Archaeological Test Pit Evaluation at Manor Farm Eltisley
An Archaeological Test Pit Evaluation at Manor Farm, Eltisley

By James Fairbairn

With contributions by David Crawford-White, Chris Faine MA MSc AIfA, Rachel Fosberry HNC AIfA and Dr Charles Turner

Editor: Stephen Macaulay BA MPhil MIfA, Chris Thatcher BA

Illustrator: David Brown BA, Stuart Ladd MA

Report Date: February 2012
Report Number: 1319
Site Name: Manor Farm Eltisley
HER Event No: ECB3672
Date of Works: October 2011
Client Name: English Heritage
Client Ref: n/a
Planning Ref: n/a
Grid Ref: NGR TL273593
Site Code: ESLMAF11
Finance Code: ESLMAF11
Receiving Body: CCC Stores, Landbeach

Accession No:
Prepared by: James Fairbairn
Position: Supervisor
Date: December 2011

Checked by: Stephen Macaulay
Position: Manager
Date: February 2012
Signed: [Signature]

Disclaimer
This document has been prepared for the titled project or named part thereof and should not be relied upon or used for any other project without an independent check being carried out as to its suitability and prior written authority of Oxford Archaeology being obtained. Oxford Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability for the consequences of this document being used for a purpose other than the purposes for which it was commissioned. Any person/party using or relying on the document for such other purposes agrees and will by such use or reliance be taken to confirm their agreement to indemnify Oxford Archaeology for all loss or damage resulting therefrom. Oxford Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability for this document to any party other than the person/party by whom it was commissioned.

Oxford Archaeology East,
15 Trafalgar Way,
Bar Hill,
Cambridge,
CB23 8SQ

t: 01223 850500
f: 01223 850599
e: oaeast@thehumanjourney.net
w: http://thehumanjourney.net/oaeast

© Oxford Archaeology East 2011
Oxford Archaeology Limited is a Registered Charity No: 285827

© Oxford Archaeology East
# Table of Contents

## Summary

## 1 Introduction

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.2 Geology and topography

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

1.4 Acknowledgements

1.5 Bibliography

## 2 Aims and Methodology

2.1 Aims

2.2 Methodology

## 3 Results

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Test Pit 1

3.3 Test Pit 2

3.4 Test Pit 3

3.5 Test Pit 4

3.6 Test Pit 5

3.7 Test Pit 6

3.8 Test Pit 7

3.9 Test Pit 8

3.10 Test Pit 9

3.11 Test Pit 10

3.12 Test Pit 11

3.13 Test Pit 12

3.14 Test Pit 13

3.15 Test Pit 14

3.16 Test Pit 15

3.17 Test Pit 16
3.18 Test Pit 16.......................................................................................................................13
3.19 (Trench 5a) Primary School Excavation .................................................................13
3.20 Finds Summary.........................................................................................................14
3.21 Environmental Summary.........................................................................................14

4 Discussion and Conclusions......................................................................................15
  4.1 Manor Farm ..............................................................................................................15
  4.2 Significance...............................................................................................................15

Appendix A. Finds Reports............................................................................................16
  A.1 Pottery......................................................................................................................16
  A.2 Worked Bone...........................................................................................................16
  A.3 Metalwork................................................................................................................17
  A.4 Clay Pipe..................................................................................................................18
  A.5 Glass........................................................................................................................18
  A.6 Ceramic and Stone building material .................................................................19

Appendix B. Environmental Reports............................................................................20
  B.1 Environmental samples.........................................................................................20
  B.2 Faunal Remains......................................................................................................21
  B.3 Shell........................................................................................................................24
  B.4 Auger Survey Report...............................................................................................25

Appendix C. The Eltisley Moats Community Project Report........................................28
  C.1 Outreach..................................................................................................................28

Appendix D. OASIS Report Form .................................................................................35
List of Figures
Fig. 1    Site location map
Fig. 2    Test pit locations
Fig. 3    Section and plans

List of Plates
Plate. 1  Possible earlier enclosure
Plate. 2  Test Pit 2
Plate. 3  Test Pit 11
Plate. 4  Test Pit 12
Summary

Between the 6th to 8th of October 2011 Oxford Archaeology East, assisted by members of the Eltisley Local History Society, pupils from Hills Road Six Form College, The Perse School Archaeology group and children from Newton Primary School, carried out a test pit archaeological investigation within the moated enclosure at Manor Farm Eltisley. Manor Farm, Eltisley, is a Scheduled Monument of National Importance. This was the first part of the English Heritage funded Eltisley Moats Project, which is looking at the relationship between the moated sites in and around the historic village of Eltisley, Cambridgeshire.

The excavation of 15 test pits revealed evidence for human activity spanning the last two thousand years, including the remains of the earlier medieval manor which stood on the site.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation was conducted at Manor Farm, Eltisley, Cambridgeshire, in accordance with a Brief issued by Dave Kenny of English Heritage and supplemented by a Specification prepared by OA East.

1.1.2 Eltisley Manor is a Scheduled Monument (known as the Moated Site at Manor Farm, Eltisley, South Cambs, Cambridgeshire SM No. 33274) and as such is protected under the 1979 Ancient Monument and Archaeological Areas Act. Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) was applied for and approved before any ground works were undertaken on the site.

1.1.3 The work was designed to assist in defining the character and extent of any archaeological remains within the proposed redevelopment area, in accordance with the guidelines set out in Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (Department for Communities and Local Government 2010). The results will enable decisions to be made by English Heritage and Cambridgeshire County Council, on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, with regard to the treatment of any archaeological remains found.

1.1.4 The site archive is currently held by OA East and will be deposited with the appropriate county stores in due course.

1.2 Geology and topography

1.2.1 Manor Farm is located in the village of Eltisley, which lies to the south of the modern A428, 7km east of St Neots and 18km west of Cambridge. The farm house lies within in a moated site less than half a kilometre south of the medieval village green. Eltisley parish is relatively small at just 800ha and lies on the borders of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire. It occupies a plateau of watersheds dividing streams which flow south-east to the Bourn Brook, west to the upper Ouse at St Neots and the Lower Ouse at St Ives. The local geology of the area consists of glacial deposits of boulder clay with pockets of sand and gravel of varying sizes, sometimes referred to as till (Edmonds & Dinham 1965; BGS Sheet 187). The site lies at 64m AOD.

1.3 Archaeological and historical background

Prehistoric

1.3.1 Prehistoric track ways are thought to stem from the present day village green, however no prehistoric finds have been found within the parish.

Roman

1.3.2 Roman pottery and coins have been discovered in two locations within the parish, firstly at Caxton End, where a scatter of Romano British pottery was discovered during a field walking survey carried out by the Eltisley Local History Society in 2001 and also on land adjacent Manor Farm, where small amounts of Romano-British pottery and two coins were found. Furthermore, a geophysical survey conducted by GSB Prospection Ltd at Caxton End, concluded that the location may have been the site of a small Romano-British farmstead.
**Medieval**

1.3.3 Eltisley is centred on a medieval green at the junction between the Cambridge to St Neots and the Biggleswade to St Ives Roads. There was a further road from the green leading eastwards towards Caxton. The church of St Pandonia and St John the Baptist is situated on The Green side of the St Neots road and has architectural features dating from the 12th century. The Green itself is faced by several buildings dating from the 16th to 18th Centuries and may have formed the main settlement area for medieval Eltisley (VHC 1973, 47). Earthworks, including former medieval house platforms, are known lying adjacent to the west of the road from Biggleswade. (SMR 2351 and 10020). The medieval houses located next to the road to Potton End raises the possibility that there were also houses along the other roads as well.

1.3.4 A second Green at Caxton End, located on the road to Caxton, and a moated site adjacent to and to the east perhaps imply another centre of population (CHER 1179). It is however uncertain whether Caxton End represented a separate medieval focus or resulted from later expansion of the original village nucleus. Two 17th and 18th century houses presently front the south side of the route way (RCHME 1968,90) though it is not known whether this was also the site of medieval settlement. This route may have formerly been a major thoroughfare that in the 15th Century was referred to as the Kings Highway and ran from St Neots to Caxton (VCH 1973,47).

1.3.5 Until the latter half of 20th century most of the parish was covered with ridge and furrow (RCHME 1968,96), which was plotted and drawn by RCHME.

**Historical Background- Documentary Evidence**

1.3.6 The Domesday book of 1086 records Eltisley as Hecteslei meaning 'Wood (leah) of Elti', which would suggest an Anglo Saxon settlement in a wooded area (VCH 1973,46). The Domesday book records that during the reign of Edward the Confessor Eltisley formed part of the estates of Earl Alfgar, who died in c.1062 and was one of the twelve vills of the royal hundred of Longstowe. In 1086 27 peasants were recorded in Eltisley. Since only the heads of household are recorded, it is suggested that theses figures should be multiplied by a factor of four or five to arrive at a true estimate of population. This would give the village an estimated population of between 108 and 135 people in 1086. Although only rated at 3 hides, it had land for 9 ploughs and was valued at £13 which is the same rated value as in the time of Edward the Confessor, one of the most valuable in the Longstowe hundred. This suggests at the time of the Domesday Book there was already a well established settlement at Eltisley.

1.3.7 Tradition states that a 10th century Saxon nunnery was founded at Eltisley and was transferred to Hinchinbrooke after the Norman conquest. Pandonia, the daughter of a Scottish king, is said to have taken refuge in the nunnery (Haigh 1988), which is also referred to as Eltisley Abbey. Its existence and location is the subject of some debate (RCHME 1963,90); early OS maps place it to the south of the church dedicated to St. Pandonia and St John the Baptist, other sources place it at Paple Grove (Haig 1988).

1.3.8 In 1086 Eltisley appears to be held as a single manor (VCH 1973, 52). The Normans gave the estate of Eltisley to the Cathedral of St Mary, Bayeux (Calvados). The Canons may have lost these lands by 1088 (VCH 1973, 47-48). Neil, Bishop of Ely, confirmed grants of land made by Roger De Mowbray, whose family had obtained Eltisley, in the middle of the 12th century. The manor became known as Stowe in the 14th century and was acquired and lost many times during the medieval and post-medieval periods. It has been suggested that the original manor house may have been located on the site of the present Manor Farm moat (CHER 1142a).
1.3.9 During the late 12th century and early 13th century, Eltisley was divided into two fields (probably east and north) and by the 14th century there were three (Papley, Middle and East) (VCH 1973,53), this may have been the result of the three manors known to have been established within Eltisley by 1279. Musters manor is known from 1202 though by the 14th century it had been absorbed into the principle manor of Eltisley and the whereabouts of the manor house is unknown. There was a manor at Papley which originated in a series of grants of land in Eltisley and Caxton made to Hinchinbrooke between the mid 12th and early 14th century. The moated site is presumably the site of the manor house (CHER 1049). During this period, several large farms were held in freehold and several of the moated sites may have belonged to farms.

1.3.10 This subdivision of the parish into new manors and other land parcels had little apparent effect on its wealth and in 1327 40 villagers are recorded paying tax. By 1377 this figure had risen to 136 adults, the highest population in the hundred and a significantly greater population than calculated for 1086. Such an expansion in population in the 12th and 13th centuries is in line with estimates for national population growth during the period. There was a relative decline in population in Eltisley in the later medieval and post-medieval periods (VCH 1973,47).

1.3.11 Eltisley seems to have had at least two main centres of population. A document of 1456 distinguishes between dwellings in “le Estende” and “le Upende” (VCH 1973, 47). The former being Caxton End (formerly called East End) with the latter presumably around the green and the church.
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2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims
2.1.1 The objective of this test pit evaluation was to determine as far as reasonably possible the presence/absence, location, nature, extent, date, quality, condition and significance of any surviving archaeological deposits within the development area.

2.2 Methodology
2.2.1 Seventeen test pits measuring 1m x 1m were hand dug at pre-determined locations within the moated area of Manor Farm.

2.2.2 Machine excavation of a single trench was carried out under constant archaeological supervision with a wheeled JCB-type excavator using a toothless ditching bucket.

2.2.3 The site survey was carried out by Rachel Clarke using a Leica GPS

2.2.4 Spoil, exposed surfaces and features were scanned with a metal detector. All metal-detected and hand-collected finds were retained for inspection, other than those which were obviously modern.

2.2.5 All archaeological features and deposits were recorded using OA East’s pro-forma sheets. Trench locations, plans and sections were recorded at appropriate scales and colour and monochrome photographs were taken of all relevant features and deposits.

2.2.6 A total of seven bulk samples were taken during the test pit evaluation. All were processed at Oxford Archaeology East's environmental unit at Bourn under the supervision of Rachel Fosberry

2.2.7 Site conditions were variable with periods of sunshine and rain.
3 Results

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The test pits are discussed below in numbered order. They were located in order to investigate specific areas of potential interest including an area of garden to the rear of the farm house, a raised area that may have represented a house platform and a sunken area immediately in front of the farm thought to be the site of a fish pond.

3.1.2 A dark silty clay garden soil, containing modern pottery and glass was recorded in all of the test pits. This layer was on average 0.20m thick and was capped by a turf layer up to 0.10m thick.

3.2 Test Pit 1

3.2.1 Test Pit 1 was located in the western part of the rear lawn. It was excavated to a depth of 0.20m and contained roots and root disturbance. The size of roots proved a serious obstacle and as a result the pit was not fully excavated.

3.3 Test Pit 2

3.3.1 Test Pit 2 was located in the centre of the rear lawn and was excavated to a depth of 0.44m. An east to west aligned linear feature (204), filled by a dark brown silty clay was recorded truncating a pit (206) which contained a grey brown silty clay fill. The finds recovered from ditch 204 and pit 206 included bone and 12th century pottery. Ditch 204 may have represented a structural element such as a beam slot.

3.4 Test Pit 3

3.4.1 Test Pit 3 was located in the eastern part of the rear lawn. It was excavated to a depth of 0.54m and contained two layers, a dark brown silty garden soil (301.1) that overlay a silty clay subsoil (301.2). Finds from the 301.1 included a livery and military button and sherds of post-medieval and modern pottery. Layer 301.2 contained a mixture of pottery ranging in date from the medieval to modern periods.

3.5 Test Pit 4

3.5.1 Test Pit 4 was located on a possible building platform situated to the west of the house. It was excavated to maximum depth of 0.75m. Four layers were recorded, a yellow silty clay (404) overlay a grey silty clay (403) that was sealed by a dark silty subsoil (401) and finally by the topsoil layer (401.1). The finds, which included post-medieval pottery and bone did not confirm the presence of a building, however, the increased depth of deposits, particularly layers 403 and 404, do indicate deliberate build up of the ground that may well represent a platform for an earlier building.

3.6 Test Pit 5

3.6.1 Test Pit 5 was also located on the possible house platform. As with Test Pit 4 a increased depth of depth of deposits, which measured up to 0.90m thick, was recorded at this location. The earliest layer (505) was interpreted as a redeposited sub soil and contained a few sherds medieval pottery. Above this was a silty clay layer (504) into which was cut a small pit (503) that contained a piece of wood and a few small pieces of medieval pottery. The sequence was sealed by a garden soil (501) which contained post medieval and modern artefacts.
3.7 Test Pit 6
3.7.1 Test Pit 6 was located at the base of the possible house platform and was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.35m. Numerous garden features were recorded in this part of the site and a small east to west aligned linear gully (602) recorded in the test pit may have related to these. Gully 602 was overlain by a silty clay subsoil (601.2) and a mid grey silty clay garden soil. The finds recovered from these layers included animal bone and pot sherds ranging in date from the medieval to modern periods.

3.8 Test Pit 7
3.8.1 Test Pit 7 was not excavated as a result of time constraints.

3.9 Test Pit 8
3.9.1 Test Pit 8 was located to the north of the house on a raised area adjacent to the moat. It was excavated to a depth of 0.50m and revealed a small ditch or pit (806) in the south western corner which contained medieval pottery. Above this was a layer of grey silty clay subsoil (802) capped by a dark silty garden soil (801) both of which also contained pottery dating to the medieval period. The upper subsoil layer (801.2) produced a fragment of a chalk spindle whorl (see plate 20) and a small clothing clasp, both of which dated to the medieval period.

3.10 Test Pit 9
3.10.1 Test Pit 9 was located to the north west of the house and was the nearest test pit to the moat. It was excavated to a depth of 0.30m. Two layers were found before encountering a blue/grey clay which maybe a redeposited soil. A subsoil (901.2) which contained a small amount of post medieval and modern pottery and a topsoil/garden soil (901.1). There is a possibility that the clay encountered may have been originally excavated from the moated itself.

3.11 Test Pit 10
3.11.1 Test pit ten was located to the west of the house on the slope adjacent to the moat. It was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.48m. Three small pits (1004, 1006 & 1008) were excavated, all had similar silty clay fills and contained medieval pottery. They were sealed by a silty clay subsoil (1001.4) that was capped by a mid dark grey silty clay garden soil (1101.2) from which a fragment of saddle quern was recovered.

3.12 Test Pit 11
3.12.1 Test Pit 11 was located to the north of the house next to the foot path. It was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.70m. A small post hole (1107) was located in the south western corner of the test pit, at its northern limit, an east to west aligned ditch (1105) containing a pottery sherd of the Roman pottery was recorded. These underlay a layer of silty clay (1103) into which a cobbled and metalled surface (1102) had been pressed. Medieval pottery was found within layer 1103 and Ditch 1105 contained a pig mandible into which knot-like decorations had been carved, this is colloquially known as a “practice piece”. This artefact may possibly date to the Iron Age but could easily date to the Celtic revival of the Victorian period when Manor Farm is known to have had a slaughter house.
3.13 Test Pit 12
3.13.1 Test Pit 12 was located to the north of the house and in the bottom of the area thought to be a either a medieval fish pond or an area given over to flower beds and garden features. The natural clay was recorded at a depth of 0.55m. In the base of the test pit a number of large, unsorted stones were recorded within a redeposited silty clay fill (1204) that contained pottery and bone. This was sealed by a clay silt layer that was capped by a subsoil (1202) and a topsoil (1201.1).

3.14 Test Pit 13
3.14.1 Test Pit 13 was located to the east of the house on the slope of the fish pond/garden feature. It was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.30m. Its lower fill comprised a heavy silty clay (1302) underlying the topsoil (1301.1). A roughly laid cobbled surface was recorded that may have represented part of a garden feature. The finds in Test Pit 13 all dated to the post-medieval and modern periods.

3.15 Test Pit 14
3.15.1 Test Pit 14 was located directly to the north of the house within a few metres of the entrance. It was excavated to a depth of 0.33m and contained a clay layer (1403) overlain by a cobbled and metalled surface (1402) not dissimilar to (1102) in Test Pit 11. This was capped by a garden soil (1401.1). All find dated to the post-medieval or modern period.

3.16 Test pit 15
3.16.1 Test Pit 15 was located at the northern end of the site on the grass rise directly in front of the moat. It was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.30m and contained a mid grey brown silty clay soil. Although no archaeological features were found in Test Pit 15, a moderate amount of pottery was recovered that ranged in date from the medieval through to modern periods.

3.17 Test Pit 16
3.17.1 Test Pit 16 was located on the raised platform area to the west of the farm house. Due to time constraints this test pit was not fully excavated. The two layers that were excavated (160.1 & 1601.2) consisted of a grey chalky garden soil, heavily truncated by root disturbance. Pottery dating to the 19th century was found within these upper layers.

3.18 Test Pit 16
3.18.1 Test Pit 7 was not excavated as a result of time constraints.

3.19 (Trench 5a) Primary School Excavation
3.19.1 Pupils from the Newton Primary School helped excavate a shallow trench to directly north of the moat at Manor Farm. Although not within the moated enclosure it did provide evidence of a cobbled surface or a hard standing area. Pottery and finds from within the trench dated to the 19th and 20th century. Further digging revealed earlier finds from below the cobbled surface but due to health and safety factors this surface was not removed. This area may warrant further investigation sometime in the future. The cobbles and stones were all likely to have been collected locally and consisted mainly of flint cobbles. These were of varying sizes with no obvious uniformity.
3.20 Finds Summary

3.20.1 Finds recovered from the test pits consisted mainly of medieval and post-medieval pottery and ceramic building material all of which could be expected on a long standing settlement site.

3.20.2 Test Pit 10 contained a fragment of undated quern stone and Test Pit 8 produced a spindle whorl and clothing clasp of early medieval date from its upper subsoil layer. Test Pit 8 was located on the putative building platform and these artefacts may have been associated with a previous house or settlement on the site.

3.20.3 In Test Pit 11 a piece of pig jaw was recovered with Celtic motifs carved into it. This piece is undated at present but could relate to the Iron age or the Victorian period when a Celtic revival flourished; the fact that there was a slaughter house at Manor Farm during the Victorian period may help explain the provenance of this artefact.

3.20.4 Ceramic building material was recorded in almost all of the test pits and consisted of mainly brick and tile of local manufacture. Examples dating from the medieval to the modern periods were discovered, which would suggest that over the years Manor Farm has seen numerous phases of building work and demolition taking place.

3.21 Environmental Summary

3.21.1 The environmental samples revealed some charred cereal grain including wheat, oat and barley, all of which are commonly used in food preparation and animal feed. There was no evidence of germinated seed, so brewing or malting does not seem likely to have been taking place on the site of manor farm. The weed seeds found within the samples are all conducive with those growing within the cultivated crops and were likely to have been harvested at the same time as the cereals.
4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Manor Farm
4.1.1 The test pit excavations offered a rare insight into the pattern of occupation within the moat at Manor Farm. With the help of the local community this investigation of the physical and documentary evidence has determined that occupation on the site dates back to at least the 15th century and possibly much earlier. Furthermore, aerial photographs have demonstrated the possibility of an elongated enclosure (Plate 1), that may in fact have been much larger and older than first thought. This would be an area worthy of future investigation; if there were an older, larger enclosure associated with Manor Farm then this may help to confirm the belief that this was the primary moated site in Eltisley.

4.1.2 There is also a suggestion of Roman occupation in the vicinity, perhaps a small farmstead, in the form of the two small sherds of Romano-British pottery in Test Pit 11, the finds recovered by Mary Flinders of the Eltisley History Society from her own garden and the results of the geophysical survey carried out at Caxton End, to the north of the site (GSB Prospection Ltd, Report No 2004/1). This would not be surprising given the proximity of the major Roman Road of Ermine Street (modern A1198) running through Caxton 2.5km to the east.

4.1.3 The test pit excavation successfully confirmed that the mound or platform to the east of the present building probably did once support a larger building that extended eastwards and dispelled the idea that the sunken area in front of the farmhouse was once a medieval fishpond (Test Pits 6, 12 & 10).

4.1.4 The trench excavation carried out by the primary school pupils suggests that a trackway or hard standing existed to north of the moat. This possibly led to an older entrance to the moated enclosure.

4.2 Significance
4.2.1 These excavations have provided a useful insight into the historical development and occupation of the moated enclosure site at Manor Farm. They have also raised a number of questions that should perhaps form the basis for any further investigation, maybe led by the local community with professional support.

4.2.2 Further documentary research may shed light on the origins of the moated enclosure and there is scope for a geophysical survey to be conducted on the area outside the moated enclosure but within the possible enclosure seen on Plate 2. Physical investigation to the ditch to the west of Manor Farm may give some indication of the age of the suspected enclosure. The moated enclosure at Manor Farm gives a rare opportunity for the local residents of Eltisley to actively investigate an important feature of the village and to add to what is known of the history of the area.
APPENDIX A. FINDS REPORTS

By Carole Fletcher and James Fairbairn

A.1 Pottery
A.1.1 All test pits apart from Test Pit 1 produced pottery of some sort, although none was recovered from what could be described as a secure context. The bulk of the pottery was assigned to the post-medieval period and was recovered from the uppermost layers of the respective test pit. Some test pits did produce a mixture of medieval and post-medieval pottery within the same layer but this can be ascribed to normal garden type truncation and activity. Test pit 11 did provide a small piece of locally produced Romano-British Greyware, this was found in layer 1105. Other pottery of the same period was found in test pits 2 and thirteen but again this was mixed up with pottery from the post medieval periods so can thought to be residual. Medieval pottery was found in 6 of the 16 test pits (2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 8), but again this was mixed with pottery of a much later date.

A.1.2 The medieval pottery found was locally made and most probably of a utilitarian design. Some of the wares may have possibly been produced in Essex or Bedfordshire. St Neots Ware was represented in test pits 4, 5 and 14 but once again in insecure contexts that also produced pottery of a much later date.

A.1.3 Post-medieval pottery consisted of blue and white transfer printed wares and salt glazed stone wares. This type of pottery was found in all pits and is again conducive with what would likely be found on a site of this age and within a garden environment.

A.2 Worked Bone

By Chris Faine

Introduction

A.2.1 One piece of worked bone was recovered (SF 2) from Test Pit 11. This took the form of an adult pig mandible from an animal around 1-2 years of age. The caudal and dorsal portions of the ramus are chopped removing the condyle and gonion ventrale. Four areas of the ramus and alveolus are carved with distinct “knotwork” designs. Such “motif pieces” are found on variety of sites and commonly use flat elements such as scapulae and mandibles, but also more robust long bones (MacGregor, 1985). Carved mandibles have been recovered throughout the country from sites as far apart as London and York (MacGregor et al. 1999). Whilst many represent trial pieces for designs to be perfected on later media it has been suggested that some may be moulds for metalworking, be it casting or hammered panels using the presblech technique (Macgregor, 1985). However, these are normally attributed to patterns on more robust long bones as mandibular fragments are not thick enough to provide the depth of relief necessary for such work. This example is is likely to be a “motif piece” but given the undated nature of the context and non period specific design no further conclusions can be drawn.
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**A.3 Metalwork**

*By James Fairbairn*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pit</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33 nails. 2 Livery buttons 1 Plain button 1 Pewter button 1 Copper alloy sowing pin 1 Washer 1 unidentified Fe object</td>
<td>Fe, Cu, Cu, Pewter (tin alloy), Cu, Fe, Fe</td>
<td>19th C, 19th C, 19th C, 19th C, 19th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 Nails</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 Crotal bell</td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>18th Century Cast copper-alloy crotal bell with sub rectangular suspension loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 Nails 1 unidentified object</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 Nail 1 Unidentified Fe object 1 Clothing Tag</td>
<td>Fe, Cu</td>
<td>Early Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 Cu button</td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>19th Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12 Nails 1 D Shaped buckle 1 Pot leg</td>
<td>Fe, Cu, Fe</td>
<td>Post Medieval med-post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12 Nails</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23 Nails</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 Nails</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 Pins</td>
<td>Fe/glass</td>
<td>Small iron pins with domed glass heads 19th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 Nails</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4 Nails 1 domed dress button</td>
<td>Fe, Pewter (tin alloy)</td>
<td>18th -19th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 silvered sowing pin</td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>19th C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Metalwork**
A.4 Clay Pipe

*By James Fairbairn*

**Introduction**

A.4.1 The entire clay pipe assemblage came from five test pits and consisted of just seven stem fragments being stems it makes the clay pipe assemblage undatable. However a broad date range of 18th to 19th century is likely. All fragments found are likely to be residual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pit</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Weight in kg</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Tobacco Pipe</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>Stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Tobacco Pipe</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>Stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Tobacco Pipe</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>Stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Tobacco Pipe</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>Stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Tobacco Pipe</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
<td>Stem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Clay Pipe**

A.5 Glass

*By James Fairbairn*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pit</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Weight Kg</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18(^{th}) C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Window glass</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19(^{th}) C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18(^{th}) C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Window glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Window</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18(^{th}) - 19(^{th}) C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18(^{th}) - 19(^{th}) C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19(^{th}) - 20(^{th}) C</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19(^{th}) - 20(^{th}) C</td>
<td>Bottle that probably contained carbonated liquid. With embossed moulded letters OTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wine glass</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18(^{th}) – 19(^{th}) C</td>
<td>Hand made drinking glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Glass**
A.6 Ceramic and Stone building material

*By James Fairbairn*

*Introduction and methods*

A.6.1 A total of approximately 17kg ceramic building material was recovered from the test pit excavations from Manor Farm. The greater part of the assemblage comprised of undiagnostic pegged roof, slate, tile and hand made brick. No large pieces were found within the assemblage and all were abraded or heavily abraded suggesting that the CBM found was discarded material that was of no further use.

A.6.2 There are as many as a dozen different fabrics recorded among the assemblage suggesting the presence of local and imported materials and this also suggests many different phases of building. Dating the assemblage is difficult but broadly speaking ceramic building material from the medieval to the modern period was recovered.

A.6.3 Three pieces of daub was found in the upper levels of test pit 10. All were relatively small pieces measuring 58 x 35 x 25mm, 30 x 15 x 15mm and 50 x 30 x 30 with a combined weight weight of 68g, each retains impressions of the wattle. These wattle stakes would have had an approximate diameter of 18mm and most probably would have been made of hazel. The impressions also suggest that the wattle stakes were paced closely approximately 15mm apart. The daub itself is made from a chalk clay marl with inclusions of sand and crushed chalk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pit</th>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Weight kg</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Roof tile</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Orange, 60mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Roof tile and brick</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>Orange, yellow, 40 - 100mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Roof tile, brick, slate</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>Orange, yellow, 10 - 600mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brick and roof tile</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Orange, yellow, 25 – 70 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nibbed roof tile, brick and floor tile</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>Orange, yellow, 10 - 130mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Roof tile</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Yellow, 35 - 80mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Roof tile, brick and slate</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>Yellow, orange and grey, 45 – 130mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Roof tile, brick and daub</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Yellow, orange and white, 80 - 130mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Roof tile, brick</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Yellow and orange, 30 – 1000mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Roof tile, hand made brick</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>Yellow and orange, 10 - 140mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Peg, nibbed roof tile, handmade and concrete mortar brick</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Yellow and orange, 10 - 70mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pegged roof tile, hand made brick</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>Yellow and orange, 40 - 80mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tile, brick and mortar</td>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Orange and yellow, 20 - 80mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Ceramic Building Material*
APPENDIX B. ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

B.1 Environmental samples

By Rachel Fosberry

Introduction and Methods
B.1.1 Seven bulk samples were taken from layers and features within selected test pits excavated at the Manor House, Eltisley in order to assess the quality of preservation of plant remains, bones and artefacts and their potential to provide useful data as part of further archaeological investigations.

B.1.2 Ten litres of each sample were processed by tank flotation for the recovery of charred plant remains, dating evidence and any other artefactual evidence that might be present. The flot was collected in a 0.3mm nylon mesh and the residue was washed through a 0.5mm sieve. Both flot and residue were allowed to air dry. The dried residue was passed through 5mm and 2mm sieves and a magnet was dragged through each resulting fraction prior to sorting for artefacts. Any artefacts present were noted and reintegrated with the hand-excavated finds. The flot was examined under a binocular microscope at x16 magnification and the presence of any plant remains or other artefacts are noted on Table 5.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Context No.</th>
<th>Deposit description</th>
<th>Flot Contents</th>
<th>Residue Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Fill of layer above a small gulley</td>
<td>Charred grain (wheat), sparse charcoal</td>
<td>Animal bone, tile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Fill of a gulley below sample 202</td>
<td>Charred grain (wheat), sparse charcoal</td>
<td>No finds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>Dark layer</td>
<td>Charred grain (wheat), moderate charcoal</td>
<td>Animal bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>Lower fill of pit</td>
<td>Charred grain (oats, wheat, barley), Charred seeds (brome, ox-eye daisy, grass seed)</td>
<td>Animal bone, pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>Fill of a possible garden feature</td>
<td>Charred grain (wheat), moderate charcoal</td>
<td>coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>Fill of linear ditch which contained the carved bone and some possible Roman pottery</td>
<td>Charred grain (wheat, rye), moderate charcoal</td>
<td>No finds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>Fill of post hole, same pit as sample 1101</td>
<td>Charred grain (wheat), moderate charcoal</td>
<td>No finds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Results

Preservation
B.1.3 All of the samples contain plant remains preserved by carbonisation. Charred cereal grains occur in all of the samples but preservation is generally poor and the grains are abraded. All four of the main cereal types are present, wheat (Triticum sp.) is most common and barley (Hordeum sp.), oats (Avena sp.) and rye (Secale cereale) occur occasionally. Weed seeds are present in Sample 502, fill 504 and include brome (Bromus sp.), ox-eye daisy (Leucanthemum vulgare) and a grass seed (Poaceae).
B.1.4 Modern roots are present in all of the samples. Earthworm egg cases were also noted.

Discussion

B.1.5 The charred plant assemblage consists predominantly of cereal grains along with occasional weed seeds. The cereal grains may have been accidentally burnt while being dried prior to storage or during cooking over open fires prior to being deliberately deposited in middens/rubbish pits. Wheat is most commonly milled for use as flour and the compact, rounded morphology of the charred grains suggest that these are a bread wheat variety (*T. aestivo-compactum*). Barley was often used for animal fodder but may have been used for human consumption in the form of bread and soup and was also used for the brewing of beer. No germinated grains were recovered to suggest brewing or malting activities. Oats may have been used for porridge or also as animal fodder. Rye was noted in Sample 1101, fill 1103 which was thought to be of Roman date. Rye did not become an important crop until the Saxon and medieval period in this area which suggests that the deposit is either of a later date or that the single grain of Rye is intrusive. The presence of modern roots and earthworm activity in the deposits suggests a degree of bioturbation that could potentially have caused mixing of plant remains between deposits.

B.1.6 The weed seeds present in Sample 502 most likely represent plants that were growing in the cultivated fields are were harvested along with the cereal crops. Brome and grass seeds are a similar size to the cereal grains and would have to be picked out by hand prior to cooking. It is likely that occasional seeds were a tolerated contaminant. Ox-eye daisies are found in pastures and grassland and were widely used in medieval medicine.

Further Work and Methods Statement

B.1.7 The charred plant assemblage from the Manor House, Eltisley, provides limited information on the domestic refuse produced at this site. It is not considered that further processing of the remaining soil will add to this information and no further work on the assemblage is required.
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B.2 Faunal Remains

By Chris Faine

Introduction

B.2.1 3.95 Kg of faunal material was recovered from the Test pitting at Manor Farm, Eltisley yielding 60 “countable” bones (see below). All bones were collected by hand apart from those recovered from environmental samples; hence a bias towards smaller fragments is to be expected. Residuary appears not be an issue and there is no evidence of later contamination of any context. Ninety-one fragments of animal bone were recovered with 60 identifiable to species (66% of the total sample). Faunal material was recovered from from features dating from the Medieval, Post-Medieval and Modern periods. The project consisted of 14 individual test pits, all one which yielded identifiable elements.
Methodology

B.2.2 All data was initially recorded using a specially written MS Access database. Bones were recorded using a version of the criteria described in Davis (1992) and Albarella & Davis (1994). Initially all elements were assessed in terms of siding (where appropriate), completeness, tooth wear stages (also where applicable) and epiphyseal fusion. Completeness was assessed in terms of percentage and zones present (after Dobney & Reilly, 1988). Initially the whole identifiable assemblage was quantified in terms of number of individual fragments (NISP) and minimum numbers of individuals MNI (see table 1). The ageing of the population was largely achieved by examining the wear stages of cheek teeth of cattle, sheep/goat and pig (after Grant, 1982). Wear stages were recorded for lower molars of cattle, sheep/goat and pig, both isolated and in mandibles. The states of epiphyseal fusion for all relevant bones were recorded to give a broad age range for the major domesticates (after Getty, 1975). Measurements were largely carried out according to the conventions of von den Driesch (1976). Measurements were either carried out using a 150mm sliding caliper or an osteometric board in the case of larger bones.

The Assemblage

B.2.3 Tables 6 & 7 show the species distribution by test pit and phase respectively. The largest numbers of faunal remains were recovered from test pits 3, 4, 8 & 12. Few Post-Medieval remains were recovered, consisting of single sheep tibia from context 1001. As one would expect the assemblage is dominated by the domestic mammals, with sheep and cattle being the dominant taxa in the medieval and modern samples respectively, along with smaller numbers of pig. Other mammal species are scarce, with only 1 fragment of horse in both Medieval and Modern phases along with single cat element in from medieval context 301. Domestic fowl remains are present in both phases along with unidentified small bird remains (most likely passerines).

B.2.4 The Medieval cattle assemblage consists of lower limb elements and vertebrae from largely adult cattle (a juvenile metacarpal being recovered from context 801). Fifty-three percent of identifiable elements show signs of butchery, largely consisting of long bones chopped mid-shaft, although some were split longitudinally. The same body part distribution can be seen in the Modern assemblage, although 2 femur fragments were recovered from contexts 1201 & 1601. Few ageable elements were recovered although no juvenile remains were observed. Fifty-five percent of identifiable elements showed evidence of butchery, again mostly long chopped midshaft.

B.2.5 As mentioned above sheep/goat is the most prevalent taxon in the Medieval assemblage, consisting of lower limb and cranial elements from adult animals. A single ageable mandible was recovered from context 505 from animal around 6-12 months old. Butchery marks consist largely of long bones chopped at the epiphyses suggesting dis-articulation of the limbs. Few elements were recovered from the Modern sample, consisting of lower limb elements and a mandible from an animal around 4-6 years old from context 1103. No butchery marks were observed.

B.2.6 The largest number of pig remains (NISP: 9) were recovered from the Medieval sample, consisting of upper and lower long bones and mandible fragments. No ageable epiphyses were available, although a mandible from a neonatal animal was recovered from context 504. Few identifiable elements were recovered from Modern contexts, these being long bone fragments and loose teeth.

B.2.7 Other species are scarce in the assemblage. Only two horse fragments were recovered; a metatarsal from Medieval context 802 and an adult 1st molar from Modern 203. A
single adult cat humerus was recovered from medieval context 301. Domestic fowl remains comprised a juvenile fowl tarsometatarsal from Medieval context 801 and adult humerus and tibiotarsus from Modern contexts 902 and 904 respectively. Unidentified small passerines remains were recovered from Medieval context 801 and Modern Context 402.

Discussion

B.2.8 Although given the small assemblage and limited nature of the excavation precludes detailed analysis The domestic mammal assemblage is indicative of initial carcass processing, with meat bearing elements being subject to further butchery elsewhere on site. The adult nature of the cattle and sheep sample suggests exploitation for meat, although there is some evidence for the presence of juvenile animals if not necessarily on site breeding. Pigs were also exploited for meat, with some evidence of breeding. Horses were most likely ridden, with cattle being used for traction considerably later in East Anglia than the rest of the country (Langdon, 1986). Domestic fowl were most likely eaten.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medieval</th>
<th>Post-Medieval</th>
<th>Modern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle (Bos)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/Goat (Ovis/Capra)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig (Sus scrofa)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse (Equus)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat (Felis sylvestris)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowl (Gallus sp.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unid Bird</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Mammal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Mammal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Species distribution by phase.
## B.3 Shell

By James Fairbairn

### Introduction and methods

B.3.1 A total of 1.97 Kg of marine shell was recovered from the excavations at Manor Farm. The shells were quantified and examined in order to assess the diversity and quantity of these ecofacts and their potential to provide useful data as part of further archaeological investigations.

B.3.2 This assemblage is the result of hand collection and does not include shell recovered from environmental samples. The entire clay pipe assemblage came from five test pits and consisted of just seven stem

### Results

B.3.3 All of the bivalve shells were unhinged. Apices were noted in Table 6 along with the number of left and right oyster valves. The left and right valves were not observed as matching in any of the contexts. It should be noted that the number of apices represents the minimum number of individuals (MNI) but that there are two apices per individual. Notches caused by prising the valves apart prior to consumption were indistinct and not recorded.

### Table 7: Species distribution by test pit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pit</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Common name</th>
<th>Weight in Grammes</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ostrea edulis</td>
<td>Oyster</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>Estuarine and shallow coastal water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ostrea edulis</td>
<td>Oyster</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>Estuarine and shallow coastal water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mytilus edulis</td>
<td>Mussel</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Intertidal, salt water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ostrea edulis</td>
<td>Oyster</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Estuarine and shallow coastal water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Buccinidae</td>
<td>Whelk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Estuarine and shallow coastal water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ostrea edulis</td>
<td>Oyster</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Estuarine and shallow coastal water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ostrea edulis</td>
<td>Oyster</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Estuarine and shallow coastal water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ostrea edulis</td>
<td>Oyster</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Estuarine and shallow coastal water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Mytilus edulis</em></td>
<td>Mussel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02 Intertidal, salt water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>Ostrea edulis</em></td>
<td>Oyster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40 Estuarine and shallow coastal water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Ostrea edulis</em></td>
<td>Oyster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18 Estuarine and shallow coastal water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>Ostrea edulis</em></td>
<td>Oyster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.16 Estuarine and shallow coastal water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>Ostrea edulis</em></td>
<td>Oyster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.27 Estuarine and shallow coastal water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><em>Ostrea edulis</em></td>
<td>Oyster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07 Estuarine and shallow coastal water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Shell

Discussion

B.3.4 Shellfish, along with fish was religiously consumed on Fridays and during Lent in the Medieval period. The shells would have been discarded in middens which were often used for manuring cultivated fields.

B.3.5 Oyster shells predominate in this assemblage. *Ostrea edulis* is a bivalve mollusc that has an oval shaped left valve that is concave in shape with a rough, scaly surface and a right valve that is flattened and has a smoother surface. The right valve is prised off and the meat is left in the left valve. Oysters can have a fairly long shelf-life of up to around two weeks; however, they should be consumed when fresh, as their taste reflects their age.

B.3.6 Medieval oyster shells tend to be smaller than in earlier periods due to intensification of harvesting. (Winder 1993). In this assemblage, the left valve averages approx 4-7cm. Some of the smaller shells were possibly juvenile spats that had been harvested too early.

B.3.7 The percentage of mussels in this assemblage are low. Both shellfish were consumed in the medieval period but were possibly not as commonly as oysters were. This could also be explained as these species being contaminants of the oyster harvest.

B.3.8 The shellfish assemblage from excavations at Manor Farm have limited potential due to the uncertainty of the contexts within the test pits.

B.4 Auger Survey Report

*By Charles Turner*

Introduction and methods

B.4.1 As part of the community excavation programme at Manor Farm, Eltisley, Dr Charles Turner of the Cambridge Quaternary Department of Geography at the University of Cambridge carried out an auger survey on the area of garden to the north of the farm house. This area had long been supposed to be the the place of a medieval fish pond and it was hoped that the auger survey may have given an indication to the usage of this part of the moated enclosure.

B.4.2 The survey was carried out along a transect running approximately north to south (see fig 4).
B.4.3 across the northern part of the lawn enclosed by the western side of the moat. Five boreholes were made by using a 7cm diameter Duits hand auger at 5m intervals along the transect, which extended approximately between Test Pit 6 to the north and Test Pit 8 to the South.

**Borehole logs**

B.4.4 The data for individual boreholes, from north to south, is as follows:

**Auger hole 05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62.88m</td>
<td>Surface height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30cm</td>
<td>Turf. Grey-brown silt with occasional small stones (1 large at 0.30cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-60cm</td>
<td>Unconsolidated very chalky silt with stones (generally 1-4cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 60cm</td>
<td>As above but with small clasts of clay, sometimes with chalk granules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Auger hole 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62.58m</td>
<td>Surface height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-42cm</td>
<td>Turf. Grey-brown clayey silt with occasional small stones (fine to 0.08cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42cm-65cm</td>
<td>As above but becoming more compacted with some orange iron staining and occasional brick and charcoal fragments (large brick fragments at 55cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65cm-1m+</td>
<td>Compact orange-pale grey mottled clay with chalk clasts (some 1-3cm) _typical chalk boulder clay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Auger hole 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62.45m</td>
<td>Surface height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-47cm</td>
<td>Turf. Grey-brown silt with sparse chalk granules, becoming more compact and with some small stones below 45cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-49+cm</td>
<td>Compact, iron stained silty clay with chalk clasts- hole stopped by large stone at 49cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Auger hole 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62-49cm</td>
<td>Surface height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-40cm</td>
<td>Grey brown silt with sparse fine chalky granules and small stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@40cm</td>
<td>Very stony layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-65+cm</td>
<td>Yellow-brown chalky silty clay, with fine black carbonised material in upper part, but probably root material rather than charcoal, by 60cm clearly typical chalky boulder clay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Auger hole 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62.52cm</td>
<td>Surface height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-40cm</td>
<td>Grey-brown clayey silt, as in previous boreholes, with occasional brick fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-55cm</td>
<td>Light brown silty clay, becoming greyer below with iron mottling and staining and with chalk clasts and small stones. Hole abandoned at 55cm in typical boulder clay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation**

B.4.5 Three distinct units are recognisable. The uppermost of these is the grey-brown silty clay, which covers the whole area and might best be informally described as "garden soil". It is this unit that contains archaeological material, though in these borehole samples only brick fragments and occasionally charcoal were recovered from auger holes 10 and 25. The presence of charcoal n granules and small stones are ultimately derived from till, Anglian chalky boulder clay, which everywhere underlies the site.

B.4.6 The second unit of importance is, of course this chalky, silty, stony clay which in places shows surface weathering and iron mottling, but is increasingly with depth more compact and with well defined chalk clasts of varying sizes.

B.4.7 The third unit is very restricted, the chalky, stoney silt found in auger hole 05 and in the adjacent Test Pit 6. It must be sandwiched between two other units, although its lower boundary was not seen. It appears to contain no archaeological material. The best interpretation is that it is infilling of a small channel on the surface of the boulder clay, carrying away the clay and finer silt particles but leaving its channel infilled with the coarser fraction of the eroded sediment. There is no evidence as how extensive such a deposit might have been, but, even on a small scale, it would have created a drier patch in the immediate area.
APPENDIX C. THE ELTISLEY MOATS COMMUNITY PROJECT REPORT

C.1 Outreach

   By David Crawford White

   Introduction

C.1.1 This appendix addresses the community element of the project using the headings found in the original application form for Regional Capacity Building grants.

   What was the aim of the project?

C.1.2 The project concentrated on the moated site at Manor Farm as part of an overall research programme into five scheduled moated sites situated in and a round the village of Eltisley, Cambridgeshire.

C.1.3 At Manor Farm test pit excavations agreed by the owners and English Heritage took place within the moated area involving the Eltisley Local History Society, primary school pupils and 6th formers. Archaeologists from OA East and volunteers were also involved in either a paid or voluntary capacity.

C.1.4 The location of sixteen test pits were agreed by English Heritage in advance along with a sampling strategy.

   How did the project address English Heritage’s Targets for support for the Regional Capacity Building Grants Scheme?

C.1.5 The project addressed all of English Heritage’s published Targets for Support for the Regional Capacity Building Grants Scheme. The project organisers worked with a broad spectrum of the local community involving the local primary school, 6th form students as well as members of Eltisley History Society.

C.1.6 There were four listed site-specific targets and these were all realised by the project as a whole:

   ● The project did provide a more detailed insight into the origins of Manor Farm with the information being disseminated to the wider community by a site Open Day on Saturday 9th October 2011. Further dissemination took place at a Celebratory Event being held in local primary school hall on December 5th 2011. The archaeological report goes into greater detail about the archaeology found.

   ● The information gleaned by this project will support further research into the similarities and differences with the other moats in and around Eltisley.

   ● The ‘hands on’ event training and professional archaeological input given to both young and old during the project has enhanced local knowledge and skills.

   ● The current landowners, by the efforts of volunteers supported by professional staff, have learnt a lot more about their site which will be useful to them, future owners and the wider community at large.

   How was the English Heritage Funding used?

C.1.7 In fulfilment of the English Heritage grant received the funding was used in several ways including to support work with the adjacent primary school, payment for the hire
and purchase of equipment, OA East staff costs and the purchase of appropriate licences for plans.

**Newton Primary School**

C.1.8 The organisers planned and delivered a range of different experiences involving Newton Primary School. These included the following activities in school;

- An introduction to archaeology and time line to the whole school;
- Excavations in dig boxes using real artefacts to every pupil a class at a time;
  An art competition entitled “So what did Manor Farm look like in the medieval period?” Each class was given a pictorial set of examples. Examples of the pupils work will be exhibited at the Celebratory Event.

C.1.9 The whole primary school also visited the excavation site over two days and took part in the following activities;

- Everyone one including all staff, parent helpers and pupils undertook a site induction and then working in two groups, the pupils had a site tour looking at the ongoing Test Pit excavations, the tools used and the finds that had been found.
- This was followed by an opportunity to excavate in a designated area outside the scheduled area with appropriate tools under the guidance of professional staff. There was also an opportunity for all the pupils to make a replica medieval face jug using Newclay. These have since been painted and were displayed at the Celebratory Event.

C.1.10 Numbers involved: A total of 104 pupils with parent support, teaching assistants and teachers attended the excavation activity based on Manor Farm.

**Eltisley History Society and 6th Form College students**

C.1.11 The organiser’s delivered a range of ‘hands on’ learning opportunities for both members of Eltisley History Society and two secondary school groups. Briefing visits were made prior to individuals attending the excavations. Before individuals were assigned a test pit to excavate everyone underwent a site induction, a briefing on the history of the site and its position within the landscape as well as site tour.

C.1.12 The two secondary school groups came for a total of three days while members of the Eltisley History Society came for at least one day. Many society members came for all three days. Besides ‘hands on’ training on excavation techniques, test pit recording and drawing, each group also had a lunchtime information session from Dave Kenny (English Heritage), Sally Croft (CHER) and Rachel Fosberry (Environmental Archaeology – OA East).

C.1.13 Numbers involved: A total of 19 pupils and 2 staff members came from Hills Road 6th Form College and attended for one day. 13 pupils and 1 staff member came from the Perse School and attended for two days. Over the three days 10 members of Eltisley History Society attended the excavations.

**Equipment and other costs**

C.1.14 While OA East freely provided the majority of the excavation equipment (mattocks, buckets, sieves, finds bags, permatrace, GPS, levels, drawing material etc.) there was a need to provide suitable equipment for the younger school children including suitably sized gloves, buckets, trowels and shovels. Other equipment costs included additional sieves and hand brushes, hire of toilets, vehicle hire and a contribution towards refreshments for adult volunteers.
**Professional Staff Costs**

C.1.15 The services of professional staff from OA East were at various stages of the project also funded by the project with funding paying for the initial mapping of the test pit locations, the professional excavation staff and the specialists involved afterwards in reporting on the pottery, environmental samples, faunal remains. There was also the report production costs involving drawing office staff, the archiving of the material and the preparation and delivery of the Celebratory Event.

**How were the volunteers used during the project?**

C.1.16 The use of volunteers was central to the project and under the guidance of professional staff from OA East they carried out a range of activities during the three days of excavations. After a site induction all volunteers were assigned to a test pit to excavate, record, photograph as well as to draw the appropriate sections. Where archaeology was found environmental samples were also taken by volunteers as agreed with English Heritage as part of the project sampling strategy.

C.1.17 Besides supporting the work of secondary school students and the History Society members, two OA East volunteers also supported the delivery of the Primary School activity programme for two half days. After the three days members of the Eltisley History Society supported OA East staff in the cleaning and checking of equipment. OAEast volunteers also supported the professional staff in finds processing and preparation work for the celebratory event at Newton Primary School.

**What are the benefits of this project?**

C.1.18 The landowners are certainly more informed about their home and its origin and it is hoped that they will take into consideration this new found information in any future landscaping developments.

C.1.19 Using the 1-metre test pit methodology the project identified three very different areas within the moated site. While the excavations provided some of the answers as to what had taken place in the past, there is still potential for further research and excavation both within and outside the scheduled area as highlighted in the archaeological evaluation of the site.

C.1.20 The members of Eltisley History Society learnt at first hand excavation and recording techniques, which with further support will allow them to look more broadly at the type of work that they could undertake elsewhere in the village. Eventually the skills learned here will make the group capable of correctly recording their own investigations. In addition they are now aware of the correct reporting procedures and contacts with the County's Heritage services.

C.1.21 Pupils from Newton Primary School learnt about archaeology in general and about the moated site that is adjacent to their school. They will also learnt from practical experience what it is like to be an archaeologist excavating a site. The pupils were also involve in a ‘hands on’ archaeological time line and made replica medieval face jugs.

C.1.22 The 6th Form students were either studying ‘A’ level archaeology or were part of an archaeology enrichment group. Both groups had a unique practical learning experience. Working alongside professional staff, experienced OA East volunteers and Eltisley History Society members, the students excavated and recorded a number of test pits.

C.1.23 The celebratory event hosted by Newton Primary School (which is adjacent to Manor Farm) provided an ideal opportunity for the local community and others to learn about the project and groups involved to say a few words on what they did and what they
thought about the whole experience. There was also displays by pupils from Newton Primary School (pictures and pottery) and the Eltisley History Society as well as a photographic exhibition of the three days and a display of the finds to hear and see what was found. Besides PPT presentations on the project and what was found, the celebratory evening also provided an opportunity for the local people and parents of the pupils to become more engaged in their local heritage.

C.1.24 The Open Day on Saturday morning provided an ideal opportunity for the local community to come and see the excavations, have a guided tour of the site, see the finds and to talk to those taking part. The landowners kindly provided a double garage which housed various displays (e.g. Eltisley History Society, OAEast and Jigsaw) as well as free leaflets, artefacts to handle and information on the owner’s plans on the site.

*What feedback did the project get from the relevant groups?*

C.1.25 Besides verbal feedback received from the volunteers and site visitors during the three days, all of which were very complimentary, all groups were also asked to complete a simple evaluation sheet.

*Feedback from Newton Primary School*

C.1.26 Table 1 shows the feedback from teaching staff on the visit to Newton Primary School on Tuesday 4th October. Not all those that returned review sheets were present at all activities. Up to five teachers were involved in the review process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General organisation before the visit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to archaeology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline &amp; objects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dig Boxes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General feedback from pupils</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**

C.1.27 Table 2 below shows the feedback from staff on the visit to the excavation site on either Thursday 6th or Friday 7th October. Not all those that returned review sheets were present at all activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the site</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Tour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation and sieving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Clay Pots</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation &amp; general feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**

C.1.28 Staff were also asked to comment on the visit to the school by the Outreach & Learning Officer and the visit to the excavation site.

‘The whole visit by David and his team caused a sense of excitement. The children were interested and wanted to extend their learning independently. The visit to manor farm was great and I think the pupils in Yrs 5 & 6 would have loved to have stayed
longer. It was wonderful to see the pupils in the fresh air, actively learning and finding out new and interesting facts. Thank you for your time' Mrs A. Brown (the Headteacher)

C.1.29 Comments from other teachers:

‘Children really enjoyed the experience in particular the second day (site visit) where we could have stayed all day!’

‘A very informative and enjoyable visit. I would have liked more time to hear the history of that particular site and the children given more time to ask questions.’

C.1.30 Feedback from members of Eltisley History Society and the two secondary school groups.

C.1.31 Table 3 shows the feedback from members of the Eltisley History Society. Not all members attended the lunch-time on-site talks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>So what did you think?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Introduction, Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Intro on Test Pit Excavation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Excavations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>On-site talks by English Heritage, CHER and others</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The overall experience</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

C.1.32 Comments from members of the Eltisley History Society

‘The enthusiastic help & encouragement from the ‘professional’ to us amateurs was unstinting, good natured and made us fell part of the whole project. Excellent!’

‘I did not realise how much precision was involved!!

‘It was fascinating being part of the archaeological process and I learnt a lot about the documentation as well as working as a team. It was a privilege to have something ‘important’ going on in this village. I enjoyed getting to know staff and the OA volunteers and finding out what their roles involved.’

‘Great stuff.’

James and Anthony did a fantastic job rushing round helping everyone with their test pits and sharing their knowledge with the ‘trainees.’

I thought the whole project was very well organised; it was lovely to see so many students and school children involved and enthusiastic; and their activities and talks seemed to be excellent. The Open Day at the end was a very good idea, to let the community kn ow what had been happening. All the ‘experts’ were very helpful and thought the way the project had been worked out got the most of of the volunteers. I was impressed at the amount of work done and I was made to feel very welcome. I learnt a lot about test pit excavation which I hope to put to good use.’

C.1.33 Table 4 shows the feedback from Hills Road 6th Form College. The group was made up of 19 Year 12 male and female students studying ‘A’ level archaeology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>So what did you think?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Introduction and H&amp;S</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Information on test Pit Excavation 13 6 - -
3. The Excavations 17 2 - -
4. Finds Processing 11 7 1 -
5. On-site talks by English Heritage, CHER and others 10 6 3 -
6. The overall experience 17 2 - -

Table 4

C.1.34 Comments from students from Hills Road 6th From College
‘Environmental archaeology talk very good.’
‘Excellent day, many thanks for letting us come along.’
‘Brilliant’
‘Chuffed with a fun and practical day.’
‘Very good environmental archaeology talk’
Excellent array excavations and processing’.
‘Really fun day – went so fast.’

C.1.35 Table 5 shows the feedback from The Perse School, Cambridge. This group was made up of 13 male and female students from Years 11 – 13 who belonged to the school Archaeology Enrichment Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Introduction and H&amp;S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Information on test Pit Excavation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Excavations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Finds Processing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>On-site talks by English Heritage, CHER and others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The overall experience</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Further considerations
C.1.36 As with any project of this nature it does not stop when the finds have been washed and identified and the report written. This project will be ongoing and with the involvement of the various groups involved already and the ongoing support from OA East staff this project over time will increase the knowledge of all the moats sites in and around Eltisley.

C.1.37 One area that the archaeological report has highlighted as an area of potentially further test pitting is the raised platform (Area 2) adjacent to the current house. Certainly more test pits involving the existing groups could on this apparent platform ascertain the potential size and date of any early structures. Further work in Area 3 could also be undertaken to determine the depth of natural across the hollow garden area.

C.1.38 In view of researching early aerial photographs it would appear that the moated site is surrounded by another sub-rectangular ditch albeit on a much smaller scale than the moat itself. This smaller ditch is still found to the west and north east of the moat and will be looked at in greater detail by both the Eltisley History Society and the students from the Perse School early next year. The aim will be to excavate a series of one
metre wide slots across the ditch at various intervals along its current location to see if its later dating and chronology can be determined.

C.1.39 To help this project move forward to further research the other moats in Eltisley the Outreach & Learning Officer has met with the Chairperson and Secretary of Eltisley History Society. The Heritage Lottery Fund was discussed with either the Society applying on its own or in partnership with OA East. Certainly it would be beneficial to both groups if they work on the lottery bid together for the benefit of the wider community.

Photographic Record of the excavations
C.1.40 The next few pages show just a few of the many photographs that were taken as the project progressed starting with the visit to Newton Primary School on Tuesday 4th October by the OA East Outreach & Learning Officer. The photographs shown in the next few pages were taken either by staff at Newton Primary School, the landowners or staff from OAEast.

List of plates
Plate 1. Eltisley Society members working with OA East staff
Plate 2. Pupils of the Perse School with OA East staff
Plate 3. Group photograph at the end of the third day
Plate 4. Members of the Eltisley History Society working with an OA East volunteer
Plate 5. Eltisley History Society members excavating test pit 4
Plate 6. Children from the local primary school excavating
Plate 7. Pupils from Hills Road 6th form College excavating test pit 16
Plate 8. Pupils and staff members from the Perse School excavating Test pit 11
Plate 9. Members from the Eltisley History Society excavating test pit 6
Plate 10. Pupils from Hills Road 6th Form College excavating test pit 12
Plate 11. Pupils from Hills Road under instruction from OA staff
Plate 12. Pupils from the the Perse School recording their test pit
Plate 13. Test pit 12 with stones in situ
Plate 14. looking north-west across sunken area
Plate 15. Looking north east towards the farm house
Plate 16. Looking west
Plate 17. Clothing clap/tag from test pit 8
Plate 18. Part of quern stone from from test pit 10
Plate 19. Part of a chalk spine whorl found in test pit 8
Plate 20. “Celtic” style carving on pig mandible found in test pit 11
Plate 21. Close up photograph of carvings on the jaw
Plate 22. Pupils from the primary school excavating their trench
Plate 23. OA East staff giving a guided tour
Plate 24. Various test pits under excavation
Plate 25. Primary school excavating their trench
Plate 1: Two of the Eltisley Society members working with OAEast staff

Plate 2: Pupils of the Perse School with OAEast staff
Plate 3: Group photograph at the end of the third day

Plate 4: Members of the Eltisley History Society working with and OAEast volunteer excavating Test Pit 2
Plate 5: Members of the Eltisley History Society excavating Test Pit 4

Plate 6: Pupils from the local primary school excavating
Plate 7: Pupils from Hills Road 6th Form College excavating Test Pit 16

Plate 8: Pupils and staff member from the Perse School excavating Test Pit 11
Plate 9: Members of the Eltisley History Society excavating Test Pit 6

Plate 10: Pupils from Hills Road 6th Form College excavating Test Pit 12
Plate 11: Pupils from Hills Road 6th Form College under instruction from OAEast staff

Plate 12: Pupils from the Perse School completing their recording sheets
Plate 13: Test Pit 12

Plate 14: Looking north-west across Area 3
Plate 15: Looking north-east across Area 2

Plate 16: Looking west over Area 1
Plate 17: Part of a Saxo-Norman wrist clasp from Test Pit 8

Plate 18: Part of a sandstone quernstone from Test Pit 10 - date unknown
Plate 19: Part of a chalk spindle whorl from Test Pit 8

Plate 20: 'Celtic' type carving on a pig's jaw from Test Pit 6
Plate 21: Close-up photograph of the carvings on the pig's jaw from Test Pit 6

Plate 22: Pupils from the local primary school excavating their trench
Plate 23: OAEast staff giving a talk to visitors on the open day

Plate 24: The various test pits in Area 3 under excavation
Plate 25: Primary school pupils excavating their trench
APPENDIX D. OASIS REPORT FORM
All fields are required unless they are not applicable.

Project Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OASIS Number</th>
<th>oxfordar-118458</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Evaluation at Manor Farm Eltisley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Dates (fieldwork) Start</td>
<td>06-09-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Dates (fieldwork) Finish</td>
<td>08-09-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Work (by OA East) Start</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Work (by OA East) Finish</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Reference Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>ESLMAF11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning App. No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related HER/OASIS No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Project/Techniques Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Type</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please select all techniques used:

- [ ] Aerial Photography - interpretation
- [ ] Aerial Photography - new
- [ ] Annotated Sketch
- [ ] Augering
- [ ] Documentary Chronological Survey
- [ ] Documentary Search
- [ ] Environmental Sampling
- [ ] Fieldwalking
- [ ] Geophysical Survey
- [ ] Grab-Sampling
- [ ] Gravity-Core
- [ ] Laser Scanning
- [ ] Measured Survey
- [ ] Metal Detectors
- [ ] Phosphate Survey
- [ ] Photogrammetric Survey
- [ ] Photographic Survey
- [ ] Rectified Photography
- [ ] Remote Operated Vehicle Survey
- [ ] Sample Trenches
- [ ] Survey/Recording Of Fabric/Structure
- [ ] Targeted Trenches
- [ ] Test Pits
- [ ] Topographic Survey
- [ ] Vibro-core
- [ ] Visual Inspection (Initial Site Visit)

Monument Types/Significant Finds & Their Periods

List feature types using the NMR Monument Type Thesaurus and significant finds using the MDA Object type Thesaurus together with their respective periods. If no features/finds were found, please state "none".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monument</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surfaces</td>
<td>Post Medieval 1540 to 1901</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Roman 43 to 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layers</td>
<td>Medieval 1066 to 1540</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Post Medieval 1540 to 1901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Cambridgeshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Eltisley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>Cambs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>26sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Manor Farm, Caxton End, Eltisley, St. Neots PE19 6TJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid Reference</td>
<td>NGR TL273593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Project Originators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>OA EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Brief Originator</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Design Originator</td>
<td>Stephen Macaulay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Stephen Macaulay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>James Fairbain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Project Archives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Archive</th>
<th>Digital Archive</th>
<th>Paper Archive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OA East</td>
<td>OA EAST</td>
<td>OA EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLMAF11</td>
<td>ESLMAF11</td>
<td>ESLMAF11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Archive Contents/Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal Bones</th>
<th>Ceramics</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Human Bones</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Leather</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stratigraphic</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Virtual Reality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Digital Media
- ☑ Database
- ☑ GIS
- ☑ Geophysics
- ☑ Images
- ☑ Illustrations
- ☑ Moving Image
- ☑ Spreadsheets
- ☑ Survey
- ☑ Text
- ☑ Virtual Reality

### Paper Media
- ☑ Aerial Photos
- ☑ Context Sheet
- ☑ Correspondence
- ☑ Diary
- ☑ Drawing
- ☑ Manuscript
- ☑ Map
- ☑ Matrices
- ☑ Microfilm
- ☑ Misc.
- ☑ Research/Notes
- ☑ Photos
- ☑ Plans
- ☑ Report
- ☑ Sections
- ☑ Survey

### Notes:

---
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Figure 2: Test Pit Locations
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Figure 3: Plans and Sections
Plate 1: Possible earlier enclosure
Plate 2: Test Pit 2

Plate 3: Test Pit 3
Plate 4: Test Pit 12