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SUMMARY

In January and February 2007, Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out an archaeological field evaluation and building survey at Hall’s Croft garden and attic in Stratford-upon-Avon, Warwickshire (NGR SP 202 540) on behalf of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust.

The test pit evaluation within the garden revealed a medieval pit or garden planting feature, a build up of garden soils containing materials dating from the 13th/14th to the 19th centuries and evidence of levelling and landscaping. One test pit contained quantities of medieval roof tile, suggesting the presence of a building(s) in the vicinity, possibly to the north-east of the site. Overall, the concentration of archaeology in the garden appears low - based on the (admittedly small) sample of the garden that was excavated, it is possible that the area was not built up, either in the medieval period or later.

The building survey within the attic examined a tool fixed to a roof timber. The device was interpreted as a grinding machine although it is not clear what was processed through the machine. It was not located in its original position and dating remains uncertain. An examination beneath the present floorboards revealed an earlier floor surface, but one which was not part of the original early 17th century phase of the building. Environmental samples were taken of deposits beneath the floorboards. Analysis of these has revealed evidence of storage and preparation of vegetables and fruit for consumption, possibly dating to the Victorian period, but which could have accumulated over a longer period of time.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and scope of work

1.1.1 From January to early February 2007, Oxford Archaeology (OA) carried out a field evaluation, building survey and environmental sampling at Hall’s Croft garden and attic, Stratford-upon-Avon, on behalf of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust (Fig. 1). The Trust commissioned the work for research purposes - in advance of plans to enhance the presentation of the site - and it did not part of a formal planning application.

1.1.2 OA produced a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) detailing how the required investigations would be undertaken. The WSI was prepared for Ms Ann Donnelly, Museum Curator of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust and a copy was forwarded to Jonathan Parkhouse, County Archaeologist for Warwickshire, prior to works commencing on site.
1.2 **Geology and topography**

1.2.1 The site lies on Triassic mudstone, including Keuper Marl (BGS 2001) at c 38.2 m above OD, and is located at the corner of Church Street and Old Town, Stratford (at NGR SP 202 546).

1.2.2 The Church Street end of the site lies within the borough of New Stratford, but the house and most of the plot are within Old Stratford - the borough boundary runs diagonally through the garden a few metres to the west of the house.

1.2.3 A Sale Plan of 1868 indicates that the southern boundary of Hall’s Croft is a continuation of the rear boundary of burgage plots in Church Street and may even preserve a medieval strip field alignment. A wall running parallel to the southern boundary might indicate the presence of a former narrow tenement plot, though it is not shown on the 1851 Board of Health Map.

1.2.4 Further detailed analysis of the development of the historical topography of Hall’s Croft is contained within Alcock and Meeson’s Surveys, dated 1989 and 1998. The garden today is level, with the front garden being level with the street and the rear garden terraced into the slight natural slope upward to the north. A range of 17th to 19th century outbuildings are arranged along the eastern boundary together with more modern service buildings and below ground services at the rear of Hall’s Croft.

1.3 **Archaeological and historical background**

1.3.1 Old Town and College Lane were the two approach roads converging on the centre of the old manor of Stratford (the pre-borough village). Holy Trinity Church, originally an Anglo-Saxon Minster church, lies at the core of the village and dates to before the end of the 7th century. The manor is mentioned in Domesday and in a survey for the Bishop of Worcester in 1182.

1.3.2 No archaeological investigations are known to have been undertaken within Hall’s Croft. Nearby at the Old Vicarage site, an excavation in 1969 revealed the postholes of former buildings and rubbish pits containing late 11th to 12th century Cotswold Oolitic ware pottery (WA No. 1031). A pit containing 16th to 18th century pottery was found on the northern side of Hall’s Croft in 2005 during a watching brief by Warwickshire Museum (WA No.8382). Palmer (1997, 29) suggested that by the early medieval period this part of Old Town was likely to have been densely settled.

1.3.3 It is believed likely that this 17th century house belonged to or was inhabited by Dr. John Hall, a physician and Shakespeare’s son-in-law.

1.3.4 Recent building work within the attic of the house exposed a sealed deposit beneath the original floorboards containing (among other items) a mix of environmental material (seeds, nuts, pods and grains). Also found was an object mounted on the attic wall which has been interpreted as a small grinder or mill.
1.3.5 Previously the Trust, through its architects Stainburn Taylor & Michael Reardon, had commissioned a geophysical survey of the grounds (Stratascan, November 2006), and a survey of the history/architectural development of the House (Alcock and Meeson, 1989/1998 reports) and an archaeological assessment of the site by Dr N Barker (undated).

1.3.6 Stratascan’s geophysical (detailed resistance) survey of the garden revealed a number of anomalies of possible archaeological origin in the western part of the garden. High resistance area anomalies may suggest the presence of structural remains or compacted earth, although no clear pattern for these has been identified. Some anomalies are likely to be the result of tree root systems; lower resistance anomalies are suggested to have been caused by flowerbeds. A modern service trench is suspected in the eastern part of the garden.

1.4 Acknowledgements

1.4.1 Oxford Archaeology would like to thank Ann Donnelly, Curator of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust for her help and assistance during the project, and Andrew Rawle, for his help during the fieldwork. We are also grateful to Jonathan Parkhouse, the County Archaeologist, for his advice.

2 Evaluation Aims

2.1 Garden Test Pits

2.1.1 To establish the presence/absence, extent, condition, nature, character, quality and date of archaeological remains within the area proposed for development and interpretation.

2.1.2 Specifically, work in the garden area would involve the excavation of three test pits, targeting anomalies identified in the geophysical survey (Fig. 2 details the location of the test pits overlain on the base plan of the Stratascan resistivity survey.

2.1.3 To establish the ecofactual and environmental potential of any archaeological deposits and features within the test pits.

2.1.4 To make available the results of the test pit investigation and to place the results of the investigation in a wider local and regional context, taking particular account of the potential of archaeological remains to address local and regional research objectives.

2.1.5 To provide information about the archaeological remains to inform on the future management of Hall’s Croft

2.2 The attic

2.2.1 To provide an interpretation of the ‘grinder’/mill device and identify parallels if known. To investigate the floorboards and the voids beneath
2.2.2 To analyse the environmental materials, taking account of how the deposit(s) formed as well as their content.

3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 Garden test pits

3.1.1 The test pitting comprised the excavation of two 2 m x 1 m trenches and one 2 x 2 m trench within the grounds of Hall’s Croft (Plate 3 - excavations in progress).

3.2 The attic: structure and environmental material

3.2.1 One of OA’s buildings archaeologists attended site to consider, record and comment upon the possible grinding apparatus and to investigate the structure of the floorboards where environmental remains have been previously discovered.

3.2.2 Environmental deposits were examined *in situ* to ascertain whether there was any visible stratification, in order to determine the level of environmental analysis required (WSI, section 6) and samples retained for further analysis.

3.3 Fieldwork methods and recording

3.3.1 The test pits were hand-excavated to the top of the natural or to the top of the first archaeological horizon, whichever was encountered first. The trenches were cleaned by hand and the revealed features were sampled to determine their extent and nature, and to retrieve finds and environmental samples.

3.3.2 All archaeological features were planned and where excavated their sections drawn at a scale of 1:20. All features were photographed using colour slide and black and white print film. Recording followed procedures detailed in the *OA Fieldwork Manual* (ed. D Wilkinson, 1992).

3.3.3 Building recording was carried out in accordance with standard OA practise.

3.4 Finds

3.4.1 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.

3.5 Palaeo-environmental evidence

3.5.1 An environmental sample was taken from pit fill 106 (in Test Pit 1) for charred plant remains. Two further environmental samples (Nos. 400 and 401) were taken in relation to material found inside the building above and below the present floorboards for charred plant remains/pollen analysis - see Section 5 and Appendix 4.
3.6 Presentation of results

3.6.1 This report outlines the significant findings from the test pit evaluation, the building survey and environmental sampling. Section 5 describes the sequence of deposits and archaeological remains in each test pit.

3.6.2 An inventory of all finds and context (which includes measurements not presented within the text) is provided in Appendix 1, 2, 3 and 4. The plan of Test Pit 1 and sections from each of the three test pits have been illustrated.

3.6.3 Section 5 also contains the results of the building survey and environmental work.

4 RESULTS: GENERAL

4.1 Soils and ground conditions

4.1.1 The topsoil was roughly 0.13 m in depth and consisted of a friable dark greyish brown loam. In general the site and weather conditions were fair to good.

4.2 Distribution of archaeological deposits

4.2.1 The evaluation revealed archaeological deposits to the south-west of the garden in Test Pit 1 (Fig. 2). A pit or garden feature was exposed in this test pit: no other features or deposits were located although finds were recovered from each of the test pits.

5 RESULTS

5.1 Test Pit descriptions

Test Pit 1 (Fig. 3, Test pit plan and Section 100)

5.1.1 Trench 1 measured 2 m x 2 m and was located over a high resistance anomaly on the south side of the property, near to the Old Town boundary. This trench was designed to explore the possibility that buildings previously existed along this part of the Old Town frontage. The natural geology, a firm dark red/brown sandy silt with gravel (104), was revealed at a depth of 0.9 m below the present surface (37.88 m OD).

5.1.2 To the south-east corner of the test pit was part of the edge of a circular pit (105), possibly circular in plan and cutting the natural subsoil. The lower fill was a friable dark brown silty clay with natural flint inclusions (106) containing pottery of late 13th-14th century date that lay beneath a loose red-brown gravel sand (107), thought to be a capping layer. The feature is probably a rubbish pit, or perhaps a garden feature or tree planting pit. Overlying the pit fill and the natural was a layer of friable dark red/brown sandy clay (103), probably a garden soil. The layer contained pottery of 14th-15th century date and a probably intrusive sherd of 16th-17th century material, together with a buckle of medieval/post-medieval date and an iron knife.
Ceramic Building Material (CBM) with a broad 13th-17th century date was also recovered from 103.

5.1.3 This layer was overlain by a friable dark reddish-brown sandy clay (102), a further garden soil that contained pottery of late 17th - early 18th century date and clay pipe pieces dated to the late 17th and 18th centuries. Also from 102 was a Nuremberg jetton (inscribed 'HANS SCHVLTE') dated to the mid - late 16th century and a lead weight, together with ceramic building material of (broadly) 13th to 17th century date.

5.1.4 Overlying this layer was a loose dark greyish brown sandy silty gravel (101) containing 19th-20th century pottery and CBM and clay pipe pieces of similar date. The layer was apparently re-deposited natural material and used as a levelling deposit. It was capped by a layer of friable dark greyish brown sandy silt (100), the present topsoil and turf.

Test Pit 2 (Fig. 3, Section 200)

5.1.5 Trench 2 measured 2 m x 1 m and was located in the central area of the Hall's Croft garden across a high resistance linear anomaly. The natural geology was a firm dark orange brown sandy silty gravel (204), revealed at a depth of 0.7 m below the present surface (37.97 m OD).

5.1.6 Overlying the natural was a layer of friable dark orange brown sandy silt clay (203), a garden soil that produced a sherd of 13th-14th century pottery. In turn this layer was overlain by a friable dark reddish-brown sandy silt clay (202), a further garden soil containing pottery of 13th-15th century date but with one piece of possible 18th/19th century roof tile.

5.1.7 As in Test Pit 1, this layer was overlain by a loose dark greyish brown sandy silt gravel (201) containing eight pieces of 18th/19th century ceramic building material, presumably a mixed re-deposited natural used as levelling material. This layer was sealed by a friable dark grey/brown sandy silt (200), the topsoil and turf, from which pottery of 19th century date was recovered together with clay pipe pieces of early 18th century date and CBM of 17th-19th century date. No features were observed in the test pit.

Test Pit 3 (Fig. 3, Section 300)

5.1.8 Trench 3, measured 2 m x 1 m, located partly over a high resistance anomaly in the north part of the garden. As well as exploring the anomaly, this trench was to explore the possibility that the rear of Hall's Croft was used for rubbish disposal. The natural geology comprised a friable light red-brown sandy silt (303) at a depth of 0.7 m below present surface (37.96 m OD). Pottery of 13th-14th century date and a piece of early medieval roof tile were recovered from the top of the natural.

5.1.9 Overlying the natural was a friable dark red/brown sandy silt (302) containing twenty-one thick medieval flat roof tiles dated to the 13th-16th centuries, perhaps
indicative of a building(s) in the vicinity. Layer 302 was in turn overlain by a friable
dark reddish brown sandy silt (301); both were interpreted as garden soils. Layer 301
was covered with topsoil and turf (300) that produced a clay pipe fragment of
late 17th-18th century date and 18th/19th century brick.

5.2 Building Survey Summary

Scope of work

5.2.1 The site work involved investigation of the tool affixed to one of the studs near the
north end of the west attic wall, as well as the attic floor where the organic deposit
was previously identified (Plates 1 and 2). The intention was to establish the
function of the tool and to see whether the floor deposit could be better understood
and related in any way to the tool.

5.2.2 General photographs were taken but the light was not ideal (very strong low sunlight
from one direction, close to the tool). Digital photographs were also taken.

The Tool

5.2.3 The tool has a wooden base, measuring 300 mm x 110 mm x 60 mm in size. The
upper and lower 30 mm of the grinder were only 20-24 mm wide, the main body was
60 mm across. It has a flat back and the upper 130 mm of the main body is cut so that
it forms a deep ‘V’-shaped chute leading in to a circular socket some 80 mm in
diameter and 44 mm deep. Here the right hand side is lined with a thin metal plate
held in place with nails that is punctured with many small rough holes creating a
rough abrasive surface.

5.2.4 This plate appears to be a repair, as that side of the socket had been built up with a
thin fillet of wood before the plate was nailed into place. At the base of the hole and
slightly to the left side was a narrow sloping gap leading to the exterior of the object.
At the centre of the socket was a much smaller hole, only 30 mm wide that pierced
through the back of the object.

5.2.5 Holes were drilled through the object, one in the centre of the top and four in the
more substantial body section. These last four had traces of pegs still within them but
none of the pegs actually passed into the wall stud behind the grinder. Instead, the
object is fixed to the wall with four handmade iron nails. They have a square section
and irregular hand-beaten heads.

5.2.6 It is suggested that this is a grater or grinder of some sort, but that it is missing a front
panel that would enclose the entry funnel and the round grinder part. It is also
missing the round central grinder that, given the position of the grinder plates and the
exit passage, would have been turned clockwise to draw material in at the top,
clockwise across the metal plate and out at the base. It would have spun on the socket
in the rear of the grinder, and on another in the front face. Although the rear of the
grinder body was abraded in a circular fashion, there was no clear indication of
whether the turning element (probably wooden also) had a metal covering.
5.2.7 It is also suggested that the pegs were originally what fixed the front plate on and the means by which the grinder was fixed onto the wall. The lack of peg holes in corresponding locations on the stud suggests that this location is not the original site of the grinder. It might also be expected that there would be a fixing for a bag, or a chute or some equivalent beneath the grinder, to catch whatever was being processed. Nothing remained within the grinder to illustrate this.

The Floor

5.2.8 The floor in the western part of the cellar has a later modern floor surface laid over earlier boards. Two or three small areas of boarding had been lifted up revealing the earlier surface and in some small areas, revealing the structure of joists and beams beneath. A deposit found within the floor void was sampled. It consisted of a wide range of organic remains, seeds, grains, grasses, twigs, etc.

5.2.9 The floor structure in the attic where the grinder is situated was formed of large timber beams (not fully measured but at least 300 mm × 300 mm) running north-south across the attic. The common joists measured approximately 100 mm × 100 mm and formed the support for both the floor boards of the attic and the lath and plaster of the room below. The principal beam projected clearly into the room below by roughly 200 mm but the common joists were not visible. The beam rests on the lintel of the southern window and on a post at the northern end; empty sockets were visible in the post for a probable arch brace, but no corresponding socket was seen in the soffit of the beam. The common joists were cut into the side of the principal beam. No close examination of the jointing used was possible but they were nailed rather than pegged into place. The boards were old, 10 inch wide rebated boards. They had been cut into smaller lengths than the width of the attic and the eastern half of the attic, where no secondary floor was laid, showed an irregular patchwork of board work.

5.2.10 The mixed nature of the floor boards and the evidence of the beams and common joists being cut together show that the floor has been reconstructed and is not part of the same construction phase as the main framework of the house.

5.2.11 In contrast the floor in the small extension on the north side of this range (Phase II in Meeson and Alcock’s report) has an example of a primary floor. The boards are the same but are cut to the full width of the room and the common joists are properly jointed in to the beam with a slightly diminished haunch. In between the common joists the ceiling/floor void is filled entirely with lath and plaster, probably acting as insulation.

6 ENVIRONMENTAL RESULTS

6.1 Scope of work

6.1.1 During the building investigation, deposits under the present floorboards containing abundant plant remains were revealed. An environmental assessment of the deposits
beneath the floorboards and evaluation of samples from a Test Pit from the garden were carried out in order to ascertain if these deposits contained archaeobotanical and other environmental evidence.

6.1.2 Assessment of the Test Pit sample from the garden feature was undertaken to establish if environmental evidence or artefacts were preserved within this garden feature. Assessment of the floorboard deposits was undertaken in order to determine if these assemblages of desiccated plant remains might yield information about the crops and/or crop by-products, and whether they were intentionally used for floor packing. The date of the floor packing material is believed to be 19th century, on the basis of a fragment of newspaper that has the publication date of January 23rd 1882 preserved, although some material could have accumulated before then.

6.2 Methodology

6.2.1 The floor on the western part of the attic revealed an earlier surface with a deposit found in the floor void. This deposit was sampled and it consisted of a wide range of organic remains, seeds, grains, grasses, twigs, etc. Some twenty-nine samples were analysed from this floor (they varied in size from one single object to 700 ml in volume). A 20-litre sample (SBT 2006.47 <3>) was taken from the garden to determine if some of the material from the building had fallen into the garden feature.

6.2.2 All the samples were rapidly scanned for archaeobotanical and other classes of environmental remains under a low-power binocular microscope at magnifications between x10 and x20. Most of the samples contain mouse/rat droppings so precautions (use of dust masks and gloves) were taken when handling the material. A 1-litre subsample was taken from the garden soil sample and processed by bucket flotation to determine if this deposit also contained desiccated plant remains or other artefacts/artefacts. The flot was kept wet and the residue air-dried and hand sorted.

6.3 Results

6.3.1 The table presented in Appendix 4 summarises the results. The sub-sample taken from the garden soil did not produce any environmental evidence or artefacts and, therefore, it is considered highly unlikely that desiccated plant material similar to that recovered from within the Hall is present in this feature. The samples recovered from beneath floorboards in the attic at Hall’s Croft had a very uniform composition. Most contained a mixture of crops (e.g. oat, broad bean, garden pea, and onion) and fruit (apple or pear)/nut (walnut) remains. Some also contained weed seeds or heads.

6.3.2 Caryopses of common oat (Avena sativa L.) were frequently recovered. It is very likely that the straw present in most of the samples is also from oat. Corn cockle (Agrostemma githago L.) was frequently recovered with oat grain in these samples. Corncockle seeds are poisonous and difficult to clean from cereal crops, because the seeds are roughly the same size as cereal grain and, therefore, are unlikely to be removed by sieving. Bread made from flour contaminated by corn cockle could result in serious illness, particularly in the very young or elderly (Hall 1981). As a
result, laws were passed to try and prevent the sale of grain containing high proportions of corn cockle.

6.3.3 The other common crop recovered from most of the samples is broad bean (*Vicia faba* L.) with two varieties present: var. *minor* and var. *major*. Gigantism in broad bean is now well known, but when this was introduced and broadly available is not. Broad bean remains present include fragments of the seed and the pods, some of which are complete.

6.3.4 Some samples contain a small number of walnut shells and most are well preserved but some exhibited rodent gnawing, most likely by mice or rats (sample SBT2007 5/19, SBT2007 5/21 and SBT2007 5/24).

6.3.5 Onion skins (*Allium cepa* L. – tunic) were commonly recovered from these samples. In addition, root plates (most likely also from the Lily family – LILIACEAE), possibly garlic (*Allium porrum* L.) and other unidentified bulbs were also recovered.

6.3.6 Remains of insects are very common and well-preserved in these samples. These include beetles (Coleoptera), flies (Diptera), spiders (arachnids) and some types of caterpillars (Lepidoptera).

6.3.7 Besides organic remains, most of the samples contain other materials such as paper, textile, twine, threads, plastic and metal objects (mainly fragments of nails).

6.4 Discussion

6.4.1 As Ernest and Jaomet (2005) have recently pointed out, the analysis of deposits of desiccated material from within buildings can increase our knowledge of house construction, of plant cultivation and of crop processing procedures. In addition, sampling of environmental material of Victorian date is often avoided as it is frequently considered ‘too modern’.

6.4.2 The presence of cultivated oat grain, indeterminate cereal straw (although likely to also be oat) and accompanying weeds of crop in these samples does provide information about crop processing in the Victorian era before widespread mechanisation of agriculture and/or use of herbicides.

6.4.3 It is unlikely that these crops are associated with what is believed to be a grinder installed in this area of the attic at Hall’s Croft. The grinder is far too small to be associated with crop processing.

6.4.4 The presence of *Vicia faba* (broad bean) and other bulbs in the attic could be explained if the attic space was used for drying such crops before consumption or sale; this is a practice still used in some farming communities in Europe and North Africa.

6.4.5 The presence of nuts (walnut) and some fruits (apple or pear) could be explained in the same way, but the amount found is limited and evidence for rodent damage from
the nuts and partial remains of apple and/or pear cores does suggest the possibility that this material was simply carried to the attic by rodents.

6.4.6 There are a few snails in some samples but their number is too small to be of interpretable value.

6.4.7 See Section 6.1.16 for recommendations.

7 THE FINDS

7.1 The Pottery by John Cotter (OA)

Introduction and Methodology

7.1.1 A total of 114 sherds of pottery weighing 932g were recovered. This is 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

7.1.2 Overall the pottery assemblage is in a fragmentary condition, although some sherds are quite fresh and a few are fairly large. Most however are fairly small. Ordinary domestic pottery types are represented.

7.1.3 Most of the assemblage appears to be of medieval and late medieval date (13th-15th century) although this includes some wares probably of 13th- or 14th-century date rather than later. Cooking pots and jugs appear to be the only forms represented, in some cases by rim, base and handle sherds as well as numerous body sherds. Hard grey sandy wares and glazed oxidised orange-brown sandy wares are common, some of the latter show traces of incised decoration and few have a typically medieval copper-flecked green glaze. The exact source of these wares is difficult to determine, particularly in their present very fragmentary condition. It is highly likely however that these and other wares from the site correspond with some of the pottery fabrics identified from the larger medieval pottery assemblage excavated at Wood Street, Stratford-upon-Avon (Ratkai 1991-2). The glazed oxidised sandy ware matches well with descriptions of Warwickshire Fabric 14, the commonest pottery fabric at Wood Street, which is identified as a Warkwick product (ibid., Table 3). The hard grey sandy ware may be Fabric 3, or 13. These are unsourced but their frequency on both
sites suggests a relatively local source. Alternatively these two fabrics could be a
harder reduced variant of Fabric 14 above. Other sources for both the grey and
oxidised wares are however possible including the known regional production
centres at Coventry, Nuneaton and perhaps Worcester (McCarthy and Brooks 1988).
A few glazed whiteware sherds are probably from the Chilvers Coton kilns near
Nuneaton (Ratkai 1991-2, Fabrics 33, 21 and 28) while a small number of quite gritty
sherds could represent Malverian wares (ibid., Fabrics 1 and 27). Three sherds,
including a jug rim, are tempered with Jurassic fossil limestone and probably come
from Northamptonshire (ibid., Fabrics 7, 17 and 29, all c. 1100-1400) or from the
Olney Hyde kilns in northern Buckinghamshire. No definite Brill/Boarstall ware
(Bucks.) was identified although this is fairly common in the town.

7.1.4 There are very few, if any, definite 16th-century wares but these possibly include a
sherd of imported German Frechen stoneware (c. 1525-1700) and possibly a few
sherds of Midlands blackwares (with glossy ‘Cistercian’-type glazes) - though all of
these are just as likely to be 17th century. The relatively small number of 17th-18th
century wares include Midlands blackwares and other Midlands-type black or brown
glazed earthenwares and a single small sherd from a tin-glazed ‘charger’ dish with
typical blue painted decoration (possibly from London or Bristol?). A small number
of common 19th-century Staffordshire whiteware types and terracotta flowerpot
sherds complete the list.

Summary and Recommendations

7.1.5 The pottery assemblage apparently comprises medieval and post-medieval pottery
types known from previous excavations in the town and surrounding region, although
the assemblage here is neither as large or as well-preserved as some of these. In view
of the small size and poor condition of the assemblage, no further work is
recommended. However, the pottery should be retained for future reference and
possible future pottery research in the area.

7.2 The Ceramic Building Material (CBM) by John Cotter (OA)

Introduction and Methodology

7.2.1 A total of 46 pieces of ceramic building material (CBM) weighing 2443g was
recovered. This is of medieval and post-medieval date. All the CBM was examined
and spot-dated during the present assessment stage in a similar way to the pottery
(see elsewhere) and the data recorded on an Excel spreadsheet. As usual, the dating of
broken fragments of ceramic building material is an imprecise art and spot-dates
derived from them are necessarily broad and should therefore be regarded with caution.

**Date and Nature of the Assemblage**

7.2.2 The CBM assemblage is in a fragmentary condition, although individual pieces are quite fresh. Nothing particularly unusual was noted.

7.2.3 Most of the assemblage comprises unglazed flat roof tiles in orange sandy fabrics and probably of fairly local production. Most of these (22 pieces) come from just two contexts (302 and 303) and appear to be of medieval date, i.e. somewhere between the 13th and the early 16th century. The only thing notable about these is their unusual thickness (c 15-20mm) compared to ceramic roof tiles in other parts of the country (13-15mm is fairly normal), but some of the post-medieval tiles from the site are also thick (though in smoother fabrics), so perhaps this is not so unusual for the area. Only one tile (from 303) show any evidence for the mode of suspension; this is a central nib (indicating an original tile width of c 160mm) rather than the usual pair of circular nail or peg holes generally associated with medieval and later peg tiles. Nibbed tiles, however, can be early although their use was more widespread during the post-medieval period. One medieval tile corner shows a dog or other animal paw print. One or two curved pieces may be from ridge tiles. One of these is covered with a copper-flecked green glaze (context 102) and may have been from a more decorative type of ridge tile.

7.2.4 The post-medieval CBM assemblage also includes thick roof tiles. One of these (19th century?) has a crude triangular mark incised before firing. A few scraps of post-medieval red brick were also noted. No definite floor tiles were noted.

**Recommendations**

7.2.5 In view of the small size and poor condition of the assemblage, no further work is recommended.
7.3 The Clay Pipes by John Cotter (OA)

7.3.1 The pipes were recorded in a similar way to the pottery (see Table 2 below). A total of 7 pieces of clay pipe weighing 30g were recovered from 4 contexts. Most pieces are stems ranging in date from 17th to 19th century. There is a single mouthpiece fragment, and a complete plain pipe bowl datable to c.1660-1680 (context 102), which supports the pottery dating from this context. Otherwise the assemblage is unremarkable and typical of domestic refuse. No further work is therefore recommended.

Table 2. Clay pipes by context and date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Spot-date</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Bowl</th>
<th>Mouth</th>
<th>Total sherd</th>
<th>Tot Wt</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>19C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stems. 1 narrow stem with stem bore (SB) c.1.6mm, 1 pos L18/E19C SB c.2mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>L17-18C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1x complete pipe bowl c.1660-1680 with broad circular heel, slightly worn. Clumsy milling around rim. 1x mouthpiece SB c.2.25mm. 1x v burnt stem SB c.1.8mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>L17-E18C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stem. SB 2.25mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>L17-18C?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stem. SB 2.25mm. Good quality burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4 The stone by Ruth Shaffrey (OA)

7.4.1 One large object was retained (103). This is in the shape of half a sphere with one flat surface and the curved side being formed by the removal of a series of crude flakes.

7.4.2 The flat surface is very smooth suggesting it may have been a processor but it seems a fairly awkward shape for this and a more likely interpretation may be that it was used as a weight (it would make a good paper weight). It is made from a very fine-grained limestone or calcareous sandstone.

7.5 The metal by Ian Scott (OA)

7.5.1 There are ten metal objects from this evaluation, including eight iron objects, one copper alloy jetton and a lead pan weight (Table 3).

7.5.2 The finds include a Nuremberg jetton ("HANS SCHVI. TE") dated to the mid to late 16th century, a lead weight with patterns on both faces (weight 13 g), a double oval iron buckle, and a scale tang knife blade. The buckle could be late medieval or post-medieval in date, and the knife is probably of similar date. The remaining finds comprise five nails and a strip of iron.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Buckle (fe)</th>
<th>Jetton (cu)</th>
<th>Weight (pb)</th>
<th>Knife (fe)</th>
<th>nails (fe)</th>
<th>strip (fe)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.6 The animal bone, by Lena Strid (OA)

7.6.1 A total of 46 animal bones were recovered from this site (see table A3.1 - Appendix 3). Most bones were in fairly good condition, displaying a moderate amount of surface deterioration (see table A3.2). Burned bones were absent, and only three bones displayed carnivore gnaw marks. The bone assemblage seems to be household refuse.

7.6.2 The predominance of cattle and sheep/goat in the assemblage (see table A3.3) is to be considered normal, regardless of time period. Judging by the epiphyseal fusion, the cattle, sheep/goat and pig bones mainly derived from adult or sub-adult animals.

7.6.3 Two cattle bones derived from juvenile individual/s. A sheep/goat metatarsal had a hole drilled into the proximal joint surface. Similar items, interpreted as socketed points have been found in London, York and several other British sites (MacGregor 1985:174-175. Pritchard 1991:208).

7.6.4 No further information can be gained from such a small sample of bones.
7.7 Other finds

7.7.1 One fragment of flint was recovered from context 103 weighing 3 g.

7.7.2 One fragment of shell was recovered from context 102 weighing 2 g.

7.7.3 A total of 21 fragments of glass were recovered from the site (Table 4).

Table 4: Glass finds by context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>No of Objects</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Glass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION

8.1 The test pits

8.1.1 All three test pits were positioned to investigate geophysical anomalies and/or the suggested location of potential medieval activity. The natural subsoil was observed at the base of each test pit.

8.1.2 As recorded, the borough boundary originally extended diagonally through the garden a few metres to the west of the house, but this feature was not identified in any of the test pits.

8.1.3 The test pits were positioned to target high resistance anomalies but only revealed a single medieval pit or garden feature in Test Pit 1. The pit contained 13th/14th-century pottery and is likely to represent disposal of domestic rubbish, although given the small size of the test pit, the feature may be a tree planting pit or other garden feature.

8.1.4 The pit fills were overlain by a build up of garden soils similar to those encountered in the other test pits. These soils may have been worked over on numerous occasions, either for lawns or cultivation of plants, and the range of finds present within the soils dating between the 13/14th to 19th century appears to reflect these activities.

8.1.5 Pottery of 13th/14th-century date comprising ordinary domestic ware (mainly cooking pot and jug fragments) was retrieved from the worked garden soil towards the base of Test Pit 3. Also present here was a quantity of medieval roofing tiles of 13th-16th century date, which appears to hint at more intense medieval activity just outside the site - possibly to the north-east - in the form of building construction or demolition.

8.1.6 No structural evidence was recovered to suggest the existence of earlier buildings along the Old Town road frontage from Test Pits 1 and 2. Limited quantities of ceramic building materials were noted in both pits (broadly dated between the 13th-17th centuries), but there were no signs of beam slots or postholes to suggest
structures were located in this particular area of the garden. However, the limited size of the sample of the garden should be noted.

8.2 Building Survey conclusions

8.2.1 The object fixed to the wall was a grinder of some sort operated probably by a turn handle on the exterior passing through the centre of the object. Material (no obvious trace of what type) was dropped into the ‘V’ shaped funnel at the top, carried clockwise across the metal grinder plate and exited the grinder through a diagonal chute in the bottom left hand corner.

8.2.2 The central mechanism is missing as is the plate that enclosed the whole. The grinder is not in its primary location where it would have been pegged in to the structure: at present we know of no comparative grinders. The organic deposits found within the floor void seem unlikely to be associated with the grinder. The deposits were not solely concentrated below the grinder and were noted in other voids within the floor. Other factors may be involved in its deposition, for example the activities of rodents.

8.2.3 Neither the floor nor the grinder could be definitely associated with the earliest construction phase of the building in the early 17th century. While the grinder might be from this period (this will remain unclear without other comparative examples) it was not necessarily positioned in the location it was found.

8.2.4 The floor certainly reuses earlier timbers and boards but no clear evidence was seen that could more closely date the re-construction of the floor. Without larger openings and a closer examination of the structure, this cannot be established.

8.2.5 Further dendrochronology dates might be taken but it, as seems likely, the timbers are reused from an earlier structure, this technique would not necessarily further tie down the structure.

8.2.6 It seems unlikely therefore that the organic deposits can be related with certainty to the activities of the 17th physician Dr. John Hall.

8.3 Environmental conclusions

8.3.1 The environmental sample taken from the garden feature in Test Pit 1, revealed modern roots only. No further artefacts or ceramic building materials were recovered.

8.3.2 The information provided by the samples collected from under the floorboards in the attic is important, not only to investigate types of environmental material that usually does not preserve well, but also to learn more about early-modern agricultural practises.

8.3.3 Analysis of the plant remains will provide information on the crops cultivated and wild taxa (most likely weeds of crop) will provide information on cultivation conditions. Analysis of the insect assemblage can potentially help to resolve whether
these deposits are the by-products of rodent nests or if this material is ‘floor packing’ or detritus from the crop processing activities related to the grinding device.

8.4 Environmental recommendations

8.4.1 It is recommended that no further work is carried out on SBT 2006.47 <3> - the deposit of garden soil contains only modern root, and clearly does not contain any desiccated remains, artefacts or architectural fragments from the building.

8.4.2 The four samples of desiccated ‘floor packing’ materials from the attic (SBT 2006-47<1>, SBT 2006-47<2>, SBT 2007 3/1-9, SBT 2007 5/2-9, 11-21 and 25-29) contain abundant desiccated plant and insect remains and could be the subject of further detailed analysis. However, the context is not well dated, and may be as late as the Victorian period, or have accumulated over a long period. Given these factors, further analysis is not currently recommended.
## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1  ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Ctxt No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Thick (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>No./ wt</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Levelling</td>
<td>Pottery Glass Bone Metal CTP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18-19thC 19C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden soil</td>
<td>Pottery Glass Bone Metal CTP Shell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13-17th C L17-18 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden soil</td>
<td>Pottery Glass Bone Stone Metal Flint</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13-17th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural sand gravel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2 m</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of pit 105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill of pit 105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>Pottery Bone Metal CTP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17-19th C E18 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Levelling</td>
<td>Pottery Bone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18-19th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden soil</td>
<td>Pottery Bone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18-19th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden soil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. STRABCET Hall’s Croft Stratford-upon-Avon STRABCET Evaluation Report.doc
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Cxt No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Thick (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>No./ wt</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18-19th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden soil</td>
<td>CTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden soil</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13-E16th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural sand - gravel</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-E16th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organic Plant material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>401</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organic Plant remains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 2  POTTERY ASSESSMENT/ SPOT DATING

Table A2.1: Pottery by date and context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Spot-date</th>
<th>Sherds</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>19-20C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2x flowerpot bss. 1x 18-19C Midlands black glazed buff ware. 1x prob 16-17C black glazed hard red 'Cistercian'-type ware ?drinking vess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>L17-E18C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1x small bs Eng tin-glazed charger dish with blue concentric lines int (L17-E18C). 5x bss Midlands black glazed ware (sub-Cistercian-type). 2x brown glazed buff/pale orange ware incl ?dish base w int glz (L17-18C?). 1x undent hard cream ware (sub-stoneware) w patchy ext brown glaze - poss related to Nottingham stoneware? (prob L17-E18C). 2x prob late medieval fine sandy greywares incl frag jug handle w diagonal slashed dec. v black surf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>14-15C?</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>But 1x ?intrusive bs Frechen stoneware jug c1525-1700. Rest consists of small-medium sized sherds of medieval sandywares (mainly). some slightly worn but others fairly fresh. Incl greywares (incl 4 flanged cooking pot rims), thumbed greyware jug base. Various oxidised orange and brown sandy wares (Nuneaton/Coventry?). some glazed, some with green copper-flecked glaze and traces incised decoration - mainly jug sherds incl 1 or 2 rims. some v hard-fired &amp; smooth. 1-2 quite gritty. 3x shelly-limestone tempered brown wares incl 1 jug rim &amp; 2 sagging bases w grey cores - limestone ~ Jurassic (incl bryoza/punctate bivalves as in St Neots ware) poss from Olney Hyde (Bucks) or Northamptonshire (13-14C)? 1-2 yellow-glazed whiteware sherds (?Nuneaton?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Flotation Code</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.13-14C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9x grey sandy wares incl large fresh jug sherd. V dark surfs, thin walled w slightly corrugated neck/shoulder, wheellthrown. Also 2x simple sub-squared cookpot rims. 1x sharply angled sagging cookpot base. 1x oxidised sandy/gyrtty jug sherd w patchy greenish glaze. 1x thick whiteware jug floor/base with splashes copper-green glaze underside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>19C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12x Staffordshire whitewares incl 1x blue transfer-printed. 1x bs flowerpot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>13-15C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 Jug base in fine white sandy ware w traces clear glaze ext. Pedestal-like w slight pad. Very worn/abraded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>13-14C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8x grey sandy/gyrtty ware. Poss handmade, poss sooted ext</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>13-14C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38x early looking jug rim ?13C in coarse grey sandy ware. 1x weakly oxidised jar base, sharply angled but prob sagging, wheellthrown, finer sandy with some quartz grits. Both worn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX 3 ANIMAL BONE ASSEMBLAGE

**Table A3.1. Animal Bone assemblage by species**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Sheep/Goat</th>
<th>Pig</th>
<th>Dog</th>
<th>Medium mammal</th>
<th>Large mammal</th>
<th>Indet.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loose teeth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertebra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelvis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metatarsal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalanx</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longbone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminat <strong>e</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A3.2: Preservation level of bone assemblage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBT2006.47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table A3.3: Animal bone by species and weight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>No. of bones (refitted)</th>
<th>Sum of weight (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large mammal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium mammal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large mammal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large mammal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 4 ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

**Table A4.1: Results of rapid analysis of environmental material**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Volume (ml)</th>
<th>Grain</th>
<th>Weeds</th>
<th>Other remains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2006-47&lt;1&gt;</td>
<td>Attic</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Avena sieva**</td>
<td>Fagopyrum tataricum*, <em>Glycine max</em>, <em>Vicia faba</em> (fragments)</td>
<td>Rats' mice droppings present. Wood fragments observed. Legume pod fragments, cereal straw, insects, wood, string, plastic and metal objects present. Pieces of wood, hair, glass, paper, plastic, string and metal objects present. Rat and mouse droppings observed. Soil (or well-decayed decayed plant material droppings) and some snails observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2006-47&lt;2&gt;</td>
<td>Attic</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>Avena sieva**</td>
<td>1 galthotium 1 faba 1 major (fragments) Cereals sp*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2006-47&lt;3&gt;</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Normal garden soil; with no important plant remains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 3/1</td>
<td>LHS</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>A. sativa***</td>
<td>1. faba minor 1 faba major**</td>
<td>Walnut (Juglans regia L.) shells observed; some clearly gnawed by rodents (? Mice). Cereal straw, onion skin, bean pods (a few complete, but most fragmented). Small mammal bones, wood, metal objects and rat droppings observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 3/2</td>
<td>LHS</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Twigs, car of hard or macaroni wheat (Triticum durum Desf.), head of possible damsel (Lotusii cf. Temulentum L.), Mint family (LAMACEAE) stalk observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 3/3</td>
<td>LHS</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Torus sp, Root plates with rosettes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 3/4</td>
<td>LHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 3/5</td>
<td>LHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cereals sp stalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 3/6</td>
<td>LHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 3/7</td>
<td>R1HS</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>A. sativa**</td>
<td>1. faba minor 1 faba major 1 galthotium**</td>
<td>Walnut shells, onion skin, insects, hair, bean pod fragments, snails and pieces of string observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 3/8</td>
<td>R1HS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A. sativa**</td>
<td>1. faba minor** (only fragments)</td>
<td>Bean pod fragments, insects, hair, cereal straw, onion skin observed. Mice/tat droppings present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 3/9</td>
<td>R1HS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A. sativa**</td>
<td>1 galthotium 1 faba minor 1 faba major 1 Cereals sp*</td>
<td>Bean pod fragments, hair; straw; insects; unidentified seed pod present. Rat/mice droppings observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/2</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A. sativa**</td>
<td>1 faba major 1. Glycine max 1 galthotium 1 Cereals sp*</td>
<td>Bean pod (mostly fragmented, but some complete), cereal straw, snails, hair and mace/tat droppings observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/3</td>
<td>Fallen from attic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walnut shell, fragment of bean pod and string present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/4</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>A. sativa**</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paper and unidentified broad leaves present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/5</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thread, onion skin and insects present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/6</td>
<td>Fallen from attic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Textile, fragments of bean pod, onion skin and insects observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/7</td>
<td>Exhibition room</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A. sativa**</td>
<td>1 avena faba*</td>
<td>Mice/tat droppings, cereal straw, onion skin, fragment of bean pods, paper and insects observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/8</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>A. sativa**</td>
<td>1 faba major**</td>
<td>Fragments of bean pod, onion skin, cereal straw, rose family (ROSACEAE) fruit (possible crab apple), textile, insects, hair and paper present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Volume (ml)</th>
<th>Grain</th>
<th>Weeds</th>
<th>Other remains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/9</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A sativa -</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood and cereal straw observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/11</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>A sativa ++</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walnut shell, fragment of bean pod, onion skin, paper and mice' rat droppings observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/12</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>A sativa +++</td>
<td>V. faba minor ++, V. faba major ++, A githago ++</td>
<td>Wood, cereal straw, unidentified twigs, small sized small shells, unidentified nutshell, fragment of bean pod, hair, insects and mice' rat droppings observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/13</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A sativa ++</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mice/ rat droppings, bean pod fragments, cereal straw, iron objects, onion skin, snails and insects observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/14</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A sativa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Textile present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/15</td>
<td>Exhibition room walls</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone and plaster fragments observed. Cereal straw and hair present in the plaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/16</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>A sativa +++</td>
<td>V. faba minor ++, V. faba major +++</td>
<td>Bean pod fragments, onion skin, walnut shells, insects, paper, textile, cereal straw, wood fragments, knotted plant fibres (possibly from basket), unidentified flowers, unidentified leaves and caterpillar remains present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/17</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>A sativa ++</td>
<td>V. faba ++ A githago ++</td>
<td>Bean pod fragments (some complete), wild carrot (Daucus carota L.) seed, Mustard family (BRASSICACEAE) seed, paper, insects and textiles present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/18</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>A sativa +++</td>
<td>A githago ++, V. faba minor ++, V. faba major ++</td>
<td>Rat/ mice droppings, fragment of bean pods, hair, indeterminate onion/ garlic skin and insects observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/19</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>A sativa +++</td>
<td>V. faba minor ++, V. faba major ++</td>
<td>Abundant mice/rat droppings, walnut shell (some damage by mice), hazel nutshell, onion/ garlic skin, bean pod fragments, flower, string, paper and hair present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/20</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hair and textiles observed. Fungus or some kind of mould present - clearly moist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/21</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>A sativa +++</td>
<td>V. faba minor ++, V. faba major ++</td>
<td>Walnut shell (some damage by mice); bean pod fragments, unidentified flower, insects, string, paper, onion skin, twigs, pebbles; gravel, insects, knotted textile, string and mice' rat droppings present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/25</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red paper with sticky substance with hair and plant remains imbedded in it. Possible resin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/26</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Artificial flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/27</td>
<td>Small room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pieces of textile, string, straw, paper, onion garlic skins and moss observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT 2007 5/28</td>
<td>Under floorboards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A sativa</td>
<td>V. faba minor</td>
<td>String, insect, paper and onion skin present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to scores in Table 1 | ++ = present (up to 5 items). ++ = frequent (5-25), +++ = common (25-100), ++++ = abundant (>100) |
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APPENDIX 6  SUMMARY OF SITE DETAILS

Site name: Hall’s Croft, Stratford-upon-Avon, Warwickshire
Site code: SBT 2006.47
Grid reference: SP 202 546
Type of evaluation: Test pits, building survey work and environmental sampling
Date and duration of project: January/February 2007
Area of site: 0.12 hectares

Summary of results: The test pit evaluation within the garden revealed a 13th/14th century medieval pit or garden planting feature. All three pits revealed a build up of garden soils containing materials dating from the 13th/14th to the 19th centuries and evidence of levelling and landscaping. One test pit contained quantities of medieval roof tile, suggesting the presence of a building(s) in the vicinity. The building survey within the attic examined a tool fixed to a roof timber. The tool was interpreted as a grinding device for foodstuffs but was not positioned in its original location and dating remains uncertain for the piece. An examination beneath the present floor boards revealed an earlier floor surface, but one which was not part of the original phase of the building. Environmental samples were taken of deposits beneath the floorboards. Analysis of these has revealed evidence of storage and preparation of vegetables and fruit for consumption, tentatively dated to the Victorian period, but which could have accumulated over a longer period of time.

Location of archive: The archive is currently held at OA, Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford, OX2 0ES. and will be deposited with Shakespeare Birthplace Trust Museum in due course, under the following accession numbers: SBT 2006.47/SBT 2006.48
Figure 2: Plan of Test pits - based on geophysical survey results (Stratascan, 2006)
Figure 3: Test pit 1, plan and section and Test pits 2 and 3, sections
Plate 1: Close up image of grinder

Plate 2: Attic floorboards and deposits below

Plate 3: Test pit excavations in progress with Halls Croft to the rear. View south-east
Plate 1: Close up image of grinder
Plate 2: Attic floorboards and deposits below

Plate 3: Test pit excavations in progress with Halls Croft to the rear. View south-east