

NOTES

The Bricks of Wingfield College. Wingfield College was founded for three, later nine, priests, by Sir John de Wingfield, who died in 1360/61.¹ His son-in-law, Michael de la Pole, married to the great heiress, Katherine Wingfield, started to build the College in 1362.

All that was visible in 1926 has been well described by the then Vicar of Wingfield,² and it is generally assumed that the ancient timbers, including two interesting crown-posts, were those of the 1362 structure. However, there are at least two long timbers exhibiting scarf joints of a type which Cecil Hewett³ considers to be characteristic of 13th-century carpentry. One hazards the conjecture that the able merchant Michael de la Pole may have used some of the fabric of Sir John's old hall for his new college. The elegant west aspect of the building is clearly an early Georgian re-facing.

Until 1971 the building was used as a farmhouse. Mr. and Mrs. Chance, the present owners, are reconditioning the interior and in the process have revealed many hitherto hidden features, principally the extensive use of brick. The bricks, which from their texture, light venice-red body colour and irregularity of shape, are ascribed by the present writer to the last half of the 14th century, or the early years of the 15th, are used to carry the sill of the 'cloister' wall, for the plinths of the posts of the aisled hall and for some, if not all, of the south wall, extending also to about 10 ft (3 m) of the west wall.

It was, in fact, removal of decayed interior plaster from the wall in the south-west corner of the building that led to the discovery of the bricks, later found elsewhere. Although similar in texture and flinty inclusions to contemporary bricks of Suffolk provenance and incorporating micaceous sand characteristic of bricks still being made at South Cove, near Wrentham, their dimensions are not characteristic of any 14th century East Anglian bricks known to the writer. Aware that larger, almost tile-like bricks⁴ of this period are

¹ Claude Messent, *The Monastic Remains of Norfolk and Suffolk* (Norwich 1934), p. 151.

² S. W. H. Aldwell, *Wingfield: Its Church, Castle and College* (1926).

³ Cecil Hewett, *The Development of Carpentry 1200-1700* (Newton Abbot 1969), pp. 172-174.

⁴ The ratio of (L + B) to T is about $8\frac{1}{2}$, and anything greater than 8 for this ratio is considered by the writer to be characteristic of a tile. The Hull bricks were themselves called 'waltye' in 1303 and 1353.

known from the northern counties, and that Michael de la Pole was the son of William de la Pole, the wealthy merchant of Kingston-upon-Hull, whose family fortunes had been made by fisheries and the manufacture of bricks at Hull since 1303, the present writer sought the dimensions of early Hull bricks recorded by Nathaniel Lloyd⁵ and found remarkable agreement between the Wingfield brick dimensions and those from the de la Pole brickfield at Hull:

	Length (L)	Breadth (B)	Thickness (T)
Wingfield College bricks	9-10½ ins	5¼ ins	1¾-2 ins
metric mean=	246 mm	127 mm	45 mm
North Bar, Beverley, 1409-1410	9-10½ ins	5¼ ins	2 ins
Beverley Minster c. 1350	„	„	„
Holy Trinity, Hull, chancel 1340	10 ins	5 ins	2 ³ / ₁₆ ins
part built 1315-20	9-9¾ ins	4¾-4¾ ins	2 ¹ / ₁₆ -2 ¹ / ₈ ins

The ceiling timbers at the south end of the College appear to be much later than the bricks of the wall on which they rest. But the brickwork itself does not suggest that old bricks were re-used in some later rebuilding of perhaps, the 17th century. There is only one kind of mortar to be seen and the bond is irregular, with joints vertically over one another, a characteristic of very early brickwork. The mortar joints are at least 1 inch (25 mm) wide, and irregular.

It seems almost certain that either Michael de la Pole transported bricks from the family brickworks at Hull or else that skilled brick-makers were brought from Hull to make bricks from local brickearth and sand, to the sizes with which they were familiar, and for which their mould-frames were designed. Physical and chemical examination of known 14th century Hull bricks might determine this question of provenance.

The Wingfield bricks appear to have been shaped by casting a clot of tempered clay into a frame resting on a sanded table, not on a stock; there is, of course, no frog. They bear strike marks on one face (LB) but the pug must have been very soft for the edges are uneven and lumpy; some kind of 'butter-pat' shaping method ought not to be ruled out as an alternative to moulding in a frame, or even additional to it.

The writer is indebted to Mr. and Mrs. Chance for their courtesy in allowing extensive investigation of their home and to Mr. Norman Scarfe for calling attention to the brick exposure in the first place.

⁵ Nathaniel Lloyd, *A History of English Brickwork* (London 1934), pp. 5 and 10.

[The writer of the above note has since had an opportunity of examining bricks recently excavated from the 14th-century North Wall of Kingston-upon-Hull and both in dimensions and body-texture, they appear to be closely similar to the Wingfield bricks, with which they have been directly compared.

Also, similar bricks have been found at Butley Priory and there were de la Pole links with Butley, where Michael de la Pole lies buried.]

L. S. HARLEY

Two Late Medieval Pipe-Drains from Thetford Priory. Two pipe-drains were discovered and lifted during excavation and consolidation work at Thetford Priory by the Office of Works, now Department of the Environment. Twenty-nine sections of drain-pipe survive in the store of architectural and archaeological material on site, and these can be identified as the remains of two separate drains.⁶ Dated earthenware pipes are almost unknown in medieval contexts, and the significance of these from Thetford is that they can be dated architecturally by association with dated buildings.⁷

The pipe sections are all of the same earthenware, a hard, finely sanded fabric, usually orange-brown in colour, although some examples have been reduced to a dull grey. There are splashes of a yellow-green or brown glaze on some of the pipes, but none were glazed intentionally. The pipes had remained unwashed in the site store, which had fortunately preserved some evidence of laying. They had been buried in a light, sandy, grey soil, not unlike the present topsoil on the site. There had been no attempt to seal the junctions of separate pipes, and the suggestion that they served as drains is supported by the fact that a heavy deposit of silt remains on the inside surface of each pipe. A drain of similar pipes remains *in situ* below the infirmary block, partly laid in a stone-built culvert, and still serves to drain away surface water.

The first type of pipe (Fig. 26, 1 and 1a) was a tapered, wheel-thrown tube, rather irregular in shape. The inside showed marked throwing-rings, although the outside was fairly smooth. Incised on the ends of each pipe were assembly marks. On one pipe, the marks were three vertical slashes and a cross, whilst the other surviving section of pipe bore a corresponding cross and a 'D'-shaped mark. The two sections were obviously designed to fit together, the join being marked by the two crosses. The pipes were 11½ and 12½ ins

⁶ Listed as TP P35 in the catalogue of finds from the site held by the Department of the Environment Inspectorate of Ancient Monuments.

⁷ Mr. R. Gilyard-Beer has brought to my attention a series of pipes from Glenluce Abbey, similar to types 2 and 3 at Thetford, but with a complex series of assembly marks, and which are late medieval in date. For details of these pipes see: S. H. Cruden, *Trans. Dumfries. & Galloway Nat. Hist. & Antiq. Soc.* xxix, pp. 177-194.