EXCAVATION AND SURVEY AT THE OLD HUTT, HALEWOOD, IN 1960

Stuart Wrathmell

INTRODUCTION

In 1960 two medieval moated sites at Halewood were excavated by Mr Ernest Greenfield on behalf of the Ministry of Works. Wright's Moat (SJ 446841) and The Old Hutt (SJ 450838) were both threatened with destruction because they lay within the area chosen for Ford's motor manufacturing plant. Wright's Moat was, at the time, an empty site, and investigations were confined to a single trench. Given the short time available (five weeks) and the limited resources, it was perhaps inevitable that work should be concentrated upon The Old Hutt, where the position of medieval and 17th century structures was evidenced by standing remains. Even so, the extent and depth of the trenches proved, in the end, too small to provide much more than fragmentary building plans of the phases of occupation.

Until 1985 the full excavation report remained unwritten. This task has now been accomplished at the initiative of English Heritage. The following account of the discoveries is based upon the archive of site records held by English Heritage; it also makes extensive use of surveys and descriptions of the buildings which survived at The Hutt until 1960. These were the work of Mr W. G. Prosser, and are now part of the National Buildings Record. Some of the architectural stonework was probably dismantled and taken to Liverpool Borough Engineer's Depot; its present location is unknown. The excavated finds are to be deposited in Liverpool Museum.

In preparing the material for publication I would like to thank, first of all, those who have contributed specialist reports and identifications of artefacts: Marion Archibald, Lionel Burman, Peter Davey, John Mallet and Anna Slowikowski. Information on the glass vessels had been provided soon after the excavations by R. J. Charleston and Dorothy Charlesworth, and on the coins by Stuart Rigold. This has been incorporated in the present report. The staffs of the Lancashire Record Office, Preston and the Local History Department, Liverpool City Libraries provided valuable assistance in the search for historical sources; and Roger Dickinson of Archaeological Services, Liverpool University, was kind enough to provide the transcript of the 1675 probate inventory used in Appendix B, and to discuss its interpretation. I am indebted to Robert Philpott and Ed Southworth of Liverpool Museum, and to Peter Davey who assisted in the search for additional material related to The Old Hutt and its settlement context. I am grateful to Margaret Wood of English Heritage for her assistance, and to Anna Slowikowski and Chris Philo for, respectively, the drawings of the ceramic finds, and all but two of the other illustrations; Figures 12 and 14 were drawn by Margaret Tremayne (Mrs Mahoney), then of the Archaeological Illustrators' Office, English Heritage.

On behalf of Mr Greenfield and English Heritage I should, finally, acknowledge the assistance of the late Mrs E. M. Minter in the excavations, and the cooperation of the site owners, Fords, and the main contractors, Trenthams.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The manors of Hale and The Hutt

For over three centuries the manor house called The Hutt was a residence of the Ireland family of Hale. It lay about 2.5km north-west of the village of Hale (Fig. 1); indeed, it was just outside the vill territory, in the adjacent township of Halewood. Yet in the 17th century the Irelands also held a capital messuage in Hale itself: Hale Hall, which at the end of that century replaced The Hutt as their principal residence. The Hall is dated structurally to the early 17th century, with substantial modifications in the 1670s (Farrer and Brownbill 1907, 147); yet one cannot assume that it was a post-medieval foundation, nor that it was unavailable earlier to the Irelands as a residence. It may even have preceded The Hutt as a manorial centre by several centuries.

The existence of these two capital messuages, as well as a third manorial homestead, Love's Hall in Halewood, is a reflection of the rather complicated division of interests in the manor. The complexities began in 1203, when King John granted the vill to Richard of Meath (Farrer and Brownbill 1907, 141). The Hale Charter Roll, a 15th century transcript of manorial charters, shows that Richard in return had to pay a chief rent of £7 annually out of the vill, a rent which had been granted by King John to Nicholas de la Huse (Lancs RO DD Ib: Charter Roll, nos. 1, 3 and 5). After Richard's death the succession to his holding became the subject of litigation. He had intended that his illegitimate children and their mother, Cecily of Columbres, should hold the manor of his brother, Henry of Waleton (Farrer and Brownbill 1907, 142). The children of Henry and of Cecily disputed possession, but the claims of the Waletons were settled for a time when Cecily granted them a third of the manor. In the 1270s, however, Adam of Ireland, grandson of Cecily, claimed both the Columbres share and also the Waleton third. The dispute over the latter part of the inheritance continued until 1321: in that year William of Waleton alienated his interest to the Irelands (Lancs RO, DD In 22/5).
Figure 1: Above: The townships of Hale and Halewood, showing manorial and moated settlements. Inset: General location map. Below: Map showing Wright's Moat and Old Hutt Farm, based on Ordnance Survey, 1st edition 6".
Nevertheless, the manorial control of the Irelands was still circumscribed, for the de la Huse family, grantees of the chief rent, had established a mesne lordship. In the 1260s another Nicholas de la Huse had been assigned the wardship of Richard of Waleton. Later, he granted his interests to the Holand family (Lanes RO DD lb: Charter Roll, no. 7). In 1285 Robert of Holand gave his daughter in marriage to Adam of Ireland, and with half the Holand land in Halewood (Lanes sheriff had to issue a writ ordering them to keep an agreement with Adam over their holding was described as the manor of Halewood (Farrer 1915, 100). An inquisition of 1349 listed the manor of Hale as a Holand possession (Farrer 1915, 201), but in the 15th century their holding was described as the manor of Halewood (Farrer and Brownbill 1907, 143). Towards the end of that century the Holand lands descended to the Lovel family, whose seat at Hale Bank still bears their name (Fig. 1). Their estate was confiscated by the Crown in 1487 (Farrer and Brownbill 1907, 150).

It is tempting to assume that the Holand-Lovel estate became centred in Halewood as the Irelands established themselves in the vill of Hale itself. Unfortunately, the spheres of interest in the late 13th and 14th centuries are by no means so well defined. Both the Irelands and the Holands held land in various parts of Halewood, and the Irelands, too, erected their principal residence in that township. The earliest reference to The Hutt by name is in a deed of 1422, when William of Ireland of Hale held manerium de Hale ... ac ecciam manerium del hutte (Lanes RO DD lb, deed no. 89). In view of the structural evidence, however, The Hutt seems to have been established at least a century before that date.

Medieval settlement in Halewood

In the 12th and early 13th centuries the vill of Hale lay within the royal forest (Shaw 1956, 10), although the hunting grounds were presumably confined to its appendant wood. The woodland area, which became the township of Halewood, extended from Ditton Brook on the north to Ram's Brook on the south (Fig. 1). By the late 13th century it contained scattered settlements of single and multiple farmsteads, but we do not know whether they were at that date recent creations, or whether they were long-established.

Halewood was called a vill in a deed of 1349 (Farrer and Brownbill 1907, 151), but in the mid-15th century its eastern end, the area known as Hale Bank, was described separately as a vill (Lanes RO DD lb, deed no. 125). The division of Halewood into two parts has been attributed to the position of the late 12th century forest boundary, which may have encompassed only the western half of the territory (Cowell 1982, 22). It certainly continued into post-medieval times, for a list of inhabitants, drawn up in 1693, recorded them under two sub-headings: Halewood end and Halebank end (Lanes RO PR 2725/2).

The detailed evidence of medieval and later settlement in the township has been discussed by others (Cowell 1982; Hollinshead 1981), and only the main characteristics need be considered here, to provide a context for the excavated sites. By the later 13th century Halewood contained a number of sub-manorial freehold estates. In 1285, for example, the Halewood lands granted by Robert of Holand to Adam of Ireland included those held by Richard of Holand, Thomas Forester, Robert of Thornhead and Adam of the Bank (Lanes RO DD lb, deed no. 9). These were all freeholders, who in 1292 possessed, respectively, 60, 16, 8 and 6 acres of land (Farrer and Brownbill 1907, 144).

Some of the freeholders had houses as well as lands in the wood; this is evident from their surnames (including 'of Halewood' and 'of the Bank'), as well as from incidental information. Robert of Holand, for example, granted to Roger Carpenter 2 acres of land in Halewood on either side of Roger's house (Lanes RO DD lb, deeds, unnumbered).

Some of the houses may have been isolated, set within their own fields. There were, however, at least two places within the wood where messuages were grouped more closely together, and where fields were in multiple ownership. One of these was in Hale Bank. A 1347 lease by William le Bonker to John of Ireland concerned 3 acres in Bonkerfield (Lanes RO DD lb, deed no. 42); and the open fields of Halebank survived, at least in part, until the early 19th century (Cowell 1982, 22). The other place is named in the deeds as Crosbyhouses, and it, too, gave the surname to one of the freehold families (Lanes RO DD lb, deed no. 18). In the late 13th or early 14th century William of Halewood granted to Ralph, son of Elen, 3 acres in Halewood in the field called Crosbyhowses, between the land of Henry son of Adam and the land of Richard son of Simon (Lanes RO DD lb, no. 14). The name Crosbyhowses does not appear to have survived into more recent times, and it seems that this subdivision or 'end' of Halewood township came itself to be called, rather confusingly, Halewood.

The moated sites of Halewood (Fig. 1) are the only medieval homesteads which can be precisely located. Two of them, The Hutt and Lovel's Hall, can be classed as isolated manorial settlements, though it is as well to remember that 'isolated' is not necessarily 'small': the resident population of these two establishments could well have been, at times, larger than that of all the remaining farmsteads combined. The two other certain moats seem also to have been isolated, but they were
probably sub-manorial in status. One of them, known most recently as Yew Tree House, was investigated briefly in 1976, at the time of its destruction (Warhurst 1977, 5-10). The other, Wright's Moat, was sectioned at the time of The Hutt excavations (Appendix A, below). In neither case was it possible to characterise the occupation, nor indeed to demonstrate occupation by means of structural evidence. Nor has it been possible so far to identify the medieval owners or occupiers. Yew Tree House, formerly Horrock's House and Peacock House (Lancs. RO DRL 1/32), has obviously undergone a series of name changes. Wright's Moat seems to have derived its modern name from the tenant family which held that land at the time of the first Ordnance Survey.

It is a reasonable presumption, but no more, that these latter moats were associated with the farmsteads of substantial freehold tenants. One freeholder, John of the Mill of Halebank, had a house which in 1420 was called the Pele (Lancs. RO DD 1b, deed no. 87), probably the same dwelling which in 1341 had been called a capital messuage (Lancs. RO DD 1b, deed, list no. 29). It may not have been moated, but it was, no doubt, a substantial and protected farmstead.
Plate I: The gatehouse from the north, a drawing by H. Mary Milner, dated 1917.
MANORIAL SETTLEMENT OF THE HUTT

The precincts

The manorial farmstead lay on the southern boundary of Halewood township, close to Ram's Brook. It was delimited by the brook on its south and east sides; and on the north it seems to have been bounded by a smaller stream. The various elements of the settlement are shown in Figure 2: they have been reconstituted from details on the tithe map of 1843 (Lancs RO DRL 1/32), on the survey by W. G. Prosser (Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), National Buildings Record, Old Hutt file), and on various editions of Ordnance Survey maps.

The principal component was a moated enclosure measuring about 50m by 55m. Its eastern half contained the residential buildings, focussed upon the medieval hall. To the west, across a courtyard, was a medieval and 17th century gatehouse, fronted by a stone bridge and causeway. These various structures are discussed in more detail below. The water level of the moat was presumably regulated by leets from and to Ram's Brook, but no evidence of these has been recorded.

On the west side of the moated enclosure was an outer precinct containing farm buildings. Until 1960 these were grouped in three ranges. Most were outwardly 19th century brick structures, but three of them at least were earlier in origin. The best preserved was a two-storey building of the 17th century which stood near the east end of the north range. It contained brick-mullioned windows. Further west, behind more recent brick walls, were the remains of two cruck trusses (RCHM(E), photographs). The northern half of the west range contained a building identified as a stable block. The lower, stone-built part was attributable to the early 17th century; one of its two doorways bore the inscription 'John Ireland 1603' (Rylands 1893, 24). By 1960 the upper storey, originally timber-framed (Liverpool City Libraries (LCL) photograph, E. M. Abraham c. 1900), had been rebuilt in brick.

Two other significant features were shown on the tithe map, but did not survive into more recent times. The first was a group of three fishponds to the north of the farm buildings, which may well have originated in the Middle Ages. The second was the line of a trackway running east to west through the outer courtyard. Eastwards, it led directly to the gatehouse of the moated homestead. At its west end, immediately south of the stable block, the remains of a large outer gateway could still be traced in the 19th century (Rylands 1893, 24).

The gatehouse

The most substantial manorial building which remained in 1960 was the gatehouse. Its core was a timber-framed structure of two bays and three storeys, forming an entrance passage on an east-west axis, with rooms above. The accompanying plan (Fig. 3) is based upon the 1960-61 survey by W. G. Prosser (RCHM(E)). Vertical studding survived in the south-side wall at ground-floor level, whereas the upper storeys on the north side had diagonal studs forming a herringbone pattern (Plate I). The second floor, and the roof with its deep coved eaves, had been destroyed by enemy action in the Second World War.

The surviving records indicate that the gatehouse was modernised in two distinct stages. The first of these was marked by the refronting of the principal, western facade, and by the erection of two projections, on each side of the entrance. The new west front was of brick, and seems to have been in the form of an English-bond skin applied to the front of the timber. The upper storeys were each given an eight-light, mullioned and transomed window of stone. Above the first-floor window was a hood mould which may have been repositioned: it had no terminals and looked oddly placed. It incorporated a central panel bearing, on two shields, the arms of the Ireland and Handford families. These have been ascribed to William Ireland and his wife Ellen, who lived in the early 15th century (Rylands 1893, 24), and may have been the builders of the timber gatehouse.

The projections on each side of the gateway were new constructions, in English-bond brickwork, with small circular stone portholes (Plates II and III). They were designed to appear symmetrical from the west, but were in fact unequal in size. Each contained a chamber at ground and first floor levels, but those of the north were smaller than the southern ones, and they screened a chimney stack. The stack served a fireplace in the room above the western half of the gate passage, which had 'John Ireland 1608' carved upon its mantel piece (Rylands 1893, 24). The brick projections were founded upon offset, chamfered plinths of sandstone.

The second 17th century rebuild included an extension of the south side of the gatehouse: rooms on two floors, incorporating a chimney stack and brick-mullioned windows (Plate III). It, too, was set upon sandstone blocks, but in this case the height of the plinth was uneven, and there was no chamfer. It is probable that the extension was built partly on top of earlier walling: the sandstone beneath its west wall may in fact have been the medieval perimeter wall, along the inner edge of the moat. The two fine, round-headed stone archways at either end of the entrance passage may also be ascribed to this second rebuild. On the north side of the west front archway, the bottom corner of the stone facade abutted awkwardly the south end of the earlier chamfered plinth, and may have been carried over one of the chamfered stones (Plate II).

During the 18th century a new brick farmhouse was attached to the north side of the gatehouse, and the gatehouse was itself incorporated in the dwelling. The west wall of the house may have been founded like the
Figure 3: The gatehouse: an interpretation of structural phases (simplified; based on plans by W. G. Prosser, Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England).
Plate II: The gatehouse from the north-west in 1960, showing the stone plinth of the brick projections (RCHM(E)).
Plate III: The gatehouse from the south-east in 1960 (RCHM(E)).
Plate IV: The hall doorway from the west (scale in feet).
Plate V: The 17th century brick wall and fireplace (scale in feet).
Figure 4: The excavations: general plan of trenches and structures in the eastern half of the moated island.
southern extension, upon an earlier perimeter wall or range, since its lower courses were of sandstone. The line of this stonework was resumed further north, where it formed the foundation of an outbuilding (LCL photograph, J. Henderson 1868). This was certainly at one time the line of the inner edge of the moat; it confirms that the gatehouse had, from its earliest phase, projected into the moat.

The manor house

By 1960 only two fragments of the manor house remained standing above ground: a piece of sandstone wall containing an arched doorway, and a brick wall on a sandstone plinth, incorporating a fireplace. These perhaps represented the earliest and latest building phases. The two-centred sandstone arch with roll and fillet mouldings (Plate IV) was identified by Rylands (1893, 24-5) as the entrance to the great hall, and dated to the early 14th century. It had a hood mould of which one terminal, at least, had been in the form of a grotesque face. Above the doorway a chase in the masonry indicated that the entrance had once been covered by a porch. The wall in part stood to its original height of about 5m. In Ryland’s day there was also, perhaps lying on the ground, part of a ‘large pointed window showing parts of two trefoil lights and a circle filled with tracery’ (Rylands 1893, 25).

The brick wall and the fireplace (Plate V) are clearly to be dated to the earlier part of the 17th century. The jambs of the fireplace have strapwork, and the lintel scroll decoration. The style is similar to the ornamentation on the fireplace of the State Bedroom at Speke Hall. The structure which incorporated this hearth evidently survived much more substantially at the beginning of the 19th century. In about 1820 Gregson wrote of a ‘large stone transom window-frame, the ancient chimney piece, and an upper range of windows, of similar dimensions, that were remaining a few years ago’ (Harland 1869, 207). The ground-floor window was photographed by Waite (1888-1921, Plate 41): it had eight lights in a rectangular frame, with a king mullion and ovolo mouldings. According to Rylands (1893, 26) there was also ‘a very fine bay-window looking east’ which fell into the moat in the early 19th century. He identified this structure as a banqueting hall or great parlour. Its architectural details certainly indicate that it was an imposing two-storey block.

The only other structure which survived into the 1820s was ‘the massive stack of the kitchen chimneys’ (Harland 1869, 207), which was partly uncovered in the 1960 excavations.

THE EXCAVATIONS

Introduction

The excavations were largely confined to the eastern half of the moated enclosure, to the area which, on the evidence of surviving masonry, had contained the principal buildings (Fig. 4). The cuttings took the form of a series of trenches aligned close to, but not precisely upon, the axis of the known walls; and on the north, south and east sides the longest trenches were carried down the slope of the moat ditch.

Beneath the turf there was generally a layer of black soil containing debris of the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries. This topsoil covered the remains of the 17th century manor house: lines or groups of large, dressed sandstone blocks associated with layers of sandy or clayey loam. It is unfortunate that, on the whole, time did not allow the trenches to be excavated below the level of the final structural phase, for the remains of this phase were very fragmentary, and it is difficult to form them into a coherent building plan. Only towards the north end of the site, in the area of the medieval and later kitchens, did excavation reach the pre-moat soil horizon, beneath a series of make-up and occupation layers.

The surviving records in the site archive reflect the unevenness of discoveries. For the excavations as a whole, the only available plan is at a scale of one inch to 8 feet (1:96). It is this plan upon which Figure 4 is based. Individual stones were drawn in some places, but not in all. Nor were the associated layers recorded: these have been reconstructed from the two long section drawings for trenches 6NW to 12NW and 2NE to 5NE.

The more extensive remains of the kitchen area are recorded in greater detail. There are plans and/or section drawings, at a scale of one inch to 2 feet (1:24), for trenches 11NW, 12NW, 15NE, 15NW, 23 and 28-30. These are the basis of Figures 6 and 7. The written descriptions of layers appear both on the section drawings and, equally briefly, in the finds book which records artefacts by context. Supplementary information and interpretations appear in the typescript interim report submitted to the Ministry of Works in 1960.

The hall block

The principal and earliest datable structure was the medieval hall building. Until 1960 a short stretch of its west wall survived above ground. This contained the two-centred arched doorway described earlier, identified as the main west entrance to the hall. The rubble footings of the north end wall of the building were recovered in trenches 13NE and 14NE. They comprised flat slabs, supporting thicker blocks which were faced externally and occupied rather more than half the width of the foundation (Plate VI). The footings returned southwards through trench 10NW as the east wall of
Plate VI: The foundation of the north wall of the hall block, viewed from the north.
Plate VII: The stone sill of a timber wall, south wall of the 17th century extension east of the hall screens passage, viewed from the west.
the hall block. In this stretch they may, however, have been rebuilt for timber framing: one of the photographs (photo. OH 17) indicates the edge of external paving running along the centre line of the original foundation, as if butt ing a distinctly narrower, later wall. The wide foundation, and probably the rebuilt footing, turned westwards in line with the north side of the west wall occupied by the remains of a partition wall traced in doorway. Within the building the same line was occupied by the remains of a partition wall traced in trench 27 and possibly also in 14NW.

To the south of this line, the position of the original east side of the hall is unknown. The building was probably narrower than at the north end, though in the absence of deep trenching it is impossible to be certain. The medieval foundation may have run beneath the footings in trenches 9NW and 8NW, which were attributed by the excavator to the 17th century. On the west side, the hall extended at least as far as trench 19, where fragments of the medieval foundation were traced.

The structures assigned to the 17th century seem in general to reflect an enlargement of the facilities. To the north of the hall block the kitchen, which in medieval times was free-standing, and which is described in detail below, seems to have been linked to the hall by a single line of ashlar blocks in trench 11NW. The blocks, which had a level top and were backed by reused stones, one with medieval moulding, were presumably the base for timber framing. The rebuilt north wall of the kitchen was extended 8m eastwards beyond the original building, to form an additional room or wing. This foundation, too, incorporated a reused medieval architectural block. The east end wall was traced in trenches 12NE and 11NE, though in the latter it seems to have terminated abruptly.

Another 17th century addition extended east through trenches 9NE, 16, 22 and 26. This comprised, on the south side, another single line of sandstone ashlar blocks with a level top (Plate VII), set on a wider foundation and presumably a sill for timbering. Only two of the original blocks remained on the east end foundation, which incorporated a piece of medieval architectural stonework: a corbel which had probably supported a roof truss of the medieval hall, with an attached springer for an arch (Plate VIII). A third block had been used to increase the width of the sill; if it was the sole survivor of another line, it may indicate the replacement of a timber wall by brick. This room was built over an area containing a number of pits. Some of them, at least, must have been filled at or before the time this structure was erected.

Further south, and running parallel to this addition, was the surviving wall of brick, on a sandstone foundation, which contained a 17th century fireplace. As already recorded, its east end wall is known to have slipped into the moat. The position of the south side wall is not certain, but it may have been represented by the foundations in trench 5NE.

At the south end of the hall block the remains were, if anything, even less coherent than those already described. A key to their interpretation may be an area of clay and plaster flooring which extended through parts of trenches 3NE, 4NE and 8NW (layer 6, Fig. 5, S1). In this last trench the floor was edged on the north by a partly-robbed east-west wall (Fig. 5, S1), which in turn seems to have cut the line of the east side wall of the hall. It indicates that the floor may have belonged to a room athwart the south end of the hall. If so, it will have been established earlier than the wall containing the 17th century fireplace, which at its west end abutted the hall wall.

The trenches on the south side of the flooring contained various groups of masonry. Some, particularly the remains in trenches 2NW and 21, appear to have been small projections from the main building. A stone-lined and stone-capped drain, assigned to the 17th century, ran along the west side of this area, in trenches 2NE, 17, 18 and 19. It probably followed a course parallel to and just outside the line of the west wall.

The kitchens

Beyond the north end of the hall block was a rectangular building, measuring 9m by, probably, 8m, which contained a hearth, an oven and a chimney stack. It was identified as a kitchen. The structure was located in trenches 11NW, 12NW, 15NE, 15NW, 23, 28, 29 and 30. It can be divided into three phases of construction:

Phase I. The first phase is defined by the primary walling (mainly rubble foundations) on the west, east and south sides (Fig. 6). Immediately outside the first two of these walls were drainage gullies. The north wall was not located, because the siting of caravans prevented trenching in the relevant area. Its position can, however, be estimated from the evidence of trench 12NW (Fig. 7, S4), where the north end of the east wall presumably marks the point of return westwards, beneath a secondary wall. The floor base of the first phase was numbered layer 12 in trench 15NE. It comprised buff-brown silt and clay, with patches of sand. It may have been either the disturbed old ground surface, or a deposited levelling layer. The latter is perhaps the more likely, since there was no record of a foundation trench for the east wall cut through it: layer 12 appears to run right up to the facing stones.

Towards the centre of the building was a feature (F2) identified as an oven (Plate IX). It was formed by a setting of stone slabs, their surface on approximately the same level as the surface of layer 12 (Fig. 7, S3). A layer of white wood-ash, layer 11, on top of the stones lends support to the idea of an enclosed oven rather than an open hearth. The stones were set in a depression which extended beyond the slabs on the east side. There, it was filled with sand and burnt clay (layer 10), and was identified as a rake-back. The edge of the depression cut not only layer 12-13, but also layer 18
Plate VIII: A medieval corbel and arch springer, reused in a 17th century foundation (scale in inches).
Figure 5: The excavations, section S1 through hall block and south moat. Numbered layers are: topsoil (1); rubble (5); clay and plaster (6); sandy buff soil (12, 15); old ground surface (13); sandy red soil (14).
Figure 6: The excavations, plan of kitchen structures.
Figure 7: The excavations, sections S2-4 through kitchens. Numbered layers are described in the text.
Plate IX: The kitchen Phase I oven floor (on bottom of trench) with Phase II features, including door threshold (behind ranging poles), on make-up above oven (scale in feet).
above, interpreted as a make-up layer for the second phase. The rake-back seems, therefore, to have been at least partially disturbed after Phase I. On the east side of the building, the silt filling of gully F1 (layer 7) was overlain by a spread of roofing slates (layer 6). This presumably represented the removal of the first-phase kitchen roof covering. Above it was layer 5, a sandy layer said to contain occupation material, which was probably first-phase debris levelled during the construction of Phase II.

**Phase II.** The start of the second phase was marked by a widespread levelling layer of red-brown clay, perhaps derived from the moat ditch. In trenches 15NE and 23 it was numbered layers 9, 14 and 18; in trenches 15NW and 12NW, layer 4 (Fig. 7). Above it was a spread of ash and silt, layers 3 and 8, which marked the second-phase occupation. The internal feature which can certainly be attributed to this phase was a circular open hearth or oven floor of cobbles, F3, set in a shallow depression in the surface of layer 4 and overlain by layer 3. Another feature possibly of this phase was the chimney-stack foundation, built partly over the site of the Phase I oven: it was thought by the excavator to have been a third-phase insertion, but the section drawings show no evidence of a foundation trench for it, cut through the second-phase layers.

Evidence for the walling associated with this phase is ambiguous. At the north-east corner layer 3 lapped over the inner facing stones of what was, presumably, the north side wall foundation of both phases (Fig. 7, S4). On the south side, layer 4 lapped over the inner face of the primary wall foundation, but layer 3 extended above it completely, and continued as far as the north wall of the hall building (Fig. 7, S2). On both the west and east sides there were, again, indications that the levelling and occupation layers extended over the lines of the Phase I walls (Fig. 7, S3). A partition wall running through the eastern half of the building can be attributed to this phase. Its west end, formed by two dressed rectangular blocks placed end to end, may have been the threshold of a doorway abutting the chimney stack (Plate IX). To the west of the stack, an area of cobbles edged with larger stones seems to have extended over the Phase I walls on both the west and south sides. The cobbles were underlain by a single line of large blocks of stone which may have represented a first-phase or an earlier second-phase partition.

**Phase III.** The occupation material of Phase II was overlain by another band of red clay, layer 2. It formed a fairly uniform spread over all the building remains except the chimney stack. To the north of the kitchen it extended as far as the inner of two moat-edge walls, in trench 12NW (Fig. 7, S4); it probably marks the demolition of the kitchen, and the re-levelling of its site for other purposes. Only in trench 12NW, however, had the superimposed occupation layer (layer 20) survived as a distinct spread beneath the topsoil.

---

**THE FINDS**

1. **Introduction to the contexts and artefacts**

It will be evident from earlier observations that information about the stratigraphic sequence of contexts is very patchy. The kitchen building is relatively well documented, and the sequences to the east and south east of the Kitchens can be partially reconstructed. Elsewhere, however, only the final phase floors and overlying demolition material were excavated, and only three section drawings remain to indicate the stratigraphy.

In the original finds records each object (including each potsherd) is given a unique number. The object numbers are grouped into bag numbers, which distinguish material from a particular context. In some cases a context is represented by more than one bag number. These have now been grouped into the phases of activity identified in various parts of the site, and phase/area codes are used below to record the context of each find. The codes are as follows:

---

**A The Kitchens**

**A1**

Phase I occupation features: bag nos. 49, 52, 57, 70, 71, 74.

Layers: 7, 12, 13, 15 in Figure 7, S3.

Dating: There was no precise dating evidence, though the pottery types would be consistent with a 13th to 14th century period of use.

**A1/2**

Demolition material marking the end of Phase I: bag nos. 48, 50, 51, 56.

Layers: 6 and 10 in Figure 7, S3.

Dating: There was no clear dating evidence, and there were few finds of any kind. It is assumed that demolition of the Phase I kitchens and construction of Phase II (see below) took place over a short period of time.

**A2/1**

Make-up material for construction of Phase II: bag nos. 23, 26, 27, 45, 46, 47, 68.

Layers: 4, 5, and 18 in Figure 7, S3.

Dating: The pottery from these contexts and the demolition material A1/2 was consistent with a rebuilding in the 15th or 16th century.

**A2**

Occupation features of Phase II: bag nos. 36, 43, 54, 65, 66.

Layers: 3 and 8 in Figure 7, S2 and S3.

Dating: The occupation of this building phase should be ascribed to the 16th and 17th centuries. The sherds of Mottled Ware in these contexts were presumably intrusive.
A3 Red clay levelling after demolition of Kitchens: bag nos. 3, 42.
Layers: 2 in Figure 7, S3.
Dating: This clay is presumably part of B3, below, which has been assigned to the 18th century, and linked to the erection of the new farmhouse.

B East and south-east of the Kitchens

B1 Phase I occupation:
Layer: ‘Old ground surface’
Dating: This phase of occupation is the same as for A1, above.

B2/1 Make-up material for Phase II: bag nos. 28, 38, 39
Layer: 4 in Fig. 7, S4
Dating: This phase of construction is the same as for A2/1, above.

B2 Filling of pits: bag nos. 24, 25, 29, 64
Layer: --
Dating: Some at least of these pits should have been filled before the erection of the narrow room projecting eastwards from the hall and presumably dating to the 16th or 17th century. A few of the finds attributed (unspecifically) to the pits are, however, of the early 18th century (e.g. clay pipe no. 4).

B3/1 Demolition material of Phase II: bag nos. 2, 19, 41, 44.
Layer: 3 (different from layer 3 in A2 above)
Dating: This material was sealed by layer B3. It contained three clay-pipe bowls, of which one (clay pipe no. 5) has been dated to the period 1710-1740.

B3 Red clay levelling after demolition of Phase II
Layer: 2
Dating: The clay contained a very worn coin of c. 1700 and the clay pipe bowls in B3/1, below B3, give a terminus post quem of 1710. It is probable that this clay was deposited as a levelling layer in the 18th century, when most of the manor house had been demolished, and when the new farmhouse, next to the gatehouse, had been erected.

C The Moat

C3/1 Demolition and occupation material in north moat
Layer: 21 in Fig. 7, S4
Dating: 17th century onwards

Other than pottery, few artefacts were apparently recovered. Those described below are principally the ones from stratified contexts. The absence of animal bones is surprising; but none was recorded. Only a fish bone and an oyster shell are listed, and these had been discarded during the excavations. The architectural stonework was evidently destined for Liverpool Museum, but does not seem to have reached it. Neither the 14th century hall doorway, nor the 17th century fireplace can now be located, although the individual stones of both were numbered for dismantling and may have been removed by the Borough Engineers. Nor have the excavated architectural blocks been found, though some appear in their archaeological contexts in the photographic archive.

2. The pottery vessels (Figs 8-11)

A. M. Slowikowski

Introduction

The quantity of pottery from The Old Hutt was not great, and the vessels were very fragmentary. In view of the large proportion of rims and bases, it may be that many body sherds were discarded during the excavations. The following analysis comprises all the surviving excavated pottery, and takes account also of another small collection of objects, in Liverpool Museum (accession numbers 1961. 68. 1- ). This latter material seems to have been recovered from The Old Hutt moat after the excavations had taken place. Nothing more is known of its content, and it consists mainly of 18th and 19th century black-glazed wares, transfer-printed wares and stonewares. Only two of the vessels seem to be earlier in date, and to belong to the manorial occupation. These have been included in the following quantifications and descriptions.

The pottery was examined within its stratigraphic groups (Table 1). Sherds belonging to the same vessel were brought together and quantified within the earliest context. There were very few cross-contexts; these are presented in Table 2. A type-series was defined, primarily by fabric examination, both by eye and by a x10 lens, but taking into account also the forms, decoration and manufacturing techniques. The definition of a pottery type is that used in the Sandal Castle report (Moorhouse 1983, 84): a sequence of pottery representing either broad geographical traditions, or regional styles within the more general traditions.

The vessels chosen for illustration are representative of what survives (Table 3). They are published at a quarter of the original size, with hatched sections to show hand-built or applied portions. Pottery quantification was by vessel and sherd count. In the tables, however, all totals refer to numbers of vessels, since the numbers of sherds may be the result of selection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type number</th>
<th>Phase I Occupation</th>
<th>Phase II Construction</th>
<th>Phase II Occupation</th>
<th>Phase III Abandonment</th>
<th>Phase II Demolition and Pit Fills</th>
<th>Moat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A1/2</td>
<td>A2/1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B2/1</td>
<td>B2 and B3/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49, 55, 70</td>
<td>51, 71, 74</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48, 50, 51</td>
<td>23, 47</td>
<td>28, 38, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early occupation</td>
<td>Primary occupation</td>
<td>Fill of gully</td>
<td>Demolition of roof</td>
<td>Levelling</td>
<td>Levelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Pottery quantification, minimum number of vessels by type and phase.
Table 2: Cross-context vessels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Phases (OH No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not illustrated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>1 - A1 (OH 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - A 1/C (OH 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not illustrated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>vessel</td>
<td>1 - A1 (OH 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - A1 (OH 57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - A1/2 (OH 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>cistern</td>
<td>1 - A2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - B2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - U/S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pottery type definitions

**Type 1.** Fairly hard, finely but abundantly gritted. Buff in colour throughout, oxidized. Unglazed and undecorated. Only one rim fragment from a jar was found.
*Illustration: 1.*

**Type 2.** Fairly hard, lightly gritted fabric with frequent red-orange inclusions, possibly haematite. Pale pink in colour with buff external surface. No sign of any glaze.
*Forms:* only one body sherd was found, possibly from a round-shouldered jug.
*Illustration: 2.*

**Type 3.** Fairly hard to hard fabric, gritty in texture but varying from finely and evenly gritted to inclusions of grits of varying size. Both oxidized and reduced colours occur, sometimes patchily on the same vessel, light orange where oxidized and dark grey where reduced. Reduction only occurs where there is glaze, indicating accidentally rather than deliberate reduction. Cores vary in colour from dark grey to buff (but only where the thickness of the vessel is more than 3mm), otherwise the fabric is orange throughout.
*Forms:* mainly unidentifiable body sherds, possibly from jugs. Spots of glaze occur, usually externally, but can be seen internally on one vessel which was probably a wide-mouthed jar. Glaze colour is orange or green, sometimes both colours occurring on the same vessel. This appears to be a local variation of the general category, Gritty ware, found all over the north of England, dated to the 13th to 15th centuries (Le Patourel 1966, 43)
*Illustrations: 7 - 8.*

**Type 4.** Fairly soft, very finely and evenly gritted fabric with tiny, shiny inclusions, either very fine quartz or mica. Colour is bright orange on external surfaces and buff-orange on internal surfaces, with occasional light grey core.
*Forms:* pipkins, jugs. Only one example of each was found. Glaze on the pipkin was patchy and mainly on the interior surface. External splashes were probably accidental. Glaze on the jug was external only and almost worn away. Colour on both vessels was green-brown. There was thumbing in groups of at least four around base of the jug.
*Illustrations: 3, 6.*

**Type 5.** Fairly hard, very fine and smooth fabric. Tightly knit with few obvious inclusions, besides small amounts of red inclusions (?haematite) and a few fine quartz particles. The colour is buff-orange with patchy bright orange external glaze.
*Forms:* one possible jug.
*Illustration: 4.*

**Type 6.** Very hard, very evenly gritted fabric. Quartz inclusions are very fine and white in colour, and appear to have been sprinkled in a crushed form. A few large quartz inclusions are present, up to 0.5mm in diameter. Both reduced and oxidized examples occur. Oxidation gives a light brown colour to the fabric and darker brown surfaces. The glaze, which is external only, is a bright orange colour. When reduced the fabric is dark grey, allowing the quartz particles to show very clearly, and the glaze is dark green to brown-purple in colour. On both reduced and oxidized vessels the glaze is patchy and applied in powdered form.
*Forms:* jugs vary from quite large examples with strap handles and triple thumbing above and below them, to smaller examples of which only plain body sherds were found. One example (no. 10), has a mock lug or twisted knob applied to the body. Both lug and handle are applied by gently pushing from inside. Finger marks, but not prints, were left on the interior of the body.
*Illustrations: 5, 10.*

**Type 7.** Very fine, smooth, hard fabric. No inclusions were visible to the naked eye, but a x10 lens revealed some very fine quartz. Partially oxidized, the colour of the surfaces was buff-brown and the core light grey.
*Forms:* one probable jug with thumbing in pairs around the base. This is a good quality, well made vessel.
*Illustration: 9.*

**Type 8.** Surrey ware (Orton 1977, 82). Smooth, very fine, hard fabric. Very finely gritted so that almost no inclusions are seen by eye, although tiny quartz particles can be seen by x10 lens. The fabric is white with a light buff internal surface, oxidized. Glazed patchily on the interior but with a good cover on the exterior, light to dark olive green with tiny brown speckles, possibly caused by iron.
*Forms:* only one sherd was found, probably from a jug.
Figure 8: Pottery vessels, nos. 1-17.
Figure 9: Pottery vessels, nos. 18-33.
Figure 10: Pottery vessels, nos. 34-53.
This vessel was very thin-walled, 3mm.

**Illustration: 11.**


**Forms:** only one tiny body sherd was found. It was very thin, about 2mm.

**Unillustrated.**

**Type 10. Vitrified Earthenware** (Moorhouse 1983, 93, Type 49W). Very hard, almost vitrified fabric, gritty but with grits occasionally fused by heat to give a smooth, almost stoneware appearance to the break. Colour is usually a purple-brown, with some variety to the shade. Characterised by its high firing. Common as a general category in the 15th and 16th centuries throughout England, but with local variations.

**Forms:** cisterns, both rounded and sagging-bellied.

**Illustration: 12.**

**Type 11. Red ware.** Very hard, medium gritty fabric with some tiny quartz inclusions. Usually oxidized, bright orange throughout, sometimes with dark orange-brown surfaces. Glaze is patchy but rather heavier on the exterior, bright orange in colour but can be purple-brown where applied over a brown surface.

**Forms:** cisterns, probably two handled, and jars with upright rims; one urinal with internal white residue, from the Liverpool Museum collection. One reduced example occurred, dark grey throughout with patchy, dark purple, almost black, glaze on the exterior.

**Illustrations: 13, 16, 61**

**Type 12.** Hard, gritty fabric, oxidized to an orange-brown colour with an occasional light grey core. The fracture is very rough due to the quartz inclusions. Surfaces can be light brown in colour, with a patchy brown glaze.

**Forms:** unrecognisable, but possibly wide mouthed, open forms as the glaze has often been splashed onto the interior, either deliberately or accidentally.

**Unillustrated.**

**Type 13.** Hard, smooth, tightly knit fabric, oxidized, orange-brown in colour with orange-buff surfaces. Unglazed.

**Forms:** jugs, of similar fabric and form to Skipton-on-Swale drinking jugs from West Yorkshire (Moorhouse 1983, 91, Type 29f), with presumably the same function. Dated by a coin hoard from Chester to after 1361 (Rutter 1975, 18-21).

**Illustration: 14.**

**Type 14. Cistercian type ware** (Brears 1967, 19-21). Hard, fine, purple-brown to grey fabric. Glazed thickly, both externally and internally, with an overall coat of brown. One example has a purple-brown exterior but an olive green interior, indicating that the interior had been reduced.

**Forms:** usually cups of various types, but not enough sherds were found to give complete profiles. Numbers 19, 20 and 34 are round-bodied cups. Cistercian ware was made at various centres, with regional differences, and is often difficult to distinguish from the Black ware (Type 19) into which it develops in the 17th century. The earliest date for Cistercian ware is in the late 15th century (Le Patourel 1955, 23), although it does not occur in 1484-5 contexts at Sandal Castle (Brears 1983, 215).

**Illustrations: 17, 19-21, 34**

**Type 15. Mottled ware.** Hard, fine, light buff fabric with occasional streaks of white or red, probably from admixtures of different clays. Glazed internally and externally with a good cover of dark yellow glaze with purple-brown streaks in it. There is also a very dark version; the fabric colour remains the same but the glaze is red-brown with dark purple, almost black, streaks. A locally made ware, the clay was obtained from the South Lancashire coalfield, and although a number of kilns are known from Prescot, none has been found in Liverpool itself (Peter Davey pers. comm.). Corresponds to Fabric 1 of the South Castle Street typology, and dated late 17th to mid-18th centuries (Philpott 1985A, 50-55). Traditionally called Manganese-glazed Ware, but X-ray spectroscopy on the South Castle Street material has shown only minute quantities of manganese, iron being more likely to have produced the mottling effect (Philpott 1985A, 54-55).

**Forms:** both coarse and fine wares were made, round rimmed bowls and internally glazed dishes predominating.

**Illustrations: 15, 22, 35, 54**

**Type 16. Slipware.** Hard, fine, off-white fabric with no inclusions visible. Glazed thickly, both internally and externally, yellow with olive green patches. Some combed red slip decoration beneath the glaze.

**Forms:** only one tiny fragment of rim was found, possibly a cup with slightly flaring, simple rim.

**Illustration: 55**

**Type 17. Staffordshire-type slipware.** (Davey 1985A, 33-49). Very fine, smooth fabric, creamy buff in colour, with few inclusions visible, except occasional red fragments, possibly haematite. Decorated with a dark-brown, light-brown and white slip beneath a clear glaze. This type is not necessarily from Staffordshire itself: it could be a local product. Probably 18th century.

**Forms:** press-moulded plates with scalloped edges.

**Illustration: 36**

**Type 18. Tin-glazed earthenware.** Fairly hard, tightly knit fabric with no inclusions visible. Buff in colour, with a thick, flaky, off-white glaze and blue painted decoration.
**Figure 11:** Pottery vessels, nos. 54-61.

**Forms:** Two vessels were found, with dark blue and light blue decoration. Both were shallow dishes; no. 25 was made in Liverpool, the other fragment, unillustrated, was made either in Liverpool or Bristol.

I am grateful to Lionel Burman for these identifications.

**Illustrations:** 25

**Type 18(a). Imported tin-glazed vessel.** Mr. John Mallet, formerly of the Victoria and Albert Museum reports that a sherd of tin-glazed earthenware with blue, yellow and purple decoration ‘is very probably from a small Netherlands drug-pot of albarello form ... The rather coarse, greyish glaze with slight crazing and semi-matt appearance is very similar to our no. 649-1906, a drug-jar which we have labelled as "Netherlandish; second half of the Sixteenth Century". I would guess that yours might be a little earlier, say mid-16th Century ...

**Illustration:** 37

**Type 19. Black ware** (Philpott 1985B, 85). Hard, smooth, tightly knit fabric, usually brick-red in colour, but can be overfired, when it is purple-brown. Very sparse, small grits. Glazed, internally and externally, an overall deep black or dark brown. A local variation of the general Black ware tradition, dated mid to late 17th century.

**Forms:** Mainly fine wares, usually cups, either single- or multi-handled; also a bottle from the Liverpool Museum collection. There is an underfired version, a body sherd (OH 41) possibly from a jug, and a jug rim (OH 132). Both have an orange-red fabric and a red-brown internal and external glaze.

**Illustrations:** 38-41, 56

**Type 20. Coarse black ware** (Philpott 1985B, 85-86). Coarse, very hard and rough fabric, with frequent white inclusions. Colour can vary with the degree of firing and/or reduction, from brick-red to purple-brown. Surfaces vary from light to dark brown. Glaze is dark brown to black, sometimes coating both the interior and the exterior, and at other times only the interior.

**Forms:** heavy, thick-bodied vessels, either bowls or jars. Because coarse wares are not likely to have travelled far, these were almost certainly made locally, and probably in the 18th century.

**Illustrations:** 26, 42-4, 57-8
Type 21. **Vitrified black ware.** Very hard, gritty fabric, although the grits have often been fired out to leave a fairly smooth, compact, almost vitrified fabric. Colour is red-brown to purple, depending on the degree of firing. Glaze is patchy, purple in colour and usually only on the exterior.

**Forms:** mainly jars with simple rounded or squared rims.

**Variant:** There are two (nos. 45-6) totally unglazed examples, with grey outer surfaces. Jar no. 46 is probably a non-local product (Peter Davey pers. comm.).

**Illustrations:** 23-4, 45-7

Type 22. **Slipped blackware (Philpott 1985B, 86).** Hard, fairly rough, light red to pink fabric, with frequent white and red inclusions. Characterised by an all-over red slip to give a good black colour to the glaze, which is well applied, both internally and externally. The slip is thin and difficult to distinguish.

**Forms:** Only two examples occur, both are bowls, probably 18th century.

**Illustration:** 48

Type 23. ‘**Reversed**’ Slipware (Davey 1985A, 34). Hard, smooth, compact, buff fabric, covered with an overall red slip and glazed to give a good, even, glossy black appearance to the vessels. Some applied white slip decoration is present. Probably local, but no sources are known. Dated early to mid-18th century.

**Forms:** mainly jugs

**Illustration:** 30

Type 25. **Dark yellow ware.** Hard, buff to light orange-pink fabric, fairly smooth with a good glaze beneath which, occasionally, is a slip of the same clay as the fabric. The darker the colour of the fabric, the more orange will be the glaze, with some vessels almost brown. This type corresponds to the ‘self coloured’ wares from South Castle Street (Innes 1985, 106-115). There are two variations of this type: one is a pink fabric with large (up to 5mm), white, angular inclusions that show through the light orange glaze as large white patches; the other is a fine fabric, smooth, buff-pink in colour, with no visible inclusions.

**Forms:** bowls, puzzle jugs, pipkins.

**Illustrations:** 18, 31-3, 51-3, 60

**Discussion**

Three major groups were identified, A, B and C, of which only Group A, from the kitchen area was well documented (see Table 1). This group was the only one that produced medieval pottery, and because so little is as yet known from the Liverpool area, it forms an important group, even though the quantity was not large and it must be regarded as incomplete. The kitchen area produced mainly locally made pottery, with jugs predominating. The pipkin (no. 6) is a rare form in this area. Cisterns (e.g. nos. 12-13) are a common late medieval form, used either for storage or brewing of liquids. The noticeable absence of ceramic jars, the commonest form of the early medieval period throughout the country, suggests that metal was already in use for cooking. The pottery was very fragmentary with the bulk of it being residual. Presumably the kitchen area was kept well cleared of debris. The pottery cannot be precisely dated, but most of it occurred in Phase 1 levels which have been dated structurally to the 14th to 15th centuries. Types 1-4 could well be earlier. In West Yorkshire the Gritty wares, of which Type 3 seems to be a local variant, begin sometime in the 13th century, but they have a long life and continue into the 15th century (Moorhouse and Slowikowski 1987, 111).

The pottery from Group B, the area south-east of the kitchen and the pit fills, forms a less well stratified collection. It has been dated to Phase II (construction and occupation). The pottery was mixed, with four late medieval vessels (Types 10 and 11) occurring in the make up levels (B2/1) and the rest dating to the 17th to 18th centuries, with some residual 16th century material.

The pottery from Group C also dated to the 17th to 18th centuries and consisted of the same types as in the pit fills. This material was probably tipped into the moat as rubbish either during the use of the house or immediately after.

The coarse wares considerably outnumber the fine wares, especially in the 18th century. By this time the fine Black table ware had declined in popularity and been replaced by stonewares and Mottled wares as at South Castle Street, Liverpool (Philpott 1985b, 87). The coarse wares continued to be made for domestic and farm use, with large bowls predominating presumably for dairying.

**Manufacturing techniques**

Manufacturing techniques were examined to try to determine characteristic methods of each pottery type. Not enough of the medieval pottery survived to be able to say much beyond the fact that it was all wheel-made. The application of handles on Type 6 has already been mentioned.

Medieval pottery was not fired in saggars, like the later fine wares, but stacked directly one on top of another. Yellow wares (Type 25) were also fired in this way, and this can be clearly seen from the pipkin handle (no. 18) that has a fragment of another pipkin handle still adhering to it. They had been stacked one on top of another, and one vessel had slipped and stuck to the one below it. It was, however, still sold, possibly as a second. The direction that the glaze has run also indicates the position of vessels in the kiln. The scar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illus. Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Bag Number</th>
<th>OH Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>pipkin</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>A2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>A2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>cistern</td>
<td>A2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>A2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>A2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>cistern</td>
<td>A2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>222+28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>pipkin</td>
<td>B2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>pedestal</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>cistern</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>B3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>colander</td>
<td>B3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>B3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>B3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>vessel</td>
<td>B3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>albarello</td>
<td>B3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illus. Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Bag Number</th>
<th>OH Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>shallow</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>B3/1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>B3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>B3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>alabarello</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>pedestal</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Dutch oven</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>120+136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>jug/cup</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>puzzle jug</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>C3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>U/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>U/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>U/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>U/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>U/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>U/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>U/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>urinal</td>
<td>Moat</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Pottery information table (descriptions for vessels on Figs 8-11).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type no.</th>
<th>Jar</th>
<th>Jug</th>
<th>Pipkin</th>
<th>Cistern</th>
<th>Urinal</th>
<th>Cup</th>
<th>Bowl</th>
<th>Dish</th>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Colander</th>
<th>Albarello</th>
<th>Puzzle jug</th>
<th>Unrecognised vessel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Vessel forms by pottery type.
and glaze drip on the rim of a Coarse Black ware (Type 20) bowl indicate that it was stacked upside down, directly on top of another vessel; while another bowl of the same type has glaze runs away from the rim, indicating an upright position.

The fine Black ware cups of the 17th century were removed from the wheel using a wire and a sawing motion. This leaves parallel grooves under the base. Cistercian wares (Type 14), however, were removed from the wheel with a loop of wire pulled tight, leaving concentric grooves on the base, with their centre at one side of the base.

Both Cistercian and Black wares were fired in saggars leaving no scars of other vessels (Moorhouse and Slowikowski, forthcoming). Mottled wares (Type 15) were propped up on three broken sherds or purpose made props to prevent them from sticking. Scars from these props have been found on bowls and cups of this type.

**Evidence of Use**

Evidence for the use of the pottery was sparse and consisted of sooting and wear marks. No residues survived except for that in the urinal (no. 61) which is typical of such vessels.

Wear marks were infrequent and only occurred on bases. The base angles of several Yellow ware (Type 25) bowls were worn, usually all the way round, indicating a circular motion such as mixing the contents of the bowl, resting on a surface harder than the pot, such as stone. The worn base of a medieval jug, Type 4 (no. 3), indicates long use, as does the completely worn base of a vessel of Type 11. No evidence of wear was found on any rims and it must be assumed that, if lids were used, they were of a material softer than pottery.

Sooting was rare on the late vessels because it does not adhere to glazed surfaces. One Yellow ware (Type 25) bowl was sooted heavily externally, with the sooting extending half way down the body and just inside the rim.

Sooting was slightly more frequent on the medieval vessels from the Kitchen, indicating either their use in the cooking process or the fact that soot adhered well to the unglazed vessels of this period. A pipkin of Type 4 (no. 6) is sooted under the base as one would expect from a cooking vessel. Sooting also occurs on the interior of unidentifiable vessels of Types 7, 11 and 12 and a jug of Type 13 (no. 14), which is also sooted on the exterior. The clean breaks indicate that it was sooted during use rather than after it had been discarded. The most obvious way that a vessel became sooted internally was in its use for containing embers, either in place of a curfew or to carry the embers from room to room to light another fire. The jug, however, is more likely to have been used to burn something inside it, such as herbs for medicinal purposes (Culpeper n.d., 301)

### 3. Six clay tobacco pipes (Fig. 12)

P.J. Davey

From the 1960 excavations at The Old Hutt six pipe bowls survive. Such a small number of finds, lacking in stems and detailed stratigraphy, cannot provide the kind of absolute dating or socio-economic interpretative evidence which can be expected from large groups of pipes in complex excavated sequences. The most that can be suggested is a *terminus post quem* for the contexts in which the pipes occur and some idea of the production centres from which they derive.

The six pipes cover a date range of around 1630 and 1740. The earliest of them (no. 1) may be an 'import' from London or Bristol, the rest appear to be local products, whether from the dispersed industry at Rainford (Davey 1978), or from Liverpool itself (Davey 1985b). The catalogue below provides a summary description, comparanda and site details.

**Catalogue**

1. Well made and finished bowl with flat heel; burnished; very dense, off-white fabric with few inclusions; slight grey reduction zones within the body. This is not a typical north-western form or fabric for this period and is probably London or Bristol in origin (cf. Jackson and Price 1974, 89, no.20).

   1630 - 1650

   Stem bore: 7/64"  

   OH 194 (CP6) Context uncertain; described as 'buff sandy' in trench 5NE; layer above natural, but other relationships and exact provenance not recorded.

2. Damaged, flat heeled bowl; low quality uneven moulding; milled; off-white clay body, with a fairly coarse texture and a few opaque white inclusions. On grounds of form and fabric probably a South Lancashire product (cf. Davey and Pierce 1977, 104, nos. 2-3).

   1650 - 1670

   Stem bore: 8/64".

   OH 25 (CP4) Context group B 3/1.

3. Well made and finished spurred bowl; burnished and partially milled; coarse grained, off-white creamy fabric, high fired, with many inclusions and dark grey reduced core. A South Lancashire type, but in view of the good quality, colour and firing temperature possibly a Liverpool, rather than Rainford product. The Rainford makers appear to have continued to use local pipe clays until the middle of the the 18th century (Davidson and Davey 1982), whilst pipe clay movements into Chester and Liverpool were a frequent occurrence.
in the middle to late 17th century (Rutter and Davey 1980; Grant and Jemmett 1985, 482-486). This particular pipe resembles others recovered from Liverpool itself in the 1976 and 1977 excavations (Davey 1985b, 124-5, fig. 44, nos. 1-9).

1650 - 1670 Stem bore: 7/64".

OH 24 (CP3) Context group B 3/1.

4. Elegant, very well made bowl, with small, flat, oval heel; cut off mouth, angled to horizontal; very dense, highly refined fabric, white on the exterior only, reduced nearly black throughout the core. Probably made in Liverpool. This example is indistinguishable from the major group of c. 1727 from South Castle Street (Davey 1985b, 126, fig. 45, nos. 28-30).

1710 - 1740 Stem bore: 5/64" (damaged).

OH 23 (CP2) Context group B3/1.

6. Bowl with ribbed heel, as no. 5; a poorer quality mould not milled or burnished; similar fabric, with reduced grey core. A more typical South Lancashire form; cf. a very similar example from Norton Priory (Davey 1985c, 182-3, fig. 7, no. 53).

1710 - 1740 Stem bore: 6/64".

OH 5 (CP1) From demolition rubble, below topsoil.

Figure 12: Clay pipes, nos. 1-6.
4. Coin and jetton

1. The only coin recorded in the excavations was provisionally identified by S.E. Rigold as a groat of ?Mary II; cleaning has rendered it totally illegible. (Context group B3)

2. A jetton found in the excavations was provisionally attributed by S.E. Rigold to Hans Krauwinckel. Miss M. Archibald has confirmed the reading ‘HANS KRAUWINCKEL IN NU’ and suggests it was fairly fresh when lost (?c. 1600-1625). (Below demolition rubble, in silt on floor of the early 17th century south-east wing.)

5. Copper alloy (CA) and Iron (IR) objects
(Fig. 13)

The excavation archives record the discovery of five copper alloy and three iron small-finds. One of the bronze numbers relates to material from the filling of the first-phase kitchen oven (context A1/2), but the artefact is now missing. Of the rest, three copper alloy objects were from demolition or topsoil contexts, and were clearly more recent in date than the manorial settlement. The remaining items are illustrated here:

CA 1. Harness ring, plain, copper alloy (context group A1/2).

IR 1. Iron knife blade (broken) and part of the whittle tang (context group A1).

IR 2. Iron socketed tapering bar with broken end; in view of its provenance, possibly the end of a flesh-hook (context group A2).

IR 3. Iron key (context group B2).

6. Glass vessels

Report by R. J. Charleston (nos. 2, 5,6) and Dorothy Charlesworth, prepared in 1963 (Fig.14)

G1. Sack bottle in green glass with brownish enamely weathering; irregular rim outsplayed, rounded short neck expanding towards shoulder (context group B3/1).

G2. Foot of a small jug, of the type called generically (and almost certainly erroneously) 'Nailsea'; a date in the first quarter of the 19th century would be reasonable (demolition rubble below topsoil).
G3. Sack-bottle rim, roughly finished, trail below (demolition rubble below topsoil).

G4. (Not illustrated) Fragments of bowl in blue glass, decorated with opaque white threads; analysis showed the opacifier to be calcium antimony oxide (Ca₂Sb₂O₇); probably a 17th century import (demolition rubble below topsoil).

G5. Seal from bottle, bearing the name PIERMONT WATER; probably dates from the first half of the 18th century; such bottles were no doubt imported with their contents (Pyrmont was a German spa) since the glass of the bottles does not seem to be English in quality; see Hume 1961, 109 and fig. 8 (demolition rubble below topsoil).

G6. Apothecary's bottle in blue glass, rim knocked off and fire polished; thick base with small kick and pontil mark (demolition rubble below topsoil).

G7. Rim of urinal in green glass, flaking iridescent weathering; rim outsplayed and folded over at top; for type see Barrelet 1953, pls xxiii and xxvii (centre) (context group B2 17th century deposit).

7. Stone mortar (Fig.15)

Two fragments of a red sandstone mortar were found in the Kitchens, trench 23, in different contexts. The smaller piece, containing a lug with a runnel, came from layer 18 (context group A 2/1). A larger one, from layer 12 (context group A 1), contained the opposite lug with a runnel, and one of the side lugs. Unfortunately, only the first of these fragments has been found amongst the site finds: this is the basis for the drawing in Figure 15. The second piece was recorded quite definitely as part of the same mortar, and it is shown, in situ, on one of the archive photographs (Photo. OH. 46).

The surviving lug has a U-shaped runnel which widens out both internally and externally. The exterior face of the lug is in the shape of a shield. As far as can be seen in the photograph, the opposite lug was similar. The side of the bowl survives to the internal basal angle. It does not appear to have been attenuated by grinding. The provenance of both pieces indicated that it was used in the Phase I Kitchens, in the late 13th or 14th century. The date range accords with that of many other stone mortars found in England (see Dunning 1977, 320-323).

---

Figure 14: Glass vessels: nos. 1-7.
8. Stone roofing materials

The excavation records indicate two significant deposits of stone roofing tiles, both of them apparently derived from the Phase I Kitchens. The first of these was a dump of 'purple slates' (layer 6, context group A1/2) in the east-side drainage gully. The second, said to comprise 'York Stone slates', was on the south side, in an equivalent stratigraphic position. Both are likely to have fallen from the Kitchen roof; their occurrence on adjacent sides of a square-plan building indicates that the kitchens had a pyramid roof. The difference in materials may well have arisen because one roofing plane was re-tiled.

All the roofing slates were left on site but the dimensions of three of them (without recorded provenances, but presumably from the contexts listed above) were noted. The only complete purple slate measured 23 inches by 11 inches (585mm by 280mm). It had an original, single, central peghole, as well as a secondary one off-centre. Two York stone slates measured 12½ inches by 10 inches (313mm by 254mm) and 14½ inches by 9 inches (368mm by 229mm). These also had central pegholes.
9. Ceramic roof tiles (Fig. 16)

A.M. Slowikowski

Thirty-one roof tiles were recovered, and all were of the same type.

**Type description**

Hard, very finely gritted fabric although there are infrequent fragments of quartz up to 1.5mm diameter. The upper surface is fairly smooth and frequently glazed, although the glaze does not always reach the edges of the tile. The colour of the fabric varies depending on the degree of reduction, which is often patchy. Where oxidized, the fabric is orange-brown in colour and, where reduced, light grey. Number 6 is slightly harder fired with brown fabric sandwiched between purple-grey margins. The glaze colour also varies with the degree of reduction, between green or green and light brown patches where oxidized, and dark brown or purple where reduced.

**Discussion**

All surviving tiles are ridge tiles with the possible exception of the tiny, unidentifiable fragments. Most of them come from the Kitchen area (twenty in all), and are found in Phase I occupation levels or Phase II construction levels. A small number (six in all) also occurred in the Phase II make-up levels south-east of the kitchen. The moat and pit fills produced one tile each, and the trenches immediately east of the Hall produced three tiles. Two tiles were unstratified. The occurrence of purple slate and York-stone roofing slabs (section 8, above), and the absence of flat ceramic tiles indicates that pottery was used only for the ridge tiles.

Six of the more complete examples are decorated. The most common form of decoration is a coxcomb crest with knife incisions along one side (nos. 3-4). Three different versions of an applied and thumbed crest are found (nos. 5-7). The crest on no. 6 corresponds in shape and reduction to no. 25 from Hen Blas (Davey and Morgan 1975, 47) although the Old Hutt fabric appears to be slightly finer. It appears that replacement of broken ridge tiles occurred in a piecemeal fashion, with tiles being bought in when needed, rather than a special order being made to the tiler for tiles that matched those still remaining.

Number 8 is a crested ridge tile with part of the opening for a finial at one end. Fragments of two finials (nos. 1-2) were also found, in Phase I occupation levels. The bodies are globular in shape (see Wood 1965, 298) and have been turned on a wheel. The necks were hand made and then luted on to the body. Finger marks (but not prints) are clearly visible on the inside. A cordon applied to strengthen the join between neck and body as well as for decoration, has come away leaving a scar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitchen</th>
<th>South-east of kitchen</th>
<th>Pit fills</th>
<th>Moat</th>
<th>Hall</th>
<th>U/S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/1</td>
<td>A 1/2</td>
<td>A 2/1</td>
<td>A/3</td>
<td>B 2/1</td>
<td>B 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 (3)</td>
<td>243 (4)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>164 (5)</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>165 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167 (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>293 (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Ceramic roof tile, distribution in context groupings, by catalogue number (illustration numbers for Fig. 16 in brackets).
Figure 16: Ceramic roof fittings, nos. 1-8.
The fabric of both the finials is finer than the tile fabric and has no large quartz particles. It is oxidized throughout to an orange-brown colour with a light brown outer surface. There is some speckling of light green glaze, indicating that the main body of the finials was glazed. The necks show only accidental speckling. Green glaze, indicating that the main body of the finials was oxidized was glazed. The necks show only accidental speckling.

All the tiles have been listed in Table 5, by OH number, with illustration numbers in brackets.

10. Decorated plaster (Fig.13)

The recorded fragments of moulded plaster all came from the demolition rubble or topsoil above the 17th century room at the south end of the hall.

P1. Part of a moulded framework for decorative motifs (demolition rubble below topsoil).

P2. Part of a fleur-de-lis (topsoil).

CONCLUSIONS

Archaeological evidence for the layout of the manor house is very fragmentary. What is known of the various rooms through excavation and through records of standing masonry has been assembled for the interpretation plan, Figure 17. There are, in addition, two documentary sources which provide a substantial amount of detailed information. These are the probate inventories taken after the death of Sir Gilbert Ireland in 1626, and after the death of the last Sir Gilbert of The Hutt, in 1675 (Lanes RO WCW). The buildings and rooms which are named in these valuations are listed, in order, in Appendix B. The two inventories seem by and large to follow the same order of description, allowing for changes in the function and naming of rooms during the intervening fifty years. Both start with a group of principal residential and reception rooms (hall, parlour, best chamber, drawing chamber etc). In 1626 the great parlour (no. 1) contained 'statutes', and the best chamber (no. 5) held the 'glasse of Armes'. In 1675 the 'Looking Glass with Severall Coates of Armes' was recorded in the parlour (no. 7).

Both inventories then move to outbuildings and service rooms: in 1626 the gatehouse (no. 15) is followed by store house, dairy etc.; in 1675 the little parlour (no. 19) is followed by dairy, kiln, mills etc. Thereafter, both return to domestic rooms: the old hall (no. 35) and adjoining chambers in 1626; and in 1675 the women's (?) chamber (no. 30), old drawing room etc.

It seems at first sight that there are two distinct sets of residential buildings, especially as the 1626 inventory records both a hall (no. 3) and an old hall (no. 35). When the lists are examined in detail, however, it is clear that the description begins at the upper end of the residential block, works out, via the gatehouse, to the outbuildings, and then returns to the lower end of the manor house. This explains, for example, the occurrence of the knight's chamber (no. 10) in the first part of the 1675 inventory, and of a room or space next to the knight's chamber (no. 39) in the second part. The record of two halls in 1626 can also be explained, for most items listed under 'halle' (no. 3) - the great ash table, the carpets and hangings - are said specifically to be in the new end. The old hall (no. 35) may have been that part of the original structure which had not been rebuilt, and which had gone out of domestic use: it contained a great chest and other 'implements'.

Bearing in mind these descriptions, as well as the excavated evidence of buildings and structural materials, we may now attempt to infer the plan of the manor house, and the development of its layout.

Phase I

The principal medieval structure, dating to the 14th century, was a hall with stone walls and a timber roof supported on corbels. The doorway, which survived until 1960, gave access to the screens passage, with service rooms on the north. The kitchen was a detached square-plan building beyond the services, with a pyramid roof. Presumably the private chambers of the lord and his immediate family lay at the south end of the hall.

Phase II

By the second quarter of the 17th century the upper end of the hall had been remodelled. The most notable architectural units must have been the gallery, with various chambers off, and the great parlour. Much if not all this work may have been undertaken by John Ireland, whose rebuilding of the gatehouse and the outer-court stables has already been noted. It no doubt included the wing projecting eastwards from the south end of the hall, with its Jacobean fireplace and its mullioned and transomed windows. The first floor of this wing could well have contained the gallery.

By this time also, the lower end of the hall had gone out of use as a reception room, though various chambers attached to it still provided service and residential facilities. Archaeological evidence attests the erection of a chamber block east of the screens passage, and the reconstruction of the kitchens, to bring them within the building complex. Further rooms were added to the east side of the kitchens.
Figure 17: Interpretation plan, the structural phases.
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APPENDIX A: WRIGHT’S MOAT

Excavation at this second moated site (see Fig. 1) was confined to a single trench, dug across the axis of the island from north-east to south-west. The results are recorded in a surviving section drawing (Fig. 18). Below topsoil was a scatter of stones and occupation debris (layer 2). The debris included, towards the south-west, a number of large burnt stones with pieces of coal intermixed. This material lay on the surface of layer 3, a red-brown clayey soil which was described at the time as ‘make-up’, and seems to have been the moat platform, derived from the ditch. The brown sandy soils below it (principally layer 4) might have been either original sub-soil or a primary make-up layer. If the latter, then the thin layer 5, described as black sandy clay, could be the compressed pre-moat soil horizon. Beneath it, further shades of sandy soil overlay red clay.

The only artefacts recovered were sherds of medieval pottery, all of them from the occupation layer 2. The pots were very fragmentary, and the majority were represented by single, abraded sherds. All the vessels have been identified as Type 3 (see page 25, above): four are jugs and two are bowls. Such as it is, the evidence indicates occupation during, but not beyond the Middle Ages. It may be that this site was one of the 14th century freehold farmsteads, and that it was abandoned when the Irelands bought up the holding; they certainly owned the moat in the early 19th century (Lancs RO, DRL 1/32).

The publication of this paper has been made possible by a grant from English Heritage (Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England).
Figure 18: Wright's Moat excavation, section S5 through moated island. Numbered layers are described in the text.
APPENDIX B: PROBATE INVENTORIES OF THE HUTT

1626: Inventory of Sir Gilbert Ireland, proved 1628 (Lancs RO WCW)

1. greate parlor
2. parlor Sellar
3. the Halle (newe ende)
4. wyne Sellar
5. beste Chamber
6. drawing Chamber
7. greate gallerie
8. nurerie
9. gallerie Chamber
10. Poarche Chamber
11. knights Chamber
12. Middle Chamber
13. Staire Foote Chambre
14. little Parlor
15. gate House
16. top of the gate howse
17. Store Hose
18. old Closett
19. meale lofte
20. boltinge house
21. wett Larder
22. Kitchin
23. dry larder
24. Dayrie
25. Maide Chamber
26. wash howse
27. buttrie, Pantree, bread house
28. salte house
29. waine howse
30. Armor (insert)
31. Garners, Barne
32. Butterie, Seller
33. Brewhouse, Dayrie
34. Cookes Charge
35. olde halle
36. Swine howse
37. Chamber adjoyninge to the olde halle
38. The other chamber
39. Chamber at the lower end of the halle
40. Porters Chamber
41. Captaines Chamber with the Closet
42. Mr Thomas Irelandes Chamber
43. Red Chamber
44. Nurcerie
45. under the staires to the store howse
46. Sir Gilbertes Chamber
47. maids Chamber
48. Store house
49. Ladies Closet

1675: Inventory of Sir Gilbert Ireland (Lancs RO WCW), based on a transcript by Roger Dickinson.

1. hack house
2. lyme house
3. Roome Over the Lyme house
4. Cart house
5. Grooms Chamber
6. Hall
7. parlor
8. Nursery
9. mr Stanleys Chamber
10. Knights Chamber
11. poarch chamber
12. Gallery Chamber
13. Sir Gilberts Closett
14. Cheese Chamber
15. Roome next to my Ladys Closett
16. my Ladys Closett
17. Butterey
18. old So(?)ehouse
19. Little parler
20. Dayrey
21. Inner Dayrer
22. Kitchen
23. weete Larder
24. Brewhouse
25. Servants Chamber
26. Kilne
27. wynd milne
28. water Milne
29. ?
30. weomens Chamber
31. Starehead Chamber near the (?)Dining) Roome
32. chamber over the (?)
33. Long Closett
34. Round Closett
35. Ould Draweing Roome
36. Severall Chambers
37. Dyneing Roome
38. Black Chamber
39. Next to the Knights Chamber
40. New Roome
41. Furthest Chamber in the Gallery
42. Redd chamber
43. Taffety Curtains
44. Stare head Chamber
45. Low butlers Chamber
46. Little Syde Roome
47. passage Chamber next the great Stares
48. Roome next mrs Dones
49. mrs Dones Chamber
50. Long Closett
51. high Butlers Chamber
52. Roufes
53. ould mr Robert Irelands Chamber
54. men Servants Chamber
55. Little Closett belowe
56. Garden Chamber
57. farther Storehouse
58. Nearer Storehouse