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ABSTRACT

This report summarises the results of a series of archaeological investigations at the former Albany and Greyhound Hotel site in Fordingbridge, a town where comparatively little archaeological work has been undertaken. The first clear evidence for medieval occupation in the north-eastern part of the town was identified, with a sequence of 13th/14th century buildings, some with peg-tile hearths, fronting onto Bridge Street and Salisbury Street. Decorative louvers, glazed roof tiles and a zoomorphic finial found in a demolition spread overlying one of these buildings suggest that this substantial building belonged to an individual of some social standing. The later history of the site has been reconstructed using the archaeological findings amplified by documentary evidence, particularly for the Greyhound plot. Excavations in the eastern part of the site, close to the River Avon, revealed a 17th and 18th century tannery, with waterlogged barrel pits, a stone-lined trough and several large rectangular clay-lined pits. The animal bone evidence suggests that both cattle hides and sheep skins were being processed.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The archaeological work was undertaken following the demolition of the Greyhound and Albany Hotels in the late 1980s and in advance of redevelopment of the site in 1998. Avon Valley Archaeological Society (AVAS) carried out an evaluation followed by an excavation on the site of the former Greyhound Hotel. The excavation was undertaken over a period of three months from the beginning of January 1989, working mainly at weekends. At the same time, they carried out a watching brief on the excavation of a sewer pipe trench across the site of the former Albany Hotel. Eight years later, Wessex Archaeology was commissioned to undertake a programme of archaeological work in advance of imminent redevelopment. This comprised the evaluation of three proposed building footprints in September and October 1997, followed by the excavation of two of the footprints in October and November 1997. Both stages of the 1997 work were undertaken according to briefs issued by the County Planning Officer’s Archaeologist for Hampshire.

The site comprised a roughly ‘L’-shaped plot of land, covering c. 0.25 hectare, at the north-eastern end of the historic core of the town, centred on NGR SU 1490 1425 (Fig. 1). The western boundary of the site was formed by Salisbury Street, the southern boundary by Bridge Street and the eastern boundary by the River Avon. The site lies just to the east of a former market area formed by the junction of Salisbury Street, Bridge Street and Round Hill, which is now encroached upon by buildings. It also lies just to the north of the bridge over the River Avon, the principal and historic crossing point for the roads from Salisbury to Ringwood and from Southampton to Shaftesbury. Prior to the archaeological work, the land was used as a car park.

The ground surface slopes gently down to the east towards the River Avon, from a height of c. 27m Ordnance Datum (OD) near Salisbury Street to c. 25mOD near the river. The drift geology for the area consists of Valley Gravel which is overlain by recent alluvium in the eastern part of the site along the River Avon. Solid geology for the area comprises Eocene and recent strata (Reading Beds, London Clay, Bagshot Sands, Bracklesham Beds and Plateau Gravel) over Upper Chalk (BGS 1976).
HARDING AND LIGHT: EXCAVATIONS IN FORDINGBRIDGE, 1989 AND 1997
In the past, much of the southern side of the Greyhound Hotel plot was very wet and marshy with gently flowing springs merging to form a streamlet which discharged eastwards into the main river. By the 15th century, this spring source was known as Babwell (King’s Coll., FOR/8, Breamore House D298).

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND by Anthony Light

There have been few archaeological investigations undertaken within the town and no finds of prehistoric date are recorded in the County Sites and Monuments Record (Hampshire County Council 1997). There have, however, been isolated finds of Roman date, including pottery and coins, but there is no conclusive evidence for settlement.

The place-name 'Fordingbridge' means 'bridge of the dwellers of Ford' (Coates 1993, 78). Domesday Book contains the first mention of the manor of Forde, with a recorded population of thirteen smallholders, a church and two mills. The name Forde indicates a ford across the river, although Fordingebrige was the name of the hundred in the 11th century, suggesting that there was a bridge in existence at that date. The first reference that would definitely indicate that there was a bridge here dates from 1252, when the bailiff and men of the town received a grant of pontage for its repair (Page 1911, 567). Grants for further repairs were made in 1268 and 1272 (Jervoise 1930, 75). The frequency of the need for repairs to the bridge may indicate that the structure was already quite old in the mid-13th century (Hampshire County Council 1997).

By the 13th century there were three manors holding property in the town: Fordingbridge, Burgate and Woodfidley Rectory. It is generally accepted that the Domesday village of Forde was created out of the much larger manor of Burgate at some point before the Norman Conquest. Because of its size and wealth, as well as its control of the Hundred Court, the latter was always to dominate the small town of Fordingbridge which grew up during the 12th and 13th centuries.

From the late 13th century until 1958, the lordship of the Manor of Fordingbridge was held by the Brune family, later the Prideaux-Brunes, of Padstow in Cornwall. There is no indication that they ever held a manor house within the town. Rather, they were absentee landlords who administered their lands through bailiffs and stewards.

The administration of the area was further complicated by the establishment of the Rectory Manor of Woodfidley towards the end of the 12th century. Lay rectors were appointed by successive members of the Falaise and Brune families, Lords of the Manor of Forde from the 13th to 15th centuries. After the death of Henry Brune in 1461 possession was obtained by the College of St Mary and St Nicholas, later King’s College, Cambridge (PRO C140/2/27).

The rectors were men of power and influence in a large and lucrative parish that included the nearby villages of Midgham, Bicton, Godshill, North Gorley, and Sandleheath, as well as Burgate and its outlying farms in the Stuckton area. The absence of a manor house within the town, and a largely non-resident Lord of the Manor, were factors which led to the Lords of Burgate Manor and the rectors having more control over local affairs than otherwise might have been the case.

Early rectors lived in a purpose-built Rectory about 800m to the north of the church within a large block of land which must have been part of the original gift from the then Lord of the Manor (Fig. 2). Two other blocks within the town which were to become tenanted land must also have been part of this grant. These comprised a block on the west side of Provost Street which probably contained seven medieval tenements, and another along Salisbury Street which included the former Greyhound Hotel site and ran northwards with the River Avon as a boundary on the east. This block probably contained four or five tenements. A further five detached tenements in the town, around Church Street and in the Market Place, and holdings in Rockbourne, Ibsley and Gorley are likely to have been later additions to the Rectory Manor.

Although there are now only a few surviving detailed documents relating to the medieval Manor of Fordingbridge (HRO 1M53/1–2, 79M95/1–2), Burgate has been more fortunate. It has a good series of Court Rolls as well as some
other sources from the 15th century onwards together with Books of the Hundred (HRO inc. in 1M53/3-218).

The College of St Mary and St Nicholas did not gain possession until 1461, though the Rectory had actually become part of their foundation.
grant in 1446 (Cal. Pat Rolls 1 Mar 25 Hen VI) and there are considerable, although far from complete, holdings of documents from this time in the King's College muniments. Many of these have fortunately become available for research in recent years, and have been of considerable assistance in rectifying some of the gaps in previous knowledge of the development of the town.

Fordingbridge clearly grew up as a market centre serving the many small settlements in the area. There are documentary references to a market being held in the town by 1273 (Page 1911). It is difficult to estimate the overall size of the town at this time, but if the evidence of the 13th and 14th century ‘Extents of the Manor of Ford’ is added to archaeological and documentary information for Burgate and the Rectory a total of about 70 households is likely, stretching from the area of the church northwards to the north-east corner of Barton Field (PRO C133/100/11, E152/106). There is, however, no evidence as yet of early occupation along what is now the High Street, and it therefore appears that there may have been two distinct areas of settlement, one around the church and the other around the bridge approximately 500m to the north-east (Fig. 2). Excavations at Church View, some 100m north of the church, in 1974/5 produced evidence of 13th/14th century occupation (Light 1978).

Two market areas have also been identified (Fig. 2). One lay at the junction of High Street, Provost Street and Shaftesbury Street and is marked as the ‘Market Place’ on the Ordnance Survey 1st Edition map of 1872. The other lay at the junction of High Street, Salisbury Street and Bridge Street. Recent research has shown that this was the site of a market until about 1670 (Light and Ponting 1993), when it was encroached upon by the block of buildings without gardens which today exists between Round Hill and the High Street.

It seems possible that the medieval settlement area around the bridge extended northwards from the bridge, around the market area, and along the east side of Salisbury Street as far as the end of Barton Field where the road turned westwards towards Whitsbury in front of a small group of houses belonging to the manor of Burgate. The existence of dwellings along Salisbury Street is suggested by several entries in the Rectory Court Rolls including that for 12th September 1455 which reads - 'John Boon, John Baron and John Berkham to set up piles at the end of their gardens against the River Avon to prevent accidental encroachment of the water.' There was no other Rectory land which would have bordered the river (K Coll FOR/9). To the east of the bridge, there was a small settlement known as Horseport since the 14th century at least (Fig. 2).

By the mid-15th century, the Rectory Manor appears to have held sixteen dwellings within the town (K Coll FOR/52), as well as those in Gorley, Rockbourne and Ibsley, although the figure seems to have been reduced to twelve by the 16th century, apparently as the result of a serious fire in about 1517 (K Coll FOR/78/2). The evidence suggests that the buildings destroyed by the fire lay along Salisbury Street, and they appear not to have been immediately rebuilt (Light and Ponting 1993).

The medieval moated Rectory seems to have been abandoned by the mid-15th century as the only building mentioned in the grant of 1446 was a barn, although a lease of the Rectory Farm in 1548 specifically excluded ‘all buildings within the Motte’ (K Coll FOR/41). It was probably 1584 before a new house was put up on the site by the then farmer of the Rectory. This was apparently built outside of the moat, however, where the present day ‘Parsonage House’ now is.

The 16th century saw an up-turn in the fortunes of the town and there was some growth, with redevelopment along Salisbury Street (Light and Ponting 1993). At this time, almost all of the trades and industries expected in any small rural town were to be found in Fordingbridge, particularly those associated with leather working. Butchers, skinners, tanners, leather dressers and shoemakers are all recorded, as also are dyers, shirtmakers, brewers, bakers and mercers (general merchants in cloth, household goods and exotic foodstuffs). Unfortunately, serious fires in the town in 1662, 1672 and 1702 destroyed many of the medieval buildings and these fires must have had a severe economic impact on the town.
The Greyhound (Fig. 1)

The Greyhound site was anciently associated with four acres of land in Burgate Field and this holding can be identified in numerous documents between the 15th and 19th centuries. The earliest reference is in the Court Roll for 16th May 1452 where there is a record relating to the surrender by John Sutton of 'a tenement situate in the north part of Babwell in Fordingbridge with 4 acres of arable lying in Burgate Field in the west part of la Barrowe here, the next tenant being Ralph Bright who pays a fine of 16s. 8d for entry of himself and his wife' (K Coll FOR/8).

An undated rental (K Coll FOR/52) was probably written a decade or two before this and mentions 'Sutton' as having taken over a holding of 'H. Blake', which was previously in the possession of 'Stohman'.

There is no further record until 28th August 1573 (K Coll FOR/18) when Richard Godding surrendered these premises, the previous tenant having been Richard North. The new tenant was Nicholas Norrice, yeoman, whose descendants were to remain there for almost exactly a century. At his death in 1587 the Inventory of his goods show clearly that his dwelling was by now being used as an inn (see below) (HRO 1587 Ad45).

The extent of his own involvement in this enterprise is unclear, however, as it was his son Edward who was a victualler at his own death in 1597 (K Coll FOR/55). Edward's widow Anne took possession but in the following May she surrendered in favour of Edward's brother Nicholas (K Coll FOR/61).

There is then a hiatus in the records until the Survey of 1641 (K Coll FOR/62), by which time Nicholas had died, and his widow, possibly Mary, was tenant.

On Wednesday 2nd July 1662, a serious fire destroyed fifteen houses at the north end of Fordingbridge, including that of Mary Norris, widow (HRO QO/4). Rebuilding must have continued apace as on 27th May 1663 the manor court granted permission for a small land grant from Robert Curtis's holding next door to Mary Norris for her Greyhound tenement, the first mention of the name yet discovered. Within a few years, however, disaster struck again, with a massive fire sweeping right through the town and destroying 102 houses on Tuesday 9th July 1672 (HRO QO/5).

In the court book of 15th September 1674 (K Coll KCE/86) it is written that 'the Greyhound hath of late burned down to the ground and as yet remaineth unbuilt'. Edward Norris of the Greyhound had died in late August 1672 and Widow Norris, either his wife or his mother, some two years later (K Coll FOR/75). The heir to the premises was now John Norris, Edward's brother, but he had no use for the wrecked building and surrendered his interest (K Coll KCE/86).

Since 1651 John had been living about two hundred yards away in Fore Street (HRO1M53/603) (now the north end of High Street), and it was this property that was resurrected after the fire and turned into the new Greyhound Inn, although he himself was to die within two years. It was, however, this inn that confusingly continued the Greyhound name for some years to come, with James Freak, Widow Freak and Timothy Coles as successive innkeepers.

Meanwhile the old Greyhound property was granted to William Barter, a local butcher, on the condition that he rebuilt the premises, and by 1676 he had reopened the inn under the name of the White Horse (K Coll KCE/86). Sadly, there is a lack of information during the following century, although the names of the tenants and some of the occupiers are known.

In 1702 a further extensive fire destroyed numerous properties in the Round Hill area of the town (Morley Hewitt 1966), although its effect upon the White Horse is uncertain. Many of the houses which still exist in this area today were rebuilt following the fire, and several have contemporary date-plaques.

Even the date of the name change back to the Greyhound is unclear. Manorial court records of 1727 and 1734 (K Coll. Court Book 1720-40) still mention the White Horse but it is not certain that these are reliable, as the list of ratepayers for the relief of the poor dated 1733 (HRO 1M53/1301) does not include an inn of that name. There is, however, an entry for the Greyhound, but the occupier Andrew Adams is at present unknown from any other source and the property cannot be identified with certainty.
It is not until 1790 (K Coll. Court Book 1752-1802) that there is definite evidence of the Greyhound name back at the original site, although the above-mentioned 1641 Survey was annotated in 1749 with 'Widow Hilman's 3 copies, one of these the Greyhound', so it is probable that the name change had occurred before the middle of the century.

In the Survey of College lands made in 1859 (K Coll FOR/30), it is stated that the tenant was Richard Westcott Withers and the occupier R. Chilcott. The Copy comprised the Greyhound Inn, formerly the White Horse, and two pieces of land (at Sweatford and in Broad Mead). The house was 'roomy and commodious with excellent Brewhouse and Offices.' 'For the most part' the premises were 'in good repair, but the principal timbers in the brew house' needed attention.

The College continued to hold the inn until December 1920 when it was sold to the Marston Dolphin Brewery Ltd, the lessees for the previous thirty years (Deeds - Shering Collection).

*Winge's Tenement* (Fig. 1)

Although the adjoining premises to the north of the Greyhound have from time to time been associated with it, there is no documentary record of occupation here before 1570. In the College's 1576 Survey (K Coll Survey of Woodfidley Manor 1576) Katherine Winge widow is recorded as occupier by virtue of a copy dated 16th May 1570, her husband Ralph having proceeded her. The premises are described as 'a tenement and messuage lying in the south part of the Manger, and two little gardens measuring \( \frac{1}{2} \) acre', for which a rent of 12d per annum was due.

A copy of Court Roll of 10th February 1574 (ibid.) admitted Roland and Robert Boweman, but their entry in the 1576 Survey is deleted and annotated as 'vacant'.

The property is next mentioned in 1593 when Nicholas Norris took the tenancy (K Coll KCE/55). It is not clear whether this is the same Nicholas that had an interest in the Greyhound premises next door, as he seems to have succeeded a John Norris, although this could be an error for Joan, his mother. The known Nicholas is recorded on various occasions as a leather dresser and a tanner between 1597 and 1604 (K Coll KCE/65).

Once again, there is a gap in the record at this point until 10th April 1638 when Robert Curtis, also a leather dresser, took possession (K Coll KCE/78). The 1662 fire destroyed this property as well and it apparently remained as a shell for some time, as on 7th May 1663 the Court ordered it to be rebuilt (ibid.).

On 27th May 1663 Robert Curtis surrendered 'all that parcel of ground from the corner next unto the street of his Backhouse, to the south side of his gatepost next the street to the intent the Lord may regrant the same to Mary Norris widow, to the intent that it may be annexed to the Greyhound tenement' (ibid.).

On 5th October 1666 Robert Curtis surrendered the entire holding in favour of William Read, tanner, and John and James Read his sons (ibid.), but it is likely that Robert continued to live in part of the premises as he is listed next to William in the names of those whose property was destroyed in the 1672 fire (HRO QO/5).

There is a further reference to the 1663 agreement in the court papers for 21st July 1668 - 'Agreed in Court by William Read that John, Edward and Alice Norris, part of whose copyhold brewhouse starts . . foot of (sic) the copyhold ground of the said William Read, and all occupiers of the said brewhouse shall at all times hereafter quietly enjoy the said piece of ground in consideration it is agreed by the said John, Edward and Alice Norris that the said William Read shall from time to time and at all times hereafter have liberty to convey part of the springs on the backside of the said John, Edward and Alice into the garden of the said William' (K Coll KCE/42).

William continued as occupier until 19th May 1691 when he was succeeded by William Barter, tenant of the White Horse next door (K Coll KCE/87).

An undated survey of the early years of the 18th century (K Coll FOR/74) refers only to an outhouse, backside and garden, whilst a note of 1720 calls the copyhold, 'Brockwell's Malthouse' an allusion to Wingfield Brockwell (K Coll Survey of Woodfidley Manor 1576), now occupier of the inn, so it is likely that the dwelling
was also destroyed in the 1702 fire, remaining derelict for some years to come. However, by 1731 there was again a tenement on the premises (K Coll Court Book 1720-40).

The above mentioned Survey of 1576 has an annotation, dated 1749, which adds ‘Elizabeth Hilman holds this except 9 perches of the land with a tenement adjoining now held by Elizabeth Wiseman’. Here, then, is the key to the future use of the plot, as although no dates are yet certain, there were by now two houses, one on the site of the ancient tenement which was already incorporated into the inn and a new dwelling which was established in the north-west corner adjacent to the road.

Edsall's Tenement (Fig. 1)

This plot was occupied by a dwelling described in a Copy of 1798 as ‘a shop and 9 perches of land in the north part of a customary tenement, heretofore Barter’s’ (K Coll Court Book 1752-1802). The tenant James Hicks is in the Universal British Directory of 1792 as a baker.

In 1851 a new tenant, Henry Edsall, a relative of the well known family of Breamore blacksmiths took over and the entry in the 1859 Survey reads ‘These premises have been improved since the admission of the tenant. A new blacksmith’s forge has been erected and the whole property is in good repair. There is now no garden attached to the copy nor as in other cases does it communicate with the river’ (K Coll FOR/30).

The Albany site (Fig. 1)

The Albany site comprised two ancient house-plots fronting onto Bridge Street and running back northwards as far as the Greyhound boundary. Unlike the Greyhound, however, they are poorly documented as one was a copyhold of the Manor of Forde, for which few record papers are known to survive, and it can not be established whether the other was freehold or copyhold.

For a time in the 16th century the manor was leased to the Bulkeleys of nearby Burgate, and within the Coventry family papers (HRO 1M53) are several extant Court Books. It is difficult to link copyhold entries from these to specific house-plots, but the following extract appears to refer to Tithe Map plot 158, alongside the river (Fig. 12). 25th Oct 1519 John Jeayd takes a tenement, late Richard Rows in the Ville of Forde, next to the Bridge of Forde in the north part of the King’s Way here.’ A further entry dated 5th May 1557 may also relate to the site:- ‘Jasper Phetiplace takes a tenement with garden adjoining next to the Bridge of Forde, and 1 acre of meadow for his life and that of Richard his son, paying a heriot of 10 shillings.’

Nothing further is known of John Jeayd or Richard Rows, although the latter may well have been a descendant of John Rouse, tanner, who in 1449 had ‘unjustly changed the proper course of the stream which runs from Babwell, viz. between land of Thomas Ringwood and land of John Kymon, having used it outside of its old course’ (HRO 1M53/3).

A recent deposit of Prideaux Brune family documents at Cornwall Record Office has enabled some aspects of the documentary history of Tithe Map plot 158 to be developed (Table 1).

By using the 1841 Census in conjunction with the Tithe Map of 1840 it can be seen that plot 158 consisted of two cottages, a shop and garden, and was owned by Robert Blachford Curtis, a local miller. Whilst he and his family occupied one cottage, the other was held by William Arney, carpenter, and his family.

A deed of 28th September 1899 in the Shering Collection refers to a plot of 17½ perches, ‘on which messuage and buildings lately stood but which have since been pulled down’. Reginald Hannen writes in 1909 that as the floors of these tenements were well below road level the lower storeys were damp and unfit for habitation (Hannen 1909).

The house, shop and bakehouse on plot 157, to the west of plot 158, were occupied in 1840 by John Keay, grocer and baker, and his family. He was still there in 1857, but gone before 1875. According to Hannen the premises were rebuilt as two tenements in 1879 (ibid.), whilst the aforementioned 1899 deed describes them as ‘formerly two messuages, dwellinghouses and premises with passage, gardens and outbuildings.’

In 1881, the new premises were extended and adapted into the Albany Temperance Hotel, and
Table 1  Some aspects of the documentary history of Tithe Map plot 158

1593  Premises in possession of Andrew Pope, with licence to let the same to an honest tenant, presumably a tanner? for his life and those of William and Gilbert his sons (Cornwall R.O. PB4/158/1).

1639  William Pope recorded as tanner (HRO 24M82/Apprenticeship Indenture).


1704  Charles Barter pays Poor Rate for the Tanhouse (HRO 1M53/1372).

1733  John Barter pays Poor Rate for the Tanhouse (HRO 1M53/1301).

with the adjacent cottages demolished, plot 158 became its gardens, and in more recent times its car park (Light and Ponting 1997). A mortgage agreement dated 1st January 1896 was drawn up between William Reynolds Neave and Josiah Percy Neave to the sum of £9,000 for the Albany Coffee Public House which was then in the possession of the Albany Coffee Public House Co. Ltd. (HRO 40M78/E/T18). The premises were sold subsequently to Mr George Jones, a grocer and draper from Cranborne on 28th September 1899 for £1,500 'leaving £7,500 only due on the within mentioned security'.

METHODS

Avon Valley Archaeological Society (AVAS) excavated a machine-dug trial trench, roughly 40m long by 1m wide, from the Greyhound Hotel plot down towards the River Avon to the east (Fig. 1). Work was then concentrated at the western end of the trench, with an area excavation (Trench 4) roughly 15m square. A watching brief was also carried out on the excavation of a machine-dug sewer trench, c. 28m by 1.2m, across the site of the former Albany Hotel.

The Wessex Archaeology evaluation comprised three branching machine-dug trial trenches concentrated within three proposed building footprints. The evaluation showed that well-preserved archaeological deposits existed in the southern and eastern parts of the site. The footprints of the two proposed buildings (Trenches 1 and 2) in these areas were therefore excavated. Both trenches were 10m wide; Trench 1 was 25m long and Trench 2 was 23m long. No further excavation was undertaken in the northern part of the site, since two truncated 17th–18th century pits were the only archaeological features found in evaluation Trench 3. These cut Valley Gravel, which was generally overlain by accumulations of 19th–20th century demolition rubble. This area had clearly been disturbed by 19th–20th century buildings fronting onto Salisbury Street.

Modern overburden was removed by machine in all the evaluation and excavation trenches. Most subsequent archaeological deposits were excavated by hand. It had been the intention to remove the 19th century foundations of the Albany Hotel in Trench 1 by machine once the overburden had been removed. However, this was not possible due to the delicate nature of the archaeological deposits close to these foundations. They were only removed by machine once the surrounding deposits had been fully recorded. Some archaeological deposits in Trench 1, particularly demolition deposits, were removed by machine once a sufficient sample had been excavated by hand and their extent and nature had

Fig. 3 (opposite)  Phase 1 features in Trench 1
been established. In Trench 2, floodplain deposits of gravel mixed with grey clay, which lay under the modern overburden, were machine-excavated in controlled spits to a depth of 1.2m. Since this trench suffered from constant flooding and had to be continuously pumped, a smaller hand-dug trench, 6.6m long and 1m wide, was excavated within the eastern part of Trench 2 (Fig. 1). In both Trenches 1 and 2, six large rectangular tanning pits were recorded in plan, of these two in Trench 1 and one in Trench 2 were sectioned and excavated. Four barrel pits were recorded in plan in Trench 1, of these three were sectioned and excavated.

A different sequence of context and cut numbers was used for each trench; 1000-1500 for Trench 1, 2000-2050 for Trench 2, 3000-3060 for Trench 3 and 1-175 for Trench 4.

RESULTS by Phil Harding (Trenches 1-3) and Anthony Light (Trench 4)

Phase 1 - 13th - early 14th century

Trench 1 (Fig. 3)
Grey alluvium, up to 1m deep, overlay Valley Gravel within Trench 1. Occupation debris, including large quantities of hand-made jars, was found within the upper alluvial clay deposits within the southern-western part of the trench. Glazed jug sherds amongst this debris suggest it was dumped in the 13th century, probably mid century.

The debris was sealed by a gravel layer, which was laid to provide a firm foundation for an overlying structure. Evidence for this structure included a flint wall foundation (1430), 0.6m wide, probably the east wall. Although there was no evidence for the north wall, it probably coincided with the southern boundary of a cobbled yard (1495) and may have been of timber sleeper beam construction. The south wall on the Bridge Street frontage appears to have lain to the south of the trench under the present pavement. The structure included an oval hearth (1348) of heavily burnt flint cobbles sealed by a fire-hardened clay surface.

The cobbled yard (1495) extended north from the building for approximately 6m to a stake-lined culvert (1488), bordered by tree stumps. The culvert may have drained the stream that originated in the southern side of Trench 4 at the spring source, known as Babwell in the 15th century. The culvert had vertical sides and a flat base and was 0.85m wide and 0.8m deep. Its timber lining comprised round oak stakes up to 1.1m long and approximately 0.07m in diameter. Most were hewn to a square tip. The eastern end of the culvert was bordered by planks and a probable fence line of timber posts (1463), each 0.1m in diameter and 0.2-0.3m apart, which had been piled into the alluvial clay. To the north of the culvert, a row of horizontal timbers appeared to mark the tenement boundary (Fig. 3).

Trench 4 (Fig. 4)
Within Trench 4, gravel was used to raise the area probably in the 13th century. Rafts of flint (159
and 161) were used to backfill the wet area around the spring head.

Post-holes indicated the presence of more than one timber building but there was insufficient evidence to provide precise dimensions or forms. A small outhouse associated with a sequence of hearths was recorded. The structure had flint walls (111 and 112) with a door apparently at the west end of the south wall. The earliest, peg-tile, hearth (96), 1.5m by 0.6m, was replaced by hearth 78, which was constructed of nearly horizontal, slightly overlapping clay peg-tiles. The latest and most substantial hearth (77) was built of vertically set clay peg-tiles and was ‘keyhole’ shaped, measuring 2m by 1.25m. Two small sub-rectangular areas of unburnt clay and horizontal tile marked the location of an arch separating the flue from the chamber. A flint wall (86), 0.25-0.3m wide, wrapped itself around the southern and eastern edge of the hearth. These hearths appear to represent non-domestic activity and it is probable that the latest hearth at least was used as a baker’s oven.

Phase 2 - 13th - early 14th century

Trench 1 (Figs 5 and 6)
Phase 2a. The small phase 1 structure in Trench 1 was replaced by a larger rectangular building. This building extended from the Bridge Street frontage, which lay to the south of the trench, for at least two bays with a possible third bay or extension to the rear. It had flint wall foundations, approximately 0.4m wide, though wall 1253 may have been more substantial. Fragments of clay overlying these foundations in several places suggest that, above ground, the walls had been constructed of clay/cob. The demolition rubble indicates that it had a ceramic tiled roof. A parallel flint foundation wall was found 1m to the east of its east wall and may represent the west boundary wall of plot 158 and at the south end formed the west wall of a building in that plot. The gap between the two walls appears to have been a narrow alleyway.

A series of well-preserved floor surfaces was recorded at the south end of the large rectangular building. One of these floors was associated with a broad internal or earlier flint wall foundation (1385), 0.7m wide. In contrast to other flint wall foundations within the trench, which were generally built of unstained flint nodules probably collected from the fields, this wall was constructed of ochreous stained flint nodules from a different source. The relationship of this wall to wall 1253 or wall foundation 1255 to the north had been destroyed by subsequent development. Other floor surfaces were recorded to the west of wall 1385.

The phase 1 culvert was still in existence in phase 2. It appears to have been capped with ironstone slabs and ran obliquely across an area, 3.5m square, enclosed by walls which continued to the north-east. It is not clear whether this area was part of the main building, an outbuilding with a floor suspended above the culvert, or an open yard. Ironstone slabs revetted the culvert sides where it passed through the wall foundations into the alleyway. They had also been used to form the floor of the alleyway. The east tenement boundary at the north end of the trench was defined by a shallow ditch (1387), 0.47m wide and 0.27m deep, with a stake line to the east.

There was some evidence for the layout of the adjacent tenement to the east. Superimposed clay floor surfaces, some of which were heavily burnt, were recorded in section at the south-east corner of the trench, however, they did not extend sufficiently into the excavation area to interpret or date precisely. These appear to be the same as those recorded during the AVAS watching brief in the east facing section of the sewer trench to the east of Trench 1. A vertical tile hearth was also observed in this section. The floors were visible in the section for 5m from the southern end of the trench at the Bridge Street pavement, suggesting that the building was at least 5m wide (Fig. 6). The clay floor with the tile hearth was overlain by a thick burnt layer containing abundant peg-tiles. The remains of the west wall of this building were recorded in Trench 1, 1m to the east of the large rectangular building.

Phase 2b. The demolition of the large rectangular building was marked by a spread of peg-tile with other associated roof furniture across most of the central part of Trench 1, including a thin spread which overlay the floor at the front (south end) of the building. Medieval, 13th/14th century, pottery (72 sherds weighing 1,384g) was consistently
recovered from the many contexts which made up the tile spread. Although a few sherds of 17th/18th century pottery were recovered from one tile spread context, this was found to be intrusive from a later barrel pit.

Post-dating the tile demolition horizon was a hearth (1008) of vertical tiles, 1.7m by 0.75m, in the south-west corner of the trench. This hearth appears to have been built against a flint wall to the west, but only two heavily crazed flints of this wall remained, since the rest had been removed by the foundations of the Albany Hotel.

Trench 2 (Fig. 6)
A ditch (2032), over 1m deep and 1.4m wide, was recorded in Trench 2. This ditch probably
drained the springs which originated in the southern half of Trench 4 and flowed eastwards towards the river. It had cut through the alluvial clay down to the underlying Valley Gravel. A medieval floor tile and butchered animal bone were found in its rich organic basal fill, which was sealed by a clay deposit. Pottery of 13th/14th century date was found in its upper fill.

**Trench 4 (Figs 6 and 7)**

A cottage, which was probably constructed on timber sills, was built alongside Salisbury Street in the south-west corner of Trench 4. Precise dimensions could not be ascertained as site clearance and rebuilding in the 17th century, as well as 20th century demolition, had removed much of the northern and eastern side of the structure. The overall length was estimated as about 8.7m however, given that there were probably two rooms of equivalent size separated by a cross-passage, of which the beam slots survived.

The southern room, 2.7m by 3.6m, had a well-preserved clay floor (114), which abutted the south wall (115). This wall had a heavily-built flint foundation and was 0.6m wide, perhaps more substantially built to withstand the water flow from the springs at this end of the house. There were no other flint walls, and the presumed timber sills along the sides of the house had been entirely destroyed by later building work.

Immediately under the clay floor an arcing shallow trench (129); 0.45–0.8m wide and 0.25m deep, was filled with loosely packed flints, with many voids between them, and capped with a single horizontal layer of clay peg-tiles. This seems to have been intended as a soakaway to drain the springs, as was gully 122.

The northern beam slot (92) of the cross-passage had a width of 0.1–0.12m and a similar depth. It was filled with a grey silt. The southern beam slot (118), 0.8m away, was larger and was divided into two distinct sections. The western end, 1.3m in length and 0.2m wide was 0.12–0.15m deep, and at its east end turned through almost a right angle and projected for 0.5m into the south room. The eastward continuation of the slot was up to 0.35m wide and 0.2m deep with a patchy but substantial flint packing within its grey silt fill.

A reddened clay hearth (154), 1.6m by 1m, seems to have been built close to or against the inside of the north wall of the cottage, but insufficient stratigraphy survived here to ascertain whether it was an original feature or a later addition. Only small patches of its vertical peg-tile surface survived.

Post-holes 133, 144 and 172 lay along the east and west sides of the cottage and possibly belonged to this phase. With diameters of 0.2m, 0.34m and 0.3m respectively, their depths varied from 0.05m to 0.12m.

An external clay oven (168), 1.3m by more than 0.7m, was found against the south-west corner of the cottage with its flue facing south. A post-hole (174) against the wall here, with a diameter of 0.25m and a depth of 0.2m below the oven floor, appeared to be contemporary.
A clay floor (76) in the north-east corner of the trench may have belonged to an outhouse associated with the cottage. This floor also had a shallow flint-filled soakaway or drain (57) under it to help keep it dry. The floor capped the phase 1 hearth wall (86).

**Phase 3 – 16th – 18th century**

There are no features within the site which can definitely be dated, on the basis of pottery, to the period between the later 14th and the end of the 15th century. Indeed, 16th century pottery, such as 'early Verwood' and Raeren stonewares are, in most instances, associated with Verwood earthenwares which are presumed to be 17th century or later.

**Trench 1 (Figs 8 and 9)**

A ditch (1038) at the south end of Trench 1 contained 16th century pottery: Tudor Green, Raeren stonewares and 'early Verwood', but also five sherds of Verwood earthenwares which are probably 17th century or later. It was 1.4m wide by 1.4m deep and had steep sides and a flat base. This feature and two shallow pits (1064 and 1091) pre-date a row of cottages shown on the 1840 Tithe map (Fig. 12). One of the pits (1091) also contained 17th century or later Verwood earthenwares.

Archaeological evidence for the cottages included a flint wall (1043), probably an internal wall, which sealed a sherd of 17th century or later Verwood pottery, and an associated floor to the west of the wall. A short length of mortared tiles (1148) continued the line of wall 1043 northwards. The only evidence for the rear (north) wall of the cottages was a slot (1290) containing pitched tiles. This slot was on the same alignment as the rear wall of the extant standing building to the west. No evidence for the front (south) wall was found, but it probably lay just to the south of Trench 1.

Most of the features of 17th or 18th century date to the rear (north) of the cottages within Trench 1 appear to have been connected with the tanning industry, the process of converting raw animal hides or skins into leather. A stone-lined trough with a brick floor (1015), 1.55m by 0.9m and 0.45m deep, was recorded. It contained a lime deposit, 0.1m deep, at its base, which was overlain by a series of grey brown sandy clay deposits, one of which contained a sherd of Staffordshire 18th century creamware. Lime may indicate tanning since hides were immersed in a solution of lime, or wood ash, or a combination of the two, for several days in order to loosen the hair and the flesh from the middle layer (corium) of the skin (Shaw 1996, 107). Animal bone from the feature included a group of sheep/goat horn cores and skull fragments. Horn cores may also indicate tanning since hides usually arrived at the tannery from the butchers' with their horns and often hooves, skull and tail still attached (ibid.).

Four truncated barrel pits (1022, 1034, 1244 and 1374), probably 'handlers', where the hides were immersed in weak tanning solutions (ibid.), were found. The hides were regularly moved from one of these pits to another, for a period of one or two months (ibid.). Pit 1374 was not excavated. Pit 1022 contained the remains of a waterlogged barrel at its base, with wooden staves up to 0.12m in length. It was 0.58m in diameter, 0.34m deep and had vertical sides with a flat circular base. A grey sandy clay deposit, containing fragments of waterlogged twigs and straw, was found in the base of the barrel. Above this layer, the barrel was filled with a dark brown silty clay, which contained clay pipe stem fragments, sherds of 17th century or later Verwood pottery and animal bones, including several cattle horn cores. Pit 1034 also contained the remains of a waterlogged barrel at its base, with a corroded iron hoop. The barrel was 0.47m in diameter and 0.14m deep. The cut was packed with stone around the barrel. A grey brown silty clay with some ash lenses filled the barrel. A clay pipe bowl fragment, c. 1760–1800, was recovered from this fill. Pit 1244 also contained the remains of a waterlogged wooden barrel at its base. It was 0.73m by 0.87m and 0.43m deep and had vertical sides with a flat circular base. A pale yellow/white silty clay deposit, 0.06m deep, was found in the base of the barrel. Above this layer, a dark black/brown silty clay deposit, 0.26m deep, containing organic material, ash and sherds of 17th century or later Verwood pottery was found. This was sealed by orange clay, 0.1m deep.
Other features included a flint-lined well (1012) and a flint cobble garden path (1003). The fill of the well contained clay pipe bowl fragments of c. 1690–1750. Animal bone included a cattle horn core and domestic fowl bones. There was some evidence for a tenement boundary to the east of path 1003, with the remains of a brick wall and some horizontal timber planks to the north. These planks were revetted by posts and the line appeared to continue in Trench 2 (Fig. 9).

At the north end of the trench, several pits possibly connected with the tanning process were found. Four of these pits (1104, 1185, 1191 and 1312) contained clay pipe bowl fragments dated to c. 1660–80. Horn cores were found in pits 1104, 1185 and 1191. The latter contained a waterlogged plank-lined box (1192) around one of a series of tree stumps which grew along the northern property boundary. This pit cut pit 1190, which in turn cut pit 1185. Both pits 1185 and 1190 were filled with a dark grey silty clay and contained 17th/18th century pottery. The latter also contained several waterlogged leather fragments. To the south of this intercutting group, two shallow pits (1104 and 1312) had black silty clay fills, pit 1104 also contained sand lenses.

Three large rectangular clay-lined pits (1260, 1281 and 1336), probably ‘layaways’ where the hides were saturated in tanning solution (Shaw 1996, 107), were recorded in the north-east corner of the trench. The hides were transferred from the ‘handlers’ to these larger pits, where they were laid out flat with layers of oak bark between them and saturated in tanning solution for nine to eighteen months, before the tanned hides were air dried in a loft. Two of these pits (1260 and 1281) were sectioned and excavated and both had vertical sides and flat bases. Pit 1260 was 1.64m by 1.34m and 0.46m deep, while pit 1281 was at least 2m by 1.27m and 0.4m deep. In both pits, a clay lining covered the base as well as the sides. An organic deposit, 0.1–0.15m deep, was found at the base of both. In pit 1260, this deposit contained fragments of waterlogged wood and leather, and lumps of white and pink clay. Above this layer, both pits were filled with a grey silty clay. In pit 1260, this deposit also contained some white, orange and pink clays. A clay pipe stem fragment and two sherds of 17th century or later Verwood pottery were recovered from this fill. Verwood pottery was also recovered from two silty clay deposits which were cut by pit 1260. No dating evidence was recovered from pit 1281. Although pit 1336 was not sectioned and excavated, a short length of its clay lining was excavated as part of a sondage. This showed that a line of stakes defined the cut of the pit, surrounding the clay lining. Although a sherd of late 12th/13th century Laverstock type coarseware was recovered from between the stakes, and a 12th/early 13th century tripod pitcher foot from the clay lining, stratigraphically the pit appeared to be post-medieval in date since it cut the phase 2b tile demolition layer.

At least three clay-lined tanning pits were observed during the AVAS watching brief in the east facing section of the sewer trench to the east of Trench 1 (Fig. 9). The southern one was lined with white clay and contained a black deposit. To the north, a succession of pits with clay and timber linings containing cattle horn cores and bark were observed.

Trench 2 (Fig. 9)

Three further probable ‘layaways’, were recorded in Trench 2. Of these, only one (2026) was sectioned and excavated. It was 1m by 2m and only 0.2m deep and contained a cattle horn core but no dating evidence. Documentary sources record a series of ‘leather dressers’ and tanners at Wing’s tenement (Fig. 1) on Salisbury Street between 1597 and 1691 and these pits may have belonged to this tenement.

A timber-lined culvert (2025), 1.35m wide and 0.24m deep, was filled with grey brown sandy silt and drained into the River Avon from the west. It contained clay pipe stem fragments and 17th century and later Verwood pottery. Animal bone included a group of cattle horn cores, cattle skull, sheep/goat and pig fragments. A similar culvert lined with oak piles had been found in the original AVAS evaluation trench, containing medieval and later pottery. This culvert was probably the

Fig. 8 (opposite) Phase 3 features in Trench 1
one referred to for the conveyance of the springs at the 1668 court.

**Trench 3 (Fig. 9)**
Two truncated pits (3003 and 3007) containing clay pipe bowl fragments dated to c. 1690-1750 were found below 19th/20th century demolition rubble in Trench 3. Both pits were situated within the tenement, which later belonged to Henry Edsall in the 19th century (Fig. 1).

**Trench 4 (Figs 9 and 10)**
Phase 3a. The phase 2 medieval cottage in Trench 4 was replaced by a timber-framed building measuring approximately 8.5m by 4.5m. Its clay floor (68) extended 1.4m further south
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Fig. 10 Phase 3a features in Trench 4

than the previous medieval floor (114) and sealed both the medieval flint wall footings and the east-west spring line. It contained 16th century pottery: Raeren stonewares and 'early Verwood', but also a small, possibly intrusive, sherd of 17th century or later Verwood earthenware. Floor 68 was edged with a row of bricks (116) laid end to end at its south end, and part of a flint wall foundation, 0.2m wide, for a timber sill was recorded along the west side of the house. An external path (153) of rammed flint and greensand led to a partly surviving limestone threshold associated with the central doorway which had an internal beam-slot (132), 0.2m wide and 1.3m in length.

The cross-passage of the previous cottage was replaced by a south-facing inglenook fireplace (62) which retained only slight traces of its original brick and tile structure. To the north of the fire-place, the clay floor continued into the north room for a distance of about 1.5m beyond which it had been removed by later activity.

A detached outhouse existed to the north-east of the timber-framed building. Partial destruction meant that no overall dimensions could be obtained, but a gravel floor (50) was bordered to the south by a well-constructed flint wall (55), 0.35m wide. Part of the foundation of a large oven (156), more than 1.8m in diameter, was found at the south-east corner of the surviving structure, built against the north side of wall 55. Its base of puddled chalk, 0.01-0.03m thick, was overlain by 0.03-0.05m of reddened clay interspersed with heavily burnt flint and ironstone cobbles.

The timber-framed building was totally destroyed by fire; a 0.02-0.05m thick layer of wood ash (67) covered the entire floor of the south room and droplets of lead indicated the intensity of the heat. This layer contained 16th century pottery (Raeren stoneware, Martincamp flask and 'early Verwood'), but also four sherds of 17th century or later Verwood earthenwares. The latter sherds are thought to be intrusive since they were unburnt in contrast to the other sherds. A clay pipe bowl fragment dated to c. 1720-40 from this layer is also thought to have been intrusive. The contents of a small sewing kit consisting of thimbles, sewing rings and brass pins and a group of bullet-shaped objects, possibly cross-bow bolt heads, were found in the ash.

The detached outhouse seems to have survived the fire, although ash and rubble debris from the main house abutted the exterior of its south wall.

Phase 3b (Fig. 11). In the mid-17th century, a new brick-built building was constructed as the Greyhound Inn on the old houseplot alongside Salisbury Street. Its frontage measured 11.8m and its width 5.3m. The only internal partition found, brick wall 74, produced two equal rooms of 5.25m by 3.9m.

It is uncertain, because of disturbance caused during the demolition in 1988, whether the rear wing of the building belonged to this phase or was added later, but it seems likely that it was original to the new Greyhound. This wing ran eastward
Fig. 11 Phase 3b and 3c features in Trench 4

from the south-east corner of the building and measured 8.7m by 5m. It contained a c. 1m deep paved cellar, entered from the main building. The springs below the building were utilised for cooling the contents of the cellar, a use that continued until recent times. The water was directed into the north-west and south-west corners of the cellar, the floor of which sloped by almost 0.2m towards an outflow in the south-east corner, from where a drain discharged into the Avon. The rooms over the cellar had been demolished some years previously.

Phase 3c (Fig. 11). The building was reduced in size by the construction of a new wall (70) immediately inside the line of the old one, at the north-east end. The new north room, measuring 4.75m by 4m, contained a small hearth (95) against the north wall with a substantial deposit of associated ash.

The south room was divided east-west by a timber partition, the north section of which was 2.2m wide and contained a flight of Jacobean-style wooden stairs. These remained in place until shortly before demolition in 1988 but were in too poor a condition to preserve.

Beyond the north-west corner of the building, a post-hole (181), 1m in diameter and 0.6m deep, had patches of flint cobbles adjoining it and was probably the setting for one of the posts of the gate into the yard.

Phase 4 – late 18th/early 19th century

Trench 1 (Fig. 12)
A brick extension (1054) was added to one of the cottages on Bridge Street. This represented the first substantial use of brick within Trench 1. To the west, a brick-built well (1068) had been capped by a broken gravestone dated 1832 to the memory of Robert Standfield, who was the grandfather of one of the Tolpuddle Martyrs. The gravestone was unweathered and the inscription had not been completed, suggesting that it had broken in manufacture. His actual gravestone stands in Verwood Parish Churchyard.

Trench 4
Following phase 3c, the building on Salisbury Street clearly underwent many further alterations and additions, few of which could be examined in detail. The main building was extended northwards and a number of new buildings were erected behind it.

The character of the inn was changed by the addition of a single brick skin to the road frontage at some point in the late 18th or early 19th century.

FINDS

Pottery by Lorraine Mepham
The pottery assemblage totals 2,391 sherds (54,387g). With the exception of a single residual Roman sherd from Trench 1, all of this material is either medieval or post-medieval in date. Most of the pottery came from Trenches 1 and 4.
Methods
Analysis of the medieval pottery has followed the standard Wessex Archaeology recording system (Morris 1994), involving the identification of fabric types on the basis of the range, size and frequency of macroscopic inclusions, and the grouping of these types according to the dominant inclusion type or known source. In this instance the fabric series is based around the Laverstock-type fabrics coded within Wessex Archaeology’s ‘established wares’ series (Group E). Only three other fabric types were recorded, one within Group E, one flint-tempered (Group F) and one sandy (Group Q). Fabric totals are presented in Table 2.

Vessel forms have been defined using rims and other diagnostic sherds, and follow the recommended nomenclature for medieval vessel forms (MPRG 1998); the vessel type series for the Laverstock-type wares is based on existing
Table 2  Pottery fabric totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric type</th>
<th>Trench 4</th>
<th></th>
<th>Trenches 1-3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. sherds</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>No. sherds</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>No. sherds</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMANO-BRITISH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIEVAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laverstock-type fineware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E420</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E421</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laverstock-type coarseware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E422a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E422b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3605</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E422c</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>2915</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>8468</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>11383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole Harbour whiteware</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-total</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3243</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>13655</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>16898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATE MEDIEVAL/EARLY POST-MEDIEVAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Tudor Green' ware</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Early Verwood type</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-MEDIEVAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse redwares</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Wares</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verwood type earthenware</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>9178</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>22650</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>31828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Wiltshire Brown' ware</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Cistercian type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire-type slipware</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire type mottled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Palissy type</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martincamp flasks</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinglazed earthenware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trench 4</th>
<th>Trenches 1-3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware German</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White saltglaze</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined redwares</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial wares</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>603</strong></td>
<td><strong>11373</strong></td>
<td><strong>808</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1010</strong></td>
<td><strong>15102</strong></td>
<td><strong>1381</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-medieval pottery has not been analysed in such detail, but has been quantified by broad fabric group (e.g. coarse redwares) or known type (e.g. Verwood-type earthenware). Basic vessel forms have been recorded but not details of rims and other component parts.

In the fabric descriptions below, the terms used to describe the density of inclusions follow Terry and Chilingar (1955), and are defined as follows: rare (1–3%); sparse (3–10%); moderate (10–20%); common (20–30%). The fabrics identified are discussed below within groups according to known or putative source.

Laverstock-type medieval wares
The overwhelming majority of the medieval assemblage from the site comprises coarseware and fineware sherds which are comparable to products of the Laverstock kilns just outside the city of Salisbury (Musty et al. 1969). The coarsewares represent variations of a single fabric, which has been subdivided into three on the basis of the size of the quartz inclusions (E422a–c). The divisions are somewhat arbitrary but may have chronological implications. Two basic fineware fabrics have been defined (E420 and E421).

Coarseware fabrics

E422a Hard, moderately coarse matrix; common, fairly well sorted, subangular/subrounded quartz, sometimes iron-stained, <1mm; rare iron oxides. Handmade; firing varies from completely oxidised to completely unoxidised; 'pimply' surface finish.

E422b As E422a but with quartz <0.5mm; slightly 'pimply' surface finish.

E422c As E422a but with quartz <0.25 mm.

Fineware fabrics

E420 Hard, fine matrix; common, well sorted, subrounded/subangular quartz, not iron stained, <0.5mm; rare iron oxides. Handmade or wheellthrown; oxidised (very pale-firing: buff to cream).

E421 Hard, fine matrix; moderate to common, well sorted, subrounded quartz, generally iron-stained, <0.5mm; rare iron oxides. Handmade or wheellthrown; oxidised (pale-firing; buff to pale salmon pink).
The only source as yet known for these fabrics is the Laverstock production centre. The excavated kilns there have a restricted estimated life span of 1230-75 based on archaeomagnetic dates (Musty et al. 1969, 93), although there is indirect documentary evidence for the operation of kilns in the vicinity of Laverstock in the early 14th century (ibid., 83, footnote), and it is apparent from pottery assemblages excavated in Salisbury that Laverstock-type fabrics continued to be produced after the known date of the excavated kilns.

Visually similar coarseware and fineware fabrics are, however, ubiquitous throughout south-east Wiltshire and east Dorset, and it is more than likely that other kilns remain to be discovered. Recent chemical analysis (Spoerry 1990) has failed to differentiate between coarseware pottery samples from Laverstock and south Dorset, while a documentary search has demonstrated the likely existence of further medieval production centres exploiting the clays of the Reading Beds and London Clay which outcrop in a band from south-east Wiltshire to Purbeck, particularly in the area of the post-medieval Verwood industry (Spoerry 1988). It is the latter area which, on the basis of its proximity to Fordingbridge, is the most likely potential source for pottery found in the town. The earliest known documentary reference to potting in the area is from Alderholt in 1337, referring to the digging of clay for potting (Algar et al. 1987), but there are other, largely undated, references from the parishes of Cranborne and Verwood from at least the 13th century (Spoerry 1988).

**Vessel forms**
The coarseware assemblage is dominated by jars, while the finewares are used almost exclusively for jugs. The term 'jar' is used here deliberately, in preference to 'cooking pot', following recommended nomenclature (MPRG 1998), although a cooking function is indicated by the presence of sooting on many of these vessels. Jars are subdivided here on the basis of rim form and the addition of handles. The coarseware jars are generally round-based although some have a barely discernible basal angle; these vessels are frequently 'scratch marked' on the exterior and sometimes the interior, and a very few examples have finger-impressed rims (e.g. Fig. 13, 1). There seems to be no chronological significance in the various jar types – all types occurred in the Laverstock kilns, and have also been found in 13th century contexts in Salisbury, although type 1 jars are perceived at this period to be an 'archaic' form. Certainly all types appear to be contemporaneous here.

There are smaller quantities of coarseware bowls/dishes and possible curfews (one example actually came from a phase 1 hearth (1348) (Fig.
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1. Jar (type 1), heavily sooted, finger-impressed rim; Laverstock-type coarseware (E422c). PRN (Pottery Record Number) 202, Trench 1, context 1459, culvert 1488, phase 1.
2. Jar rim (type 5), possibly a cauldron; Laverstock-type coarseware (E422b). PRN 210, Trench 1, context 1459, culvert 1488, phase 1.
3. Bowl rim (type 3); Laverstock-type coarseware (E422c). PRN 229, Trench 1, context 1459, culvert 1488, phase 1.
4. Pitcher with plain rim and thumbed strap handle; Laverstock-type coarseware (E422c). PRN 236, Trench 1, context 1459, culvert 1488, phase 1.
5. Jug with plain rim and pulled lip; Laverstock-type coarseware (E422c). PRN 238, Trench 1, context 1459, culvert 1488, phase 1.
6. Glazed jug with slip decoration; Laverstock-type fineware (E421). PRN 207, Trench 1, context 1459, culvert 1488, phase 1.
7. Frying pan handle; Laverstock-type coarseware (E422c). PRN 219, Trench 1, context 1459, culvert 1488, phase 1.
8. Jar rim (type 4); Laverstock-type coarseware (E422c). PRN 136, Trench 1, context 1210, phase 2b.
9. Bowl/curfew rim; Laverstock-type coarseware (E422b). PRN 170, Trench 1, context 1347, hearth 1348, phase 1.
10. Costrel lug; Laverstock-type fineware (E421). PRN 85, Trench 1, tile spread context 1168, phase 2b.
11. Zoomorphic handle, glazed, possibly from dripping dish; Laverstock-type fineware (E421). PRN 116, Trench 1, context 1197, feature 1198, phase 2a.
12. Small jug or mug; Pearly Verwood type. PRN 35, Trench 1, context 1063, unphased.
13. Jar; Pearly Verwood type. PRN 47, Trench 1, context 1101, feature 1038, phase 3.
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and there are also examples of coarseware jug or pitcher forms, including slip-decorated examples, although the more elaborately decorated jugs are confined to the fineware fabrics. Other less common forms are represented by a costrel and a frying pan, and an unusual zoomorphic flat handle in a fineware fabric (Fig. 13, 11) may derive from a dripping dish, a form not so far paralleled either at the Laverstock kilns or in Salisbury.

Jar Type 1: Everted, slightly thickened rim; everted at approximately right angles to the body; the rim orientation varying from flared to almost horizontal (Fig. 13, 1).

Jar Type 2: Everted rim as Type 1, but with a slight lid-seating.

Jar Type 3: Everted, thickened and slightly moulded rim, sometimes with slight lid-seating; necked vessel.

Jar Type 4: Short everted rim, squared, sometimes grooved along the top (Fig. 13, 8).

Jar Type 5: Two-handled, rounded jar (cauldron) with flattened, thickened rim (Fig. 13, 2).

Bowl/dish type 3: Rounded bowl with thickened rim, often knife-trimmed (Fig. 13, 3)

Bowl/dish type 4: Shallow dish or lid

Jug Type 1: Tripod pitcher

Jug Type 2: Jug or pitcher with plain rim and pulled spout (Fig. 13, 4)

Jug Type 3: Jug with plain or slightly moulded rim and bridge spout (Fig. 13, 5)

Jug Type 4: Jug with moulded or 'collared' rim, with pulled lip or bridge spout, generally decorated (Fig. 13, 6)

Costrel (Fig. 13, 10)

Curfew (Fig. 13, 9)

Frying Pan (Fig. 13, 7)

Laverstock-type finewares are relatively scarce here (3% by weight of the medieval assemblage) by comparison with contemporary sites in Salisbury (e.g. 30.7% at Ivy Street; Mepham 2000). The preferred fabric for decorated jugs appears instead to be the finest coarseware variant (E422c), in which are found jugs with simple or slightly moulded rims, bridge spouts, strap handles and a range of red painted slip motifs; there is one example with stamped slip motifs (Fig. 13, 5). Alongside these are plainer jugs with simple rims, possibly pulled lips, and thumbed handles (Fig. 13, 4). The scarcity of Laverstock-type finewares might be explained by distance from source, if fineware production was restricted to Laverstock itself. Demand for decorated wares would then be met by the locally-produced coarseware fabrics.

Potentially the earliest form here is the tripod pitcher, represented by a single tripod foot. This form is generally dated to the 12th or early 13th century in southern England. Tripod pitchers were not produced by the 13th century Laverstock kilns, but apparently formed part of an earlier repertoire of 'south-east Wiltshire pitchers' (Vince 1981), which were widely distributed across Wiltshire, Dorset, north Hampshire and beyond. There is a possibility that some of the coarser variants of the Laverstock-type coarseware fabric (E422a) could be of similar date; such wares have been found in 12th century contexts at Old Sarum (Musty and Rahtz 1964) although their continued use into the 13th century is well attested in Salisbury.

All the other forms, with the exception of the possible dripping dish handle, are paralleled at the Laverstock kilns, and are well represented in 13th/early 14th century contexts in Salisbury, although precisely when these forms ceased to be produced is unknown.

Other medieval wares

Three other medieval fabrics were identified, of which one is of known type. This is a white-firing fabric similar to Laverstock fine ware but with a distinctive honey-yellow glaze and brown/black (iron-washed) applied decoration (pellets, strips, etc), more characteristic of the whitewares found in the Poole Harbour area, for example in Poole itself, and which are thought to be of local manufacture (Jarvis 1992, fabrics 3–5; Barton et al. 1992, Fig. 32, nos. 34–8). Only two sherds are present at Fordingbridge.

The other two fabrics comprise two flint-tempered sherds (F400), from a phase 3 context, and two sherds from a glazed jug in a fine sandy fabric of unknown source (Q400), from an
unphased context. Neither is closely datable, but could fit within a 13th century date range.

F400  Hard fabric; sparse to moderate, poorly sorted, subangular flint <1.5 mm; sparse to moderate, poorly sorted, subrounded quartz <1 m. Handmade; unoxidised with patchily oxidised surfaces.

Q400  Hard, fine sandy fabric; abundant subrounded/subangular quartz <0.125 mm. Manufacture uncertain; unoxidised with oxidised (pale-firing) internal surface.

**Distribution and ceramic sequence**

Medieval wares (13th-early 14th century). Most of the medieval pottery derived from Trenches 1 and 4, with smaller quantities from Trench 2; no medieval pottery was recovered from Trench 3. In Trench 1, the presence of Laverstock-type finewares within the phase 1 upper alluvial deposits containing occupation debris places the beginning of the sequence here no earlier than the 13th century, probably mid century. However, there are hints of possible earlier (12th/early 13th century) activity in the vicinity in the form of the tripod pitcher foot (residual from the clay lining of the mainly unexcavated phase 3 tanning pit 1336) and sherds in the coarseware variant E422a, found throughout the sequence.

Pottery from phases 1 and 2 is all very similar in character, but only phase 1 produced any quantity of material. The largest group derives from the phase 1 culvert 1488 in Trench 1, which includes type 1 jars, type 3 bowls, a frying pan, a possible cauldron, and both plain and decorated jugs (Fig. 13, 1–7). Other phase 1 contexts produced jars of types 2 and 4, a plain jug, and a possible curfew (from hearth 1348 in Trench 1: Fig. 13, 9). The only diagnostic material from the phase 2a building in Trench 1 comprises type 4 jars. Pottery from phase 2b contexts relating to the demolition of this building is likely to be residual. Certainly pottery from these contexts includes little which does not also occur in earlier contexts, apart from a fineware zoomorphic handle (Fig. 13, 11) and a fineware costrel lug (Fig. 13, 10).

Late medieval/early post-medieval wares (15th/16th century). The problems of providing an end date for the earlier medieval forms has been compounded by the relative absence of recognisable late medieval groups in Salisbury and elsewhere, and the situation appears to be similar here. Only one known late medieval fabric type is present – ‘Tudor Green’ ware, represented by just one sherd. There is, however, a small group of sherds which might represent a transitional stage between the earlier medieval ‘Laverstock-type’ coarsewares and the post-medieval ‘Verwood-type’ earthenwares. These sherds are in a slightly coarser version of the Verwood type earthenware, and are generally only minimally glazed; examples have been found in Salisbury in contexts associated with ‘Tudor Green’ wares (Mepham and Underwood n.d.), but could have a date range spanning the 15th to 16th century. Vessel forms present here include jars (Fig. 13, 13), bowls, and a small jug or mug (Fig. 13, 12). Other 16th century wares represented comprise Raeren drinking vessels, a ‘type fossil’ of the early 16th century, and sherds of at least one Martincamp flask of the earliest type which has a date range of 1475–1550 in this country (Hurst et al. 1986, fig. 47, 142).

There are no features on the site which can definitely be dated, on the basis of pottery, to the period between the later 14th and the end of the 15th century. Possible 16th century contexts, however, include the clay floor (68) of the timber-framed building with the inglenook fireplace in Trench 4, and those from the burnt layer (67) above, and ditch 1038 in Trench 1. The latter produced a small group of ‘early Verwood’ sherds, including the jar illustrated (Fig. 13, 13), and rim and base sherds from a Raeren drinking vessel of typical early 16th century form, although nine other sherds of Verwood earthenware from the same context could push the date of this feature into the 17th century. Clay floor 68 and layer 67 contained a similar assemblage and the latter also contained Martincamp flask sherds. Both layers contained Verwood earthenwares which are presumed to be 17th century or later (see below), however, the small sherd from floor 68 and the four unburnt sherds from layer 67 are thought to be intrusive.
Post-medieval wares (17th century onwards). The virtual monopoly of a local potting industry is again evident in the later post-medieval assemblage, which is dominated by Verwood-type earthenwares. The almost complete absence of any other coarse earthenwares in this assemblage is striking – the exceptions are nine sherds of coarse redware and seven of whiteware, possibly Border Ware (Pearce 1992). The origins of the Verwood industry in the medieval period have already been discussed, but from the 17th century a dispersed, village-based industry is known from both documentary sources and kiln sites, and this industry survived until the mid-20th century in Verwood (Algar et al. 1987).

This was essentially a utilitarian industry, and this is reflected in the range of forms found here: predominantly sturdy jug, bowl and jar forms aimed at kitchen and dairying activities. The jar forms are sometimes handled (including chamber pots), as are the bowls. More specialised forms include dripping dishes and chafing dishes, a tripod pipkin, a candlestick and a lid. Tablewares are represented by mugs, dishes and porringer, but these are still basic, functional forms – decoration is limited to horizontal rilling, applied thumbed strips below rims, and occasional grooved or incised wavy lines around the inside of rims.

While many of these forms are not closely datable, several, including the dripping dishes and chafing dishes, as well as the wavy line decoration, are paralleled at the mid-17th century kiln at Horton (Copland-Griffiths 1989) and are unlikely to have survived into the 18th century.
Eighteenth century Verwood wares are characterised by the presence of the distinctive but erroneously named 'Wiltshire Brown Ware', glazed a mottled or streaky brown by the addition of iron minerals to the lead glaze. This was apparently a deliberate attempt to imitate the Staffordshire-type mottled wares of the late 17th and early 18th century, and was produced at Alderholt and Crendell and probably other kilns (Algar et al. 1987). Vessel forms represented here, illustrated by a group from phase 3 pit 3007 in Trench 3, comprise straight-sided and rounded jugs, bowls and two-handed mugs or 'tygs' (Fig. 14, 14-17).

Other post-medieval wares are present in much smaller quantities. There is a smattering of other 17th and early 18th century wares, such as tinglazed earthenware, stonewares (German and English), and Staffordshire-type slipware, and the rise of the factory-based industries of Staffordshire is reflected in the small quantities of refined redwares, white saltglaze, creamware and the later industrial whitewares, but Verwood types are still dominant throughout the sequence. One sherd from a lead-glazed oval dish with polychrome moulded decoration (Fig. 14, 19), from a phase 3 context, could be of Palissy type.

Ceramic building material by Emma Loader

A large quantity of ceramic building material was recovered (208 kg), and this constitutes only a sample of what was present on the site. The assemblage is dominated by a large collection of medieval roof tiles, including a significant group of more elaborate roof furniture (chimney pots, louvers and a zoomorphic finial).

Methods

Glazed and other diagnostic tiles from medieval contexts have been quantified by context, with details of form, glaze, decoration and fabric. Full fabric analysis has not been carried out, but there are two broad fabric groups within the medieval assemblage:

Fabric 1: Poorly wedged, sparsely sandy with prominent iron inclusions.

Fabric 2: Moderately coarse, sandy fabric, pale-firing, which is a good visual match for the fabrics of the Laverstock-type coarseware pottery (see above, Pottery).

Unglazed medieval roof tiles, post-medieval tiles and bricks have not been analysed in detail, other than quantification by context. Full details of analysis are available in the site archive.

Flat roof tiles

The majority of the assemblage comprises fragments of irregular, handmade flat roof tiles, many of which have surviving peg-holes. No complete tiles were recovered. Of the total assemblage, 228 fragments (17,194g) were glazed, with the glaze ranging in colour from clear to green to dark brown. One fragment of hip tile was noted in a phase 2b demolition tile spread in Trench 1.

The main area of manufacture of roof tiles in this region extends from Hampshire to Wiltshire, along the line of the Reading Beds (Hare 1991). It is difficult to pinpoint the source of tiles within this large area because the same fabrics and methods of firing were used. The closest known tile production centre to Fordingbridge was at Alderbury, which was in operation at least by the mid-14th century and possibly a century earlier (ibid., 89). It is possible that many of the tiles recovered from Fordingbridge were manufactured at this centre, which lies about 15 km to the north. This would place Fordingbridge within the known radius of Alderbury's distribution area (ibid., 98), but closer putative sources could have been exploited, for example in the Verwood area, where pottery production is postulated in the medieval period (see above).

Ridge tiles

Six fragments (915g) of coxcomb ridge tiles were recovered, all are at least partially glazed. All the fragments have knife-cut triangular crests (Fig. 15, 1). Three of the fragments are in Fabric 1, which is of uncertain source. The remaining three fragments are in Fabric 2, which is visually similar to the fabric of Laverstock-type coarseware pottery.
Fig. 15 Medieval roof furniture
Evidence of ridge tile manufacture has been found at Laverstock (Musty et al. 1969).

**Chimney pots**

Two fragments of possible chimney pots were found; a rim fragment with a small pre-firing perforation (Fig. 15, 2) came from Trench 1, and a body fragment with a diameter of 60mm came from Trench 2. Both are in the same fabric, which matches medieval pottery fabric E422b; again, the most likely source is the Laverstock kilns (Musty et al. 1969, fig. 25).

**Louvers**

Fifty-two fragments (2,090g) representing at least three louvers were recovered from a number of contexts, mostly from the phase 2b demolition spread. All the fragments have at least a partial
green glaze, and three are decorated. Most are in Fabric 2, suggesting that they are Laverstock-type products. Indeed, louvers are known to have been produced by the Laverstock kilns (Musty et al. 1969).

One louver, recovered from a phase 2b demolition spread, comprises part of a large hooded aperture with an adjacent trefoil/quatrefoil vent, decorated with incised lines and applied thumbed strips, and glazed dark green (Fig. 15, 3, 4). The closest parallel found for this louver is from Exeter (Allan 1984, fig. 133, 2946). A tubular opening from a second louver came from the same context (Fig. 15, 9).

Three joining fragments of a louver were recovered from another phase 2b demolition spread. This was decorated with a horizontal applied thumbed strip above (or below?) an aperture opening with an applied, rounded edge and was partially glazed with a mottled green glaze (Fig. 15, 5). Its precise form is uncertain, although a general idea can be gained from an example from Southampton; a type that would have been attached to a ridge tile (Dunning 1975, fig. 215, 1413). Also recovered from this context are two smaller fragments also with applied strips (Fig. 15, 6), and a fragment of a hooded aperture (Fig. 15, 7), smaller in size but otherwise identical to the more complete louver described above (Fig. 15, 3). Two joining fragments with thumbed applied strip decoration were recovered from 1219, a phase 2b demolition spread in the top of culvert 1488 (Fig. 15, 8).

Louvers served two functions: the first was to allow ventilation and circulation of air in a room; the second was to allow smoke to escape. The presence or absence of sooting on the interior of the louver gives an indication of its use. A louver in the roof of a hall would generally be placed directly above the fire to draw out the smoke, while one in the roof of a kitchen would not only remove the smoke from a fire but also allow steam to escape. None of the examples from the Fordingbridge excavation shows any evidence of sooting on the interior, and they were presumably used for ventilation purposes. Moorhouse notes how surprisingly few louvers are sooted internally, and suggests that their main function was to facilitate ventilation (1988, 45). Such objects would also have had an implication for social status; Moorhouse (ibid., 46) notes that objects such as louvers on the medieval roof 'were very much a social divider'. This group of decorative louvers and the glazed roof tiles are likely to have come from a substantial building belonging to an individual of some social standing.

**Finial**

The presence of a possible high-status building is strengthened by the recovery of a zoomorphic finial, from a phase 2b demolition spread in the top of culvert 1488 in Trench 1 (Fig. 16, 10). From the fragments recovered, it seems that the object would originally have been a relatively realistic representation of a cow, which would have been attached to a ridge tile. A large portion of the head is present, minus horns and one ear. The ears were modelled separately and were mortised into the head; the horns were attached in the same way and were stabbed around the base. The nostrils are stabbed holes and the eyes, below realistically modelled eyebrow ridges, are formed from applied pellets of red slip, stamped with ring-and-dot motifs. A fragment of what is thought to be a leg and a part of the tail are also present. The object is in a fine, pale-firing fabric equivalent to the medieval Laverstock-type fineware pottery fabric E420 (see above, Pottery), covered with a clear lead glaze which appears yellow. The head is covered with a thin surface slip of similar colour to the body, with a contrasting red slip over the ears and tail. The possible source of this object in the Laverstock kilns is interesting; as yet there has been no evidence that finials were produced there.

This is one of a small group of zoomorphic finials known from this country, with a distribution concentrated in the Midlands. Horse or horse-and-rider finials seem to be most common (e.g. Dunning 1979; Fairbrother 1990, fig. 5.2), although a range of other animals is represented, including lion, bear, boar, ruminant and stag, as well as birds (Dunning 1979). A supposed 'cow' finial was found associated with the late 13th century manor house at Faccombe Netherton, Hampshire, although this is not such a realistic modelling and, indeed, the identification is uncer-
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1. Quernstone. ON38, Trench 1, context 1167, pit 1104, phase 3.
tain; the ‘horns’ in the tentative reconstruction may, in fact, be anders (Fairbrother 1990, fig. 5.3, 1).

There is evidence that at least some of these zoomorphic finials originally formed parts of narrative schemes and were related to the occupants of the house. Examples include those on the roof of ‘La Maison du Grande Veneur’, a 16th century building in Laval, France (Fairbrother 1990, fig. 5.4), and the finial from Faccombe, if interpreted as a stag rather than a cow, may have belonged to a hunting scene (ibid.). Likewise the use of a bear on a finial from Miserden Castle in Gloucestershire could have been a reference to a bear being kept to amuse the occupants of the Castle (Dunning 1979). The cow from Fordingbridge may have had a similar symbolic value. The connection may be tenuous, but it is tempting to see a link with the later tanning activity.

Floor tiles
A few fragments of undecorated floor tile were noted. These are generally 35mm in thickness. Possible sources include the Clarendon and Nash Hill production centres, which were both in operation during the 13th and 14th centuries, but the fragments are too small for positive identification.

The other finds by M. Laidlaw with a contribution by Jenny Hill and Anthony Light

Stone
A complete medieval Purbeck Marble quernstone (Fig. 17, 1) came from 17th century pit 1104 in Trench 1. It forms the upper part of a quern and has three equally spaced circular holes around the upper surface, for insertion of a stick for rotation. On its concave lower surface, it has two small slots on both sides of the central hole. One slot contains traces of the iron bar which would have run across the central hole and sat upon the pivot of the lower stone. A similar quernstone fragment from Exeter is recorded as late 13th century (Allan 1984, fig. 166, 19).

Fig. 18 Glass and bone

1. Flared rim from beaker. Trench 1, context 1189, pit 1185, phase 3.
2. Beaker body fragment with wrythen mould-blown ribbing. Trench 1, context 1028, stone-lined trough with brick floor 1015, phase 3.
4. Worked bone gaming piece. Trench 2, ON 1, context 2028, phase 2.

Fig. 18 Glass and bone

4. Worked bone gaming piece. Trench 2, ON 1, context 2028, phase 2.

Comparable mortars from Southampton are dated to the 13th and 14th centuries (Platt and Coleman-Smith 1975, fig. 268). The micaceous schist whetstone had smooth worn surfaces and was found in a phase 3c make-up layer, which also contained 17th century and later Verwood pottery.

Worked bone
A bone gaming piece (Fig. 18, 4) was recovered from a medieval layer (2028) in Trench 2. It had probably been cut from a cattle mandible and one side had been incised with compass-drawn concentric circles and ring-and-dot decoration. Comparable early 13th century pieces are recorded from Southampton (Harvey 1975, fig. 247, nos. 1923 and 1930).

Wood
Ten oak stakes were retained from the timber lining of phase 1 culvert 1488 in Trench 1. They
were found in situ and had been vertically driven into the alluvial clay at the sides of the culvert. They had survived only to the height of the water table. The bulk of them were therefore incomplete, ranging in length from 0.2m to 0.89m, with diameters of 70mm to 100mm. They were all roundwood and had been roughly squared to form pencil points. Six had a small percentage of bark surviving.

Seven smaller structural timber fragments were recovered from 17th/18th century phase 3 contexts. These include three plank fragments from three different features: timber-lined culvert 2025 in Trench 2, the plank-lined box in pit 1191, and the tenement boundary in Trench 1. These fragments are all rectangular in section, two have possibly been split tangentially and have either flat faces and/or sawn ends. One other fragment with two sawn faces, roughly rectangular in section, was recovered from a linear feature (2013) in Trench 2. Another structural fragment, a roundwood fragment with two sawn ends, was also recovered from pit 1191. One small peg with an iron nail in one end, a possible obliquely cut coppiced piece, was found in pit 1190. The seventh fragment was part of an in situ stake found within 1081, a 17th–18th century layer in Trench 1.

Leather
Four fragments of leather were recovered from 17th–18th century pit 1190. Two fragments of shoe soles have traces of edge/flesh stitching. The third fragment, a heel repair, had been attached possibly by thonging through the widely placed holes around its edge and centre. The fourth fragment is an offcut with uneven edges.

Metalwork
The small assemblage of metalwork recovered includes one silver and seven copper alloy coins, 111 other copper alloy objects, 118 fragments of iron, mainly nails, and ten fragments of lead. Full
descriptions of all the objects are held in the archive. Apart from the lead, all have been X-radiographed.

**Coins**

The seven copper alloy coins are all post-medieval. The earliest are two Charles I farthings (one ‘Rose’ and one ‘Maltravers’ type) from Trench 4 (from a phase 3b floor make-up layer (61) and phase 3c brick wall 70 respectively). A farthing of George II (1746 or 1749) came from a 19th century drainage cut (51) in Trench 4. The others are all 19th or 20th century, including a silver French 10-franc coin of 1932.

**Copper alloy objects**

The other copper alloy objects all came from Trench 4.

**Dress-related objects.** Four dress-related objects were found in medieval contexts. A large pin with a decorated head (Fig. 19, 1) came from a 13th–14th century rubble layer, which overlay floor 76 (phase 2). A smaller pin and a lace-end were found in a 13th–14th century pit (135) (phase 1). A triangular hooked clothes fastener (Fig. 19, 3) came from post-hole 124 (phase 1).

**Sewing instruments.** A group of objects, which appear to have belonged to a sewing kit, was found within the burnt layer above floor surface 68 (phase 3a). It consisted of 60 small pin fragments, all with globular heads, a complete thimble and several fragments of sewing rings (a minimum of four rings). Several fragments of bullet-shaped objects with a maximum diameter of 10mm, made from rolled sheet metal were also found in this layer. None is complete, and their overall form is unknown, but seven ‘points’ are present and they may have been cross-bow bolt heads. Most of the objects from this burnt layer are corroded and distorted by fire damage, and there are remains of burnt/mineralised textile around many of them. The sewing equipment would fit with the 16th century date suggested by the pottery from this context; comparable examples are known, for example from Colchester and Norwich (Crummy 1988, fig. 32; Margeson 1993, fig. 139). Sewing rings were normally used for heavy duty sewing, and thimbles for lighter work, but in this instance the punched indentations suggest a heavy duty use for both types.

**Buckles.** Two buckle fragments were found; one from this burnt layer and the other from an unstratified layer.

**Other objects.** Other miscellaneous items include a small circular object (diameter 25mm), possibly a box, from a medieval gravel layer (164) in phase 2. A cylindrical weight (Fig. 19, 2) with incised decoration, weighing 2g, came from a medieval rubble layer (101) in phase 2. A dome-headed tack and a riveted sheet fragment both came from the phase 3a burnt layer above clay floor 68. An unstratified late 19th/early 20th century barrel tap was also recovered.

**Non-diagnostic fragments.** These fragments are all probably post-medieval, and include unidentified fragments, melted or waste fragments (most from the phase 3a burnt layer) and strip and sheet fragments.

**Iron objects**

Three iron objects, other than nails, were found in medieval contexts in Trench 4. A knife with a rounded blade and integral handle came from a phase 1 post-hole (142), a trapezoidal buckle (Fig. 19, 5) possibly from a harness fitting, came from a phase 2 make-up level sealed by clay floor 114, and a multi-point spur rowel (Fig. 19, 4) came from phase 2 gully 122.

Objects from post-medieval contexts include a square buckle and a possible horseshoe fragment, both from phase 3 pit 1185 in Trench 1, a hook from the phase 3a burnt layer in Trench 4, and a cast-iron glue-pot (unstratified).

The remaining ironwork (118 objects) consists mainly of nails and nail fragments, most of which have rectangular-sectioned shanks and flat, sub-rounded heads. Other forms have sub-rectangular, T-shaped or slightly domed heads. Other iron fragments are also likely to be structural in origin. These consist of bar, rod, strip and sheet fragments, one possible bracket fragment and one hook/catch fragment. The ironwork was dispersed across the site in features dating mainly to the 17th and 18th century (phase 3).
Table 3 Summary of diagnostic clay pipes and makers’ marks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>No. of bowls</th>
<th>Makers’ marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1640–1660</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>rosette stamp; Hugh Gauntlet (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660–1680</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gauntlet (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690–1750</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Thomas Smith (1); Edward Higgs (1); Joel Sanger (3); William Sayer (6); Mickel Way (3); ?William Lawrence (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th century gen.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750–1820</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Benjamin Morgan (2); John Morgan (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840–60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>James Skeames (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glass

The glass consists of 184 fragments, including both vessel and window glass.

Wine bottles. Wine bottle fragments made up most of the glass assemblage (120 fragments, nearly all from Trench 4). With the exception of four modern fragments, all are from green wine bottles. No complete bottles were recovered but on the basis of the surviving neck and base fragments an early 18th century date seems likely for most of the bottles; all of which derived from phase 3 and 4 contexts.

Other vessel glass. Four fragments derive from three small drinking vessels of 16th/17th century date, two from Trench 1 and one from Trench 2, all from phase 3 features. All are thin-walled fragments in translucent, very pale green glass. The vessels comprise a flared rim with no visible decoration (Fig. 18, 1), a body fragment with wrythen mould-blown ribbing (Fig. 18, 2), and two body fragments with mould-blown lozenge-trellis decoration (Fig. 18, 3). Parallels for all three vessels can be found within late 16th/early 17th century assemblages, for example from Exeter and Plymouth (Charleston 1984, figs. 149–50; 1986), and similar types are known to have been produced at late 16th/early 17th century English glass-houses such as Hutton and Rosedale (Charleston 1972, figs. 61 and 64).

Other vessel glass includes fragments of wine glasses, small bottles or phials, and miscellaneous jars; all are of 18th century date or later.

Window glass. The small quantity of window glass (24 fragments) is all of post-medieval date; most was recovered from Trench 1, with a small concentration in 17th/18th century pit 1185.

Clay tobacco pipes by Jenny Hill and Anthony Light

In total, 530 fragments of clay pipes were recovered (2379g) and include 65 datable bowls or part bowls. These range in date from 1640 to 1820 with the bulk of the bowls dating to the late 17th century. A total of 25 pipes are stamped with the maker’s mark, either on the bowl, foot, spur or stem. Makers’ marks are listed below, and correlated to bowl types in Table 3.

Pipes found in Trenches 1–3 appear to come from contemporary contexts, while those from Trench 4 are largely residual in 19th century levels. The exception to this was a small, decayed wooden box-like structure set into the ground just to the north of the cellar of the Greyhound Inn (Trench 4, context 73, phase 3b, Fig. 11). This contained the greater part of a late 17th century Verwood storage jar, and a number of clay pipe fragments including three contemporary bowls, two with ‘Gaundet’ marks. Other 17th century groups were recovered from, for example, pits 1104, 1185 and 1191 (all phase 3 in Trench 1), and late 17th/early 18th century groups from...
flint-lined well 1012 (phase 3 Trench 1) and pit 3007 (phase 3 Trench 3).

The identifiable pieces of all periods, with the exception of the pipes of Mickel Way (?Shaftesbury) and William Lawrence (Winchester), originated from Salisbury or south Wiltshire and this seems to have been the main source throughout the 17th and 18th centuries.

Makers’ marks

2. Gaundet heel mark on small, bulbous bowl. Hugh Gaundet of Amesbury, recorded 1651 (ibid., 185).

ENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE

Animal bones by Sheila Hamilton-Dyer

Animal bones were recovered from all four trenches. They were fully recorded and analysed following a detailed assessment by Pippa Smith.

Methods

Species identifications were made using the author’s modern comparative collections. All fragments were identified to species and element with the following exceptions. Ribs and vertebrae of the ungulates (other than axis, atlas, and sacrum) were identified only to the level of cattle/horse-sized and sheep/pig-sized. This restriction does not apply to burials and other associated bones where ribs and vertebrae were assigned to species. Unidentified shaft and other fragments were similarly divided. Any fragments, which could not be assigned even to this level, have been recorded as mammalian only. Where possible sheep and goat were distinguished using the methods of Boessneck (1969) and Payne (1985). Recently broken bones were joined where possible and have been counted as single fragments. The small number of bones from sieved samples is included. Measurements follow von den Driesch (1976) in the main and are in millimetres unless otherwise stated. Withers height calculations of the domestic ungulates are based on factors recommended by von den Driesch and Boessneck (1974). Withers heights of dogs are calculated using the factors of Harcourt (1974). Archive material includes metrical and other data not presented in the text.

General results

A total of 640 individual bones was recorded. The bones are mainly well preserved with little erosion but individual contexts vary considerably. Some bone had clearly been waterlogged. Gnawing on bones from several contexts shows that these had been accessible to dogs before final disposal. A few bones had been burnt, particularly those from phase 3 pit 3007 in Trench 3. Most of the identified material is of cattle, sheep and pig; a few bones of horse, deer, dog, cat, hare, rabbit, rat, fowl, goose, duck, and cod are also present (Table 4). While 32 of the 104 sheep/goat bones in phase 3 could be identified as sheep, none could be attributed to goat and the material is referred to as sheep throughout. The few withers height estimates are similar to other contemporary material (Table 5). Other measurements are kept in archive.
Table 4 Animal bones: species distribution by phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>phase 1&amp;2</th>
<th>phase 3</th>
<th>phase 4</th>
<th>unphased</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>% cattle, sheep, pig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>horse</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cattle</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sheep/goat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pig</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red deer</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fallow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cattle-sized</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sheep-sized</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mammal frags</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dog</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rabbit</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rat</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fowl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goose</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duck</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bird frags</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total ident.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ident</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Medieval 13th to 14th phases 1 and 2

The 73 bones recorded for these phases are almost all from Trenches 1 and 4. In addition to the expected cattle, sheep and pig, there are bones of domestic fowl from both trenches, single bones of fallow and hare from Trench 1, and two cod vertebrae from Trench 4. The fallow is represented by the distal half of a radius, chopped across the proximal part of the shaft. The hare bone, a humerus, is also butchered with a diagonal knife mark across the shaft. Most areas of the body are represented in the bones with no particular concentrations and the material, though a small sample, appears to derive from several sources including butchery and household waste.

Post-medieval 16th to 18th phase 3

The bulk of the material is derived from contexts assigned to this phase, and was largely recovered from Trench 1. In addition to large numbers of
Table 5  Animal bones: withers heights

**sheep (Tschert's factors)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phase</th>
<th>feature</th>
<th>anatomy</th>
<th>measurement Gl (mm)</th>
<th>withers height (metres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>metacarpus</td>
<td>102.2</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>metacarpus</td>
<td>124.6</td>
<td>0.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>metatarsus</td>
<td>130.5</td>
<td>0.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>metatarsus</td>
<td>131.8</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unphased</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>metatarsus</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>max wht</th>
<th>min wht</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>cv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**cattle (Foch)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>feature</th>
<th>anatomy</th>
<th>measurement Gl (mm)</th>
<th>withers height (metres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>metatarsus</td>
<td>230.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>metacarpus</td>
<td>172.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**horse (Kiesewalter)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>feature</th>
<th>anatomy</th>
<th>measurement Gl (mm)</th>
<th>withers height (metres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>radius (L1)</td>
<td>330.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cattle and sheep bones there are a few bones of horse, pig, red and fallow deer, dog, hare, rabbit, rat, and poultry (Table 4).

Both of the red deer remains are small pieces of an antler, which had been naturally shed and though not charred appears to be slightly heat affected. There are five bones of fallow from this phase. These comprise two radii; a chopped proximal half, possibly from a buck, and a distal portion; and three metatarsi. The latter included an unusual distal half from barrel pit 1022 in Trench 1. This bone had a deliberately polished shaft. This context also contained several cattle horn cores and it is possible that this bone was used for smoothing hides. The radii are meat bones but the metapodia may have been trimmings or perhaps attached to skins.

The small assemblage from floor 68 in Trench 4 included an unusual shank bone from a hen. This tarsometatarsus has two accessory metatarsals. This indicates polydactyly, a variation known from the Roman period and exhibited by such breeds as the five-toed Dorking and Faverolle amongst others (Sadler 1991). The bone has a greatest length of 78.4mm.

The most notable feature of this assemblage is the relatively large number of bones from the head and feet of cattle and sheep. Of the 121 cattle bones over a quarter (31) are of horn cores and frontal fragments, yet upper and lower jaw fragments number just six. Foot bones are well represented at 36% (34 bones). Similarly over 11% of the sheep remains are of horn cores and frontals and 41% (43 bones) are from the foot, even though there is a typical taphonomic bias against the toes (Table 6). These elements are not only found scattered throughout the site, but are also found in small groups in some contexts.

Stone lined trough 1015 contained a mixture of bones that included a group of sheep horn cores,
Table 6  Animal bones: Anatomical distribution for cattle and sheep/goat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cattle</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>sheep/goat</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>skull /horn core</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other skull</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maxilla/premaxilla</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaw</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loose teeth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atlas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>axis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scapula</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pelvis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humerus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ulna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>femur</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tibia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calcaneum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metacarpus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metatarsus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phalanges</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

skull fragments and metapodia. Barrel pit 1022 contained a group of cattle horn cores and frontal fragments including one from a calf and two coated with lime deposits. Although barrel pit 1244 contained few bones, these included a cattle horn core and a metacarpus also coated in lime.

Timber-lined channel 2025 in Trench 2 also contained a group of cattle horn cores and frontal fragments. Tanning pit 2026, also in this trench, contained only one bone, but this too is a cattle horn core.

It could be argued that these remains are simply slaughter waste. However, the cattle skull remains are not those of the whole head including the upper and lower jaws, rather they are mainly the remains of the bucrania, i.e. that part of the skull that has the horn cores attached. Astragali are also absent from the foot bones and only two calcanea are present. These bones are usually removed and discarded with the feet, the absence of the carpals and the other tarsals might be explained by taphonomic bias but the astragalus and calcaneum are large solid bones. There is some evidence that the feet were left on the skin or hide to act as handles through part of the tanning process (and perhaps to provide neatsfoot oil as well, Serjeantson 1989) and that the hides arrived at the tannery with the horns attached, perhaps to indicate sex and age (Shaw 1996, MacGregor 1998). Horn workers would
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have obtained their raw material from the tannery. At the present site the animal bone evidence is supported by the presence of pits and troughs of types associated with tanning. The lime deposits found in some, and on some bones, indicate the removal of hair from the hides. There is also documentary evidence for tanners occupying the tenements.

Several of the sheep horn cores are slightly pathological with ‘thumb mark’ depressions. This has been suggested as resulting from a combination of castration and nutritional deficiencies (Hatting 1975) and may therefore indicate the processing of skins from wethers.

Other environmental evidence by Michael J. Allen and Sarah Wyles

Oyster shell was collected from all trenches, mainly from post-medieval (17th/18th century) contexts.

Waterlogged plant remains and wood fragments were observed in five one litre environmental samples from two 13th/14th century contexts and three 17th/18th century tanning features in Trenches 1 and 2. Charred grain was found in a bulk sample from 13th/14th ditch 2032 in Trench 2 while a sample from a 17th/18th century tanning pit (1281) produced relatively sparse carbonised plant remains.

DISCUSSION

The earliest medieval phase (phase 1) on the site has been assigned a broad 13th–early 14th century date. It included a small building with flint wall foundations, an associated hearth and cobbled yard apparently aligned parallel to Bridge Street (Trench 1) and a sequence of hearths associated with another small building with flint wall foundations close to the street frontage on Salisbury Street (Trench 4). The high water table and springs would have restricted early occupation of the Albany and Greyhound plots on Bridge Street and Salisbury Street respectively. The phase 1 structures in both areas were built on rafts of gravel, which were laid down to backfill wet areas and provide firm foundations for the buildings.

The later medieval phase (phase 2), again assigned a broad 13th–early 14th century date, saw the replacement of the earlier structures by larger buildings (Fig. 6). In Trench 1, on Bridge Street, the new rectangular building extended back from the street for at least two bays. It had flint foundations and was constructed gable end-on to the street. Decorative louvers, glazed roof tiles and the zoomorphic finial found in the overlying demolition layer suggest that this substantial building belonged to an individual of some social standing. Although this is an unusual location for a substantial medieval building, perhaps the owners were able to exert some control over the bridge, possibly collecting tolls. In Trench 4, on Salisbury Street, a cross passage timber-framed house was constructed parallel to the street.

Although documentary evidence suggests that the street frontages within the site continued to be occupied in the 15th and 16th centuries (see below), there are no archaeological features which can definitely be dated, on the basis of pottery, to the period between the later 14th and the end of the 15th century. Indeed, 16th century pottery is in most instances associated with Verwood earthenwares which are presumed to be 17th century or later. The paucity of later medieval evidence has been noted in many other medieval towns, such as Romsey and Winchester in Hampshire and Devizes, Salisbury and Wilton in Wiltshire and is likely to reflect a change in rubbish disposal practices rather than any changes in the density of occupation.
The Greyhound site is better documented than many others within Fordingbridge, including the Albany site, although there are still gaps which the excavation of Trench 4 did little to fill. However, this excavation showed that the Greyhound site had been occupied for perhaps two centuries before the surviving historical record begins in the mid-15th century. There is then little subsequent documentary information before the mid-16th century apart from a brief description of the holding and reference to certain of the tenants.

By the last few decades of the 16th century, the phase 3a building in Trench 4 was in place and it is this period which is now the best recorded of all, in particular thanks to the evocative Inventory of Nicholas Norris dated 1587 (HRO 1587 Ad 45). Nicholas is described as a yeoman, but it is clear from the lists of his contents that this was no ordinary domestic dwelling. Twelve beds and their bedding, unusual quantities of furniture, an elaborate kitchen and a well-stocked brewhouse (possibly the out house shown on Fig. 10) all point to it being an inn, although nowhere is it recorded as such. It was this building, possibly a precursor of the Greyhound Inn, which was destroyed by fire, probably within a few years of the completion of the inventory. Whilst there are a number of recorded fires in the town there are none between 1517 and 1662, though fire may have only affected this particular house.

The King's College court papers are defective for much of the first half of the 17th century. This leaves open the question of whether there was really a break in occupation between the end of phase 3a (late 16th century) and phase 3b (mid 17th century), as suggested by the excavation of Trench 4.

The brick building, phase 3b, is probably the Greyhound Inn first recorded in 1663, possibly put up by Widow Norris after the fire of 2nd July 1662. Its life was in any case to be short, as it is recorded in the court papers that the Greyhound was destroyed by the massive fire of 9th July 1672. Surprisingly, no archaeological evidence was found for either the 1662 or the 1672 fire. However, it is likely that the phase 3c building corresponds with the rebuild of 1676 by William Barter, but in view of the relatively short space of time between these events it was impossible to pin-point them precisely within the archaeological record.

The events of the 18th century are relatively less well understood. A further widespread fire in 1703 may also have affected the Greyhound, but this could not be confirmed. Nor has it yet been possible to determine when the inn reverted from the White Horse to the Greyhound, or to even compile a complete list of its tenants. Inevitably, the 19th century is much better covered through much improved documentation, maps, and local newspapers, although there was regrettably no opportunity to investigate the standing building before demolition in 1988.

By contrast, nearly all the features of 17th and 18th century date in Trenches 1 and 2 appear to have been connected with the tanning industry. The archaeological and Tithe map evidence shows that the southern part of Trench 1 was occupied by two cottages, which fronted onto Bridge Street, from the 17th to the late 19th century. The back yards of both cottages were used as tanneries in the 17th and 18th century, and documentary evidence suggests that this activity originated at least as early as the mid-15th century (see below).

Tanning features in Trench 1 included a stone-lined trough containing a deposit of lime and four barrel pits, possibly 'handlers' (Shaw 1996, 107). In addition, several large rectangular clay-lined pits, possibly 'layaways' were also found. Interestingly, the barrel pits were found close to the cottages, with the larger pits or 'layaways', where the hides were left for longer, further away and closer to the river. The animal bone evidence suggests that both cattle hides and sheep skins were processed.

Documentary evidence suggests that Tithe Map plot 158, the Bridge Street tenement by the river, was in the possession of John Rouse, a tanner, in 1449 and that tanners occupied the tenement between 1593 and 1733. The tanning features recorded in the eastern part of Trench 1 and in the sewer trench, to the east, clearly relate to this property. Documentary evidence also shows that a series of tanners and 'leather dressers' occupied Winge's tenement between 1597 and 1691, and it is possible that the tanning features recorded in Trench 2 relate to this property.

Post-medieval tanneries are also known at Downton (Waymouth 1999) and Ringwood (Light 1985, 75), and they clearly formed an important
part of the local economy in the Avon Valley. The excavations at Fordingbridge are the first to provide detailed archaeological evidence for the tanning industry in the area, and this has been linked to the documentary evidence which indicates that it originated in the medieval period. Together with the earlier 13th to 14th century sequence, the site overall has demonstrated the archaeological potential of one of Hampshire's smaller towns, particularly where a sufficiently large area including street frontage(s) is available for investigation. It is hoped that further opportunities for excavation in the town will arise in the future, particularly in the earlier medieval core area to the south-west, which may provide information on Fordingbridge in the 11th and 12th centuries.
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