

**CASTLES, SIEGEWORKS  
AND SETTLEMENTS:  
SURVEYING THE  
ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE  
TWELFTH CENTURY**

**Edited by**

**Duncan W. Wright  
Oliver H. Creighton**

**ARCHAEOPRESS ARCHAEOLOGY**

ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD

Gordon House  
276 Banbury Road  
Oxford OX2 7ED

[www.archaeopress.com](http://www.archaeopress.com)

ISBN 978 1 78491 476 9  
ISBN 978 1 78491 477 6 (e-Pdf)

© Archaeopress and the individual authors 2016

Cover: Geophysical survey being undertaken at the Rings, Corfe Castle, Dorset. Photo: Oliver Creighton

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, in any form or  
by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise,  
without the prior written permission of the copyright owners.

Printed in England by Holywell Press, Oxford  
This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website [www.archaeopress.com](http://www.archaeopress.com)

# Contents

<b>List of Figures</b> .....	v
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	ix
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	xi
<b>Chapter 1 Introduction: Surveying the Archaeology of Twelfth-Century England</b> .....	1
Civil War in King Stephen’s Reign.....	1
Approaches, Methodologies and Challenges.....	2
The Structure of this Volume.....	4
<b>Chapter 2 Burwell Castle, Cambridgeshire</b> .....	6
Duncan Wright, Oliver Creighton, Steven Trick and Michael Fradley	
Abstract.....	6
Introduction.....	6
Historical and Archaeological Background.....	7
Prehistoric and Roman .....	7
Early Medieval.....	7
The Castle.....	8
Later Medieval and Post-Medieval.....	11
Map Analysis.....	11
Earthwork Description and Interpretation .....	13
Geophysical Survey Results and Interpretation .....	17
Magnetometry .....	17
Earth Resistance .....	17
Discussion .....	23
<b>Chapter 3 Castle Carlton, East Lindsey, Lincolnshire</b> .....	26
Duncan Wright, Steven Trick, Oliver Creighton, and Michael Fradley	
Abstract.....	26
Introduction .....	26
The Physical Setting .....	27
Archaeological and Historical Background.....	28
Map Analysis.....	30
Earthwork Description and Interpretation .....	30
Area A.....	31
Area B.....	32
Area C.....	34
Magnetometry Results and Interpretation .....	34
Discussion .....	35
Conclusion .....	39
<b>Chapter 4 Corfe, ‘The Rings’, Dorset</b> .....	40
Duncan Wright, Michael Fradley and Oliver Creighton	
Abstract.....	40
Introduction .....	40
Historical and Archaeological Background.....	40
Map Analysis.....	42
Earthwork Description and Interpretation .....	44
Geophysical Survey Results and Interpretation .....	44
Magnetometer .....	45
Earth Resistance Survey .....	45
LiDAR Analysis .....	47
Discussion .....	47
Summary.....	49

<b>Chapter 5 Crowmarsh Recreation Ground, South Oxfordshire</b> .....	49
Michael Fradley, Duncan Wright and Oliver Creighton	
Introduction .....	49
Historical and Archaeological Background.....	50
Map Analysis.....	51
Geophysical Survey Results and Interpretation .....	53
Earthwork Description and Interpretation .....	54
Discussion .....	55
<b>Chapter 6 Folly Hill, Faringdon, Oxfordshire</b> .....	57
Duncan Wright, Steven Trick and Oliver Creighton	
Summary.....	57
Introduction .....	57
Historical and Archaeological Background.....	58
Map Analysis.....	60
Geophysical Survey Results and Interpretation .....	61
Area A.....	64
Area B.....	64
Area C.....	65
Summary .....	65
Earthwork Description and Interpretation .....	65
Discussion .....	69
<b>Chapter 7 Hailes Camp, Gloucestershire</b> .....	71
Michael Fradley, Duncan Wright and Oliver Creighton	
Abstract.....	71
Introduction .....	72
Historical and Archaeological Background.....	72
Map Analysis.....	74
Archaeo-Topographical Survey at Hailes Camp .....	74
LiDAR Analysis.....	77
Discussion .....	79
Conclusion .....	79
<b>Chapter 8 Hamstead Marshall, Castle I, Berkshire</b> .....	82
Duncan Wright, Michael Fradley and Oliver Creighton	
Abstract.....	82
Introduction .....	82
Historical and Archaeological Background.....	82
Map Analysis.....	87
Earthwork Description and Interpretation .....	88
Geophysical Survey Results and Interpretation .....	92
Magnetometry .....	92
Earth Resistance .....	92
Discussion / Conclusion .....	94
<b>Chapter 9 Malmebury, ‘Cams’s Hill’, Wiltshire</b> .....	96
Duncan Wright, Michael Fradley and Oliver Creighton	
Summary.....	96
Introduction .....	96
Historical and Archaeological Background.....	96
Map Analysis.....	99
Geophysical Survey Results and Interpretation .....	100

Magnetometry .....	100
Earth Resistance .....	100
Earthwork Description and Interpretation .....	100
Discussion .....	102
Conclusion .....	104
<b>Chapter 10 Mountsorrel, Leicestershire .....</b>	<b>105</b>
Steven Trick, Duncan Wright and Oliver Creighton	
Abstract.....	105
Introduction .....	105
Archaeological and Historical Background.....	107
Mountsorrel Castle.....	107
Mountsorrel Town.....	108
Earthwork Description and Interpretation .....	109
Upper Plateau .....	110
Lower Plateau .....	111
Earth Resistance Results and Interpretation.....	112
Discussion .....	113
Conclusion .....	116
Acknowledgements .....	116
<b>Chapter 11 Rampton, ‘Giant’s Hill’, Cambridgeshire .....</b>	<b>118</b>
Duncan Wright, Steven Trick and Oliver Creighton	
Abstract.....	118
Introduction .....	118
Historical and Archaeological Background.....	118
Map Analysis.....	120
Earthwork Description and Interpretation .....	121
Geophysical Survey: Methodology, Results and Interpretation.....	122
Area A.....	122
Area B.....	122
Area C.....	122
Summary.....	122
Discussion / Conclusion .....	123
<b>Chapter 12 Wellow, Nottinghamshire .....</b>	<b>130</b>
Steven Trick, Duncan Wright and Oliver Creighton	
Abstract.....	130
Introduction .....	130
Historical and Archaeological Background.....	131
Map Analysis.....	132
Earth Resistance Survey: Results and Interpretation .....	133
Stonebank .....	133
Unnamed field, south of St Swithin’s church .....	133
Summary .....	134
Earthwork Description and Interpretation .....	134
Gorge Dyke.....	134
Nine Lanes.....	140
Woodside Farm .....	140
Northern Hollow Way .....	141
Jordan’s Castle.....	141
Moat Farm.....	142
Other earthworks.....	142
Discussion .....	143
Conclusion .....	145

<b>Chapter 13 Woodwalton, 'Church End', Cambridgeshire.....</b>	<b>146</b>
Duncan Wright, Michael Fradley and Oliver Creighton	
Abstract.....	146
Introduction.....	146
The Castle .....	148
Historical and Archaeological Context .....	148
Map Analysis.....	149
Earthwork Description and Interpretation.....	150
Magnetometry Results and Interpretation.....	152
Discussion .....	153
<b>Chapter 14 Conclusion .....</b>	<b>156</b>
Surveying the Civil War: Results and Implications .....	156
The Future of the Anarchy: Further Research Avenues .....	158
<b>References .....</b>	<b>160</b>
Abbreviations.....	160
Primary Sources.....	160
Secondary Sources.....	161

# List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Magnetometry survey underway at Folly Hill, Faringdon, Oxfordshire, during the War and Status project. ....	3
Figure 1.2: Resistivity survey being carried out for the War and Status project at the Rings, Corfe Castle, Dorset.....	3
Figure 1.3: Topographical survey using differential GPS at Burwell castle, Cambridgeshire, for the War and Status project.....	4
Figure 2.1: The location of Burwell in southern Britain and the survey area in its local landscape. ....	6
Figure 2.2: Lethbridge leading excavations in the castle ditch at Burwell, 1935.....	10
Figure 2.3: Stone building foundations, apparently of medieval date, excavated by Lethbridge in the 1930s. ....	10
Figure 2.4: Photograph of Burwell castle during the 1930s, looking south east .....	12
Figure 2.5: Burwell castle today, looking west across the moat towards the parish church .....	12
Figure 2.6: Enclosure map of Burwell castle and the surrounding landscape (dated 1817) .....	13
Figure 2.7: Tithe Map of Burwell (dated 1842) showing the site of the castle as a rectilinear enclosure covered in vegetation ...	14
Figure 2.8: OS First Edition 25" of Burwell castle, dated to 1890. ....	14
Figure 2.9: Hachured earthwork plan of Burwell castle .....	15
Figure 2.10: Annotated hachured plan of Burwell castle. ....	15
Figure 2.11: Results of magnetometry survey overlaid on earthwork survey at Burwell castle. ....	18
Figure 2.12: Interpretive plan of anomalies identified by magnetometry survey at Burwell castle.....	19
Figure 2.13: Results of the earth resistance survey overlaid on earthwork survey at Burwell castle. ....	20
Figure 2.14: Interpretive plan of anomalies identified by resistance survey at Burwell castle .....	21
Figure 3.1: Castle Carlton in the local landscape and its position within central England .....	26
Figure 3.2: View across the deserted site of Castle Carlton 'new town', looking west, with the tree-covered earthworks of the castle..	27
Figure 3.3: OS First Edition 25" of Castle Carlton .....	30
Figure 3.4: The three topographic survey areas at Castle Carlton.....	31
Figure 3.5: Earthwork plan of Castle Carlton. ....	32
Figure 3.6: Annotated earthwork plan of Survey Area A at Castle Carlton. ....	32
Figure 3.7: Annotated earthwork plan of Survey Area B at Castle Carlton.....	33
Figure 3.8: Annotated earthwork plan of Survey Area C at Castle Carlton.....	35
Figure 3.9: Magnetometry survey plot of Castle Carlton. ....	36
Figure 3.10: Interpretation of anomalies identified by magnetometry survey at Castle Carlton.....	36
Figure 3.11: Viewshed map from a 2m elevation from the top of the motte at Castle Carlton .....	37
Figure 4.1: The situation of the Rings in relation to Corfe Castle, and the location of Corfe Castle in southern Britain.....	41
Figure 4.2: The Rings, looking south.....	41
Figure 4.3: Detail from 1775 Estate Map of the Corfe Castle area. ....	43
Figure 4.4: Ordnance Survey First Edition map of the Rings, published in 1889. ....	43
Figure 4.5: Hachured earthworks plan of the Rings. ....	44
Figure 4.6: Magnetometry survey being carried out at the Rings. ....	45
Figure 4.7: Magnetometry survey plot of the Rings overlaid on hachured earthwork plan. ....	46
Figure 4.8: Interpretation of magnetometry survey at the Rings overlaid on hachured earthwork plan. ....	46
Figure 4.9: Earth resistance survey plot of the Rings overlaid on hachured earthwork plan. ....	46
Figure 4.10: Interpretation of earth resistance survey at the Rings overlaid on hachured earthwork plan.....	46
Figure 4.11: LiDAR hillshade model of the Rings and surrounding landscape.....	48

Figure 5.1: The location of Crowmarsh within southern Britain and in the local landscape .....	49
Figure 5.2: The survey area in relation to the excavated ditch of ‘Crowmarsh Castle’ identified on the Lister Wilder site to the south-west .....	51
Figure 5.3: OS First Edition 25” (dated 1878) of the western part of Crowmarsh.....	52
Figure 5.4: OS First Edition Second Revision 25” of Crowmarsh, dated 1912 .....	52
Figure 5.5: Magnetometer survey plot of Crowmarsh Recreation Ground.....	53
Figure 5.6: Interpretation of anomalies identified by magnetometry survey at Crowmarsh Recreation Ground.....	53
Figure 5.7: Results of the Crowmarsh Recreation Club magnetometer survey with the ditch of the twelfth-century siegework excavated at the Lister-Wilder site.....	54
Figure 5.8: Archaeology of the Wallingford bridgehead area, showing earthworks, key sites and geophysical anomalies.....	55
Figure 6.1: Location of Folly Hill, Faringdon, in the local landscape and in southern Britain .....	57
Figure 6.2: OS First Edition 25” map showing Folly Hill, Faringdon, published in 1876–7.....	60
Figure 6.3: OS First Edition Revision 25” map showing Folly Hill, Faringdon, published in 1899 .....	61
Figure 6.4: ‘Faringdon Folly’. Major G.W.G Allen Collection .....	62
Figure 6.5: Geophysical survey areas and the location of surveyed grids at Folly Hill, Faringdon.....	62
Figure 6.6: Composite magnetometry results at Folly Hill, Faringdon, with PHF Archaeology Ltd survey overlaid .....	63
Figure 6.7: Magnetometry results from Area A at Folly Hill, Faringdon. ....	63
Figure 6.8: Interpretive plot of anomalies recognised in Area A at Folly Hill, Faringdon.....	66
Figure 6.9: Magnetometry results from Area B at Folly Hill, Faringdon. ....	66
Figure 6.10: Interpretive plot of anomalies recognised in Area B at Folly Hill, Faringdon.....	67
Figure 6.11: Magnetometry results from Area C at Folly Hill, Faringdon .....	67
Figure 6.12: Interpretive plot of anomalies recognised in Survey Area C. ....	68
Figure 6.13: Hachured topographic plan of the earthworks on the summit of Folly Hill. ....	68
Figure 6.14: Plan of excavations at Folly Hill, Faringdon, carried out by Leeds in 1936 overlaid on earthwork plan. ....	69
Figure 7.1: Location of Hailes Camp in southern Britain (inset) and in the local landscape.....	71
Figure 7.2: Hailes as depicted on the OS 25”First Edition map, published in 1884. ....	73
Figure 7.3: Hailes as depicted in the OS 25” First Edition, First Revision, published in 1902. ....	73
Figure 7.4: ‘Hayles Camp’ as surveyed in 1840 by Sir Henry Dryden in 1840, from a copy made in 1888.....	75
Figure 7.5: Hailes as depicted on the OS 1:2500 map, published in 1975.....	75
Figure 7.6: Archaeo-topographical plan of Hailes Camp. ....	76
Figure 7.7: Annotated survey of Hailes Camp. ....	76
Figure 7.8: LiDAR hillshade plot of Hailes Camp.....	77
Figure 7.9: LiDAR hillshade of the Hailes landscape.....	78
Figure 7.10: LiDAR hillshade of the Hailes landscape with interpretation. ....	78
Figure 7.11: Viewshed analysis of Hailes Camp.....	80
Figure 7.12: View from the west of the parish church of Hailes, originally constructed by Ralph of Worcester during the twelfth century. ....	80
Figure 8.1: The location of the surveyed site, Hamstead Marshall Castle, I in southern Britain and in Hamstead Marshall Park. ....	83
Figure 8.2: The site of Castle I, Hamstead Marshall, in the local landscape .....	83
Figure 8.3: View of the surveyed site of Hamstead Marshall Castle I, looking north. ....	84
Figure 8.4: Castles II and III and the parish church of Hamstead Marshall, St Mary’s.....	85
Figure 8.5: Hamstead Marshall Castle II, looking north.....	85
Figure 8.6: Matthias Baker’s 1775 map of Hamstead Marshall.....	87



Figure 8.7: 1840 Tithe Map showing the Hamstead Marshall Estate. ....	88
Figure 8.8: OS First Edition 25", published in 1880. ....	89
Figure 8.9: OS 25" map from 1969 showing the site, now labelled as 'Mound'. ....	89
Figure 8.10: Early photograph of Castle I, Hamstead Marshall, looking east. ....	90
Figure 8.11: Annotated earthwork plan of Castle I, Hamstead Marshall. ....	91
Figure 8.12: Results of the magnetometry survey at Castle I, Hamstead Marshall, plotted against the hachured earthwork plan. ....	92
Figure 8.13: Interpretive plot of magnetometry survey of Castle I, Hamstead Marshall. ....	92
Figure 8.14: Results of the earth resistance survey at Castle I, Hamstead Marshall, overlaid on hachured earthwork plan. ....	93
Figure 8.15: Interpretation of anomalies identified by earth resistance survey at Castle I, Hamstead Marshall. ....	93
Figure 8.16: Viewshed analysis for Castle I, Hamstead Marshall. ....	95
Figure 9.1: The location of Cam's Hill in southern Britain and in relation to Malmesbury. ....	97
Figure 9.2: The Cam's Hill ringwork looking south-east. ....	98
Figure 9.3: Aerial view of Cam's Hill, looking north-west. ....	98
Figure 9.4: 1886 OS First Edition of Cam's Hill. ....	99
Figure 9.5: Earth resistance plot of Cam's Hill. ....	101
Figure 9.6: Interpretation of earth resistance survey at Cam's Hill. ....	101
Figure 9.7: Annotated hachured earthwork plan of Cam's Hill. ....	102
Figure 9.8: LiDAR hillshade image of the Cam's Hill landscape. ....	103
Figure 9.9: Viewshed diagrams of Cam's Hill at 0m elevation, 2m elevation, 5m elevation, and 7m elevation. ....	104
Figure 10.1: Location of Mountsorrel in the local landscape and in Britain. ....	105
Figure 10.2: OS First Edition 25" map of 1884 showing Mountsorrel. ....	106
Figure 10.3: Map of George Watkinson Estates (1816), including Mountsorrel Castle. ....	109
Figure 10.4: Annotated plan of earthworks at Castle Hill, Mountsorrel. ....	110
Figure 10.5: View across upper plateau of Mountsorrel castle from south to north, showing the prominent mound. ....	111
Figure 10.6: LiDAR Digital Terrain Model of Castle Hill revealing the extension of bank and ditch through Watling Street. ....	112
Figure 10.7: Location of the earth resistance survey grids on the upper and lower plateaux of Mountsorrel castle. ....	113
Figure 10.8: Results of the earth resistance survey in the upper plateau of Mountsorrel castle. ....	115
Figure 10.9: Anomalies within the resistance survey of the upper plateau of Mountsorrel castle. ....	115
Figure 10.10: Results of earth resistance survey of the lower plateau of Mountsorrel castle. ....	116
Figure 10.11: Anomalies in the resistance survey of the lower plateau of Mountsorrel castle. ....	116
Figure 10.12: Viewshed analysis from a theoretical tower 8m high on Castle Hill located where the war memorial currently stands. ....	117
Figure 11.1: Location of the survey area in the local landscape and Rampton in southern Britain. ....	119
Figure 11.2: OS First Edition 25" map of Rampton. ....	121
Figure 11.3: Annotated earthwork plan of Giant's Hill, Rampton. ....	122
Figure 11.4: Areas of geophysical survey at Giant's Hill, Rampton. ....	124
Figure 11.5: Results of the earth resistance survey at Giant's Hill, Rampton. ....	124
Figure 11.6: Area A earth resistance results at Giant's Hill, Rampton. ....	125
Figure 11.7: Interpretation of anomalies in Area A at Giant's Hill, Rampton. ....	125
Figure 11.8: Earth resistance results in Area B at Giant's Hill, Rampton. ....	126
Figure 11.9: Interpretation of anomalies in Area B at Giant's Hill, Rampton. ....	126
Figure 11.10: Anomalies identified in Area C at Giant's Hill, Rampton. ....	127
Figure 11.11: Viewshed of Giant's Hill, Rampton. The dot represents the observer, located at an elevation of 2m. ....	128

Figure 12.1: The location of Wellow within southern Britain (inset), and in the local landscape .....	130
Figure 12.2: Rufford parish showing the disappeared villages of Grimston, Cratley and Old Rufford, and the old line of the Great North Road .....	131
Figure 12.3: Plan elements of Wellow based on OS 25" First Edition mapping .....	133
Figure 12.4: View of Stonebank field.....	134
Figure 12.5: The location of the geophysical survey areas within Wellow village.....	136
Figure 12.6: The earth resistance survey results from Stonebank field, overlaid on hachured earthwork plan.....	137
Figure 12.7: Interpretation of the earth-resistance survey results at Stonebank field overlaid on hachured earthwork plan. ...	137
Figure 12.8: Earth resistance survey results of field south of St Swithin's churchyard. ....	138
Figure 12.9: Interpretation of the earth resistance survey results south of St Swithin's church overlaid on hachured earthwork plan. ...	138
Figure 12.10: The profile of Gorge Dyke as recorded by topographic survey.....	139
Figure 12.11: Earthwork survey being undertaken in the back garden adjacent to Stonebank field, looking north-east. ....	139
Figure 12.12: Surface model of the southeast section of the Gorge Dyke earthwork .....	140
Figure 12.13: Ridge and furrow earthworks in Nine Lanes field.....	141
Figure 12.14: Earthworks recorded at Woodside Farm, and the hollow way on Wellow Green .....	142
Figure 12.15: Surface model of earthworks at Moat Farm. Inset: model in 3D .....	143
Figure 13.1: Location of Church End, Woodwalton, in southern Britain, and within the local landscape.....	147
Figure 13.2: View over the Church End earthworks, looking north and showing the site traditionally identified as the vestiges of a motte and bailey castle on a low hilltop. ....	147
Figure 13.3: 1840 Tithe Map of Church End and surrounding landscape .....	149
Figure 13.4: OS First Edition 25" map (1888) of the Church End earthworks and the surrounding landscape .....	150
Figure 13.5: OS Second Revision 25" map (1926) of the Church End earthworks and the surrounding landscape .....	151
Figure 13.6: Earthwork plan of Church End.....	151
Figure 13.7: Annotated earthwork plan of Church End.....	152
Figure 13.8: Plot of magnetometry results at Church End, overlaid on hachured earthwork plan. ....	153
Figure 13.9: Interpretation of magnetometry survey at Church End. ....	154
Figure 13.10: Interpretive plan of earthworks at Church End. ....	155

## List of Tables

Table 2.1: Description and interpretation of magnetometry anomalies at Burwell castle.....	17
Table 2.2: Description and interpretation of earth resistance anomalies at Burwell castle.....	22
Table 3.1: Description and interpretation of magnetometry anomalies at Castle Carlton.....	35
Table 4.1: Description and interpretation of anomalies identified by earth resistance survey at the Rings.....	47
Table 6.1: Description and interpretation of anomalies identified during magnetometer survey at Folly Hill. (1).....	64
Table 6.1: Description and interpretation of anomalies identified during magnetometer survey at Folly Hill. (2).....	65
Table 10.1: Description and interpretation of earth resistance survey anomalies identified at Castle Hill, Mountsorrel.....	114
Table 11.1: Description and interpretation of geophysical anomalies at Giant’s Hill, Rampton.....	123
Table 12.1: Description and interpretation of earth resistance anomalies identified at Wellow.....	135



## Acknowledgements

This edited collection is an output from the Leverhulme Trust research grant *Anarchy? War and Status in Twelfth-Century Landscapes of Conflict* (RPG-2012-734), and the Trust is warmly thanked for its support of the work. This volume comprises a series of site reports detailing the archaeological fieldwork and supporting desk-based research undertaken during the project. A thematically-based volume of synthesis and discussion resulting from the project is available separately (*The Anarchy: War and Status in 12th-Century Landscapes of Conflict*, by O.H. Creighton and D.W. Wright, with contributions by Michael Fradley and Steven Trick, published by Liverpool University Press, 2016). Oliver Creighton was the Principal Investigator on the project. The award employed Duncan Wright as the Project Officer for the duration of the project and Michael Fradley and Steven Trick as Post-Doctoral Research Assistants, for shorter periods of time, for survey and fieldwork expertise and work on the project GIS.

A great number of individuals and organisations made our research possible, but we would especially like to thank Mr and Mrs Hynd of Castle Hill (Mountsorrel Historical Society), Annemarie Gosse, Martin Papworth (National Trust), Gene Webb and the Faringdon Folly Trust, Scott Chaussée and Maggie Eno who undertook elements of survey, the many members of staff at the county archives, collections, museums and Historic Environment Records who assisted us with their expertise, and the parish councils, community groups and local people who enabled our work to take place and provided advice or cups of tea when we were in the field. We would further like to extend our appreciation to all the landowners who permitted fieldwork on their land and Historic England (formerly English Heritage) for providing Scheduled Monument Consents where required. All images were produced for the *War and Status* project unless otherwise stated. Thanks are offered too to Jess Collins who kindly checked an earlier version of this volume and provided constructive feedback, and to Ben Heaney at Archaeopress for his editorial input and patience.

This volume is dedicated to Elizabeth, and in memory of Daniel.



# Chapter 1

## Introduction: Surveying the Archaeology of Twelfth-Century England

This volume comprises twelve reports detailing fieldwork undertaken by a research project which sought to assess the archaeological evidence of the period of conflict that took place in mid-twelfth-century England popularly known as ‘the Anarchy’. The reign of King Stephen (AD 1135–54) was characterised by a protracted struggle for power between forces loyal to the crown and those who supported the Angevin claim of his cousin and rival, the Empress Matilda. Alongside a succession of bitter rebellions the war also saw large-scale Scottish invasions into, and occupation of, large parts of northern England as well as border warfare on the marches between England and Wales and a struggle for control of Normandy. While the period is infamous for the proliferation of conflict, castle-building and siege warfare, and for a breakdown of royal government, its characterisation as ‘the Anarchy’ is now challenged by historians (see Crouch 2000).

As previous understanding of this tumultuous period had rested almost entirely upon interpretation of written sources, *Anarchy? War and Status in Twelfth-Century Landscapes of Conflict* was a programme of research which systematically studied the archaeology of mid-twelfth century England for the first time. Carried out by a team from the University of Exeter and funded by the Leverhulme Trust, *War and Status* placed material culture at the vanguard of research, with the aim of not merely enhancing historical narratives but also seeking to challenge views derived from the written record. Assessment of the material culture relating to the period was undertaken via a series of different avenues and at a variety of scales, the results from which form the basis of the Liverpool University Press volume *The Anarchy: War and Status in 12th-century Landscapes of Conflict* (Creighton and Wright 2016). The reader is referred to this separate, thematically structured, volume for detailed discussion and synthesis of the total material evidence for the period, viewed within its historical context; it extends to cover the conflict’s historical geography, landscapes, military and everyday material culture (including coins), castles, churches, monasteries and settlements. A major component of the project was the targeted archaeological investigation of selected case study locations across England. Geophysical and topographic surveys were supplemented with archival, documentary and cartographic analyses in order to reveal the character and chronological development of a sample of potential Anarchy-period sites and landscapes. The current volume represents the product of these endeavours. It does not duplicate the content of the Liverpool University Press volume *The Anarchy: War and Status*, but rather presents self-contained reports of the sites where these investigations took place, arranged alphabetically.

### Civil War in King Stephen’s Reign

The infamously turbulent reign of King Stephen is exceptionally well covered by historians, so only a brief outline of events is necessary here. Scholars of the period have produced biographies of the king (Davis 1967; Cronne 1970; Crouch 2000; Mathew 2002; King 2010; Watkins 2015), and of the Empress Matilda (Chibnall 1991); collections of essays and thematic studies of the period (Stringer 1993; Dalton and White 2008); compilations of charters (Cronne and Davis 1968); and military studies of events (Bradbury 1998). The disorder and rebellion which arose during Stephen’s reign ultimately derived from a disputed succession to the English throne, triggered in 1135 by the death of Henry I. Fifteen years before his death, Henry’s only legitimate male heir, William Adelin, had drowned in The White Ship Disaster. Having failed to produce further male issue, Henry attempted to secure the succession for his only surviving legitimate child, the Empress Matilda. Encouraging leading nobles to swear support for Matilda’s assumption to the throne, Henry hoped to ensure a smooth transition for his daughter, who had married Geoffrey of Anjou following the death of her first husband, the Holy Roman Emperor Henry V. When Henry I died, however, his nephew Stephen of Blois sailed to England and was quickly crowned, on 22 December 1135. Rescinding their earlier pledges, many of the nobles who had previously sworn support to Matilda instead backed Stephen’s new claim, at least initially.

In spite of the general support of many leading magnates, Stephen’s assumption to the throne was far from straightforward. From the outset of his reign Stephen had to repel attacks in the north from King David I of Scots, who was both Matilda’s uncle and an ardent support of her cause. In addition to the incursions of the Scottish forces, which clashed with an English army in the largest pitched battle of Stephen’s reign near Northallerton, North Yorkshire, in 1138, Stephen struggled to secure southern England and Normandy as nobles began to take advantage of a perceived vacuum of power. A more comprehensive state of political unrest came in September 1139, however, when Matilda landed at Arundel with her step brother Robert of Gloucester with the hope of raising support for her cause. Stephen struggled for power with the Angevins in several complex phases of conflict over the next fourteen years until the summer of 1153, when the Treaty of Winchester recognised the king’s supremacy while acknowledging

the Empress' son Henry of Anjou as Stephen's heir to the throne. While the peace agreement appears to have been precarious, a more comprehensive resolution to the war came following the death of Stephen a little over a year after the treaty, leaving Henry of Anjou to be crowned as Henry II at Westminster in December 1154.

A somewhat surprising feature of the conflict is that despite its long duration it witnessed only two significant pitched battles, at Lincoln (1141) and Northallerton (also known as the Battle of the Standard, 1138). The documentary evidence instead highlights how the warfare of the period was characterised by sieges, raids and landscape devastation, while the overall strategic landscape was dominated by defended towns and, especially, castles, many of them newly built or strengthened by lords anxious to promote and protect their own interests in an uncertain political climate (for the military history of Stephen's reign, see Bradbury 1998). Episodes of siege and counter-siege were a regular occurrence as forces from both sides attacked and blockaded rival castles and settlements, frequently for protracted periods of time. The prominence of castles and siege warfare in the conflict renders it a period of significant archaeological potential. The *War and Status* research programme was developed in order to tap into this potential, with an approach that placed investigative fieldwork at the centre of our understanding.

### Approaches, Methodologies and Challenges

Attempting to investigate sites and landscapes of a period which by its very nature is defined by written texts presents a number of challenges, not least the difficulty of dating material to a discrete twenty-year window of time. While the written record often provides us with the specific date at which key events took place as well furnishing us with details of the personalities and locations involved, it is frequently problematic to attribute archaeological evidence specifically to Stephen's reign — indeed it might be seen as misguided or naïve to attempt to do so. Even when such sites are subject to comprehensive open area excavation, archaeologists are reliant upon a small corpus of diagnostic artefacts, most notably coins, to date the phases of activity which they have revealed. As the fieldwork of the *War and Status* project comprised no excavation, even these few key material sources of phasing were not available to the investigators. The research team instead utilised documentary evidence and published sources to initially locate sites which were likely to have been a focus of significant activity during the Anarchy. Especially important in this respect were castles built or strengthened in the period, documented episodes of siege warfare that saw the construction of siege castles, and settlements known to have been established in the middle years of the twelfth century. Following initial desk-based assessments to assess preservation, accessibility and other logistical concerns, comprehensive archaeological investigations

were undertaken on a sample of locations selected to cover a range of site types and geographical areas. Even when documentary evidence indicates a likely Anarchy-period site, however, a frequently complicating factor is that these locations have usually witnessed later phases of use and remodelling. This proved to be the case even with those sites thought to have been rapidly abandoned after short periods of military activity in the mid-twelfth century. In addition to the deliberate slighting of many castles after the civil war by Henry II and his successors, many twelfth-century foci were subject to later developments which may have destroyed or altered Anarchy phases beyond recognition.

Research therefore has to consider that Anarchy-period activity often represents a brief phase within sites that commonly possess complex chronological sequences. The use of documentary evidence by medieval archaeologists has been widely critiqued since the early 1990s, with some scholars suggesting that archaeologists should eschew the written record almost entirely in order to develop an independent discipline (e.g. Austin 1990). Yet, even though archaeology must not play the role as the 'handmaiden of history' as it often has done in the past, an interdisciplinary methodology which places archaeology at the centre of our understanding represents the most productive means to best understand the lived experience of the civil war. Such an approach to research requires a critical attitude to the available evidence, and a willingness to accept the sometimes conflicting or contradictory picture derived from different sources.

With these conditions in mind, the *War and Status* project conducted a detailed investigation of twelve sites and landscapes across England, combining topographic and geophysical survey with a range of other studies. Geophysical survey comprised earth resistance and magnetometry investigation, with the application of techniques determined by factors such as geology and the size of the area to be investigated. Generally speaking, the rapid coverage available through magnetometry was used as an initial method of investigation, with earth resistance employed to target areas which were identified as of interest either by magnetometry assessment or topographic survey. As all but one of the sites included at least some areas that are Scheduled Monuments, archaeological assessment was undertaken as outlined in project designs submitted to Historic England (formerly English Heritage). The standards used to complete the geophysical survey were informed by those defined by English Heritage (2008) and the Institute for Archaeologists (2013) codes of approved practice. Geophysical surveys were usually conducted using 30m by 30m grids set out using a differential Global Positioning System (GPS). The collected geophysical data were processed using TerraSurveyor software, and exported to ESRI ArcGIS 10.2, where they were geo-referenced and interpolated.





FIGURE 1.1: MAGNETOMETRY SURVEY UNDERWAY AT FOLLY HILL, FARINGDON, OXFORDSHIRE, DURING THE WAR AND STATUS PROJECT. DOCUMENTARY SOURCES INDICATE THAT A NEWLY BUILT ANGEVIN CASTLE AT FARINGDON WAS THE FOCUS OF A MAJOR SIEGE BY KING STEPHEN THAT INVOLVED THE CONSTRUCTION OF SIEGEWORKS (THIS VOLUME, CHAPTER 6 FOR DISCUSSION).



FIGURE 1.2: RESISTIVITY SURVEY BEING CARRIED OUT FOR THE WAR AND STATUS PROJECT AT THE RINGS, CORFE CASTLE, DORSET. THE SITE IS LIKELY TO BE A SIEGE CASTLE BUILT BY KING STEPHEN AGAINST THE MAJOR CASTLE IN THE BACKGROUND, WHICH WAS HELD AGAINST THE KING (THIS VOLUME, CHAPTER 4 FOR DISCUSSION).



FIGURE 1.3: TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY USING DIFFERENTIAL GPS AT BURWELL CASTLE, CAMBRIDGESHIRE, FOR THE WAR AND STATUS PROJECT. THE EARTHWORKS IN THE BACKGROUND ARE HEAPS OF SPOIL CREATED DURING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE MOAT OF AN UNFINISHED ROYAL CAMPAIGN CASTLE BUILT FOR KING STEPHEN ON THE FEN EDGE (THIS VOLUME, CHAPTER 2 FOR DISCUSSION).

The magnetometer surveys were completed using a Bartington Grad 601–2 (dual sensor) fluxgate gradiometer and automatic data logger (Figure 1.1). The survey methodology comprised a sampling interval of 0.25m of traverses 1.0m apart walked in zigzag fashion. The data were downloaded from the instrument using the Grad601 application and typically cleaned and clipped to give better contrast to the data. The earth resistance surveys were undertaken using a Geoscan RM15–D Resistance Meter in a twin-probe configuration, with the mobile probes set at a fixed distance of 0.5m apart (Figure 1.2). The sample interval was 0.5m and the traverse interval was 1m. The geophysical plots for each site are displayed in raw form, but interpretations of the anomalies identified by the survey team are also offered where appropriate. Topographic survey was undertaken using differential GPS (Figure 1.3), with point data downloaded into either Adobe Illustrator or ESRI ArcGIS 10.2 from which hachured plans, and sometimes digital terrain models, were created. Where available, this survey information was supplemented by Historic Environment Agency Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data. These field surveys were complemented by consultation of relevant Historic Environment Records (HERs), local records offices and other archives in order to produce a comprehensive assessment of each site and landscape. Where utilised, HER and other

archive entries are referenced using an abbreviation (e.g. Cambs. HER) followed by a catalogue number accurate at the time of publication. The first fieldwork by the *War and Status* project was undertaken at Cam's Hill, Wiltshire, in early October 2013, with the final phase of investigation conducted at Castle Carlton, Lincolnshire, during October 2014.

### The Structure of this Volume

As research was undertaken by different combinations of the *War and Status* project team, this volume is presented as a series of self-contained reports. The first site presented is Burwell castle in Cambridgeshire, built by King Stephen on the edge of the Cambridgeshire fens in a campaign during which he may also have constructed the castle at Rampton (Chapter 11). Also on the fenland fringe, the castle at Church End, in the historic Huntingdonshire parish of Woodwalton is most likely to have been constructed by the rebellious Earl of Essex, Geoffrey de Mandeville, or his immediate heir Ernulf (Chapter 14). A further Anarchy-period castle was that built at Hailes, Gloucestershire, apparently in a distinct location away from a nearby settlement and contemporary church by Ralph of Worcester (Chapter 7). Castles were also a stimulus for rural and urban settlement growth, as can be seen at the sites of Castle

Carlton, Lincolnshire (Chapter 3) and Mountsorrel, Leicestershire (Chapter 10). Standing distinct from such locations is Wellow, Nottinghamshire, which was probably developed in the mid-twelfth century by the clerics of nearby Rufford Abbey and represents the only defended village in the country not accompanied by a castle (Chapter 12).

The challenges of investigating Anarchy-period sites are perhaps best encapsulated by the survey of Sudeley Castle in Gloucestershire. Given the known Anarchy-period military activity at the site this was one of the locations selected for survey, although the investigations provided little or no evidence for twelfth-century phases (while casting important new light on the later elite landscape) and will be published separately and elsewhere (Fradley *et al.* forthcoming). Rather more amenable to archaeological investigation are twelfth-century siegeworks that have not been

subject to significant later change. Likely Anarchy-period siegeworks are presented at Cam's Hill, near Malmesbury, Wiltshire (Chapter 9), Corfe Castle, Dorset (Chapter 4), Crowmarsh, Oxfordshire (Chapter 5), and at Hamstead Marshall in Berkshire (Chapter 8). A further potential Anarchy-period landscape was investigated at Faringdon, Oxfordshire (Chapter 6), although the traditional interpretation that the summit of Folly Hill was a twelfth-century Angevin castle is questioned. These chapters are summarised by a short concluding chapter which also suggests possible avenues for future study. Together this volume hopes to reveal both the challenges but also the significant potential of investigating the civil war of Stephen's reign through archaeology, recognising that many of the key developments of the period were not played out on the field of battle, but instead took place amongst a complex landscape of *Castles, Siegeworks and Settlements*.