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1 Summary

This report presents the results of a programme of archaeological excavation of five 1m2 ‘test pits’ in the Suffolk village of Little Waldingfield carried out in summer 2013. The excavations were funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund through the Managing a Masterpiece project intended to engage the communities of the Stour valley in their heritage. Over two days, more than 50 pupils and staff from the local middle school area took part in the excavations which gave them a taste of archaeological excavation and provided new evidence for the development of the area now occupied by the village from the prehistoric period onwards. The area was used by humans in the prehistoric period, but no material of Roman date was found. Small amounts of Late Anglo-Saxon pottery hint that there may have been a settlement of some sort along The Street. Larger volumes of pottery of high and late medieval date from some pits are clearly indicative of occupation in the vicinity of The Street and Church Road, which may have been relatively resilient in the later medieval period and suffered less contraction than many East Anglian communities. Likewise, some pits produced large numbers of post-medieval sherds, suggesting some parts, at least, of this community thrived in this period.
2 Introduction

Over the two days of the 24th and 25th of June 2013, five small archaeological test pits were excavated within private gardens through the village of Little Waldingfield in Suffolk. The project was a partnership between Access Cambridge Archaeology, led by Dr Carenza Lewis; All Saints Middle School, led by Deputy Head teacher Robert Wheeler; and the local community through Vic Flute. The excavations were undertaken by pupils from All Saints Middle School in Sudbury, with the whole of year 6 (46 students) present on the first day and the whole of year 7 (29 students) undertaking the work on the second day. The students were accompanied by 20 members of staff and eight local residents, including members of Little Waldingfield History Society.

2.1 Managing a Masterpiece

Managing a Masterpiece (http://www.managingamasterpiece.org/) is a £1.1 million Landscape Partnership Scheme for the Stour Valley with £910,000 of that awarded by the National Heritage Memorial Fund for 62 projects within three programmes over three years. Delivery of the scheme began on 1 June 2010. The Managing a Masterpiece vision is for a Stour Valley where the landscape is understood cared for and celebrated by communities with the knowledge, skills and opportunities needed to manage and enjoy it. The scheme consists of three programmes, under which there are fifteen projects and around sixty outputs across a range of work including archaeology, access, public training events, outreach projects to traditionally hard to reach groups, school projects, built conservation projects, public survey of heritage features, production of a heritage compendium, use of church towers as interpretation points, website development, provision of a Hopper Bus, new walking and cycling leaflets, new art exhibitions and projects, restoration of a Stour lighter (barge), new hedge and tree planting and management, new displays for museums and practical conservation management. Programme 1, ‘Understanding the Masterpiece’ seeks to increase awareness and understanding of the Stour Valley by residents and those with an interest in its landscape and heritage assets, by learning more about them and how they are managed, and actively working to manage and restore the key features. A component of the Understanding the Masterpiece programme is ‘Project 1f: Stripping Back the Layers’ which comprises four archaeological excavation projects carried out by community volunteers trained, supervised and led by professional archaeologists and summarised in a chapter of the Stour Valley Heritage Compendium. The community-based archaeological test pitting in Little Waldingfield comprised one of the components of Stripping Back the Layers.

2.2 Access Cambridge Archaeology

Access Cambridge Archaeology (ACA) (http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/aca/) is an archaeological outreach organisation based in the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research in the University of Cambridge, which aims to enhance economic, social and personal well-being through active engagement with archaeology. It was set up by Dr Carenza Lewis in 2004 and specialises in providing opportunities for members of the public to take part in purposeful, research-orientated archaeological investigations including excavation. Educational events and courses range in length from a few hours to a week or more, and involve members of the public of all ages.

Thousands of members of the public have taken part in scores of programmes run by ACA, including teenagers involved in Higher Education Field Academy (HEFA) test pit excavation programmes intended since 2005 to build academic skills, confidence and aspirations. More widely, ACA has involved thousands of members of the public of all ages and backgrounds, including those with special needs, in a wide range of archaeological activities including field-walking, excavation, analysis and reporting. These have included projects funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund and events in 2011-12 as part of the Cultural Olympiad for the 2012 London Olympic Games.
2.3 Test pit excavation and rural settlement studies

Rural settlement has long been a crucial area of research for medieval archaeology (Gerrard 2003; Lewis et al 2001, 5-21), notably since the pioneering work of W. G. Hoskins, Maurice Beresford and John Hurst in the 1940s and 1950s (Hoskins 1955; Beresford 1955; Beresford & Hurst 1971), but until recently attention was focused largely on the minority of medieval settlements which are today deserted or extensively shrunken. Currently occupied rural settlements (CORS), overlain by domestic housing and related buildings of living secular communities – the villages, hamlets and small towns of today – were generally largely disregarded as targets for research-driven excavation. Very few regions have seen any systematic research-driven primary investigation aimed at CORS, and most of that which has taken place has not involved excavation, including those of a survey based nature (Roberts 1987; Roberts and Wrathmell 2000; Roberts and Wrathmell 2003). However, recent attempts to redress this bias in favour of the majority of medieval rural settlements which are still inhabited have opened up new areas for debate which are beginning to call into question established theories about the development of rural settlement in the historic period (Aston & Gerrard 1999; Jones & Page 2006). However, despite these recent advances, the number of CORS to have seen methodical research-orientated investigation including excavation remains very small. In order to begin to resolve this problem, Access Cambridge Archaeology, working with members of the public including school pupils, has carried out test pit excavations in more than 30 CORS, most in eastern England. This will help allow the evidence upon which knowledge and understanding of the origins and development of the medieval rural settlement pattern of eastern England is based, to be more representative of the entire range of medieval settlements, not just on the minority of sites which are currently deserted (Lewis 2006; 2007a; 2007b).
3 Aims, objectives and desired outcomes

3.1 Aims
The aims of the test pit excavations in Little Waldingfield were as follows:

- To engage with local communities and widen the participation of people in the heritage of the area
- To enable local school pupils to develop a wide range of practical and analytical archaeological skills.
- To increase knowledge, understanding and appreciation of the setting, origins and development of Little Waldingfield and its environs.

3.2 Objectives
The objectives of the test pit excavations in Little Waldingfield were as follows:

- To investigate the archaeology of the environs of Little Waldingfield through test-pitting carried out by members of the community in properties throughout the village.
- To provide the opportunity for a minimum of 30 volunteers to learn new practical and analytical archaeological skills.
- To support and engage with members of local communities through involvement with the project.

3.3 Outcomes
The desired outcomes of the test pit excavations in Little Waldingfield were as follows:

- A minimum of 30 people with new archaeological skills.
- A minimum of 30 people with a better understanding of the process of archaeological excavation.
- A minimum of 30 people with an enhanced understanding and awareness of the history and heritage of Little Waldingfield.
- A more engaged and informed local population.
- An improved knowledge and understanding of the potential of the archaeological resource of the village of Little Waldingfield.
4 Methodology

4.1 Test pit excavation strategy

The test pits excavated in the course of the Little Waldingfield Community Excavations followed the standard procedure outlined below, used successfully by ACA in the excavation by members of the public of over 1,000 test pits in eastern England since 2005. Each test pit required a minimum of three to four people over a two day duration.

- Test pits were 1m square. Turf, if present, was removed in squares by hand. Each test pit was excavated in a series of 10cm spits or contexts, to a maximum depth of 1.2m.
- The horizontal surface of each context/spit was drawn at 1:10 scale before excavation and the colour recorded with reference to a standardised colour chart, included in the written handbook.
- A pro-forma recording system was used by excavating members of the public to record their test pit excavation. This comprises a 16-page pro-forma Test Pit Record booklet which has been developed by ACA for use with members of the public with no previous archaeological experience.
- Cut features, if encountered were excavated sequentially in the normal way.
- All spoil was screened for finds using sieves with a standard 10mm mesh, with the exception of any heavy clay soils which were hand-searched.
- All artefacts from test pits were retained in the first instance. Excavators were instructed to err on the side of caution by retaining everything they think may even possibly be of interest.
- Each spit/context was photographed and planned before excavation at 1:10. The bottom surface of the test pit was also photographed. Sections were also photographed if possible.
- A register was kept by each test pit excavation team detailing photographs taken including context number, direction of shot and date and time of day.
- All four sections were drawn at 1:10 scale with the depth of natural (if reached) clearly indicated on pre-drawn grids on page 13 of the Test Pit Record booklet.
- Other observations and notes were included on the context record sheet for each context or on continuation sheets at the back of the Test Pit Record booklet.
- Test pits were then backfilled and the turf replaced neatly to restore the site.

On-site finds identification and retention

- Non-metallic inorganic finds and bone (unless in very poor condition) were washed on site where possible, thoroughly dried and bagged separately for each context of the test pit or trench. Either on site or during post excavation the animal bone, pottery, burnt clay, flint and burnt stone are bagged separately, ready to be given to specialists.

On-site archaeological supervision

- Professional archaeologists from ACA and the University of Cambridge visit all the test pits regularly. They provide advice and check that the excavation is being carried out and recorded to the required standard. Pottery and most other finds are provisionally spot-dated/identified on-site by experts.
Trench and test pit closing and backfilling

- A member of the archaeological team inspected each test pit before it was declared finished confirming whether or not natural has been reached. A small sondage may be excavated within the bottom of the pit to examine whether or not natural has been reached. Some test pits will stop above natural or 1.2m on encountering a feature (ancient or modern) which is deemed inadvisable or impossible to remove, or have to finish at a level above natural due to time constraints.
- After the excavations were completed the archaeological records and finds are retained by the University of Cambridge for analysis, reporting, archiving and submission to HER's, publication and on-going research into the origins and development of rural settlement. Finds are returned to owners after analysis is complete if they are requested; otherwise they are curated by the University of Cambridge.

Recording

- The test pit recording system used by excavating members of the public comprises a 16-page pro-forma Test Pit Record booklet which has been developed by ACA for use with members of the public with no previous archaeological experience.
- This pro-forma format, which includes designated spaces, prompts and pre-drawn 1:10 planning grids, is used in order to ensure that all required observations are completed and recorded.
- It is used in conjunction with the live presentation and written handbook also developed and delivered by ACA.
- This system has been used successfully by ACA to record required archaeological data from the excavation of over 1,000 test pits since 2005.
- The site code is LWA/13.

Finds processing and recording

Few excavations retain all the finds that are made if they are deemed to be of little or no research value. Test pit excavations and the upper levels of the trenches may produce significant quantities of modern material, not all of which will have research value.

Finds appropriate for recording, analysis, reporting, retention and curation

- All pottery has been retained.
- All faunal remains, worked and burnt stone have been retained
- All other finds from contexts pre-dating 1800 have been retained.
- All finds pre-dating 1900 have been retained

Finds appropriate for disposal after recording and reporting

- The following finds which are not considered to warrant any further analysis have been discarded after they have been photographed and their weight and number by type has been recorded.: Slate, coal, plastic, Perspex, modern glass, modern metal objects (including nails), concrete, modern mortar, modern fabric, shoes and other
modern items (including batteries and shotgun cartridges), naturally occurring animal shells, unworked flint and other unworked stone (including fossils).

- C20th window and vessel glass has been discarded after sorting, counting and weighing.
- C19th and C20th CBM has been discarded after counting and weighing. One sample of any hand-made, unusual or older type of CBM was kept with the remainder discarded after counting and weighing.
- Most fragments of C20th metal whose use can be identified has been discarded and the same is true for any unidentifiable object of ferrous metal, aluminium or modern alloys from contexts containing other material of post-1900 AD date. Modern nails have also been discarded but handmade nails were retained.
- C20th tile (floor, roof and wall) have been discarded after counting and weighing, with a sample of each type of pre-modern tile retained with the remainder discarded after counting and weighing. Any decorated examples have been retained unless these have been recovered in very large quantities in which case representative samples were retained after counting and weighing.
- Modern wood was weighed and counted but was also discarded.

Legal ownership of finds

- Ownership of objects rests in the first instance with the landowner, except where other law overrides this (e.g. Treasure Act 1996, 2006, Burials Act 1857).
- Owners of private unscheduled land where test pits have been excavated who enquire about the final destination of finds from excavation on their property will be informed that ACA prefers to retain these in the short term for analysis and ideally also in the longer term in order that the excavation archives will be as complete as possible.
- NB: Most land-owners are not concerned about retaining ownership of the finds and are happy to donate them to ACA.
- Any requests by owners for the final return of finds to them will be agreed. Finds will be returned after recording, analysis and reporting is complete, accompanied by a letter inviting them to treat the finds with care, retain them in association with identifying documentation and to consider donating them to ACA/University of Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology should they ever change their minds about wishing to have possession of them.
- If the landowners are unwilling, for whatever reason, to donate any or all of the finds from the excavation on their land to ACA, the requested finds are returned to them after recording and analysis is completed, safely packaged and conserved (if required), accompanied by a letter explaining how they should be cared for and asking for them to be returned to the University of Cambridge if for any reason the owners no longer wish to retain them, and that if they are moved from the address to which they were returned the ACA should be informed. The location of such finds will be stated in the site archive.

Curation of Archaeological Finds

- All finds which are not discarded or returned to owners are retained and stored in conditions where they will not deteriorate. Most finds are stored in cool dry condition in sealed plastic finds bags, with small pierced holes to ventilate them. Pottery, bone and flint have been bagged separately from other finds.
• Finds which are more fragile, including ancient glass or metal objects, are stored in small boxes protected by padding and if necessary, acid free paper. Metal objects are curated with silica gel packets if necessary to prevent deterioration.

• All finds bags/boxes from the same context have been bagged/boxed together, and bags from all test pits excavated in the same settlement in the same year will be kept together. All the trench finds have also been stored together. All bags and boxes used for storage will be clearly marked in permanent marker with the site code (which includes settlement name code and year of excavation code), test pit number and context number.
5 Location

The village of Little Waldingfield is situated on the B115 between Sudbury (c.6km to the south-west) and Monks Eleigh (c.5km to the north-east) in south-west Suffolk. The village is also just 4km south of Lavenham and is centred on NGR TL 924451.

Figure 1: Map of England with a close up insert of East Anglia, and the village of Little Waldingfield highlighted in red. (Map courtesy of Digimap).

Little Waldingfield sits just to the north-east of Great Waldingfield and is arranged as a linear settlement along the B1115 equidistant either side of a T-junction with Church Road. The small village has a very rural feel and is surrounded by farmland. The parish of Little Waldingfield also includes the smaller hamlet of Humble Green, which lies c. 0.5km to the north-east, also arranged along the B1115. Little Waldingfield has a population of just over 300 and the village boasts a number of societies and social activities that utilise both the parish room and playing field. There is also a public house in the village as well as the parish church of St Lawrence1.

Two streams which rise in the parish, one to the south-east of the village and the other to the north-west of the village meet south of the village and flow south-eastwards as the River Box, which meets the River Stour south-east of Stoke-by-Nayland. The River Stour forms the county boundary between Suffolk and Essex and empties into the North Sea between Harwich and Felixstowe.

1 http://littlewaldingfield.onesuffolk.net/ (Accessed September 2013)
The conservation area of Little Waldingfield (figure 3) comprises the majority of the village, particularly all the houses along the road to the north of the T-junction as well as those leading off the minor road past the church. To the south of the T-junction only a small area is encompassed into the conservation area, mainly the properties fronting the main road as far south-west as the estate of Croft Lea.
Figure 3: Extent of the Little Waldingfield Conservation Area
6 Geology and Topography

Suffolk is a coastal county in East Anglia, bounded by the North Sea to the east, Norfolk to the north, Essex to the south and Cambridgeshire to the west. Little Waldingfield sits on a spur of high ground in the south-west of the county at between 60 and 70 m OD.

The River Box rises in Little Waldingfield and has a narrow floodplain as it flows through a predominately rural area to join the River Stour that forms the Suffolk – Essex border. The topography of the area has been classified as ‘Ancient Rolling Farmlands’, and is indicative of a rolling arable landscape, with field patterns of both ancient random enclosures as well as post World War II open agricultural changes. Small areas of ancient woodland are scattered throughout and the settlements are usually quite dispersed with a network of winding lanes and paths lined with hedgerows connecting them2.

The underlying geology of the parish consists of the till and boulder clays that are typical over most of Suffolk. The village however sits in a pocket where this is absent, so it exposes the underlying gravel and sands3.

---

7 Archaeological and Historical Background

No significant archaeological features or monuments have been recorded in Little Waldingfield, although a number of find spots have been recorded in the parish, mainly through metal detecting. These date from the Neolithic through to the post medieval.

A number of prehistoric find scatters have been recorded with later finds, possibly suggesting a consistent favouring by pre-modern populations of the same locations over time, but alternatively potentially indicating areas favoured by modern metal detectoists. The earliest finds on the Suffolk SMR are a Neolithic polished axehead from Slough Hall Farm (WLF 004), a Late Bronze Age bronze socketed axehead (WLF 008) and a possible Later Bronze Age hoard found on a site that contained mainly later Iron Age and Roman artefacts and consisted of a Middle-Late Bronze Age gouge and hammer and a rapier blade fragment (WLF 015). A large number of items dating to the Iron Age have also been recorded in Little Waldingfield, all found through metal detecting with the majority found along with later Roman objects. The items found include six bronze and one silver coins (one Iceni, three Cunobelin, one Gall-Belgic C and one Addedomaras), a terret ring fragment, an openwork mount and a bronze brooch (WLF 015). Another Iron Age coin has also been recovered (WLF 016) as well as an unidentified decorative object of probable Late Iron Age date (WLF 008).

Evidence for Roman activity in Little Waldingfield is again mainly limited to finds from metal detecting and consist of a number of objects, including over 40 coins (including some identified as Constantine), glass vessels, a gaming counter, various types of pottery, two terminals, two dolphin brooches, two crossbow brooch fragments, a possible seal box fragment and a weight (WLF 008, WLF 009, WLF 015 and WLF 016).

There is very little evidence for Saxon activity within the parish with only two finds spots so far identified, one of a possible cruciform brooch (WLF 008) and the other of two small long brooches, both probably dating to the Early Saxon period (WLF 010).

There is more evidence of post-Conquest medieval date. The village name is recorded in the Domesday Book as Walingafella, but there are only combined entries for both the villages of Great and Little Waldingfield (Williams and Martin 2003).

The church in Little Waldingfield is dedicated to St Lawrence, as is the church in Great Waldingfield, which may have stemmed from confusion during restoration work during the 19th century (WLF 005). St Lawrence in Little Waldingfield was completely rebuilt during the 15th century, from the wealth gained as part of the cloth trade that was prevalent through much of Suffolk (see below). The rebuilding took place on a grand scale, with a similar style to the grander churches of the county, such as St Marys in Bury St Edmunds, with the presence of turrets and the larger proportions of the windows.

The cloth trade in Suffolk was already flourishing before the arrival of Flemish weavers during the first half of the 14th century and Little Waldingfield lay in the centre of the main broadcloth-producing region of Suffolk which extended from Bury St Edmunds to Sudbury and Hadleigh. The 16th century will of a member of the Wynll family (WLF 011) indicate that there was extensive settlement connected with the cloth trade around Humble Green, the hamlet now incorporated into Little Waldingfield parish. The large number of buildings were recorded on maps into the 18th century, although only a few survive today on the south side of the road.

4 www.suffolkchurches.co.uk/lwalding.htm (Accessed September 2013)
Both medieval finds and features have been recorded on the SMR, with a scatter of medieval pottery recorded from Barrow Field (WLF 003) along with medieval roof tiles, an undated buckle and oyster shell. Other scatters of medieval pottery have been recorded along the route of a pipeline (WLF 014 and WLF Misc) and through metal detecting where a scatter of medieval metalwork (including coins and a purse) were identified in the north-eastern half of a large field outside the village (WLF 008). Medieval rubbish pits were recorded under The Priory building, suggesting continual occupation on that site (WLF 018) and a moated site has also been identified on the SMR at Nether Hall (WLF 002).

It seems likely that during the post medieval period, Little Waldingfield experienced little in the way of growth or development, partly due to the decline of the broadcloth industry from the 17th century onwards exacerbated by the relative isolation of the village, away from main roads, railway lines and navigable waterways, and the proximity of Sudbury, which remained a focus of industry for the area. Post-medieval records on the SMR are dominated by those of former dwellings, such as Holbrook Hall that burnt down in the 1870’s (WLF 012), and the possible deer park (WLF 026) identified through 19th century maps where Park Field and Park Wood are named. A concentration of post medieval objects were also found through metal detecting, along with the medieval artefacts noted above in the north-eastern half of a field outside the village (WLF 008).

A number of sites of possible medieval date have been recorded on the SMR and consist of areas of woodland at Camps Wood (BTE 007), Long Wood (WLF 006), Four Acre Wood (WLF 024) and Reeve Wood (WLF 025). Other sites have also been identified by names recorded on 18th and 19th century maps, including a windmill (Mill Meadow) (WLF 013); a brick kiln (Brick Kiln Field) (WLF Misc), a rabbit warren (The Warren) (WLF 023), a charcoal-burning clamp (a field called Clamp) (WLF Misc) and a second windmill site (Great Mill Field and Little Mill Field) (WLF Misc). The cropmark of a now-levelled moat (WLF 003) is thought to be the site of the manor of Wood Hall mentioned in 1580, but no work has been undertaken to specifically date this.

Previous archaeological work in the parish is limited to mainly watching briefs during local building work. A monitoring survey was undertaken by Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SSCAS) in 2005 at The Priory, prior to construction of a new pool room. Despite its name the present building property is mostly of 19th century date, with no parts of the building dating earlier than the 16th century, but during survey of undisturbed areas of the site, early medieval rubbish pits were identified (Caruth 2005). Another watching brief by SSCAS in 2005 at Pink Cottage, along Church Road, carried out prior to the construction of an extension to the rear of the property noted a great deal of disturbance but no archaeological features or finds (Gardner 2005). Similarly, at Archers Farm in the south of the parish an archaeological monitoring report by SSCAS prior to the conversion of previous farm buildings, construction of a new dwelling and extensive landscaping revealed only evidence for post-medieval activity, mostly dating to the 18th – 20th centuries (Atfield 2007).
8 Results of the test pit excavations in Little Waldingfield

The approximate locations of the five test pits that were excavated in June 2013 are displayed in figure 4 below. The data from each test pit are discussed in this section, set out in numerical order.

Most excavation was in spits measuring 10cm in depth, but in cases when a change in the character of deposits indicated a change in context, a new spit was started before 10cm. An assessment of the overall results, synthesizing the data from all the pits, including deductions about the historic development of Little Waldingfield and the potential of the buried heritage resource of the village is presented in the following Discussion section (Section 9).

Finds from each test pit are discussed in summary in this section, and listed in detail in the relevant appendices (section 13). Photographs of sites under excavation and of all finds are included in the archive, but not included in this report for reasons of space.

![Figure 4: The location of test pits excavated in Little Waldingfield (NB test pits not shown to scale) (Map Courtesy of Digimap)](image-url)
Test Pit one (LWA/13/1)

Test pit one was excavated in the enclosed rear garden of a cottage of probable 19th century date in the centre of the village. (Boston Cottage, Church Road, Little Waldingfield. TL 592347 245181).

Test pit one was excavated to a depth of 0.5m. Natural was not found, but due to time constraints, excavations were halted at this level and the test pit was recorded and backfilled.

The vast majority of the pottery excavated from LWA/13/1 dates to the Victorian period with the majority of the remainder dating from the post-medieval period (15th -18th centuries). These include Late Medieval Ware, Glazed Red Earthenware, Delft Ware and Staffordshire White Salt-Glazed Stoneware. A single small sherd of Early Medieval Sandy Ware was also recorded from context four.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1400-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1400-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1100-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1550-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Pottery excavated from LWA/13/1

Other finds consist of tile, CBM, coal, glass, fragments of plastic, concrete, iron nails and bolts, horseshoe fragments, slate, a pink child’s hair clip, oyster shell, mortar, pieces of scrap metal, clay pipe and a possible metal blade fragment. A single cow molar was also recovered.

The evidence recovered suggests that despite the location of the test pit, just west of the church, there was limited activity on site from the 12th century, with the site in use as manured open fields with more intense occupation evident from the 16th century and later. During the 19th century a great deal of disturbance is evident on site with a range of later finds and pottery that were all mixed through the test pit. However, as the test pit was only excavated to 0.5m and did not reach natural, it is entirely possible, and on balance quite likely, that more finds of pre-16th century date are present in lower, unexcavated deposits.
Test Pit two (LWA/13/2)

Test pit two was excavated in the enclosed rear garden of a Grade II listed 18th century cottage set back from the road in the centre of the village. (The Cottage, Church Road, Little Waldingfield. TL 592321 245211).

Test pit two was excavated to a depth of 0.7m, at which natural was found. Excavations were halted at this level and the test pit was recorded and backfilled.

A large number of pottery types were excavated from LWA/13, the vast majority dating from the 15th century and later with a wide range of wares recorded. These include Late Medieval Ware, Glazed Red Earthenware, German Stoneware, Border Ware, Delft Ware, Harlow Slipware, English Stoneware and Staffordshire White Salt-Glazed Stoneware. A large amount of Victorian pottery was also found throughout the test pit, as well as a very large assemblage of later medieval (late 14th – late 16th century) pottery and a smaller assemblage of high medieval pottery including Sandy Wares and Hedingham Ware. These latter were exclusively found below 60cm, suggesting these deposits have not been extensively disturbed by activity which has disrupted later deposits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMW</th>
<th>HED</th>
<th>LMT</th>
<th>GRE</th>
<th>GS</th>
<th>BW</th>
<th>DW</th>
<th>HSW</th>
<th>EST</th>
<th>SWSG</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1200-1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1400-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1550-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1550-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>877</td>
<td></td>
<td>1400-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Pottery excavated from LWA/13/2

A possible post hole observed at 0.7m below the present ground surface on the northern side of the test pit. Excavation showed this to be at least 0.2m deep and to cut into the clay natural. It was filled with the similar type of soil that was seen through the test pit as well as with a mix of both medieval and Victorian pottery. This suggests either that it was dug in the medieval period and filled with 19th century pottery when the post it contained was removed, or that it was both dug and infilled in the 19th century. The fill appearance suggests the latter is more likely, an inference supported by its close proximity to outbuildings marked on early 20th century maps.

Other finds from the test pit consist of coal, CBM, glass, mortar, concrete, iron nails and bolts, asbestos, tile, slate, clay pipe, pieces of scrap metal, metal washers, part of a metal buckle, modern nails, oyster shell, half a bottle from the Sudbury Water Company, plaster/mortar, part of a horseshoe or metal blade fragment, a possible whetstone and slag,
suggestive of metal working on or close to site. A single tertiary flint flake was also recorded with a small piece of burnt stone. A number of animal bone fragments were also excavated and have been identified as cow, sheep/goat, pig, cat and chicken with also a number of smaller fragments that could only be identified as cattle- and sheep-sized as well as either a mammal or bird.

The worked flint may result from prehistoric tool-making, but it is possible it derives from medieval or early modern construction work on the nearby church, which has flint work in its walls. If prehistoric, it is clearly residual in context 7 where it was found along with medieval and later pottery. The burnt flint came from context 2, and may not be related to the worked flint. The pottery clearly indicates settlement in the immediate vicinity from the 12th century to the present day, not unexpected given its location in the centre of the village and just west of the church.
Test Pit three (LWA/13/3)

Test pit three was excavated in the front garden of a modern end of terrace house set back from the main road through the village. (1 The Street, Little Waldingfield. TL 592189 245142).

Test pit three was excavated to a depth of 0.5m. Natural was not found, but due to time constraints, excavations were halted at this level and the test pit was recorded and backfilled.

Five sherds of Victorian pottery were only recorded from the mid-contexts of LWA/13/3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1800-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1800-1900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Pottery excavated from LWA/13/3

Other finds consist of tile, clay pipe, slate, glass, coal, mortar, part of a horseshoe, CBM, oyster shell, pieces of scrap metal and a three pence coin dated 1914. An additional two secondary and one tertiary flint flakes were also recorded from LWA/13/3 with a single fragment of cow pelvis and a sheep/goat astragalus.

Despite the location of LWA/13/3 along the main east-west round through the village and close to the centre, there is little evidence for any activity on site prior to the 19th century. The Victorian pottery and finds suggest that there has been a great deal of disturbance on site, although as the test pit was only excavated to 0.5m and did not reach natural, it is entirely possible, and on balance quite likely, that more finds of pre-modern date are present in lower, unexcavated deposits.
Test Pit four (LWA/13/4)

Test pit four was excavated in the front garden of a modern mid terrace house set back from the main road through the village. (2 The Street, Little Waldingfield. TL 592192 245151).

Test pit four was excavated to a depth of 0.3m. Natural was not found, but due to time constraints, excavations were halted at this level and the test pit was recorded and backfilled.

Small amounts of Late Saxon, medieval and post medieval wares were all recorded through LWA/13/3, consisting of Thetford Ware, Early Medieval Sandy Ware, Hedingham Ware, Glazed Red Earthenware, Staffordshire Slipware, English Stoneware and Staffordshire White Salt-Glazed Stoneware. A number of Victorian sherds were also identified through the test pit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>THET</th>
<th>EMW</th>
<th>HED</th>
<th>GRE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>EST</th>
<th>SWSG</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>850-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1550-1900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 – Pottery excavated from LWA/13/4

The finds consist of a thin metal disc, glass, iron nails, modern screws, a twisted strip of lead, fragments of plastic, coal, CBM, complete glass bottles, tile and clay pipe. A single secondary flint flake was also recorded from context two. A sheep/goat tooth was the only identifiable bone remains although smaller bone fragments were identified as either cattle- and sheep-sized animal remains. One of the cattle-sized limb fragment had clear evidence of sawing.

This test pit was excavated in the adjoining property to LWA/13/3, but has yielded very different results suggestive of low-level activity from the Late Anglo-Saxon period until the 14th century, then again from the later 16th century until the present day. As the test pit was only excavated to 0.3m and did not reach natural, it is likely that more finds of pre-16th century date are present in lower, unexcavated deposits.
Test Pit five (LWA/13/5)

Test pit five was excavated in the enclosed rear garden of a house fronting the main road through the village. (56 The Street, Little Waldingfield. TL 592344 245253).

Test pit five was excavated to a depth of 0.8m. Natural was not found, but due to time constraints, excavations were halted at this level and the test pit was recorded and backfilled.

Single sherds of Late Saxon Thetford Ware, Early Medieval Sandy Ware and Hedingham Ware were all recorded through the upper contexts of the test pit. The majority of the pottery found however dates to the 15th century and later with a peak into the Victorian period, with a large number of these sherds recovered through the upper half of the test pit. The rest of the pottery has been identified as Late Medieval Ware, Glazed Red Earthenware, German Stoneware, Delft Ware, English Stoneware and Staffordshire White Salt-Glazed Stoneware.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP</th>
<th>Cntxt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1400-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1400-1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1550-1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1400-1600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 – Pottery excavated from LWA/13/5

Other finds consist of coal, a glass vase base, glass, CBM, tile, clay pipe, metal wire, modern tile, buttons, iron nails, slate, pieces of scrap metal, including fragments of copper, modern nails, a milk bottle top, fragment of slate pencil, part of a glass marble, fragments of horseshoe, mortar, oyster shell, a copper bracket, pieces of foil, ancient glass fragments, lead window glass, slag, a possible thin metal pin and a square metal plate. A large amount of sheep/goat bones were also recorded from LWA/13/5, along with cow, pig, rabbit, cat and chicken, as well as fragmentary bone remains that could only be identified as either cattle- or sheep-sized animals as well as two bird bones. Two sheep vertebrae were chopped axially, suggesting that the carcasses were split into left and right portions. A foetal or neonate pig radius was also found and suggests that pigs were also reared on site.

The pottery suggests that there was low-intensity activity on site in the Late Anglo-Saxon and medieval period. There is notably more material of later medieval date (late 14th – late 16th century) than of pre-14th date. More intensive activity is indicated from the 16th century onwards. A large mix of finds of probable post-medieval and later date suggest the site was extensively disturbed in the 16th century, with just the uppermost 50cm disturbed in the 19th century.
9 Discussion

The small number of archaeological test pits excavated in Little Waldingfield limits the inferences which can be made about the settlement and development of the village, although a few points of interest can nonetheless be noted.

9.1 Prehistoric

Limited prehistoric activity was identified from the test pits, all in the form of un-retouched flakes, which are generally not very diagnostic but appear to date to perhaps the later Neolithic to the later Bronze Age. All were found some distance from any known medieval or later flint building, reducing the likelihood of these being of more recent origin. It is impossible to draw any further inference from such a small number of finds other than to suggest there were one or more episodes of activity of some sort in the area in the prehistoric period.

9.2 Roman period

No pottery of Roman (43-410 AD) date was found in any of the pits. This does not necessarily indicate complete depopulation, as it has been found that only around 17% of pits in eastern England produce any pottery of this date (Cooper 2013, 32), its absence is statistically to be expected with just five pits excavated, not all to natural, at Little Waldingfield. That said, where settlement of Roman date is found to be present, a much higher percentage of pits produce pottery, so its absence from Little Waldingfield may be taken to hint at the possibility (but no more) that settlement was present in the immediate vicinity on this period.

9.3 Anglo-Saxon period

Likewise, no pottery was found dating to the early or middle Anglo-Saxon period (410-850 AD). Again, this does not necessarily indicate complete depopulation, as pottery is less widely used at this time – on average fewer than 2% of test pits in eastern England produce pottery of either early or middle Anglo-Saxon date (Lewis in preparation). Thus, with just five excavated in Little Waldingfield, it is not surprising that none has been found. Test pit excavations elsewhere indicate that material of early or middle Anglo-Saxon date is likely to occur close to sites producing Romano-British material (Cooper 2013) and thus its absence from Little Waldingfield might be correlated with the absence of Romano-British material, although the number of pits is too small to make such an inference statistically tenable.

The picture changes in the later Anglo-Saxon/Saxo-Norman period, with two out of the five pits (40%) producing Thetford Ware pottery dating broadly to this period. This is considerably more than the average for the eastern region of 19% (Cooper 2013, 32), but again, the small number of excavated pits makes valid statistical comparisons impossible. It is notable that neither of the excavated pits produced more than a single sherd (compared to a regional average of c. 9%), which would normally be taken as more likely to indicate low-intensity use such as arable rather than settlement in the vicinity. However, given that manuring is not widely observed around last Anglo-Saxon sites, and that neither of the Little Waldingfield pits where Thetford Ware was found were excavated to natural, it is reasonable to suggest that further material might be present and that the data might possibly therefore be indicative of settlement at this date in the area around the present T-
junction between the Street and Church Road, just north-west of the present church. Although no mention is made of Little Waldingfield in Domesday Book, on balance it seems more likely than not that settlement of some sort was present here at that time, although, no inference can be made regarding the likely size and layout of this putative settlement from the present small number of excavated pits.

9.4 High medieval period

Four of the five pits (90% of those excavated) produced pottery of high medieval date (early 12th - early 14th century), all producing more than the single sherd which might be expected from arable manuring. This is much higher than the regional average of around 40%. However, pits LWA/13/4 and LWA/13/5 both only produced two sherds, and are relatively unlikely to indicate settlement in the immediate vicinity. However as neither were excavated to natural, and it is impossible to know whether more material of this date might have been found had the pits been fully excavated. Although statistical comparisons with regional averages are of little meaning with such small numbers of pits excavated, the pottery data do clearly suggest that settlement was present in the vicinity of test pit two, and tentatively indicate that it might have extended further around the T-junction in the centre of the village and close to the church. Further test pitting would be needed along all three roads into the village to try and determine the size of the medieval village, to expand on the established settlement round the church.

9.5 Late medieval period

Three pits in Little Waldingfield (60% of those excavated) produced pottery of late medieval date (late 14th – late 16th century). This is much higher than the regional average of around 20% (Lewis in preparation), although again, the small number of pits excavated here make such observations relatively meaningless, although it is interesting to note the village lies in an area where several settlements do not show the sharp decline in late medieval pottery volumes which is typical elsewhere in the eastern region. Test pit LWA/13/2 produced a very large number of shreds (47), clearly indicative of settlement in the immediate vicinity. All three pits which produced late medieval pottery are clustered tightly together around the junction between Church Road and The Street, hinting at the possibility that settlement at this time was concentrated in this area. Further work would be needed to determine whether settlement at this time was restricted to this area only.

9.6 Post-medieval period

Four of the pits produced post-medieval pottery, with LWA/13/2 and LWA/13/5 doing so in very large quantities. Although it is difficult to extrapolate from such a small number of pits, it does seem likely that this is indicative of rising levels of population, and probably of prosperity derived from the local broadcloth industry.

The faunal remains that were excavated suggest that the village had a sole reliance on livestock species, with no evidence so far found for use of any wild fauna.
10 Conclusion

Overall, the archaeological test pit excavation programme carried out in Little Waldingfield in 2013 fulfilled its aims of advancing understanding of the past development of the settlement and providing an opportunity for local school children to get involved in excavation within their own locality.

Although limited in number and extent, the archaeological evidence gained from the excavations at Little Waldingfield have provided some evidence for the prehistoric use of the landscape, and the development of settlement in the late Anglo-Saxon and medieval periods, hinting at the possibility that a hamlet was present in the late Anglo-Saxon period which expanded in the high medieval period and proved relatively resilient in the later medieval period before expanding again in the post-medieval.

The evidence from the excavations also allows inferences to be drawn about the volume and extent of further evidence of archaeological value remaining buried under the streets, gardens and houses of the existing homes in Little Waldingfield. The 2013 excavations clearly indicate there is a high probability of these being present, and that the value of such evidence for further advancing understanding of the historic development of the settlement is also likely to be high. This information should be of use in managing this resource in the future, should further excavation be possible in the future.
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13 Appendices

13.1 Pottery – Paul Blinkhorn

THET: Thetford ware. So-called because archaeologists first found it in Thetford, but the first place to make it was Ipswich, around AD850. Potters first began to make it in Thetford sometime around AD925, and carried on until around AD1100. Many kilns are known from the town. It was made in Norwich from about AD1000, and soon after at many of the main towns in England at that time. The pots are usually grey, and the clay has lots of tiny grains of sand in it, making the surface feel a little like fine sandpaper. Most pots were simple jars, but very large storage pots over 1m high were also made, along with jugs, bowls and lamps. It is found all over East Anglia and eastern England as far north as Lincoln and as far south as London.

EMW: Early Medieval Sandy Ware: AD1100-1400. Hard fabric with plentiful quartz sand mixed in with the clay. Manufactured at a wide range of generally unknown sites all over eastern England. Mostly cooking pots, but bowls and occasionally jugs also known.

HED: Hedingham Ware: Late 12th – 14th century. Fine orange/red glazed pottery, made at Sible Hedingham in Essex. The surfaces of the sherds have a sparkly appearance due to there being large quantities of mica, a glassy mineral, in the clay. Pots usually glazed jugs.

LMT: Late medieval ware. 1400 – 1550. Very hard red pottery with lots of sand visible in the clay body. Main type of pots were big glazed jugs, some with geometric designs painted on them in white liquid clay (‘slip’).

GRE: Glazed Red Earthenwares: Fine sandy earthenware, usually with a brown or green glaze, usually on the inner surface. Made at numerous locations all over England. Occurs in a range of practical shapes for use in the households of the time, such as large mixing bowls, cauldrons and frying pans. It was first made around the middle of the 16th century, and in some places continued in use until the 19th century.

GS: German Stonewares. First made around AD1450, and still made today. Made at lots of places along the river Rhine in Germany, such as Cologne, Siegburg and Frechen. Very hard grey clay fabric, with the outer surface of the pot often having a mottled brown glaze, with some having blue and purple painted decoration, and others moulded medallions (‘prunts’) with coat-of-arms or mythical scenes on them. The most common vessel type was the mug, used in taverns in Britain and all over the world. Surviving records from the port of London (‘port books’) show that millions such pots were brought in by boat from Germany from around AD1500 onwards.

BW: Border Ware. AD1550-1700. Everyday pottery made from a white clay, with a green, yellow or brown glaze. The potters worked in the Surrey/Hampshire border region, at places such as Farnborough Hill, Ash and Hawley. Lots of different types of pots were made, catering for all the household needs of the people of the time.

HSW: Harlow Slipware. Similar to glazed red earthenware (GRE), but with painted designs in yellow liquid clay (‘slip’) under the glaze. Made at many places between 1600 and 1700, but the most famous and earliest factory was at Harlow in Essex.

DW: Delft ware. The first white-glazed pottery to be made in Britain. Called Delft ware because of the fame of the potteries at Delft in Holland, which were amongst the first to
make it. Soft, cream coloured fabric with a thick white glaze, often with painted designs in blue, purple and yellow. First made in Britain in Norwich around AD1600, and continued in use until the 19th century. The 17th century pots were expensive table wares such as dishes or bowls, but by the 19th century, better types of pottery was being made, and it was considered very cheap and the main types of pot were such as chamber pots and ointment jars.

**SS: Staffordshire Slipware.** Made between about AD1640 and 1750. This was the first pottery to be made in moulds in Britain since Roman times. The clay fabric is usually a pale buff colour, and the main product was flat dishes and plates, but cups were also made. These are usually decorated with thin brown stripes and a yellow glaze, or yellow stripes and a brown glaze.

**EST: English Stoneware:** Very hard, grey fabric with white and/or brown surfaces. First made in Britain at the end of the 17th century, became very common in the 18th and 19th century, particularly for mineral water or ink bottles and beer jars.

**SWSG: Staffordshire White Salt-Glazed Stoneware.** Hard, white pottery with a white glaze with a texture like orange peel. Made between 1720 and 1780, pots usually table wares such as tea bowls, tankards and plates.

**VIC: ‘Victorian’.** A wide range of different types of pottery, particularly the cups, plates and bowls with blue decoration which are still used today. First made around AD1800.

### Results

No = number of sherds of pottery  
Wt = weight of the sherds in grams

#### Test Pit 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP</th>
<th>Cntxt</th>
<th>EMW No</th>
<th>EMW Wt</th>
<th>LMT No</th>
<th>LMT Wt</th>
<th>GRE No</th>
<th>GRE Wt</th>
<th>DW No</th>
<th>DW Wt</th>
<th>SWSG No</th>
<th>SWSG Wt</th>
<th>VIC No</th>
<th>VIC Wt</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1400-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1400-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1100-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1550-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the pottery from this test-pit is Victorian, but the presence of small quantities of medieval and later wares suggests that there has been activity at this site from the 12th century to the present. The fact that there are only three medieval sherds suggests that it may have been fields at that time.
Test Pit 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP</th>
<th>Cntxt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1200-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1550-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>1550-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1400-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1100-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1100-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This test-pit produced a wide range of pottery types, and large quantities of sherds. It all suggests that the site has been continually occupied since the 12th century.

Test Pit 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP</th>
<th>Cntxt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1800-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1800-1900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This test-pit produced very little pottery, and it is all Victorian, suggesting that the site was not used by people before that time.

Test Pit 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP</th>
<th>Cntxt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1800-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1200-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pottery from this test-pit suggests that there was low level activity at the site in the late Saxon or Saxon Norman and early medieval periods. It then seems to have been abandoned until the 16th century, and has been in use ever since, although it may have been marginal land, such as fields or similar.
The pottery from this test-pit suggests that there was low level activity at the site in the late Saxon or Saxon Norman and medieval periods, although it may have had a marginal use, as fields or similar. It then seems to have been continually occupied from the 16th century onwards.

| TP | Cntxt | THET No. | Wt | EMW No. | Wt | HED No. | Wt | LMT No. | Wt | GRE No. | Wt | GS No. | Wt | DW No. | Wt | EST No. | Wt | SWSG No. | Wt | VIC No. | Wt | Date Range |
|----|-------|-----------|----|---------|----|---------|----|---------|----|---------|----|--------|----|---------|----|---------|----|---------|----|-----------|
| 5  | 1     | 1         | 2  | 1       | 3  | 1       | 3  | 1       | 1  | 1       | 1  | 29     | 65 | 1200-1900 |
| 5  | 2     | 2         | 8  | 1       | 17 | 82      | 195| 1550-1900 |
| 5  | 3     | 1         | 3  | 4       | 25 | 1       | 1  | 39      | 90 | 1400-1900 |
| 5  | 4     | 1         | 4  | 1       | 3  | 7       | 37 | 1       | 4  | 26      | 40 | 900-1900 |
| 5  | 5     | 1         | 9  | 173     |    | 2       | 12 | 1       | 2  | 4       | 4  | 1550-1900 |
| 5  | 6     | 1         | 3  | 15      | 228| 1       | 4  | 4       | 12 | 4       | 16 | 13      | 4  | 1400-1750 |
| 5  | 7     | 1         |    | 2       | 24 |         |    |         |    |         |    | 1550-1600 |
| 5  | 8     | 1         | 4  | 7       | 48 | 3       | 53 | 1       | 4  | 4       | 12 | 16      | 1  | 1400-1600 |
13.2 Animal Bone – *Vida Rajkovaca*

Small scale investigations at Little Waldingfield resulted in the recovery of an assemblage totaling 159 assessable specimens, of which 57 were possible to assign to species level (35.8%; Tables 6 and 7). Three main food species were identified: cattle, sheep/goat and pigs, as well as chicken, rabbit and cat. Pottery material came from contexts ranging in date and spanning the last ten centuries, although the majority of bone appears to have come from later contexts, mainly Victorian in date. The assemblage was overall moderately preserved. Gnawing was rare, recorded on four specimens only.

*Methods: Identification, quantification and ageing*

The zooarchaeological investigation followed the system implemented by Bournemouth University with all identifiable elements recorded (NISP: Number of Identifiable Specimens) and diagnostic zoning (amended from Dobney & Reilly 1988) used to calculate MNE (Minimum Number of Elements) from which MNI (Minimum Number of Individuals) was derived. Identification of the assemblage was undertaken with the aid of Schmid (1972), and reference material from the Cambridge Archaeological Unit. Most, but not all, caprine bones are difficult to identify to species however, it was possible to identify a selective set of elements as sheep or goat from the assemblage, using the criteria of Boessneck (1969) and Halstead (Halstead et al. 2002).

**Test pit 1**
Animal bone was scarce and the only identifiable specimen was a cow loose molar.

**Test pit 2**
Material came from a number of contexts, and a wide range of dates. The majority of bone came from late medieval and early post-medieval contexts, as well as from Victorian contexts. Those contexts with larger quantities of pottery typically generated relatively large quantities of animal bone. It was not possible to note any butchery marks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>TP.1</th>
<th>TP.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total to species</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle-sized</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep-sized</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal n.f.i.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird n.f.i.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Number of Identified Specimens for all species from test pits 1 and 2; the abbreviation n.f.i. denotes that the specimen could not be further identified.

**Test pit 3**
Context [2] contained a sheep/goat astragalus and a fragment of a cow pelvis. The small quantity of bone mirrors the small quantity of Victorian pottery recovered from this pit.

**Test pit 4**
Bone came from contexts [1] and [2], with pottery evidence suggesting low levels of activity from the 12th century. A cattle-sized limb bone fragment from [2] showed a clear sawing mark. Sheep/goat loose tooth was the only identifiable specimen.
Test pit 5

Dominated by the remains of sheep/ goat, test pit 5 was relatively rich in animal bone. Contexts [5] and [6] generated more material than others. These two contexts also yielded more pottery than others, probably suggesting a continued occupation from the 16th century onwards.

Two sheep/ goat vertebrae ([5] and [6]) was chopped axially, an action indicating splitting of carcasses into left and right portions. This butchery action is often noted in prehistory, yet it does not become common until the 16th century. A pig radius aged as foetal/ neonate is an indication that pigs were most likely reared on site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>TP.3</th>
<th>TP.4</th>
<th>TP.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/ goat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total to species</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Number of Identified Specimens for all species from test pits 3-5; the abbreviation n.f.i. denotes that the specimen could not be further identified.

The general characteristics of the assemblage with its exclusive reliance on livestock species is in keeping with the majority of domestic assemblages from across the country. The low incidence of butchery marks may be a recovery bias, although a few positively recorded butchery marks are a clear indication of the assemblage’s domestic character.

The site appears to have been occupied since the Norman times, with the occupation intensifying in the Post-Medieval and Victorian periods. This being said, the preservation and the quantity of the recovered material are suggesting the area was the periphery of the settlement.

13.3 Flint – Lawrence Billington

A small assemblage of five worked flints and a single unworked burnt flint was recovered from the test pitting. The worked flint consists of entirely of unretouched flakes. Whilst not strongly diagnostic, the technological traits of these pieces suggest a relatively expedient approach to core reduction using direct hard hammer percussion with no platform preparation resulting in relatively squat and broad removals of varied morphology. This material is likely to relate to later prehistoric flint working, probably no earlier than the later Neolithic and perhaps dating as late as the later Bronze Age. It is possible, however, that any of the flakes may derive from medieval or later activity related to building construction.
Table 8: Quantification of the flint assemblage.

13.4 Other Finds – Catherine Ranson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pit 1</th>
<th>Ceramic (excluding pottery)</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Metal &amp; metal-working</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. 2</td>
<td>red flat tile x15 =411g, red CBM x70 =672g, yellow/pink CBM =92g, clay pipe stem x2 =5g</td>
<td>green bottle glass =4g, clear container glass x9 =29g, clear flat glass x4 =8g</td>
<td>horseshoe fragments? x12 =257g, corroded iron nails x11 =48g, corroded iron bolt =40g, corroded iron scraps x9 =125g</td>
<td>coal x6 =31g</td>
<td>slate x2 =2g, pink child’s hair clip =&lt;1g, orange plastic fragments x2 =1g, concrete x3 =19g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
<td>clay pipe stem =2g, clay pipe bowl fragment =1g, red CBM =2g</td>
<td>clear container glass x5 =6g, green bottle glass =1g</td>
<td>corroded iron nails x3 =18g, horseshoe fragments x2 =44g, corroded iron scraps x4 =26g</td>
<td>coal x5 =5g</td>
<td>slate =&lt;1g, material fragments x2 =&lt;1g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.4</td>
<td>red CBM x14 =76g, clay pipe stem x2 =8g</td>
<td>clear container glass =6g, clear flat glass x2 =3g, green bottle glass x2 =3g</td>
<td>small corroded metal blade? =17g, corroded iron nail =4g, corrode iron scrap =4g</td>
<td>coal x30 =47g</td>
<td>oyster shell =&lt;1g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.5</td>
<td>red flat tile x10 =278g, red CBM x20 =127g, clay pipe stem =&lt;1g</td>
<td>corroded iron nails x2 =4g, corroded iron lump =21g</td>
<td>corroded iron nails x3 =18g, corroded lumps of metal x6 =37g</td>
<td>coal x9 =13g, round stone ball =24g</td>
<td>mortar =5g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pit 2</th>
<th>Ceramic (excluding pottery)</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Metal &amp; metal-working</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. 1</td>
<td>red CBM x22 =81g, clay pipe stem =2g, clay pipe bowl fragment =4g</td>
<td>clear container glass x3 =16g, green bottle glass x2 =10g, clear flat glass x2 =4g</td>
<td>rectangular flat plate of corroded metal =84g, corroded iron nails x3 =18g, corroded lumps of metal x6 =37g</td>
<td>coal x44 =221g</td>
<td>mortar x3 =12g, concrete x5 =30g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Pit 3</td>
<td>Ceramic (excluding pottery)</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Metal &amp; metal-working</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 1</td>
<td>clay pipe stem =1g, red flat tile =12g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 2</td>
<td>clay pipe stem x4 =6g, red flat tile =12g, red CBM =16g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Pit 4</td>
<td>Ceramic (excluding pottery)</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Metal &amp; metal-working</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>red CBM =4g, modern red/pink CBM =3g</td>
<td>green bottle glass x2 =12g, clear container glass x4 =8g</td>
<td></td>
<td>coal =&gt;1g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2</td>
<td>red flat tile =11g, red CBM x2 =4g, clay pipe stem x2 =2g</td>
<td>clear complete small rounded glass bottle =69g, green bottle glass x4 =4g, clear flat glass x4 =3g</td>
<td></td>
<td>coal =&gt;1g</td>
<td>red plastic fragment =1g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
<td>clay pipe stem x3 =6g, clay pipe bowl fragment? =&lt;1g</td>
<td>round clear glass vase base? =55g, green bottle glass x2 =3g, clear container glass x5 =13g, clear flat glass x3 =5g</td>
<td>corroded square iron nails x26 =152g, corroded lump of metal =11g, modern nail =2g, square corroded iron nails x2 =44g</td>
<td>coal x5 =9g</td>
<td>mortar =13g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.4</td>
<td>clay pipe stem x8 =29g, clay pipe bowl fragment =4g</td>
<td>fragment of clear and coloured glass marble? =2g, clear container glass x2 =27g, clear flat glass x9 =9g, green bottle glass x4 =17g, orange bottle glass =3g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.5</td>
<td>clay pipe stem x12 =35g, clay pipe bowl fragment x2 =5g, red CBM x3 =25g</td>
<td>fragment of small horseshoe? =12g, thin scrap of copper? =&lt;1g, corroded iron nails x7 =35g, corroded iron lumps x7 =43g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>silver milk bottle top =&lt;1g, shells fragments x3 =&lt;1g, slate pencil fragment? =&lt;1g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pit 5</th>
<th>Ceramic (excluding pottery)</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Metal &amp; metal-working</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>red CBM x2 =1g clay pipe stem x2 =6g, clay pipe bowl fragment =2g, white modern glazed tile =2g</td>
<td>round clear glass vase base? =55g, green bottle glass x2 =3g, clear container glass x5 =13g, clear flat glass x3 =5g</td>
<td>corroded square iron nails x5 =27g, thin metal wire =&lt;1g, corroded iron nails x14 =63g, decorated metal button =6g</td>
<td>coal x5 =9g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2</td>
<td>clay pipe stem x3 =6g, clay pipe bowl fragment? =&lt;1g</td>
<td>green bottle glass x2 =12g, orange bottle glass =3g, clear container glass x13 =33g, clear flat glass x16 =16g</td>
<td>corroded iron nails x26 =152g, corroded lump of metal =11g, modern nail =2g, square corroded iron nails x2 =44g</td>
<td></td>
<td>central battery core =1g, fragment of black lino? =&lt;1g, slate =1g, material scrap =&lt;1g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
<td>clay pipe stem x12 =35g, clay pipe bowl fragment x2 =5g, red CBM x3 =25g</td>
<td>fragment of clear and coloured glass marble? =2g, clear container glass x2 =27g, clear flat glass x9 =9g, green bottle glass x4 =17g, orange bottle glass =3g</td>
<td>fragment of small horseshoe? =12g, thin scrap of copper? =&lt;1g, corroded iron nails x7 =35g, corroded iron lumps x7 =43g</td>
<td></td>
<td>silver milk bottle top =&lt;1g, shells fragments x3 =&lt;1g, slate pencil fragment? =&lt;1g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.4</td>
<td>clay pipe stem x8 =29g, clay pipe bowl fragment =4g</td>
<td>clear flat glass x6 =4g, degraded clear container glass x2 =4g, degraded green bottle glass =14g, medieval glass? =2g</td>
<td>copper bracket? =4g, lump of corroded metal =23g, thin strip of metal =&lt;1g</td>
<td>coal x23 =122g</td>
<td>slate x11 =79g, silver foil fragment =&lt;1g, mortar =2g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.5</td>
<td>flat dark yellow tile?</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>201g</td>
<td>clay pipe stem</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=30g, clay pipe stem</td>
<td>x61</td>
<td>=201g</td>
<td>red/pink CBM</td>
<td>=2g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>green bottle glass x7</td>
<td>=180g</td>
<td>clear flat glass</td>
<td>x8</td>
<td>=9g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.6</td>
<td>clay pipe stem</td>
<td>x45</td>
<td>=152g</td>
<td>clay pipe bowl fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clear flat glass</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>=4g</td>
<td>degraded green bottle base</td>
<td>=162g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coal x5</td>
<td>=7g</td>
<td>oyster shell</td>
<td>x11</td>
<td>=72g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.7</td>
<td>clay pipe stem</td>
<td>x6</td>
<td>=28g</td>
<td>clay pipe bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>green flat glass</td>
<td>=&lt;1g</td>
<td>fragments of scrap metal</td>
<td>x3</td>
<td>=5g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.8</td>
<td>clay pipe stem</td>
<td>x3</td>
<td>=5g</td>
<td>clay pipe bowl fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thin square metal plates with small holes through them</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>=8g</td>
<td>corroded iron nails</td>
<td>x2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.5 Maps

Much of the value of the test pit data from currently occupied rural settlements are derived from a holistic consideration across the entire settlement. Maps showing a range of the data from the excavations in Little Waldingfield in 2013 are included below. These may be read in conjunction with relevant sections of the main report. Some of these maps are available online at [http://www.access.arch.cam.ac.uk/reports/suffolk/little-waldingfield](http://www.access.arch.cam.ac.uk/reports/suffolk/little-waldingfield) and these can be used, if wished, to prepare maps showing the distribution of other classes of data not depicted in this appendix.
Figure 10: Late Saxon pottery distribution map from Little Waldingfield
Figure 11: High Medieval pottery distribution map from Little Waldingfield
Figure 12: Late Medieval pottery distribution map from Little Waldingfield
Figure 13: Post Medieval pottery distribution map from Little Waldingfield
Figure 1. 19th century pottery distribution map from Little Waldingfield.

- **Disturbed levels**
  - 1 sherd 4g or less
  - 1 sherd 5g or more
  - 2-4 sherds
  - 5 sherds or more

- **Undisturbed levels**
  - 1 sherd 4g or less
  - 1 sherd 5g or more
  - 2-4 sherds
  - 5 sherds or more

Little Waldingfield 2013
Test pits containing pottery dating to the 19th century AD.
Figure 15: Distribution of burnt stone from Little Waldingfield test pits
Figure 16: Distribution of secondary flint flakes from Little Waldingfield test pits
Figure 17: Distribution of tertiary flint flakes from Little Waldingfield test pits
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Figure 18: Distribution of cow bone from Little Waldingfield test pits
Figure 19: Distribution of sheep/goat bone from Little Waldingfield test pits
Figure 20: Distribution of pig bone from Little Waldingfield test pits
Figure 21: Distribution of rabbit bone from Little Waldingfield test pits
Figure 22: Distribution of chicken bone from Little Waldingfield test pits
Figure 23: Distribution of cat bone from Little Waldingfield test pits