# 81-84 High Street, Egham, Surrey

Post-Excavation Assessment

for

Prides Crossing Property Ltd and Cardale Developments Ltd

Project Manager: S. Ford
Fieldwork Director: M. J. Saunders
CAD Drawings by: L. Torrance and M. Gleave
Edited by : M. Hall

**March 1998**

## Contents



### Appendices



### Illustrations

# 81-84 High Street, Egham, Surrey
## Post-Excavation Assessment

by M. J. Saunders
with contributions by Paul Cannon, Steve Ford and Andy Smith

Report 97/47

## 1. Introduction

1.1 An excavation was undertaken by Thames Valley Archaeological Services at 81-84 High Street, Egham, Surrey (TQ 01267146) (Fig. 1), between November 20th and 25th, 1998. The work was commissioned by Mr. Paul Hunt of Waters Lewandowski, Chartered Architects, acting on behalf of their clients, Prides Crossing Property Ltd. and Cardale Developments Ltd.

1.2 An archaeological watching brief was subsequently undertaken during groundworks on 2nd, 3rd and 8th of December 1998.

1.3 The site lies in an area of high archaeological potential which has been highlighted in a desk-based assessment carried out by Surrey County Archaeological Unit. A condition on the granting of planning permission required a programme of archaeological work. This is in accordance with the Department of the Environment's Policy and Planning Guidance Note, *Archaeology and Planning* (PPG 16, 1990). The proposed development of new offices and a block of flats with associated car parking spaces provided an opportunity to gather further information on the development of Egham from the early Medieval to post-Medieval period. There was also the possibility of discovering remains relating to the Prehistoric and Roman periods.

1.4 The proposal area is situated on generally level ground at an average height of 16 m. AOD and lies on River Terrace deposits of flood-plain gravel (BGS, 1981). The drift geology observed during the excavation was an orange-brown silty brickearth with gravel.

1.5 The area of deposits identified by evaluation Trench 1 (Saunders 1997), within the footprint of the new office building and located in the area previously occupied by nos. 81 and 82 High Street, was excavated (Fig. 3). The proposed excavation area was to have been c. 80 sq. m. but due to the unsafe nature of adjacent timber framed buildings this was reduced very slightly.

1.6 The excavation was supervised by M. John Saunders and the project manager was Steve Ford. The fieldwork was inspected and monitored by Ms Dinah Saich, Archaeological Officer for Surrey County Council. The site code is HSE 97/47.

## 2. The Excavation and Watching Brief

2.1 A single trench was excavated (Fig. 2) using a 360$^0$ tracked mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless bucket and subsequently a JCB-type machine, also with a toothless bucket.

2.2 Thirty one features were investigated including eight previously identified during the evaluation. These included a number of layers, including a cobbled surface, levelling courses for later buildings, two wells and a number of brick and stone foundation walls. Two areas of dark humic garden soil were also present at either end of the site, one of which produced a quantity of pottery of Medieval date. The excavation area was stripped stratigraphically and each layer cleaned, excavated, planned and fully recorded. A number of cut features were also examined and these included seven postholes, four pits and a gully. The gully and one of the pits produced a small number of sherds of pottery of Prehistoric date.

2.3 The watching brief comprised monitoring of the groundworks during excavations to carry out underpinning of the adjacent party walls and construction of the footing trench for the front of the new office building. This revealed an infilled brick cellar most probably part of nos. 81 and 82 High Street.

## 3. Aims and Objectives of the Project

3.1 The project design for the investigations at 81-84 High Street, Egham comprised the research aims outlined below.

### 3.2 Research Questions

3.2.1 The evaluation results indicate that deposits on the site include those spanning the late Medieval/post-Medieval transition. This is a period which has largely been neglected or overlooked by archaeologists but is a time when important changes are taking place in agriculture and industry and the advent of capitalism (English Heritage 1997, 45). The excavation could add information from an archaeological perspective for this period in the history of Egham.

3.2.2 What is the date of construction of the cobbled surface discovered and when was it superseded?

3.2.3 What is the nature of the dark humic garden soil, containing Medieval pottery, beneath the cobbled surface? Is this a garden soil deposit, midden, floor or part of a pit group for rubbish disposal?

3.2.4 Are there any other Medieval features or structures on the site?

3.2.5 Are the deposits able to indicate the trade or industry carried out by the occupants of the plot?

3.2.6 What is the date of the earliest deposits on the site and are there any Roman or Prehistoric deposits present?

3.2.7 To produce a settlement history of the site taking account of any previous work in the vicinity.

3.2.8 To produce information on the economy and local environment.

3.2.9 To produce relative and absolute dating and phasing for deposits and features recorded on the site.

3.2.10 Establish the character of these deposits in an attempt to define functional areas on the site such as industrial, domestic, etc.

### 3.3 Reconsideration of the Research Questions and Statement of Potential

3.3.1 Particular attention will be given to interpretation of the pottery dates to provide an indication of the transition from the late Medieval to the post-Medieval periods.

3.3.2 Preliminary assessment of the pottery would seem to indicate a late 15th/early 16th century date for the cobbled surface 6/10.

3.3.3 The dark humic deposit (4) beneath the cobbled surface 6/10 would appear to be a midden; pottery sherds contained within it range in date from AD 1150 - 1450+. Samples have been sent for specialist analysis and this may provide information on the local economy and environment.

3.3.4 Pottery of late Bronze Age date was recovered from gully 31, and pit 32 contained late Bronze Age and late Iron Age pottery. Two body sherds of Roman pottery were present within deposit 4.

## 4. Further Research Questions

4.1 Further research should be targered at producing a settlement history of the site by synthesizing the information obtained with that from other sites in the vicinity.

4.2 The above objective (4.1) should then help to build a fuller picture of the settlement of Egham during the Medieval/post-Medieval transitionary period.

4.3 Comparisons of the artefactual evidence for the late Bronze/Iron Age periods will be made with other sites in the vicinity to examine whether they were contemporary.

## 5. Further Specialist Work, Research and Compilation

5.1. A catalogue of pottery and a report is being prepared and the metalwork is currently with the specialist. Study of the metal finds may help to provide an indication of functional areas and/or the nature of any domestic or industrial activity on the site. Other finds have been catalogued and examined and it is not intended to analyse these further. Drawings of selected pottery sherds will be produced, probably comprising a single page.

5.2 An archive level report will be compiled to include all the specialist reports and illustrations.

5.3 A subsequent publication report will be produced reflecting the importance of the site in its local and regional context.

5.4 Arrangements will be made to deposit the finds and site archive with the appropriate museum.

## 6. Bibliography


BGS, 1981, *British Geological Survey*, 1: 50000 series, sheet 269, Solid and Drift Edition, Keyworth.

English Heritage, 1997, English Heritage archaeology division, Research Agenda (Draft), London.

Johnson B, 1975, *Archaeology and the M25*, Surrey Archaeological Society Monograph.

Longley D, 1976, *The archaeological implications of gravel extraction in north-west Surrey*, Research Volume of the Surrey Archaeological Society, **3**, 1-35.

Longley D, 1980, *Runnymede Bridge 1976. Excavations on the site of a late Bronze Age settlement*, Research Volume of the Surrey Archaeological Society, **6**.

Longley D and Needham S, 1979, Egham: a late Bronze Age settlement and waterfront, *Current Archaeology*, **6**, 262-7.

Mitchiner M, 1988, *Jettons, Medalets and Tokens: The Medieval Period and Nuremberg*, Vol. 1, 526.

O'Connell M, 1986, *Petters Sports Field Egham, Excavation of a Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age Site*, Research Volume of the Surrey Archaeological Society, **10**, Guildford.

PPG 16, 1990, *Archaeology and Planning*, Department of the Environment Planning Policy Guidance Note 16, HMSO.

Saunders M J, 1997, 81-84 High Street, Egham, Surrey, An archaeological evaluation, Thames Valley Archaeological Services report, Reading.

**Appendix 1:** List of Contexts

| Feature | Fill | Description | Date Range | Dug |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | - | Garden soil | 1150-1450+ | Yes |
| 5 | - | Levelling course | | Yes |
| 6 | - | Cobbled surface | | Yes |
| 7 | - | Wall foundation | | Yes |
| 8 | - | Layer (gravel) | | Yes |
| 9 | - | Layer (tile) | 1450-C17th | Yes |
| 10 | - | Cobbled surface | C15/16th | Yes |
| 11 | - | Garden soil | 1150-1450 | Yes |
| 12 | - | Foundation cut | | No |
| 13 | 52 | Well | | No |
| 14 | - | Metal sleeve | | Yes |
| 15 | - | Water bottle (well) | mid-late C18th | No |
| 16 | - | Wall foundation | | Yes |
| 17 | - | Wall foundation | | Yes |
| 18 | - | Wall foundation | | Yes |
| 19 | - | Wall foundation | | Yes |
| 20 | 54 | Pit | | Yes |
| 21 | 55,53 | Foundation cut | | Yes |
| 22 | 56 | Posthole | | Yes |
| 23 | 57 | Posthole | 1450 | Yes |
| 24 | 58 | Posthole | 1450 | Yes |
| 25 | - | Layer | 1150-1450 | Yes |
| 26 | 59 | Posthole | | Yes |
| 27 | 60 | Pit/posthole | 1100-1350 | Yes |
| 28 | 61 | Posthole | | Yes |
| 29 | 62 | Posthole | | Yes |
| 30 | 63 | Posthole | | Yes |
| 31 | 64 | Gully | late Bronze Age | Yes |
| 32 | 65-67 | Pit | late Bronze Age | Yes |
| 34 | 68 | Pit | | Yes |

**APPENDIX 2:** The Pottery

A moderate quantity of pottery was recovered from the evaluation, excavation and watching brief. This came from eleven features and from the spoil. The majority dates to the 14th/15th century with a small number of sherds of late Medieval and post-Medieval date. Two features, a gully (31) and a pit (32) both produced pottery of Prehistoric date. The pottery has been sent for specialist identification and dating and a full report and catalogue will be produced.

*Catalogue of Pottery*

**The evaluation**

| *Trench* | *Feature* | *No.* | *Weight (gms)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 248 | 2248 |
| 1 | 6 | 13 | 51 |
| 1 | 8 | 2 | 4 |
| 1 | 9 | 11 | 94 |
| 1 | 10 | 3 | 32 |
| 1 | 11 | 22 | 154 |
| 4 | 2 (50) | 3 | 30 |

**The excavation**

| *Feature* | *No.* | *Weight (gms)* |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 1 | 46 |
| 4 | 2 | 30 |
| 4 | 3 | 58 |
| 4 | 5 | 34 |
| 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | 1 | 48 |
| 4 | 1 | 8 |
| 4 | 2 | 18 |
| 4 | 1 | 8 |
| 4 | 1 | 14 |
| 4 | 9 | 42 |
| 4 | 2 | 56 |
| 4 | 20 | 196 |
| 4 | 1 | 40 |
| 4 | 13 | 36 |
| 4 | 35 | 208 |
| 6 | 1 | 18 |
| 6 | 1 | 2 |
| 6 | 13 | 130 |
| 10 | 1 | <1 |
| 10 | 1 | 2 |
| 10 | 2 | 10 |
| 10 | 1 | <1 |
| 10 | 1 | 4 |
| 10 | 1 | 2 |
| 10 | 2 | 4 |
| 10 | 1 | 6 |
| 10 | 1 | 42 |
| 21 (53) | 1 | 4 |
| 21 (53) | 1 | 8 |
| 21 (53) | 13 | 240 |
| 21 (55) | 1 | 8 |
| 21 (55) | 1 | 8 |

*Pottery Catalogue continued*

**The excavation**

| *Feature* | *No.* | *Weight (gms)* |
|---|---|---|
| 21 (55) | 1 | 2 |
| 21 (55) | 1 | 4 |
| 21 (55) | 2 | 12 |
| 23 (57) | 2 | 14 |
| 24 (58) | 1 | 2 |
| 25 | 1 | 4 |
| 25 | 2 | 58 |
| 25 | 1 | 24 |
| 25 | 1 | 18 |
| 25 | 2 | 20 |
| 25 | 4 | 40 |
| 25 | 1 | 6 |
| 25 | 1 | 28 |
| 25 | 1 | 74 |
| 25 | 4 | 30 |
| 25 | 1 | 24 |
| 25 | 1 | 2 |
| 25 | 5 | 50 |
| 25 | 1 | 6 |
| 25 | 1 | <1 |
| 25 | 1 | 16 |
| 25 | 1 | 6 |
| 25 | 1 | 8 |
| 25 | 2 | 14 |
| 25 | 1 | 2 |
| 25 | 2 | 8 |
| 25 | 1 | 16 |
| 25 | 2 | 10 |
| 25 | 1 | 6 |
| 27 (60) | 3 | 22 |
| 31 (64) | 2 | 8 |
| 31 (64) | 4 | 19 |
| 31 (64) | 3 | 14 |
| 32 (65) | 4 | 66 |
| 32 (65) | 2 | 4 |
| Unstrat. | 1 | 12 |

**Watching brief**

| *Feature* | *No.* | *Weight (Gms)* |
|---|---|---|
| 150 | 3 | 36 |
| Spoil | 2 | 8 |

**Appendix 3:** Struck Flint by Steve Ford

Six struck flint flakes were recovered from the excavation. One of the flakes is moderately rolled and may be of Palaeolithic date. Of the remainder, none are diagnostic, and they can only be broadly assigned to the Mesolithic to late Bronze Age periods.

***Catalogue of Flint***

| *Context* | *Number* | *Description* |
|---|---|---|
| 12 (69) | 2 | Intact flakes |
| 32 (65) | 1 | Intact flake |
| 32 (65) | 2 | Broken flakes |
| Trench base 52.8E/55.1N | 1 | Rolled flake |

**Appendix 4:** The Animal Bone by Andy Smith

A total of 44 fragments of bone (2.36 kg) were recovered from seven sealed contexts. Ten fragments are unidentifiable due to their size, but one of these fragments has been worked. The predominant species present are cattle and sheep/goat. The elements represented are mostly the distal ends of the larger long bones i.e. humerus and femur, and there are few cranial or jaw bone elements. However, the sample is far too small to judge the element representation in the light of animal husbandry practices for the large time scale that the site covers. Four fragments of bone were recovered from wet sieving of soil samples from the garden soil (4).

*The worked bone*
Length: 86.7 mm.
Maximum width: 10.4 mm.
Minimum width: 2.08 mm.
Thickness: 2.05 mm.

*Description*
A single piece of worked bone was retrieved from the surface of an area of cobbles (10). It is a long thin piece of bone with a rounded end and which tapers to a thin neck and then flares out slightly. It appears broken at one end where there is the suggestion of a suspension loop or hole at the top. In profile the piece is rounded on the top and has a flat base. The function is unknown but it appears to be a spatula of some sort, perhaps part of a toilet set or 'chatelaine'.

| *Feature* | *Context* | *Cow* | *Sheep/ goat* | *Cow Size* | *Sheep Size* | *Pig* | *Rodent* | *U/D* | *Total* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unstratified | - | 1 | 3 | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | 6 |
| 14 | 53 | 3 | 2 | - | 1 | - | - | - | 6 |
| 11 | - | 1 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 7 |
| 23 | 57 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | - | - | 3 | - | 2 | - | - | 4 | 9 |
| 21 | 53 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 10 | - | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 5 |
| 25 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 9 | - | 4 | - | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | 7 |
| | *Total* | *13* | *13* | *1* | *5* | *1* | *1* | *10* | *44* |
| | *%* | *29.5* | *29.5* | *2.3* | *11.4* | *2.3* | *2.3* | *22.7* | |

**Table 1:** Identification of species specific elements

| *Feature* | *Context* | *Cow* | *Sheep/ goat* | *Cow Size* | *Sheep Size* | *Pig* | *Rodent* | *Total* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unstratified | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | 3 |
| 14 | 53 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| 11 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| 4 | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| 21 | 53 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 10 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| 25 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| 9 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| | *Total* | *6* | *5* | *1* | *3* | *1* | *1* | *17* |
| | *%* | *35.3* | *29.4* | *5.9* | *17.6* | *5.9* | *5.9* | |

**Table 2:** Minimum Number of Individuals represented

| *Element/ Species* | *Bovid* | *Caprine/Ovid* | *Ovid Size* | *Bovid Size* | *Sus* | *Other* | *Total* | *%* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cranium | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 6.9 |
| Mandible | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 10.3 |
| Vertebrae | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 6.9 |
| Ribs | 3 | - | 1 | - | - | - | 4 | 13.8 |
| Sternum | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Clavicle | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Scapula | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3.4 |
| Humerus | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | 3 | 10.3 |
| Radius/ Ulna | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3.4 |
| Metacarpal | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3.4 |
| Carpals | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Phalange | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Innominate | 2 | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | 5 | 17.2 |
| Femur | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 3 | 10.3 |
| Tibia/Fibula | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3.4 |
| Metatarsal | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 10.3 |
| Tarsals | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Phalange | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

**Table 3:** Total Species specific element distribution

**Appendix 5:** Other Specialist Comments

**The Burnt Flint**
Nine pieces of burnt flint (194 gms) were recovered from layer 4, a garden soil. This was weighed and subsequently discarded. There are no recommendations for further work.

**Brick and tile**
A number of fragments of brick and tile were recovered from the excavation and these have been quantified by context (Table 4). Sample bricks were also removed from the wall foundations and from the well (13). A number of the tiles had nail or peg holes and some also had lime mortar adhering to their surfaces.

| *Context* | *Type* | *No. (gms)* | *Weight* | *Comment* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | tile | 4 | 242 | rooftile, 1 with peghole |
| 4 | tile | 3 | 14 | probable rooftile frags |
| 5 | tile | 7 | 1321 | rooftile |
| 5 | brick | 1 | 80 | |
| 7 | brick | 2 | 3976 | brick sample - wall foundation |
| 7 | tile | 4 | 1376 | 1 frag. with pegholes |
| 8 | tile | 6 | 338 | rooftile |
| 8 | brick | 6 | 174 | some appears glazed |
| 9 | tile | 6 | 600 | rooftile |
| 9 | brick | 1 | 240 | |
| 11 | tile | 1 | 11 | |
| 11 | brick | 1 | 230 | lime mortar adhering |
| 13 | brick | 1 | 2560 | brick sample from well |
| 18 | brick | 1 | 2690 | brick sample - wall foundation |
| 21 (53) | tile | 1 | 398 | ridge tile |

**Table 4:** Brick and Tile

**Daub/fired clay**
Fired clay was recovered from a single context, a levelling course of broken tile (9). This comprised five fragments weighing 278 gms in total. No wattle impressions were visible and no further work is recommended.

**Clay pipe** by Andy Smith
Twelve fragments of clay pipe were recovered from five sealed contexts. A single bowl came from pit 34. This consisted of an angled top with a near parallel sided barrel. The heel was wide and prominent from the stem with little profile change to the bowl. The only decoration was a single incised line parallel to the top of the bowl. This is a typical shape for the south of England and dates to the late 17th century, c. 1660-1690.

The bore diameters of the remaining stems indicate a date range between the late 17th and mid-18th century with one exception. This came from the secondary backfill (53) of the foundation cut (21) for the brick-domed well or 'water bottle'. There is no precise date for this fragment as the bore diameter is within the 4/64" range. This fine bore measurement is common throughout the very late 18th century and all of the 19th century, due to refined manufacturing techniques. However, minute variations, both on a regional and national scale, disallows precise dating. One unstratified fragment was also recovered from the excavation spoil and three from spoil from underpinning of the adjacent buildings.

| *Context* | *Date* |
|---|---|
| 9 | 1703±20 |
| 11 | 1696±20 |
| 21/53 | 1696±20 |
| 21/53 | late 19th |
| 34 | 1696±20 |

**Table 5:** Date range of stem bore diameters

**Oyster shell**

Ten fragments of oyster shell (*Ostrea edulis*), some complete, were recovered during the excavation. These came from six contexts and weighed 110 gms in total. Their size is generally small and some exhibit damage in the form of small holes probably caused by *Polydora hoplura* and *Cliona celata*. Notches were tentatively identified on the margins of a small number of the valves, which are thought to result from the opening procedure. The oysters have been quantified by context (Table 6).

| *Cut* | *Deposit* | *Number* | *Weight (gms)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| - | 4 | 1 | 6 |
| - | 4 | 1 | 6 |
| - | 5 | 1 | 22 |
| - | 9 | 1 | 8 |
| - | 10 | 1 | 8 |
| - | 11 | 2 | 12 |
| 21 | 53 | 3 | 48 |

**Table 6:** Oyster shells by context

**Metalwork**

Metalwork was recovered from seven contexts and comprised iron, lead and copper alloy. These have been sent for further analysis.

| *Context* | *Type* | *Number* | *Weight (gms)* | *Comments* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Fe | 1 | 26 | Corroded nail |
| 4 | Pb | 3 | 4 | Lead fragments |
| 4 | Cu alloy | 1 | 6 | Ring |
| 6 | Fe | 1 | 10 | Corroded nail |
| 8 | Pb | 1 | <1 | Thin strap piece |
| 9 | Cu alloy | 1 | <1 | Wire |
| 10 | Fe | 1 | <1 | Nail |
| 10 | Fe | 1 | 14 | Corroded nail |
| 10 | Cu alloy | 1 | 8 | Copper alloy sheet |
| 10 | Pb | 1 | 26 | Lead weight (7/8 oz.) |
| 11 | Fe | 1 | 164 | Unidentified |
| 11 | Fe | 1 | 34 | Corroded nail |
| 11 | Pb | 1 | <1 | Stem/thick length of lead with square section |
| 14 | Fe | 6 | 2070 | Tapered iron sleeve for bottom of wooden post |
| 21 (53) | Pb | 1 | 10 | Part of a ring or hook? |

**Slag**

Twenty fragments of iron slag were recovered from three contexts: 4, 11 and 21. These weighed 652 gms in total. Two of the fragments were recovered from wet sieving of samples of the garden soil (4). The slag has been quantified by context (Table 7).

| *Context* | *Number* | *Weight* |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | 2 | 30 |
| 11 | 14 | 340 |
| 21 (53) | 4 | 282 |

**Table 7:** Iron slag

**Glass**

Fragments of glass were recovered from two contexts, the secondary backfill (53) of the foundation cut (21) for the 'water bottle' (well 15) and from the cobbled surface 6. These comprised fragments of bottle glass and window glass but could not be positively dated.

| *Context* | *Number* | *Weight* | *Comments* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 1 | <1 | Window glass |
| 21 (53) | 1 | 20 | Wine bottle |
| 21 (53) | 1 | 4 | Wine bottle |
| 21 (53) | 1 | <1 | Window glass |

**Table 9:** Glass

**Burnt flint**

Nine pieces of burnt flint were recovered from the garden soil (4). These weighed 194 gms in total and have been discarded.

**Mortar**

Samples of mortar were retrieved from contexts 4 and 5, and from the spoil from underpinning of the adjacent building during the watching brief. A small quantity was also recovered during wet sieving of one of the samples of garden soil (4).

| *Context* | *Number* | *Weight (gms)* |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | 2 | 48 |
| 4 | 2 | 8 |
| 5 | 11 | 258 |
| UP 5 spoil | 1 | 28 |

**Table 10:** Mortar

**The Token** by Paul Cannon

A single brass 'show jeton' was recovered from the garden soil 11 in Trench 1, during the evaluation. This area was subsequently excavated. The jeton was made by Iohan Iacob Dietzel of Nuremberg who was working from 1711 to 1748. This is an example of one of his English style jetons modelled on the coins of George I and was therefore no doubt made prior to 1727 (cf Mitchiner, 1876).

**Soil samples**

Samples were taken from three contexts, garden soil (4), gully 31 (64) and pit 32 (65). These have been wet sieved, floated, artefacts retrieved and sub-samples sent for environmental analysis.

| *Sample No.* | *Context* | *Quantity* |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 32 (65) | 36 litres |
| 2 | 31 (64) | 40 litres |
| 3 | 4 | 30 litres |
| 4 | 4 | 40 litres |

81-84 High Street, Egham, Surrey : TVAS HSE 97/47

Animal bones

S Hamilton-Dyer

April 19, 1998

Animal bone fragments totalling just 44 individual bones were recovered from features of medieval, post-medieval and modern date.

## Methodology

Species identifications were made using the modern comparative collections of S. Hamilton-Dyer. Some fragments could be identified only to the level of cattle/horse-sized (LAR) and sheep/pig-sized (SAR). One small, indeterminate fragment was recorded as mammalian only. The few measurements follow von den Driesch (1976) and are in millimetres. Withers height estimations of the domestic ungulates are based on factors recommended by von den Driesch and Boessneck (1974) and are in metres. The taxa identified and their abbreviations used in text, tables, and printout are listed in archive. The archive contains further details of each fragment including data on anatomy, butchery, fragmentation, ageing and measurements.

## Results

The taxa identified are cattle, horse, sheep, pig and goose (Table 1). Most of the identified bones are of cattle. Half of the fragments could not be positively identified to species, the majority of these are of cattle size. There is indirect evidence of dog as a cattle jaw from the garden soil/midden has been gnawed. Rodent gnawing was observed on two bones from the 18th-19th century well foundation cut F21 (53). The condition of the bones varies considerably from clean and well preserved to dark and eroded. None were burnt.

Several bones were measurable, these, and most of the unmeasurable bones, are from large animals. This is consistent with post-medieval or early modern dates. The two bones from medieval features F23, F25 offer little information. The six bones from the 15th to 17th century cobbling include two very large cattle bones and are almost certainly from the later period of activity. The two cattle bones from the late feature F21 are similarly large.

Butchery marks are visible on several bones, these were made using both knives and cleavers but do not include the distinctive sawing seen on recent material. It is suggested that the majority of the bone, including that from unstratified or undated contexts, is of post-medieval and early modern date. There are no examples of the small cattle and sheep common in medieval material. It is noted that several of the ceramics from context (4) are residual and the bones from this context include two very abraded examples which may be residual.

Overall the bones are from the expected domestic ungulates, together with a goose bone, and are a mixture of anatomical parts. The bones include those from low value or waste areas, such as the head and feet, as well as those from prime meat areas. The remains represent the disposal of material from a variety of activities including slaughter, butchery and kitchen waste.

references

Driesch A. von den (1976) A guide to the measurement of animal bones from archaeological sites, Peabody Museum Bulletin 1, Harvard

Driesch A. von den and Boessneck J. (1974) Kritische Anmerkungen zur Widerristhöhenberechnung aus Längenmaßen vor- und frühgeschichtlicher Tierknochen, Säugetierkundliche Mitteilungen 22, München, p 325-348

**Archive Table**

**SPECIES LIST AND ABBREVIATIONS USED IN TEXT, TABLES AND ARCHIVE**

| | |
|---|---|
| HOR | domestic horse |
| COW | domestic cattle |
| S/G | domestic sheep or goat |
| SHE | positively identified as domestic sheep |
| PIG | domestic pig |
| LAR | large ungulate (probably mostly COW but may also include HOR) |
| SAR | small artiodactyl (probably mostly S/G) |
| MAM | unidentified bone, probably SAR and/or LAR |
| GOO | domestic goose |