

Test Pit Results from Lillingstone Lovell, Buckinghamshire (formerly Oxfordshire), July-August 2003

**R.L.C.Jones
University of Leicester**

November 2003

Introduction

During July and August 2003, 18 test pits measuring 1 x 1m and excavated to natural were opened in and around Lillingstone Lovell, Buckinghamshire (formerly Oxfordshire). Whilst this sample size remains small, the recovery of quantities of pottery dating from the Romano-British period (AD43-400) through to the present day, together with the identification of a number of historic features including walls and floor, provides the opportunity to propose a tentative reconstruction of the origins and subsequent development of this village. These results are complemented by earthwork survey and geophysical survey previously undertaken in the field immediately south-east of the church, and the results from systematic fieldwalking in the fields surrounding the village. A second discrete area lying approximately one mile north of the village centre was also investigated. Here four test pits were excavated on platforms lying within a regular bank and ditched enclosure, which again had been previously surveyed, providing a date for this isolated settlement. Other areas of earthworks, notably south of Hall Farm, remain to be fully investigated. It should be borne in mind, therefore, that the archaeological research remains unfinished and thus carries the potential to alter the current hypotheses should further areas be opened in the future. It is our considered opinion, however, that this work would add to the detail of the developmental story of the village, but would be unlikely to alter fundamentally the basic picture as it is presented here.

Megadata

Archaeological research is based on the recovery, analysis and interpretation of physical evidence, lost, discarded or abandoned by past societies. At best archaeological evidence provides a fragmentary record of this earlier activity. Materials were reused and recycled and thus did not enter the record; other artefacts will not have survived deposition, for example objects made of organic matter such as wood or bone if conditions are not appropriate. This partial view of the past is further exaggerated by decisions to investigate some areas and not others, decisions which may be imposed upon the excavator due to current conditions. This is particularly the case when investigating living villages. Those very areas where evidence for past activity is to be sought are those areas which are presently occupied by the houses and gardens of the latest generation of village inhabitants. Valuable evidence will remain buried and inaccessible below these houses, other evidence will have been destroyed in their construction. Access will be granted to some areas of the village and not others. And the need to respect private property dictates the use of a sampling method rather than the investigation of extensive areas. There are, therefore, severe limitations to the archaeological evidence. It is thus important to establish the quality and quantity of the information on which any interpretation will be based. This is the megadata, to adopt modern jargon, the database of information on which the grander broad brush hypotheses are based

The following pottery was recovered from the test pits:

Period	Dates	No. of Sherds
Romano-British Wares	AD43-400	23
Early Medieval Wares	AD400-1100	6
Medieval Wares	AD1100-1400	616
Late Medieval Wares	AD1400- 1550	12
Post-Medieval Wares	AD1550-1699	45
Modern Wares	AD1700-present	233
Total		935

This can be further broken down into individual fabric types:

Period	Fabric	Dates	No. of Sherds (n = 935)
Romano-British Wares	All	AD43-400	23
Early Medieval Wares	Cotswold-type Oolithic Ware	975-1150	1
		1075-1300	5
Medieval Wares	Shelly Sandy Ware	1100-1400	56
	Shelly Ware	1100-1400	67
	Sandy Ware	1100-1400	17
	Banbury Ware	1100-1400	2
	Brill/Boarstall Ware	1200-1600	6
	Potterspurty Ware	1250-1600	477

Late Medieval Wares	Late Medieval Oxidized Wares	?1450-?1500	3
	Midland Purple Ware	1450-1600	6
	Cistercian Ware	1470-1550	3
Post-Medieval Wares	German Stoneware	1450-1699	5
	Red Earthenwares	1550+	38
	Midland Blackware	c. 1550-1700	2
Modern Wares	Staffs White Salt-glazed Stoneware	1720-1780	1
	Iron-glazed Earthenwares	Late 17 th -19 th	5
	Misc. 18 th -20 th century Wares	18 th -present	227

Any analysis of this ceramic material relies on its distribution across the village. Pottery of various periods and individual fabric types were found in the following number of test pits:

Period	Fabric	No. of TPs (n = 18)
Romano-British Wares		5
Early Medieval Wares		2
	Cotswold-type Oolithic Ware	1
	Oxford Ware	1
Medieval Wares		18
	Shelly Sandy Ware	9
	Shelly Ware	13
	Sandy Ware	5
	Banbury Ware	1
	Brill/Boarstall Ware	5
	Potterspurty Ware	15
Late Medieval Wares		5
	Late Medieval Oxidized Wares	1
	Midland Purple Ware	4
	Cistercian Ware	3
Post-Medieval Wares		13
	German Stoneware	2
	Red Earthenwares	12
	Midland Blackware	2
Modern Wares		12
	Staffs White Salt-glazed Stoneware	2
	Iron-glazed Earthenwares	1
	Misc. 18 th -20 th century Wares	12

Description of Test Pits

The location of each test pit is named after the modern property name or street number. Test pits that were located within the surrounding fields are named after either the name given in a survey of Lillingstone Lovell compiled in 1613 (BRO D96/21/8) or the Tithe Map of 1839 (PRO IR29/27/90). Each entry begins with the questions each test pit sought to address. A description of the actual results follows.

LL TP 1

Home Close (1613); Sawyers Close (Tithe Map)

A sequence of three test pits, spaced at 50m intervals was located on 50m east of the brook (precise location marked on map). They were numbered sequentially from south to north. Oblique aerial photographs show a series of shallow linear earthworks running at right angles to the brook, terminating at the headland of ridge and furrow which survives in the eastern part of the field. There is thus an thin strip of land which lies outside of the medieval field system and which seems to have been parcelled up into smaller units. Typologically, these units are reminiscent of medieval property boundaries or crofts of medieval peasant houses (tofts). These test pits were designed to test whether indeed this hypothesis could be substantiated. This would be indicated not only by the presence or absence of medieval pottery, but the quantity of any such material.

Below a layer of mixed humic ploughsoil containing two sherds of shelly coarseware and modern pottery, the stratigraphy of this test pit was dominated by a dump of limestone up to 300mm deep. This contained no dating evidence but sealed a cleaner silty clay containing a single sherd of shelly coarseware and two sherds of Banbury Ware. The absence of thirteenth-century fabrics, particularly Potterpurry Ware which dominates the pottery assemblage elsewhere suggests that last deposit had been laid down in the twelfth century and had remained undisturbed since that date. The quantity of pottery recovered is probably more than might be expected to accumulate in medieval ploughsoil, but less than might build up close to settlement. It is difficult to interpret these results, but the presence of stone building materials, albeit not *in-situ*, together with some pottery, points towards the space containing medieval buildings. These may have had functions other than as a domestic residence, possibly agricultural buildings or outhouses.

LL TP 2

Home Close (1613); Sawyers Close (Tithe Map)

The rationale for locating this test pit follows LL TP 1.

This test pit contained a single sherd of Midland Blackware from the first spit together with a single sherd of Brill/Boarstall Ware. Below this mixed layer, however, the assemblage was limited to a single fabric, Potterspurry Ware. 11 sherds were recovered from spit 2, 14 from spit three and one further sherd from spit 4. A compact sandstone surface may represent a degraded floor surface. Whilst not containing any dating evidence, the presence of Potterspurry Ware above this layer in quantity and a single sherd sealed beneath it date this feature to the mid-thirteenth or fourteenth century. Here the number of sherds is indicative of occupation, although it can be noted that the sherds were severely abraded and small and may have been subject to post-depositional degradation.

LL TP 3

Home Close (1613); Sawyers Close (Tithe Map)

This test pit contained a rough limestone surface containing both medieval pottery (Potterspurry Ware and shelly coarseware represented by a single sherd respectively), a sherd of late medieval Cistercian Ware, and a single sherd of red earthenware. On ceramic grounds, therefore, this feature might date from the mid-sixteenth century. No pottery was found sealed beneath this layer. Certainly structural, the function of this surface remains unclear.

LL TP 4

Church Close (Tithe Map)

As for LL TPs 1-3, the same aerial photographs show linears running at right-angles to the brook to its west. In order to establish their function another series of three test pits, again set at 50m intervals was set close to the western edge of the field, some 60m from the brook. They were numbered sequentially from south to north. Date and usage of this zone was again sought in the quality and quantity of the ceramic evidence, and in any in-situ features which might be present.

The pottery assemblage suggest activity here over five centuries. A prominent compact limestone surface contained two sherds of sandy shelly ware of twelfth century date. No pottery was found below this feature. Above this surface, the two spits were chronologically mixed, containing eight sherds of Potterspurry Ware, two sherds of Midland Purple Ware and two sherds of seventeenth-century red earthenwares. The presence of so much Potterspurry Ware, however, is indicative of this surface surviving in use through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and might be best seen as a domestic floor surface.

LL TP 5

Church Close (Tithe Map)

The rationale for locating this test pit follows LL TP 4.

Whilst not containing any structural evidence, the pottery assemblage was exclusively medieval with no later inclusions. The presence of an assemblage containing sandy shelly wares and shelly coarsewares, and the absence of the ubiquitous Potterspurry Ware dates these deposits firmly to the twelfth century. Whilst eight sherds might not be considered large, it is unlikely to have accumulated as a result of the manuring of arable land. In this instance, then, it is probable that the test pit lies within a croft at no great distance from a

domestic residence from whence the pottery had been discarded. The total absence of later wares, however, suggests that this croft had a shortlived occupancy.

LL TP 6
Church Close (Tithe Map)

The rationale for locating this test pit follows LL TP 4.

The simple stratigraphy exhibited within this test pit was comparable in nature to that found in LL TP5. Below the humic ploughsoil was a thick layer (up to 450mm) of homogenous clay loam, itself overlying the natural clay. This central deposit contained 16 sherds of Potterspurty Ware and a single sherd of eighteenth-century red earthenware, itself found in the upper levels. Again, whilst the test pit revealed no structural evidence, it is again clear that the plot within which it was placed had been occupied during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

LL TP 7
Church Close (Tithe Map)

The northern part of Church Close contains some of the best-preserved medieval earthworks in the Whittlewood Project area, a block of twelve contiguous modern parishes stretching from Stowe in the West to Old Stratford in the east and Whittlebury in the north to Leckhampstead and Wicken in the south. The nature of these earthworks was revealed through earthwork survey, showing that it should be viewed as a manorial enclosure rather than part of the village. Geophysical survey which had accompanied this survey, had located the footprint of a substantial masonry building lying towards the centre of this complex. This test pit was placed internally in the south-east corner of this building, the eastern and southern test pit bounds following the course of these walls. The test pit sought to recover dating evidence which might be used to establish a chronological framework for the building and use of the structure, with a view to helping establish whether this site could be isolated in the documentary sources. Furthermore, by revealing the wall or foundation structure, evidence might be obtained to establish the quality and/or potential function of this building and to establish whether any associated floor surfaces survived.

The startling discovery within this test pit was the depth of the foundations of the building found by geophysics. On both the eastern and southern sides of the test, the foundations were excavated to their full depth 900mm below the present ground level. These were made up of seven rough courses of large faced limestone blocks. These well-made foundations indicate a sizeable building, probably largely constructed in stone, and of considerable status. No post-medieval pottery was recovered from this test pit. The assemblage was, however, mixed, containing no less than 10 sherds of Romano-British pottery and 9 sherds of medieval pottery. The latter contained sandy shelly ware, shelly coarseware and Potterspurty wares, likely therefore to have accumulated in the mid-thirteenth century. Whatever the function of the building, and in all probability it is the manor house itself, it cannot have survived long. Surprisingly, no evidence was found for any associated floor surfaces although if we are correct in believing that the walls represent foundations rather than above ground courses, excavation may have begun below the original level of the floor.

The presence of so much Romano-British pottery requires explanation. Since it was found in association with medieval pottery, it is clear than undisturbed deposits of this date do not survive. The material is likely, however, to derive from the immediate vicinity rather than having been brought to the site from further afield. In all probability, the pottery derives from a Romano-British site close by, whose associated deposits were disturbed in the digging of the foundation trenches for the medieval building. This is the earliest evidence for permanent human occupation of the village area.

LL TP 8
9 Brookside

Morphologically, the modern village of Lillingstone Lovell is made up of three parts: settlement around the church; outlying farms and manor house; and a row of properties lying immediately to the west of the brook, known as Brookside. As the main settlement zone, Brookside is equally prominent on the first edition Ordnance Survey maps. The properties include a number of nineteenth-century brick houses interspersed with older thatched stone cottages. If analysis of aerial photographs showing medieval property divisions is correct, it is possible that this regular row of tofts and crofts extended further north under modern Brookside. A number of test pits were located in these gardens to assess whether the current houses had medieval

antecedents. And if so, whether these extending over the whole length now occupied by Brookside.

The deposits behind the cottage were deep but disturbed throughout as attested by the recovery of modern ceramics from the lowest levels. This is not surprising. Garden soils are prone to movement as a result of various activities, the most disruptive of which is landscaping. The gardens behind properties on Brookside are steeply sloped, and many have been terraced in order to create more useable spaces. Despite this, it is likely that whilst soil has been moved within the garden, less material will have been added from without. Thus those Romano-British sherds recovered from this test pit, numbering five sherds, and the medieval pottery, numbering 13 sherds, of which 11 were sandy shelly wares of twelfth century date, almost certainly derive from human activity in this part of the village. Two sherds of Potterspurry Ware indicate continued activity here into the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The quality and quantity of the medieval period is thus consistent with occupation predating the earliest fabric of the existing cottage. It must, therefore, be a successor to an earlier structure and indicates some occupation along the eastern side of the brook. The recovery of further sherds of Romano-British pottery complements those finds of that date recovered from LL TP 7 and suggest that this area falls within the orbit of a nearby settlement possibly on the other side of the brook.

LL TP 9
3-4 Brookside

The rationale for locating this test pit follows LL TP 8.

The stratigraphy here was less deep than in LL TP 8 but its component parts are very similar, with modern material found throughout. Those observations made for LL TP 8 pertain again: soil has moved, but earlier material almost certainly derives from the immediate vicinity. In this instance the medieval pottery assemblage is made up of seven sherds of Potterspurry Ware and a single sherd of shelly coarseware. The floruit of occupation here thus dates to a few decades later than that found at 9 Brookside. With no structural evidence, once again interpretation relies on the size of assemblage. Too large to have accumulated as a result of manuring, the pottery must have come from a domestic site close by, probably under the modern house.

LL TP 10
Church Farm, Church Lane

The area around the church appears less regular in plan than Brookside. The presence of earthworks in the paddock adjoining Church Farm, immediately to the west of Church Lane, however, suggest that the occupied zone was once larger than it now appears. The termination of ridge and furrow west of these earthworks confirms that they represent something other than agricultural activity. Three test pits, numbered sequentially from south to north, were within the area of surviving earthworks. The recovery of pottery would help to establish an original date for these earthworks and provide a terminal date for their abandonment.

The upper layers of this test pit contained mixed deposits, which while containing medieval pottery also contained modern fabrics. These layers were predominately made up of a limestone rubble. Four sherds of German stoneware were recovered from within the matrix, and a further sherd of eighteenth century red earthenware. But far more common was the medieval material: 12 sherds of Potterspurry Ware; six sherds of shelly ware; and a sherd of sandy ware. Intriguingly a further two sherds of Romano-British wares were discovered. Below this rubble, a 100mm thick layer of clay loam contained two sherds of Potterpurry Ware and a single sherd of Brill/Boarstall Ware. It would appear, therefore, that the deposits represent the demolished remains of a mid-thirteenth-century building. It is possible that this building continued to be occupied through the fifteen to seventeenth centuries before finally being demolished in the eighteenth century. The recovery of Romano-British pottery suggests, as for LL TPs 7 and 8 distant antecedents for the village.

LL TP 11
Church Farm, Church Lane

The rationale for locating this test pit follows LL TP 10.

LL TP 11 layer 10m north of LL TP 10. Like its near neighbour the main matrix consisted of a limestone rubble dump containing both medieval pottery and post-medieval fabrics. The medieval assemblage is made up of 10 sherds of Potterspurry Ware, and single sherds of sandy shelly ware and shelly coarseware. Once

again, this rubble deposit capped a layer of clay loam, containing a single sherd of shelly coarseware. On this flimsy evidence, it might be suggested that once again the deposits represent a demolished medieval structure, built perhaps as early as the twelfth century although this sherd may have been residual. The presence of more Potterspurry Ware certainly indicates that the main period of occupation post-dates the mid-thirteenth century. A single sherd of Cistercian Ware proves that the building survived into the late medieval period and might have finally been totally demolished in the nineteenth century.

LL TP 12
Church Farm, Church Lane

The rationale for locating this test pit follows LL TP 10.

The stratigraphy of this test pit was shallow, terminating on limestone bedrock. In the upper there were post-medieval sherds, all overlying a stony which might have served as a floor surface. Sealed below this surface, and indicating its date of construction were five sherds of Potterspurry Ware. This layer also contained the only sherd of Cotswold-type Oolithic Ware to recovered from any of the Lillingstone Lovell test pits. Whilst difficult to interpret a single sherd with confidence, its presence here is unsurprising, so close as it is to the church, one of the best indicators of the earliest part of the village. It may be that a pre-village nucleus had been established here by the end of the tenth century, from which the medieval village grew. This is supported by the discoveries found in LL TP 18. The main conclusions, however, to be drawn from the evidence from this test pit relate to later developments, the construction of a floor in the mid-thirteenth century and its abandonment at some period between the seventeenth and nineteenth century.

LL TP 13
Autumn Cottage, Brookside

The rationale for locating this test pit follows LL TP 8.

No medieval features were found in this test pit, however, it produced significant quantities of medieval pottery. 68 sherds of Potterspurry Ware were recovered, mostly from spit three, whilst other mixed deposits contained a single sherds of sandy shelly ware, shelly coarseware and sandy ware. Clearly, then, this plot was occupied during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, with the possibility of a twelfth century origin since the lowest deposits contained material predating the start of Potterspurry production. Similar levels of pottery discard are commonly encountered in other medieval crofts, material either being placed within rubbish pits or distributed on the garden to increase fertility within the kitchen garden.

LL TP 14
2 Brookside

The rationale for locating this test pit follows LL TP 8.

As with all Brookside gardens, this test pit revealed no medieval layers which had not ben subject to later disturbance. Here, for example, Staffordshire White Salt-glazed stoneware dated to 1720-1820 was found in the lowest deposits. Throughout the sequence, however, medieval pottery was present, comprising nine sherds of Potterspurry Ware, and single sherds of shelly coarseware and Brill/Boarstall Ware. Whilst far from conclusive, it would appear that this plot was occupied in the latter centuries of the medieval period, perhaps beginning in the second half of the thirteenth century. The similarity with the assemblage deriving from its neighbouring garden, 3-4 Brookside, is striking. Both are suggestive of village growth to the north of the main village street at this period, consistent with known population growth pre-Black Death (1348-9). The subsequent history of the plot remains obscure, since with the exception of the Staffordshire Ware, all other ceramics appear to be contemporary with the current house.

LL TP 15
Town Close (Tithe Map)

Town Close lies immediately to the east of the church. It is bound to the south by the main village street, to the west by Church Lane and to the east by Brookside. Preserved within the western half of the field above the flood plain are a series of terraces and platforms. Four test pits were located on these earthworks, numbered sequentially from south to north. Each test pit sought to address the origins, function, use and abandonment of these earthworks. The recovery of ceramics would provide a chronology for activity here, whilst the survival of in-situ structural features was predicted.

In terms of pottery recovery, LL TP 15 was the most productive of all the Lillingstone Lovell test pits. Only the upper deposit contained a mixed assemblage, including sherds of late medieval Oxidized Ware and Midland Purple Ware as well as more modern fabrics in small quantities. From 230mm below the modern field surface through to natural, encountered at c. 600mm, however the assemblage was homogenous and datable to the mid thirteenth century onwards. The dominant fabric was Potterspur, sherds numbering 131 sherds. Also present in smaller quantities were sandy shelly ware (18 sherds); and shelly coarseware (14 sherds). A single sherd of Romano-British pottery was also found. Clearly, then, the earthworks in this part of the field represent building platforms and other associated property boundaries of the medieval village. The presence of so much pre-Potterspur pottery indicates an origin in the twelfth century, although none of these deposits had been untouched by later activity. The plot was occupied throughout the medieval period, and possibly into the early sixteenth century, thus surviving the late medieval crisis perhaps better than other parts of the village.

LL TP 16
Town Close (Tithe Map)

The rationale for locating this test pit follows LL TP 15.

LL TP 16 was another rich test pit, despite the shallowness of the deposits, terminating on bedrock at 350mm. Once again the upper deposits contained pottery fabrics of varying dates, from the nineteenth century dating back through to the late medieval period attested by the recovery of Midland purple Ware. Again Potterspur Ware swamps the assemblage (38 sherds) but other fabrics are present: sandy shelly ware (6 sherds); shelly coarseware (13 sherds); and sandy coarsewares (1 sherd). Again therefore, it is possible to propose activity here in line with that found in LL TP 15, beginning in the twelfth century and continuing through to the end of the medieval period.

LL TP 17
Town Close (Tithe Map)

The rationale for locating this test pit follows LL TP 15.

LL TP 17 compares well in terms of stratigraphy and finds with LL TP 15. Only the top spit contains modern fabrics. Below this, medieval pottery is distributed throughout the deposits. The same fabrics found in LL TP 16 were present: 96 sherds of Potterspur Ware; 6 sherds of sandy shelly ware; 14 sherds of shelly coarseware; and 4 sherds of sandy coarseware. In addition the test pit produced a single sherd of Brill/Boarstall Ware and three sherds of Romano-British pottery. Activity here thus reaches its apogee in the mid-thirteenth century but there is at least the indication that this continued though the medieval period. Again the quantity of pottery potentially made before 1250 points to more distant origins, perhaps around 1100, but once again any deposits of this date had been disturbed later.

LL TP 18
Town Close (Tithe Map)

The rationale for locating this test pit follows LL TP 15.

The most northern of the test pits in Town Close, once again the deposits were of mixed date, those lying above natural dated by the latest pottery to the mid-sixteenth century. But again there were significant quantities of medieval pottery. Potterspur Ware is the most frequent, numbering 31 sherds, sandy coarseware next best represented with 18 sherds, with only three sherds of shelly coarsewares. Uniquely, however, the deposits also contained five sherds of Oxford Ware, perhaps indicating that settlement here began in the late eleventh century. A single sherd of Cistercian Ware, Midland Purple Ware and German Stoneware suggest use through to the end of the middle ages. Quantities are indicative of occupation rather than any other activity.

A hypothetical Model for Village Development

Lillingstone Lovell is one of six villages within the Whittlewood Project area which has been investigated by test pitting. The others are Akeley, Leckhampstead, Silverstone, Whittlebury, and Wicken. More test pits have been excavated in these villages than at Lillingstone Lovell. Clearly, the larger the sample, the stronger the case for village development as suggested by the evidence gained from small-scale excavation. The results from Lillingstone Lovell can be compared and contrasted against the findings from these other villages, and reference will be made to these where appropriate in the following account. It should be stressed, however, that further excavation at Lillingstone Lovell would certainly clarify the model and indeed might lead to fundamental revision. Nevertheless, the emergent story appears to be coherent and the patterns appear logical. We believe, therefore, that the main phasing of the village's growth has been revealed by our work.

The first permanent occupation of the general village area appears to begin with the foundation of a Romano-British site of unknown status. Pottery from Church Close suggests that it may have lain in this general vicinity. The recovery of a further 13 sherds from other test pits in the northern part of the village, and eight sherds from the field north-west of Hall Farm appear to derive from manuring of arable land. The area was thus open and intensively exploited during this period from a number of small farms. Two of these beyond the village envelope have been identified during fieldwalking, one located 600m north-west of the church (SP 709 410) and the other immediately north of Hill Farm (SP718 397).

There is no evidence for occupation of the village between 400 and 975. This is unusual but not unique. Akeley and Leckhampstead show some evidence for occupation before 850, whilst at Silverstone and Whittlebury the proto-village appears to have been forming around 900. Lillingstone Dayrell has produced pottery of this date, indeed earlier since Ipswich Ware (c. 725-850) was found during fieldwalking of the deserted village west of the church. It remains probably that Lillingstone Dayrell was founded from Lillingstone Lovell – their medieval nomenclature of *parva* and *magna* respectively suggest the pre-eminence of the latter. The lack of material of this date must therefore be due to our small sample size rather than its total absence. Further test pits might help to elucidate this matter.

The first evidence for early medieval settlement is found in the single sherd of Cotswold-type Oolitic Ware from Church Farm and the five sherds of Oxford Ware from Town Close. This distribution, close to the church, is consistent with findings from other village. In all five other Whittlewood villages the earliest material is always found within a 100m radius of the church. Similar patterns have been found further abroad, for example at Great Linford and Milton Keynes (Bucks), and at Higham Ferrers and Raunds (Northants). Whether the church was located in an existing settlement node, or whether the presence of the church encouraged settlement growth is still unclear. Nevertheless, our results once again add credence to the idea that the church marks an early settlement focus. This need not, however, be the only population centre. Both at Silverstone and Leckhampstead, contemporary settlements lacking any ecclesiastical foundation have also been found away from the present church site.

The distribution of sandy coarsewares appears to parallel the earlier fabrics. From 1100 then the village appears to be expanding from its original core north of the church. Whether it extended south into Church Close is known since no test pits were excavated in this area. Church Lane thus emerges as the first village street, on both sides of which settlement was taking place. Geophysics suggests that this lane continued south beyond the present 'T' junction, aligning onto the hedge line marking the western bounds of Church Close in the southern part of this field. Evidence from LL TPs 1 and 5 point to some activity close to Hall Farm, possibly a new settlement focus separated from the original village nucleus. But whether this fronted onto a continuation of Church Lane is far from clear. Isolated finds of twelfth-century sandy and shelly wares below gardens in the northern part of Brookside were not found in sufficient quantity to prove categorically an expansion of the village in this region. Indeed this material is probably derivative of the manuring of arable fields and this might also be the case for LL TP 14, Autumn Cottage. Immediately the south of the main street, however, in the garden of 9 Brookside, it would appear that domestic houses had been established here by the end of the century. By 1200 or 1250 Lillingstone Lovell was losing its coherence: the original focus had been added to, and other focal points had emerged 500m to the south and 100m to the east.

If the village appears to have developed organically, even haphazardly, over the three centuries before 1250, events in the mid-thirteenth century were to alter radically the village plan. The construction of the large manorial complex with associated fishponds, farmstead, and mill disrupted the original street pattern. The southern continuation of Church Lane was severed, whilst the original routes to Leckhampstead and Wakefield/Potterspury, which had formerly led off the right-angle at the village hall through Church Close south of the current road appear to have been diverted north of the new manorial complex along the route

now followed. Properties north of the diversion, particularly along Church Lane were unaffected by this replanning, however, others – for which albeit we have no evidence – may have been forcibly relocated. Certainly, the ceramic evidence strongly suggests that the laying out of regular crofts both to the east the brook and to the south of the manorial complex was undertaken contemporaneously with the creation of the new manorial complex. Here we see the strong arm of lordship, able to appropriate space in the centre of the village and to allocate new space, probably intake from former fields, to the east of the brook. These new crofts appear to have been extended northwards beyond the new main street. The creation of new regular rows is paralleled elsewhere. At Newton Longville a tangential street was laid out and developed in the thirteenth century, at Silverstone Cattle End was developed at the southern end of Green Lane at 500m from the village centre, whilst at Whittlebury the village was extended southwards along the Buckingham-Towcester road at the same date. In the case of Lillingstone Lovell, the laying out of new plots suggests some displacement of the resident population – further evidence that the original village may have extended south of the church along Church Lane – but in scale it also appears disproportionate to immediate needs. Some contingency might, therefore, have been made for the future housing of a growing population by laying out more crofts than were initially required.

In the event, the envisaged population growth did not materialize. The fourteenth century brought poor harvests due to a deterioration in climate, animal murrain, and in 1348-9 the plague. Lillingstone Lovell, in line with many parts of the country, appears to have been detrimentally affected by these catastrophes. Notably the new eastern suburb. Only one of the test pits east of the brook produced any late medieval wares, and that a single sherd of Cistercian Ware. The implication must be that these crofts were all abandoned by 1450. In contrast, five of the seven test pits in the early village core north of the church produced late medieval sherds. Lillingstone Lovell thus contracted back to its original focus. And even the manorial complex appears to have been abandoned before the end of the middle ages. It was only after a break of perhaps three centuries, that a growing population encouraged the recolonization of Brookside.

Finally, as a postscript, something might be said about the types of pottery used in Lillingstone Lovell during the medieval period. As with all Whittlewood villages, after 1250 the establishment of a major potting industry close by at Potterspury meant that most vessels used originated here. Despite this, some vessels from Brill/Boarstall in Bernwood Forest found their way to the village, possibly through the market at Buckingham. On the other hand, pottery made at Lyvenden/Stanion to the north-east which arrived in other nearby villages appears not to have been used. There is a difficulty in accurately identifying the origins of the earlier shelly and sandy fabrics which appear to have been ubiquitously used throughout Buckinghamshire and Northamptonshire during the twelfth century, although two sherds of sandy Banbury Ware have been identified showing links in the west. Lillingstone Lovell, of course, before reorganisation was a detached part of Oxfordshire, probably subject to the manor of Kirtlington. Given this linkage, it cannot escape notice that the two earliest identifiable fabrics, Cotswold-type Oolitic Ware and Oxford Ware both emanate from the very area from whence Lillingstone Lovell was controlled. In these sherds of pottery, therefore, we see the administrative links that so often remain invisible in the archaeological record.

Heybarne, Lillingstone Lovell (formerly Lillingstone Dayrell)

Introduction

No part of Whittlewood Forest was considered to lie within Lillingstone Lovell. The perambulation of the Oxfordshire portion of the forest, made in 1300, stated categorically that '*Magna* Lillingstone with its fields, woods and other appurtenances is outside the forest'. Instead, the whole of the north-east of the parish – about 397 acres – formed a detached part of Lillingstone Dayrell. The manor of Heybarne, which lay within the forest, partly in Buckinghamshire and partly in Northamptonshire, and was held by Sir Henry Green of Roger Dayrell on Henry's death in 1369, was situated in this part of the modern parish of Lillingstone Lovell.

The origins of Heybarne appear to lie in a carucate of ancient assart which Simon de Patishulle held of Ralph Dayrell, lord of *Parva* Lillingstone, in 1279. This was presumably land which had been cleared from the wood which Simon held at *le Heybarne*, and in which he was found to have hunted illegally in 1250 when the forest justices reached Buckingham in 1255. In 1550 a close of pasture called *Heyburnefelde* in Lillingstone Dayrell was leased by Nicolas Baker of Whittlebury to an Abthorpe tanner. A century later, in 1651, Cartwell Hill Coppice was said to be bounded on the south by Heyborne field, a situation which is also depicted on the Whittlewood Forest map of c. 1608. At this time, Cartwell Hill Coppice (later known as Cattle Hill Coppice) and the neighbouring Hollibrooke Coppice and Briary Coppice (also known as Blackpitts) were all considered to lie in Lillingstone Lovell rather than Lillingstone Dayrell. This detached portion of Lillingstone Dayrell was finally incorporated into the parish of Lillingstone Lovell in 1878.

Preserved under pasture and lying within this detached part of Lillingstone Dayrell, north of the current Manor House (SP 717 423), is a prominent rectangular bank and ditched enclosure, approximately 120m x 90m in dimension. In the south-western half are clear building platforms and other terraces. The north-eastern half appears clear, from surface evidence alone, to be largely clear on other structure. To the south, a natural stream has been canalized and dammed to form a small rectangular fishpond. Typologically, this type of enclosure is consistent with other known medieval farmsteads or submanors, indeed the plan is reminiscent of that adopted by monastic granges, farms from which distant estates were managed. A similar site, for example lies only a few miles north at Monksbarne, now in Whittlebury but formerly in Paulerspury, a grange of the small Benedictine House of Luffield Priory, now lost under the race circuit at Silverstone.

Description of Test Pits

Five test pits were located within the south-western half of the enclosure. Four were placed on top of obvious platforms and were designed to address whether or not these were structural. A fifth test pit was located off the platforms but still south of the central dividing bank which delimits the two halves of the enclosure. All five test pits sought to establish a date for construction, use and abandonment of the enclosure through surviving ceramic evidence.

HE TP 1

This test pit was located on the most prominent earthwork in the extreme southern corner of the enclosure. At 360mm below the surface a compact limestone surface, possibly an internal floor was encountered. Above this surface eight sherds of medieval pottery were recovered, a single sherd of Brill/Boarstall Ware and seven sherds of Potterspurry Ware. This limited ceramic evidence points to use from the mid-thirteenth century and into the fourteenth.

HE TP 2

This test pit was also located on the main earthwork, but on its northern side. Again a more stony layer was encountered lying immediately above the natural clay. Once again medieval pottery was found above this surface: a single sherd of Potterspurry Ware and Sandy coarseware. Again a thirteenth-century date is indicated by the pottery.

HE TP 3

HE TP 3 was located on the north-western extension of the main platform. In line with the first two test pits a possible rough limestone surface was found at a depth of 420mm below the modern ground surface. This contained a single sherd of Potterspurry Ware. Above this a further 12 sherds of Potterspurry Ware were

recovered. The presence of this pottery within the matrix of the floor points towards a post-1250 date for its laying.

HE TP 4

Unlike the other test pits HE TP 4 was located off the main earthworks. At 380mm below the modern ground level a well-made limestone cobbled surface was found made up of large limestone blocks up to 100mm in diameter. Within this were found sherds of a glazed Potterspurty jug. Further substantial fragments of this jug (16 sherds) were recovered from the layer below these cobbles. Once again, therefore, the sum of the evidence suggests that not only was the enclosure in use in the latter half of the thirteenth century, but that it was being constructed at this time. A large fragment of a unidentified bronze vessel were also found within the cobbles.

HE TP 5

HE TP 5 was the only test pit where no structural evidence was found, this despite being located on the edge of another prominent earthwork lying in the south-western corner of the enclosure. Despite this a further five sherds of Potterspurty Ware were recovered, providing further corroborative evidence for the date of the enclosure and its structure.

Discussion

It is rewarding to discover that the archaeological evidence is consistent with the historical evidence. Whilst the first mention of Heybarne in 1255 (1250) need not indicate the date of foundation, in this instance it would appear to be very close. It is thought that the Potterspurty potting industry was only established around 1250 and thus pottery from this source arriving at Heybarne could not arrive any earlier. The pottery definitively proves that the earthworks are indeed medieval in origin and should best be interpreted as the seat of Heybarne manor. The archaeology and history do, however, diverge with regard to the later history. The documentary sources suggest that the manor had a lively history through to the sixteenth century. However the ceramic evidence suggests a terminal date no later than 1400. This might be resolved, however, if the site was abandoned but the estate still farmed from another location. That Heybarne passed into the hands of the Greens of Greens Norton in 1369 might represent the end of actual occupation. If so the story told by the history and the archaeology is once again internally consistent. Later references to Heybarne Fields may simply refer back to earlier arrangements.