone - broken but poss lozenge shaped w circ nailhole at top, max width (complete) 215mm, Thick 25mm, nailhole 11mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>13-14C</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Worn body frag orange-pink firing sandy chalk-flecked early roof tile (Fabric VII), unglazed. Max 20mm thick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>L12-18C</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5957</td>
<td>Fresh frags min prob 6 stone roof tiles in grey &amp; yellowish limestone, coarse and fine. Only 2 have circ nailholes surviving. 1 of these in coarse shelly yellow limestone. teardrop-shaped, Length 210mm, Width 160mm, Thick 20mm, nailhole diam 10mm. Other tile w nailhole diam 10mm in fine grey limestone, Thick 25mm, prob sub-rectang w central nailhole at top, complete width 147mm, L 180mm+. Another tile in coarse grey shelly limestone, large sub-rectang, complete Width 190mm, Length 290+mm, Thick 25mm. Another tapering large sub-rectang tile in fine grey limestone, complete Width 200mm, Length 280+mm, Thick 11-17mm, laminar splitting. Final tile also in fine grey limestone, large rectangular, complete Width 165mm, Length 245+mm, Thick 15mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>14C</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>Two-thirds complete decorated floor tile. Fresh. Prob Penn/Chiltern product. Pink-buff (or salmon-pink) sandy fabric with occasional coarse pellets of cream pipeclay and occas cream pipeclay fine streaking, also moderate finer red clay pellets and occas streaks. Sanded underside. Sides only v slightly bevelled, fresh unchipped. Tile broken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ctx | Spot-date | Mat | Sherds | Wt (g) | Comments
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---

| horizontally across the square and at right angles relative to axis of the design with 2 corners 'upper' surviving. Width 132mm, Thickness 23-25mm. Printed design (upper 2/3 only survive) of eagle with outstretched wings and right-facing beak. Parts of corner quatrefoils and parallel outlines or fillers outside these. Design in thin white slip under uneven clear glaze - glossy in places, patchy elsewhere. Design not exactly matched in local typologies incl Hohler 1942 & Haberly 1937, therefore rare. Photograph taken

**Worked Stone**
*by Ruth Shaffrey (OA)*

Two pieces of stone were retained. The stone was examined with the aid of a x10 magnification hand lens. Both pieces of stone are worked and are types of Jurassic shelly limestone. One is a narrow rectangular roof-stone (121). The other is of similar working to a roof-stone but is rather thick and may have been more appropriate as a wall course or a floor stone, although it shows no evidence of having been used for either (107). The assemblage has no real potential and no further work is recommended.

**Table A.3.2. Worked Stone by context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ctx</th>
<th>Descrip</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Wt (g)</th>
<th>Lithology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>Thick slab. Looks like roof stone but seems too thick for this. Perhaps intended for use as a wall course or in a floor.</td>
<td>Measures 42mm max thickness</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>Fine grained well cemented shelly limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Roof-stone</td>
<td>Narrow rectangular roofstone. One large corner and top missing so presumably this is where the perforation was.</td>
<td>Measures &gt;310 x 200 x 28mm</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Well cemented shelly limestone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX 4 CLAY PIPE**
*by John Cotter (OA)*

Eight pieces of clay pipe weighing 69 g were recovered from three contexts. These have been catalogued and spot-dated in a similar way to the pottery though in slightly more detail. Bowl shapes have been compared to those published from St Ebbe’s, Oxford (Oswald 1984).

Three stem and five bowl pieces are present including three complete bowls. These are all plain and unmarked although most pieces are well-burnished and thick stemmed suggesting a fairly early date.

The largest number of pieces (including four bowls) are from context (105) which includes mid and later 17th-century bowl types but also a stem fragment with a prominent spur suggesting a late 17th or early 18th century date. The fairly cohesive date and fresh condition of these pieces is puzzling considering the only pieces of pottery and tile from this context are of definite 19th century date. The pieces from the other two contexts are also likely to be of late 17th or early 18th century date.
### Table A.4.1 Clay pipes by context and date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ctx</th>
<th>Spot-date</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Bowl</th>
<th>Mouth</th>
<th>Tot sherds</th>
<th>Tot Wt</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17-18C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stem bore (SB) c2mm. Fresh. Good quality burnish - prob 17C to mid 18C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>c1690-1720?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fresh bowl frag with complete small circular heel, well burnished. Probably as Oswald 1984 fig. 51.C. SB of bowl and separate stem c2mm. Bowl heat-scorched ext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>c1675-1725?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3x complete fresh 17C bowls incl stubby spurred barrel-shaped type as Oswald 1984 fig. 51.B c1650-90 &amp; similar but sleeker bowl, both well burnished. 1x slightly worn earlier bowl with stubby spur c1640-60 (national typology). 1x early prominent spurred type lacking bowl but with thick burnished stem - prob L17C/E18C - spot-date based on this. All SBs c2mm or slightly greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOT** | **3** | **5** | **0** | **8** | **69** |

### APPENDIX 5 FLINT ASSESSMENT

*By David Mullin (OA)*

A total of twenty-three pieces of burnt flint were recovered from a single context (108). The flint is generally in a poor condition having been extensively burnt and shattered and assessment of raw materials was not possible, due to the burnt nature of the flint.

**Table A.5.1: Flint by context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Raw Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>23 burnt flint chips</td>
<td>Not visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The material recovered consists of waste flakes from the latter stages of the reduction sequence. The material is not diagnostic, but illustrates prehistoric (Neolithic to Bronze Age) activity on or near the site, which has been redepósited in a later medieval context. The assemblage is heavily burnt, but the small quantities recovered limit the interpretation of the material beyond illustrating a human presence here during the earlier prehistoric period.
APPENDIX 6 ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

By Dr Wendy Smith (OA)

Introduction
One bulk soil sample was collected from a substantial charcoal layer located to the west of garden wall 102, which is believed to be of medieval or post-medieval date. Assessment was carried out in order to establish:

- if charred plant remains (including charcoal) were present and of interpretable value
- if the charred plant remains might provide information on agricultural practice
- if the charcoal might provide information on fuel use
- if charred plant remains might provide information on patterns rubbish disposal on site
- if other classes of environmental remains (e.g. animal bone, charcoal or molluscs) are also present.

Method
The soil sample collected was 10 L in volume and was processed by flotation using a modified Siraf flotation machine for the recovery of charred plant macrofossils. Flots were sieved to 0.25 mm and heavy residues were retained in a 0.5mm mesh. Heavy residues were sorted by eye, but did not contain environmental remains apart from charcoal. The author rapidly scanned the flot and heavy residue material, using a low-power binocular microscope at a magnification of x12.5. Identification of charcoal to an individual genus or group was made at x40 magnification, based on the transverse section, only using existing breaks. Only a small sub-sample of charcoal was scanned. Radial and tangential features on the charcoal, which would require higher powers of magnification, were not examined for this evaluation. As a result, wood charcoal identifications should be seen as an indication of whether the assemblage is varied. Identification of dried-out waterlogged wood was not attempted for this assessment, largely because the transverse sections examined were too abraded for general characterisation. Comparative material was not consulted for charcoal and other plant macrofossil identifications during this assessment. As a result, all of the identifications presented here should be seen as highly provisional.

Results
The evaluation results for charred plant remains (including charcoal) from the charcoal layer to the west of garden wall 102 (sample 1, context 108) at Queen’s College, Oxford is presented in Table 1. Only charcoal, much of which was clearly roundwood, was observed in the flot and heavy residue fractions. No charred plant remains (e.g. seeds, fruits, nuts, etc.) or other ecofacts (e.g. bone and molluscs) were noted. Nomenclature for indigenous plant taxa follows Stace (1997).

The flot was still relatively damp at the time of assessment, but clearly was entirely charcoal, most of which was remarkably well preserved. Those larger fragments that were sufficiently dry to work with were all tentatively identified as hawthorn group/ cherry (POMOIDEAE/ Prunus spp.) type. The >10 and 10-2mm heavy residue fractions were fully dry at the time of this evaluation and all charcoal examined from the heavy residue was also hawthorn group/ cherry (POMOIDEAE/ Prunus spp.) type. Most of the fragments were clearly from roundwood; some of which were >5 cm in diameter.
Potential
Sample 1 (context 108 to the west of garden wall 102) contains abundant remains of charcoal, primarily from roundwood, which all appear to be from hawthorn group/ cherry (POMOIDEAE/ Prunus spp.) type taxa. Drawings of the college by James Green (VCH Oxon iii, pls 125 & 139) clearly show parts of this area were in use as orchards and gardens in 1751.

It seems plausible that the use of this area as an orchard was of longstanding. Roundwood charcoal may represent pruning debris from a garden or orchard, something which is traditionally disposed of through burning, usually in the immediate vicinity of a garden/orchard. Confirmation of this hypothesis would require full analysis of the recovered charcoal as well as an AMS C14 date, if no other means of dating the deposit were available.
Table A.6.1: Charred plant remains from a medieval charcoal layer (context 108)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Feature Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sample Vol (L)</th>
<th>Flot Vol (ml)</th>
<th>Grain</th>
<th>Chaff</th>
<th>Weeds</th>
<th>Other Charred</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Charcoal</th>
<th>Mollusc</th>
<th>CPR Potential</th>
<th>Full Analysis CPR</th>
<th>Charcoal Potential</th>
<th>Full Analysis Charcoal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>charcoal layer within soil layers accumulated to the west of wall 102</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>10 L</td>
<td>4340 ml</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ca. 10% of flot scanned - appears to all be hawthorn group (POMOIDEAE) or possibly cherry/ blackthorn (Prunus spp.) type charcoal. A great deal of roundwood (some quite large sized) present. No charred plant remains other than charcoal observed. CPR assessed as POOR.
APPENDIX 7  THE ANIMAL BONE
By Rachel Scales (OA)

Three animal bone fragments were identified with the aid of the Oxford Archaeology bone reference collection and published texts. One chicken (*Gallus gallus*) femur (114), a cattle (*Bos taurus*) metatarsal and a fragment of sheep/goat (*Ovis aries/ Capra hircus*) maxillus (3) were recovered from medieval soil deposits associated with the construction of the yard/garden walls at Queens College (Table below).

Table A.7.1. Bones by quantity and context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ctx</th>
<th>Feature Type</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fill of robber trench 6</td>
<td>Sheep/Goat</td>
<td>Maxillary bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Soil layer between walls 101/102</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Metatarsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Soil layer between walls 101/102</td>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>Femur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 9  SUMMARY OF SITE DETAILS

Site name: The Queen’s College, Oxford. Kitchen Extension
Site code: OXQUCK 08
Grid reference: SP 5179 0635
Type of investigation: Evaluation and watching brief
Date and duration of project: March 2008, 2 weeks
Area of site: 0.2 ha.

Summary of results: Layers of construction/demolition debris cut by the foundation trench and wall forming the NE corner of the medieval West Range depicted on historic views. The northern end of West Range was equipped with a hearth and later a possible doorway inserted within the wall leading to the yard outside. A narrow garden wall and a path were identified leading to the building and these are probably of later medieval/early post-medieval date. The northern line of the medieval North Range identified in a previous excavation was confirmed in service trenches and trial pits by its robber trench. Demolition debris above the structures and the robber trench dates to around 1719, when the present North Quadrangle circuit was completed with a new North Range.

Location of archive: The archive is currently held at OA, Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford, OX2 0ES, and will be deposited with Oxfordshire County Museums Service in due course, under the following accession number: OXCMS 2008.26
Figure 1: Site location

Scale 1:10,000
Figure 4: Watching Brief sections
Figure 5: Evaluation trench plan
Figure 6: Evaluation trench sections
Figure 7: Conjectural reconstruction of medieval college based on 1903, 1987, 2007 and 2008 excavations
Plate 1: West Range wall 101, step/stone floor 125 and hearth 134, top left. Looking west

Plate 2: 14th century decorated floor tile from context 124