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## Summary

In July and August 2021 an archaeological excavation was carried out by Souterrain in the former rear garden of an early $17^{\text {th }}$ century house at 1A London End, Irchester, Northamptonshire, prior to the construction of a new house.

The site lies about 100 m southwest of the former location of a $13^{\text {th }}$ century manor-house and farm. The manorial complex was reportedly excavated prior construction of a housing estate in 1967, although no written, drawn or photographic record is known to have survived. The remains are said to have extended over more than 2 hectares and included the foundations of several buildings.

Given the proximity of the present development area it seemed possible that the garden of the $17^{\text {th }}$ century house would occupy a part of the manorial site. In 2020, two small archaeological trial pits were excavated in the garden. One of these, dug in the proposed footprint of a garage, encountered a possible $13^{\text {th }}$ century midden deposit that was perhaps associated with the manor. The other, dug close to the proposed house footprint, exposed part of a laid surface of limestone rubble, on which a sherd of late medieval pottery was found. The archaeology was buried under layers of post-medieval horticultural soil.

Subsequently, in 2021, an archaeological excavation was carried out in the proposed new building footprint prior to construction groundwork: the subject of this report. The excavation revealed the previously encountered stone surface to be part of a well-built medieval causeway which traversed an ancient tract of marshy ground adjacent to the former course of a brook. The causeway was exposed for a distance of 10 m .

Three distinct phases of causeway construction were identified. It appears to have originated in the late $13^{\text {th }}$ century as a raised track-way of cobbles set in clay, at which time it was flanked by a ditch. A more robust causeway of pitched limestone slabs and kerbing was then built over it in the $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century. At some juncture in the same period the causeway seems to have suffered severe erosion and subsequently underwent significant repair and widening. It appears to have continued in use into the $14^{\text {th }} / 15^{\text {th }}$ century during which time there was a natural accumulation of soil on either side. When a stone-lined drain was built through it in the $16^{\text {th }}$ century it may have been no more than an earthwork.

The results of the excavation are compared with those obtained from the 2020 trial pits, particularly with respect to palaeo-environmental data and pottery assemblages.

The report explores the historic landscape context of the causeway - its spatial relationship with the manorial complex and its possible route - by means of historic maps and surveys, old aerial photographs and archaeological data. It is hypothesised that the causeway's construction may well have been a direct response to severe climatic anomalies of the period. Finally, an appraisal of research objectives is provided together with a consideration of the potential for any further study / analysis.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report presents an illustrated record of an archaeological excavation which took place in 2021 prior to the construction of a house at the rear of No. 1A London End, Irchester, Northamptonshire. It has been prepared by Souterrain Archaeological Services Ltd (Souterrain) on behalf of A J Bailey, of St Neots, Cambridgeshire (the Developer).
1.2 At the time of report preparation, the major part of the archaeological fieldwork had been completed, namely the investigation of the new house footprint. Minor works, such as the excavation of service trenches, are to be monitored in due course, the results of which are to be covered by an addendum report. A proposed new garage is temporarily in abeyance to allow for re-design with shallow foundations, which should avoid significant archaeological deposits.
1.3 The report integrates the results of a preliminary archaeological evaluation of the site in 2020.
1.4 The report and archive are to be available as a public-accessible record.
2. PLANNING BACKGROUND \& PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION
2.1 In May 2020 an evaluation of the proposed development site was initiated by Liz Mordue, Archaeological Advisor of North Northamptonshire Council, in advance of the determination of a planning application. This was due to the archaeological and historic significance of the locality (post, 4). The evaluation revealed the existence of significant buried archaeological remains of medieval date (Souterrain, 2020).
2.2 Planning Permission was subsequently granted by the Borough of Wellingborough Council (now North Northamptonshire Council) on the $5^{\text {th }}$ August 2020, for a 'new dwelling including access, parking and amenity space \& demolition of existing garage and replacement garage within the curtilage of a listed building' (WP/20/00057/FUL). Condition 10 of the consent was the requirement for an appropriate programme of archaeological work, which would ensure that buried remains of archaeological significance within the Proposed Development Area (hereafter the 'PDA') were adequately investigated and recorded. This is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG, 2019).
2.3 A site-specific Brief for an archaeological excavation was prepared by the Archaeological Advisor (Mordue, 2021) and issued to the Developer. In turn, an appropriate Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) was prepared by Souterrain on the behalf of the Developer (Souterrain, 2021) and endorsed by the local planning authority.

## 3. LOCATION \& ASPECT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SITE

3.1 The village of Irchester lies in the Borough of Wellingborough, about 2.5 km southeast of Wellingborough town, and 1.3 km to the southwest of Rushden town. The PDA is located at London End, beyond the south-eastern periphery of the historic core of the village (Fig. 1).
3.2 The development plot occupies the western part of the Application Site (Fig. 2). It is approximately 650 sq. m . and is centred at NGR 492690, 265580. At the time of the archaeological evaluation in 2020 it was a part of the rear garden of No. 1A London End, an early $17^{\text {th }}$ century cottage which is now a Grade II Listed building ${ }^{1}$. The cottage stands on the roadside

[^0]at the end of a cul-de-sac, its frontage facing eastwards. The building is single storey with attic. It is constructed of local limestone (now rendered) with a brick stack at one end. Originally thatched, the roof is now covered with corrugated steel sheets. The property is surrounded by houses and gardens, mostly which date from the late 1960s.
3.3 The development plot was largely lawn, though with several mature trees and a large custombuilt garage of brick and concrete in its southwest corner. The garage was accessed by a driveway which sloped down from the roadside. Topographically, the plot lies within a small localised linear depression which is broadly aligned north-northeast/ south-southwest. The existing ground height is around 67.15 m OD. This is about 1.5 m lower than the roadway to the east and about 1 m lower than the base of the $17^{\text {th }}$ century house, where the ground falls away sharply from a patio area.
3.4 The underlying geology is mapped by the British Geological Survey (BGS, 2021) as the Wellingborough Limestone Member of the Rutland Formation, described as 'a massive argillaceous, sandy, shelly and shell-detrital limestone associated with rubbly oyster-rich limestone and marl and mudstones, passing northwards into sandstone'. It is typically 3 m to 4 m in thickness. The upper boundary is of the limestone or sandstone is defined by 'rootleted siltstone or mudstone'.

## 4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND \& POTENTIAL

4.1 Although the archaeology discovered at the PDA falls wholly within a medieval context, it is considered pertinent to present a wider sense of the known archaeology in the near environs of the site, particularly as this influenced the research objectives of the Written Schemes of Investigation. A broad history of the late post-medieval to modern landscape in the environs of the PDA is also given here, in order to gain an insight to possible site formation processes and factors which have either contributed to, or affected, the survival of archaeology at the PDA.
4.2 The archaeological data, précised in this section, is primarily derived from a search of the Northamptonshire Historic Environment Record (HER), from a c. 600 m radius of the PDA. The numbers throughout in square brackets denote the HER UID, the locations of which are shown on Figures 3 and 4. Other sources comprise: archaeological investigation reports; A History of the County of Northampton (Salzman, 1937); the RCHME Inventory of Historical Monuments in Northamptonshire (RCHME 1982); and historic maps held by Northamptonshire Archives.

## Romano-British Period

4.3 The PDA lies about 1.3 km to the southeast of a small Roman town ${ }^{2}$ located at the confluence of the rivers Nene and Ise (Fig. 1) which was occupied from the $1^{\text {st }}$ to $5^{\text {th }}$ century AD. The Roman name of the settlement is unknown. Such settlements often developed at the junction of major route-ways or river crossings, where they served an agricultural hinterland. As might be expected, the archaeology of the period is reasonably well-attested in the Study Area (Fig. 3). About 800 m to the west of the PDA, Wollaston Road is believed to follow the same course as the main Roman approach road to the settlement from the south (Margary, 1973). The closest reported discoveries to the PDA have been sherds of sigillata (fine tableware imported from Gaul) and tessera (pieces used in mosaic), which were found in 1967 prior to housing development in Wantage Road, c. 85 m ENE of the PDA [3149]. Chance finds include a gold coin found somewhere near the village centre in 1904 [3135/0/0] and a disc brooch from Sharwood Terrace on the east side of High Street in 1981 [1640/0/0].

[^1]4.4 In 1965, tangible evidence of occupation - ditches and pits with Romano-British pottery - was revealed in a pipe trench on the south-eastern periphery of Irchester [3111/0/1]; c. 400 m SE of the PDA. Less certain evidence was found during groundwork at Townwell Lane in 2017 -shallow ditches [1540/1] and a single sherd of pottery, possibly Roman. Aerial photographs show the presence of ditches and enclosures on the south-western outskirts of the village, some of which may have been part of the Romano-British landscape [3125/0/14], while to the northwest a geophysical survey in 2011 may have detected either a settlement or a funerary site [3126].

## Medieval Period

4.5 Prior to the Norman Conquest there were two Anglo-Saxon estates at Irchester, the largest held by countess Gytha of Hereford ${ }^{3}$. By 1086 both estates had become Norman lordships, or manors. William Peverel had taken over the land of the countess, which was by then inhabited by the households of three freemen and a Frenchman. The assets comprised two plough-lands worked by three teams of oxen, ten acres of meadow and a mill. The smaller manor was held by Count Robert of Mortain - one household and three and a half acres of meadow. Although, nothing is known of the layout or extent of either estate, their descent has been traced as far as possible from manuscripts by Victoria History of the Counties (VCH). Throughout the medieval period the larger estate was held of the manor of Higham Ferrers by a tenant lord. Its manor house and farm is thought to have been on the site now occupied by Manor Farm (Fig. 4, [3124/6]), which is located at the north end of High Street adjacent to the parish church of St Katherine [3124/5/1]. The oldest surviving building at Manor Farm is a $16^{\text {th }}$ century tithe barn. The descent of the smaller estate was traced to the mid $14^{\text {th }}$ century, after which it becomes uncertain.
4.6 The parish church is Irchester's oldest standing structure, its earliest elements stylistically dated to the $12^{\text {th }}$ century, although a much earlier foundation is not doubted. Together, Manor Farm and the church are thought to represent the northernmost extent of the medieval settlement, but tangible archaeological evidence is so far fairly sparse. Before the Victorian period the village was mainly situated along High Street, where the majority of its oldest buildings are today. These largely date from the $17^{\text {th }}$ or $18^{\text {th }}$ century, though a two storey $18^{\text {th }}$ century house known as Manor House is understood to have originated as a $14^{\text {th }}$ century hall ${ }^{4}$. In 1970, a pit or ditch containing $11^{\text {th }}$ to $13^{\text {th }}$ century pottery was found at No. 3 James Street (Fig. 4, [3124/0/19], c. 190 S of the PDA), and in 2013 a possible $12^{\text {th }}$ century tenement boundary gully was found at No. 66 High Street ([3124/0/21], c. 385 NW of the PDA).
4.7 Significantly, in 1967, a second manorial focus was confirmed during a major housing development on a large tract of pastureland known as Manor Field, approximately 250 m east of High Street and immediately northeast of the PDA. This is now known as the Wantage Road estate. The field contained various earthworks, including the postulated site of a manor house, the broad extent of which is depicted on the revised OS $25^{\prime \prime}$ map of 1925 (Fig. 5). Machineremoval of the earthworks during ground preparation exposed the remains of a $13^{\text {th }}$ century manor house complex. The site is reported to have covered some c. 2.2 hectares and included the foundations of various buildings and an extensive limestone yard.
4.8 There is a presumption in the HER entry that the site was archaeologically excavated ${ }^{5}$ although it is uncertain how much investigation and recording actually took place: "Excavation took place in 1967 during development of the site for housing. Prior to development there had been extensive earthworks and excavation found evidence of Saxon remains overlaid by medieval manorial remains'. However, other than brief 'annual round-up' summaries of archaeological discoveries in the county (e.g. Brown, 1967; Wilson \& Hurst 1969, 273) and a collection of pottery sherds

[^2]there appears to be no surviving field record, and nothing that might indicate the extent and layout of features. It seems as though only a salvage record was made: "In June 1967, extensive levelling of Manor Field for building work uncovered a wide range of occupation material. The site was watched, by kind permission of Messrs Pandered Son \& Swindall. The following sherds were recorded:- samian fragments, one decorated with impressed small crosses, jar rims in St Neots ware, carinated bowl in shelly reduced fabric, glazed Stamford ware, wide range of $13^{\text {th }}$ century shell wares, and Lyveden type wares. One orange clay tessera and several pieces of bronze were also recovered (R Harper, A Johnson)" (Brown, 1967). A subsequent summary in Medieval Archaeology reads: "Saxon remains on the site of the manor house were covered by later manorial buildings and an extensive limestone yard. Several other isolated rectangular buildings were found. The kitchen area had a well-preserved oven floor, which had been repaired several times. From a preliminary analysis of the pottery, the manor appears to have been built in the $13^{\text {th }}$ century and to have lasted until the $15^{\text {th }}$ century" (Wilson \& Hurst, 1969, 273). The point shown on Figure 4 for HER record [3124/0/5] is assumed to refer to 'uncertain Saxon remains' across the greater part of the area [3124/1].
4.9 Mid-20 th century air photos show that earthworks also existed on the north side of Station Road, about 180 m north of the PDA (Fig. 4, [3124/0/1 \& 3124/0/18]). The earthworks generally tally with a zone of 'old inclosures' known from a map of 1845 (NA T183) and are presumed to indicate a further wider extent of medieval settlement, particularly as a handful of pottery sherds was found during field-walking in 1977 (3124/0/0). A large part of this area was investigated in 2014, when twenty-five trial trenches were excavated over three fields (see Morris 2015, 53-4). Medieval remains were revealed in five of the trenches near to the village They consisted mainly of early $14^{\text {th }}$ century pits, ditches and post-holes, although one trench exposed limestone foundations of a timber-framed building which was thought to be associated with ironproduction (Fig. 4, [3124/0/24] \& [3124/0/25]). Some of the earthworks previously interpreted as building platforms proved to be spoil heaps alongside medieval iron ore quarries [3124/0/16]. A background scatter of $10^{\text {th }}$ to $12^{\text {th }}$ century pottery indicated a presence of some kind in the late Anglo-Saxon and early Norman periods.

## Evaluation of the PDA in 2020

4.10 Given the proximity of the aforementioned $13^{\text {th }}$ century manor-house and farm complex discovered in 1967 (ante, 4.7-4.8) it was assumed that the early $17^{\text {th }}$ century house and its rear garden (i.e. the PDA) could occupy a part of the manorial site (Fig. 4, [3124/1]). In May 2020, Souterrain excavated two archaeological trial pits (each $2 \mathrm{~m} \times 2 \mathrm{~m}$ ) in the rear garden, in order to assess the significance of any buried archaeological remains that might be affected by a proposed development (Souterrain 2020).
4.11 The trial pits were positioned about 14 m apart (Fig. 6, TP 1\& TP2) and with respect to a number of constraints (i.e. suspected routes of live services, extant buildings and mature trees). One of the pits (TP1) revealed a medieval deposit of substantial thickness, which was interpreted as a midden, possibly associated with the manor. The deposit was located $0.3 \mathrm{~m}-0.36 \mathrm{~m}$ below the existing ground surface and sealed by $17^{\text {th }}$ to $19^{\text {th }}$ century horticultural/garden soils. Broadly dated by pottery to the $13^{\text {th }}$ century, it yielded an extensive range of carbonised plant macrofossils, particularly cereal grain. The other trial pit (TP2) located a layer of limestone fragments in a clay matrix which had the appearance of a building foundation. A single sherd of late medieval pottery was found above the stones. The discoveries were resonant of those made nearby in 1967.

## Later land-use at the Proposed Development Area

4.12 A map produced in 1845 shows that the PDA was once part of an 'old inclosure' (i.e. a preparliamentary enclosure), which was presumably long set to pasture, though the date of its creation is not known. By 1899 the enclosed field was converted to allotment gardens, which
included a large portion of the PDA. A track-way ran through the allotments between the east end of East Street and London End. This landscape was unchanged in 1925 (Fig. 5). The track became defunct in the late 1960s when houses were built over the allotment site. At the same time, the garden boundary of No 1A London End was greatly extended to the west and to the south, where it enveloped the east end of the track: about 36 m of its length. A brick and concrete garage-workshop was then built in the southwest corner of the new garden, above part of the former track. The remainder of the track became the foundation for a driveway.
4.13 A series of sheds/outbuildings and pig pens are recalled to have stood near to the western boundary of the plot in the mid $20^{\text {th }}$ century ${ }^{6}$. At some juncture in the late 1960 s or 1970 s the garden was cut through for the installation of a substantial storm drain, the flow of which is south to north. This is understood to have been a replacement of an existing culverted brook ${ }^{7}$. The hypothesised line of the storm drain is show on Figure $6^{8}$. Subsequent to its installation, the entire garden was raised and landscaped to form a lawn tennis court ${ }^{9}$.

## 5. RESEARCH PRIORITIES \& OBJECTIVES

5.1 The primary focus of the archaeological work has been to identify, record and recover data that may contribute to key regional archaeological research themes and priorities, as expounded by Knight, Vyner \& Allan (2012) in the Updated Research Agenda and Strategy for the Historic Environment of the East Midlands (URS).
5.2 In this respect, the proximity of the PDA to the medieval manorial complex discovered in 1967 has been a foremost consideration, as it is presently poorly understood how manorial centres and their estates developed from the early medieval period. It was thus anticipated that excavation might shed light on elements of the manorial chronology or even its structural development (c.f. URA Research Objective 7F).
5.3 Given the relative proximity of the small Romano-British town south of the confluence of the Nene and the Ise, there was also the possibility that the PDA would yield archaeological information pertaining to the town's relationship with its agrarian hinterland (c.f. URA Research Objectives 5H, 5G).
5.4 As a matter of course, other essential county objectives were to: a) examine the significance of archaeological remains; b) establish the date, nature and extent of past activity or occupation at the proposed development site; c) recover palaeo-environmental remains to determine local environmental conditions; and d) recover artefacts that may assist in the development of regional type series.
5.5 Consideration would be given to the effectiveness of the prior field evaluation in the light of the results of the archaeological investigation.

## 6. EXCAVATION RESULTS

Note: In the following account of the investigation photographs are prefixed by ' $P$ '. These are combined with the figures at the rear of the report.

[^3]
## General

6.1 The excavation fieldwork was carried out between the $26^{\text {th }}$ July 2021 and August $8^{\text {th }}$ 2021. The investigation was conducted with due consideration to Health and Safety and observed the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' Code of Conduct and Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation (2020).

## Area of Excavation \& Constraints

6.2 The area of excavation was positioned to provide adequate clearance from known and projected courses of buried services. These comprised two substantial brick-built storm-drain culverts and a foul drain, all of which appeared to be still in use. Their projected courses are shown on Figure 6. The brick culverts came to light after the demolition of the concrete garage which stood in the southwest corner of the site. Notably, the brick type denoted construction in the late $19^{\text {th }}$ century to early $20^{\text {th }}$ century (P. 1). The foul drain was discovered during ground reduction to define the course of the NW/SE-aligned culvert (P. $2 \& 3$ ). This was a sectional salt-glazed ceramic type which was common from the late $19^{\text {th }}$ century through to the mid $20^{\text {th }}$ century. Critically, in terms of archaeological potential, a preliminary exploration of this area revealed it to have been wholly disturbed to a depth of at least 1.34 m . In places, the ground reduction above the conduits reached 66.40 to 66.10 m OD .
6.3 One of the brick-built culverts, aligned WSW/ENE, was buried beneath rubble make-up layers of the late $19^{\text {th }} /$ mid $20^{\text {th }}$ century track-way (Figs. $5 \& 6, \mathrm{P} 3$ ). This conduit probably fed into a culverted watercourse, now a storm drain, which flows northwards beneath the lawn at the rear of the existing house (Fig. 6; ante, 4.13).
6.4 Except for the south-western part of the site where the garage had stood, the area of excavation was previously occupied by a lawn. Here, the existing ground height was between 67.10 m and 67.22 m OD. Two mature trees were felled prior to the investigation. During ground reduction it was decided to leave the tree stumps in place rather than than cause unnecessary upheaval to archaeological structures and deposits by their excavation.

## Excavation \& Recording Methodology

6.5 Modern to late post-medieval overburden was carefully removed by a mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless bucket, under archaeological guidance (P 1).
6.6 Archaeological deposits and features were cleaned and investigated using hand-tools. An archaeological context recording system was used for registering textual descriptions and stratigraphic relationships. Archaeological features, excavated sections and the limit of excavation were surveyed to Ordnance Survey National Grid co-ordinates and orthometric heights by means of Differential GNSS. The archaeology was then planned by hand in greater detail at 1:20 scale. Measured drawings were made of all key sections and a high resolution digital photographic record was made. A series of representative levels were taken across the site and PDA and relevant non-archaeological hard detail was also surveyed.

## Archaeological Phases

6.7 In the account which follows, the archaeological deposits and features encountered are described in order of earliest to latest. Where appropriate, and for ease of description, these are ordered by 'phase'. Wherever possible the broad date of each observable stratigraphic event has been determined by the presence of diagnostic pottery sherds.

## Geological Stratum

6.8 The geological stratum (005) in the area of excavation was encountered at approximately 1.1 m below the existing ground level; around 66.02 m OD. It comprised mid orange-brown sandy clay with very few stone inclusions.

## Local Environmental \& Ground Conditions in the $13^{\text {th }}$ Century

6.9 Overlying the geological stratum was a layer of compact silty clay (019), generally $0.25-0.32 \mathrm{~m}$ thick. This material was found to extend throughout the area of excavation. During fieldwork it was interpreted on site as the remains of a marshy landscape, presumably adjacent to the aforementioned brook, now culverted (ante, 4.13). Pottery sherds from within the layer range in date from the late Saxon period through to the $13^{\text {th }}$ century. Subsequently, the environmental analysis confirmed the on-site interpretation. It revealed the presence of two species of freshwater snails, one species (Anisus leucostoma) common to marshland or standing water, the other (Lymnaea truncatula) often found in wet hollows or slow-moving water (see Summers, post, $7.23 \& 7.26$ ). It also contained a range of carbonised material that reflects local cultivation (and indeed diet) during the medieval period, consisting of cereal grains (free-threshing wheat, hulled barley and oats) and peas or beans. However, the low concentrations of arable weeds and the absence of cereal chaff suggest that the assemblage represents accumulated remains from domestic activity (i.e. food processing and preparation) that took place in the vicinity, as opposed to being by-products of crop processing.

## Phase 1: Causeway \& Ditch (c. late $13^{\text {th }}$ century)

Contexts 038, 025, 024, [016], 017, 041
6.10 The earliest anthropogenic deposits consisted of material put down to form a raised track-way, or causeway, across sodden ground. The causeway was aligned approximately north-south and appears to have been about 2.5 m wide. Initially, a base layer was laid. This consisted of compact mid greenish-brown clay with crushed ironstone fragments (038), generally between 0.08 and 0.2 m in thickness (Fig. 12, Section 4: P13 \& P14). Pottery sherds from within the material suggest that the work probably took place in the latter half of the $13^{\text {th }}$ century. Above this was a surface layer ( $0.05-0.08 \mathrm{~m}$ ) composed of compacted mid orange-brown sandy clay, with frequent small to medium-sized fragments of limestone. Its variable consistency (i.e. contexts $024 \& 025$ ) probably reflects alternate barrow-loads of material extracted from a differing local source, but overall represents the same depositional event. Notably, there were no wheel ruts. The causeway was perhaps no more a raised footway or packhorse track.
6.11 At some juncture, a ditch [016] was dug along the west side of the causeway, cutting through the marshy ground (019) into the geological stratum below (005) (Figs. 10 \& 12: P 13-15 \& 21). It is difficult to say whether the ditch was a planned part of the initial causeway construction. In section the ditch appeared to have been cut through the causeway layers (contexts 024 and 038), although this does not rule out erosion, either through natural processes or via periodic manual scouring out of the ditch. Where investigated by excavated segment the ditch proved to have steep smooth sides $\left(45^{\circ}-50^{\circ}\right)$ falling to a flat base at a depth of c. 0.5 m (Fig. 12 , Section 4; Fig. 15, Section 7, P21). The width across the top of the ditch was c. 1.2 m , while its basal width was c. 0.9 m .
6.12 The fill of the ditch (Section 4, 017; Section 7, 041) comprised a homogeneous gley deposit of mid grey-brown sandy clay with occasional small to medium sized stones. Pottery sherds attest to the ditch being open during the $13^{\text {th }}$ and $14^{\text {th }}$ century. The ditch became redundant having silted up (as opposed to having been deliberately in-filled). The environmental evidence (Summers, 2021, post, 7.17-17.28) presents an evocative image not only of the use-life and neglect of the ditch, but also of the wider landscape setting of the track-way. The taxa assemblage denotes that tall vegetation thrived on the damp ditch margins and, beyond it , was a short-turf calcareous grassland. Snail shells from the ditch include a type which reflects seasonal standing water. Seeds of arable weeds were rare and there was a relatively low density of carbonised cereal grains and seeds. For the most part the carbonised food stuffs comprised hulled barley and free-threshing wheat, but also oats and rye, together with seeds of pea or bean. The absence of chaff suggests that the assemblage was a gradual accumulation of culinary
waste. This hypothesis is supported by the presence of hearth ash, a few fragments of marine shell (from context 017) and very occasional bone fragments of consumed livestock - pig, sheep and cattle, including a dog-chewed bone (see Holmes, post, 7.16, Table 5).
6.13 Surprisingly, the two excavated segments through the ditch produced only a very small quantity of pottery attributable to its use-life: eight $12^{\text {th }} / 13^{\text {th }}$ century sherds and four $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century sherds (post, 7.4, $7.8 \& 7.11$, Table 1). The pieces are from seven different vessels. Three residual pieces of late Saxon pottery ( $10^{\text {th }} / 11^{\text {th }}$ century) date were also present. The overall low density of all domestic-derived material suggests that occupation may have been set back some way from the track.
6.14 At this point it is interesting to compare the environmental results with those from a trial pit dug in 2020, located 12 m northeast of the excavation area (Fig. 6, TP1). Here, a 'significant' number of carbonised plant macrofossil remains were recovered from a single, but substantial, medieval layer (103). Broadly dated by pottery to the $13^{\text {th }}$ century, the layer was $\mathrm{c} .0 .58-0.6 \mathrm{~m}$ thick and directly overlay the geological stratum. There were no discernible depositional horizons or tip lines and it contained occasional angular to sub-angular fragments of limestone ( $<60 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) which were notably unsorted. Of the carbonised plant remains, cereal grains were 'overwhelmingly dominant', in particular free-threshing wheat, then barley, but also pulses (pea or beans seeds). Significantly, however, there was a notable scarcity of chaff and arable seeds, which mirrors the results of samples taken from both the former marshy ground layer (019) and the track-side ditch (017/041). Moreover, since the material also contained a few bone fragments (including fish) and frequent bits of charcoal, probably domestic fuel debris, the deposit was also considered likely to be culinary waste. Appreciating the key-hole nature of the trial pit ( $2 \mathrm{~m} \times 2$ m ) it was difficult to determine the exact nature of the deposit, although it is feasible that the pit was centred on a midden mound or a manure heap with domestic waste located on the east side of the former brook. The full environmental analysis from the trial pit is included in this report at Appendix 3.

## Phase 2: Stone-built Causeway ( $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ Century)

## Contexts 020, 009, 008, 007

6.15 It is in Phase 2 that the track way is transformed into a well-designed and well-built causeway. Initially, a make-up layer (020) was laid down, up to 0.15 m thick and approximately 3.7 m wide (Figs. $12 \& 13$ ). This comprised fragments of limestone and ironstone set in a dark greenishbrown sandy clay matrix. Some of the larger stones appeared to have been arranged, while others randomly-placed. This base layer was laid not only over the existing track-way, but also over the ditch. By then the ditch was completely silted up, which seems to suggest that a considerable length of time, possibly decades, had passed between the filling of the ditch and the construction of the new causeway. There were no artefacts present.
6.16 Set above the base layer was a layer of limestone in a matrix of crushed ironstone and sandy clay (009), $0.15 \mathrm{~m}-0.25 \mathrm{~m}$ thick. A distinct kerb of limestone blocks (007) survived intermittently along its western side (Figs. 7, 12 \& 13: P 11 \& 17). The centre of the causeway was no more than 1.75 m wide and fairly level, whilst its sides had a marked camber. In total, about 10 m of the causeway's length was exposed in the area of excavation. Figure 8 includes the portion of the causeway that was previously uncovered in Test Pit 2 in 2020.
6.17 A meticulous technique had been employed in construction of the causeway surface, elements of which could still be observed throughout its course. This consisted of irregular small slabs of limestone (i.e. fractured along the natural bedding plane), pitched at an angle of $30^{\circ}-40^{\circ}$ and overlapping (e.g. Fig. 7 (009); P 10). The gaps in-between had then been filled with crushed ironstone, but sometimes fragmented limestone, to achieve a durable and more or less smooth
surface. Over time however, much of the finer in-fill material had washed away. To avoid lateral movement the pitch of the stones was aligned with the course of the causeway: in this case each stone pitched southwards.
6.18 Spot heights taken along the causeway surface revealed the southern 6 m or so to be fairly consistent, around 66.70 m OD (Fig. 8). This was comparable with the northern end recorded in Test Pit 1. The exception was a slight dip to around 66.61 m OD , where two distinct rows of flatlaid slabs with roughly-squared facings crossed the causeway, east-west (Fig. 7, (008); P 8 \& P 9). The facing edges of the slabs were separated by a gap of $c .0 .4 \mathrm{~m}$. Their purpose is uncertain, but it may have been the remains of a culvert, to allow water flowing down from the west to drain over the causeway into the brook. It was clearly an original feature of the causeway, since pitched stones were firmly set against the rear of the southern row.
6.19 A very small amount of pottery was found in main upper body of the causeway (i.e. context 009), but sufficient to confirm a broad date of construction: at some time in the $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century. The assemblage includes a fairly 'fresh' sherd of Potterspuryware ( $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century), a couple of abraded sherds of shellyware $\left(12^{\text {th }} / 13^{\text {th }}\right.$ century) and three much-worn sherds of St Neots ware ( $10^{\text {th }} / 11^{\text {th }}$ century) (post, 7.11, Table 1 ).

## Phase 3: Causeway Repair and Widening ( $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ Century)

Contexts 043, [039], 027, [029] 026, 018, 010
6.20 Two excavated segments through the causeway revealed that its east side had undergone extensive repair and probable widening (Fig. 9; Fig. 12, Section 4; Fig. 14, Section 5; P18-P21). It appears that the east side of the causeway had suffered considerable erosion, quite possibly washed away in a single flooding event. Either that or it had been deliberately cut down at an angle of $\mathrm{c} .30^{\circ}$ to $45^{\circ}$. The former explanation seems more plausible. The repair was about 2 m wide. It is assumed that the Phase 2 stone-built causeway also had a line of kerbstones on its east side, which was subsequently lost to erosion.
6.21 The repair episode comprised raising the ground on the east side of the causeway. Two distinct layers were identifiable, although it was uncertain whether the lowermost layer was a deliberate deposit, or an erosion product. In Section 4 (Fig. 12) the lowermost layer (026) was directly above the former marshy ground (019). It was composed of very claggy mid-grey-brown clay, with occasional limestone fragments and was around 0.4 m thick. A similar layer (027) was encountered in Section 5, this up to 0.15 m thick (Fig. 14). The most recent pottery sherds from this deposit suggest that it was formed in the $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century. Layer (027) appeared to be cut by a rather nebulous feature [028] which was not observable in plan during excavation.
6.22 The material forming the surface layer of the repair was composed of small fragments of limestone set in matrix of greyish-brown clay (Section 4, 043; Section 5, 018; P 18). Pieces of limestone were impressed into the top of the layer to create a robust surface. Again, there was no sign of wheel ruts. A small amount of pottery suggests that this layer was put down at sometime in the $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century.

## Phase 4: Accumulation of soils alongside the causeway (c. $14^{\text {th }} / 15^{\text {th }}$ century)

Contexts 015, 014, 004
6.23 Lapping up to the causeway on either side was a compact layer of mid yellow- sandy clay with small to medium sized fragments of limestone (004) (Figs. 11 Sections $2 \& 3$ : Fig. 14, Section 5). This was generally c 0.1-0.14 m thick and had the appearance of subsoil. It was probably formed through a natural accumulation of soils and vegetation. It contained a small quantity of bones of sheep or goat. A few sherds of $14^{\text {th }} / 15^{\text {th }}$ century pottery embedded in the surface of the layer
indicated a rough date of its formation. In particular, four un-abraded adjoining sherds came from the west side of the causeway, seemingly lying where the vessel was dropped and smashed.
6.24 Subsequent layers, considered to have been the result of naturally-occurring ground deposits were discernible in Sections 2 and 3 (Fig. 11, contexts $014 \& 015$ ). One of these layers (014) appeared as a bank of mid orange-brown sandy pebbly clay with an upper band of pebbles. This was up to c .0 .26 m in thickness. It was possibly a seasonal build-up of material deposited by the brook. It was devoid of no pottery. Directly above it was a layer of dark orange-brown sandy clay, c. $0.25-0.28$ m thick with occasional small to medium-sized fragments of limestone (015) (Fig. 11). This was also a possible natural build-up of material alongside the watercourse. It contained a few scraps of bone from pig and cattle. Pottery found impressed to the surface of the layer suggested that its formation occurred in the $14^{\text {th }} / 15^{\text {th }}$ century. It is uncertain how long the causeway continued in use as a route-way. The latest pottery found between the pitched surface stones dates from the $14^{\text {th }} / 15^{\text {th }}$ century.

## Phase 5: Early Post-medieval (c. $16^{\text {th }}$ century)

Contexts [030], 037, 012, 011
6.25 At some juncture either in the late medieval or the early post-medieval period, a stone-lined and capped drain was built through the causeway to allow water from the west side to drain into the brook (Fig. 7, [030], 011/012: P 6 \& P7). Exposed over a distance of c. 7.3 m , it was generally c. $0.28-0.32 \mathrm{~m}$ wide and c .0 .3 m deep. There was a bifurcation as it approached the former watercourse.
6.26 Although the drainage channel was cut from above the $14^{\text {th }} / 15^{\text {th }}$ century ground layers (Fig. 11 Sections $2 \& 3,015$ ) it is difficult to assign a close date for this type of construction which was fairly common prior to the early $19^{\text {th }}$ century. The advent of clay tile field under-drainage in England did not occur much before 1800, and cheap mass production of clay tile or cylinder drains not until the mid 1840s (Darby, 1964, 194-5). Hand-excavation (c. 75\%) of the channel revealed no diagnostic pottery. The few artefacts present comprised three brick fragments and a piece of orange clay roof tile (post, 7.15 , Table 4, 037) all of which appear to have been deposited at the time of construction. However, the bricks provide a rough dating mechanism since their relative thinness ( $13 / \mathrm{s}^{\prime \prime}$ and $1 \frac{1}{2 \prime \prime}$ ) indicate that they may have been made prior to a charter of 1571 which stipulated a brick thickness of $21 / 2^{\prime \prime}$.
6.27 A cut feature of indeterminable form and function was partly visible in the south-east corner of the excavation area (Fig. 12, Section 4, [039]), where it was disturbed by the roots and stump of a mature tree. The latest sherd of pottery is probably from a $15^{\text {th }}$ century kiln at Glapthorn, about 22 miles north of Irchester (post, 7.11, Table 1).

## Phase 6: Later Post-medieval Land-use

Contexts [031], [033], [035], [208], 003, 002, 001
6.28 The entire site was buried under a substantial layer of loose dark brown gritty silty soil (003), 0.3 - 0.4 m deep. This contained frequent a high content of charcoal /coal flecks and occasional pottery sherds which range in date from the $18^{\text {th }}$ to $19^{\text {th }}$ century. The topsoil comprised loose dark grey-brown, gritty loam, generally 0.2 m to 0.28 m in thickness. There were no artefacts present.
6.29 As previously mentioned, the development plot is known to have been part of a preparliamentary enclosed field of pasture long before 1845 (Fig. 16). By the late $19^{\text {th }}$ century the field had been converted to allotment gardens with a track-way passing through the middle
which linked the cul-de-sac of East Street with that of London End. This landscape was unchanged in 1925 (Fig. 5), and presumably altered little until housing developments in the late 1960s. The investigation of 2021 revealed the rubble remains of the track just beyond the southern baulk of the excavated area and a brick-built culvert (ante, 6.3) beneath it. A series of early-modern post-holes found in the northern part of the causeway (Fig. 7, [031], [033], [035] \& [208]) were quite feasibly associated with a clutch of outbuildings and pig pens that are known to have once stood in the north part of the garden (ante, 4.13).

## 7. THE FINDS

7.1 The earliest artefact from the excavation is a single body-sherd of possible Romano-British shelly coarseware ( 12 g ), similar to wares produced at Harrold (Beds), c. 8.8 km to the southeast. The sherd was recovered from the former marshy ground layer underlying the late $13^{\text {th }}$ century raised track (Phase 1).

## Medieval Pottery by Martin Wilson

## (Confirmation of fabric-type was carried out by Jackie Wells MA)

7.2 A total of 87 sherds of medieval pottery were recovered from the excavation, with an aggregate weight of 739 grams. The estimated minimum number of vessels represented is 57 . The sherds are listed by context in Table 1 and quantification by context is given in Table 2.

## Early medieval period ( $9^{\text {th }}-11^{\text {th }}$ century)

7.3 The earliest wares are predominantly St Neots-type (fabric F100), a fine-walled black pottery with reduced core which date from the Late Saxon / early medieval period ( $9^{\text {th }}-11^{\text {th }}$ century). In all, nine pieces were found in contexts ranging from c. $13^{\text {th }}$ century through to the $14^{\text {th }} / 15^{\text {th }}$ century (contexts 004, 018, 038, 041). All of the pieces are much-abraded and from different vessels. In addition, a possible Stamford-type ware (fabric F205) (c. $10^{\text {th }} / 11^{\text {th }}$ century) was recovered from the fill of the trackside ditch; a probable late $13^{\text {th }}$ century deposit (041). The residual Saxon material makes up c. $11.5 \%$ of the total assemblage, with an overall weight of 46 g . It clearly reflects activity, perhaps even occupation, in the vicinity during the Late Saxon period.

## High Medieval period (12 ${ }^{\text {th }}-13^{\text {th }}$ century)

7.4 Shelly limestone-tempered coarsewares (fabric 330) make up c. $35.6 \%$ of the pottery assemblage: 37 sherds. These are unglazed vessels with surface colour varying from grey or buff to light orange and a light grey reduced core. They date to the $12^{\text {th }} / 13^{\text {th }}$ century. Most of the assemblage has light to medium abrasion, suggesting exposure to the elements, or even redeposition. Ten pieces came from the marshy ground layer (019), the stratigraphically-earliest deposit. Another sherd was found in track make-up layer (038) and a further seven pieces were recovered from the fill of track-side ditch (041). Notably, all of the sherds from the former marshy ground layer (019) have signs of weathering, as do other $13^{\text {th }}$ century wares from the same context (i.e. Lyveden-Stanion ware). In contrast, there are some $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century sherds (Potterspury ware) from the same context with slight abrasion, although this may be on account of their superior quality.
7.5 Most of the shelly coarseware sherds are too small to determine vessel forms, although the assemblage includes two rim sherds from cooking pots or jars (009 \& 026), a jug rim (041) and a plain jug handle (009). There are three known production centres for this type of pottery in the wider locality: Yardley Hastings (Northants), c. $13 \mathrm{~km}^{10}$ to the southwest; Olney-Hyde (Bucks), c. 13 km to the south-southwest, and; Harrold (Beds) c. 11.5 km to the southeast. Notably, the jug rim from context (009) has a close resemblance with vessels produced at Harrold in the $13^{\text {th }}$ century (c.f. Hall, 1972, f. 5, J.1).
7.6 In addition, the assemblage includes eight sherds of Sand-tempered, unglazed, coarse-ware (fabric 360), possibly from cooking pots. These broadly date to the $13^{\text {th }}$ century, although they cannot be attributed to any specific provenance. They include two decorated body sherds from different vessels. One of these came from the marshy ground layer (019) and is lightly abraded.

[^4]It has a grey outer surface with an applied horizontal band of light orange clay, and an oxidised inner surface, the fabric with fine sand inclusions. The other piece has incised horizontal bands on its outer surface. Notably unabraded, it came from the base of the repair layer (018) on the east side of the causeway (Fig. 14, Section 5).

High Medieval period ( $13^{\text {th }}-14^{\text {th }}$ century)
7.7 Seventeen sherds of Potterspury-ware (fabric F329) were recovered from the excavation, representing c. $17 \%$ of the total pottery assemblage with an aggregate weight of 135 g . They are from 11 individual vessels and date to the $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century. They were made at Potterspury (Bucks), c. 28 km to the southwest, where pottery production is understood to have begun in the middle of the $13^{\text {th }}$ century. Typically, the vessels are fine and relatively thin-walled having been wheel-thrown. They are of superior quality to the shelly limestone tempered wares. Although frequently glazed or partially glazed, all of the recovered sherds are unglazed. Significantly, a piece was found in the earliest context, the marshy ground layer (019), along with a number of sherds of shellyware (ante, 7.4). It is quite possible, therefore that the track-way was constructed in the latter half of the $13^{\text {th }}$ century. Sherds of this type subsequently occurred in each structural phase of the track-way and causeway.
7.8 Other sherds of $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century date comprise of 10 pieces of Lyveden and Stanion ware (fabric F319) which originate from north-eastern Northamptonshire. These comprise c. $11.5 \%$ of the total assemblage and are from 7 individual vessels, probably jugs. All are unglazed body sherds with relatively thin-walls and generally poorly finished surfaces. The fabric is calcitetempered with oxidised outer surface (buff to light orange) with light grey reduced core. They are considered be late $13^{\text {th }}$ century in date although close dating of these wares is uncertain. The products have a mainly localized distribution in the East Midlands and East Anglia (Blinkhorn, $2018,286)$. Sherds of this type were present in marshy ground layer (019), the track layers, trackside ditch (017) and (041). Moreover, the fresh appearance of the pieces from the the track layers would seem to support a late $13^{\text {th }}$ century date for its construction.
7.9 The rarer $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century wares in the assemblage were two very small pieces of Brill/Boarstall ware (fabric F324). Both are thin-walled with outer green-glaze and are probably from jugs. They originate from the locality of the two Buckinghamshire villages (c. 60 km to the southwest). One sherd was found in the surface layer of the causeway repair (018), while the other was from a probable late $15^{\text {th }}$ century context (010).

Later Medieval period $\left(14^{\text {th }}-15^{\text {th }}\right.$ century)
7.10 The assemblage includes eight pieces of Late medieval oxidised ware (fabrics F325/F378/F401) four of which are considered to be of $14^{\text {th }} / 15^{\text {th }}$ century date. All have a light orange oxidised surface and a grey core. Although their origin is uncertain, they provide a reasonably secure dating mechanism for the continued usage of the causeway and the accumulation of soils (004) along its sides. Four sherds from the same vessel were found impressed into the old ground surface (004) and have unabraded historic fractures. The latest piece of this category is an unabraded rimsherd from an unglazed vessel with an upright neck, which has a slight trace of a handle; perhaps a jug or even a bung-hole jar. It has light orange fabric with light grey reduced core, abundant both rounded and sub-rounded grains of quartz. The fabric and form has similarities to vessel types from the 'Leacroft' and 'Gypsy Lane' kiln sites at Glapthorn near Oundle, Northants (c.f. Johnstone et al. 1997, Nos. 13 \& 21)

### 7.11 Table 1. Medieval Pottery Types and Chronology

(Note: Fabric codes denote Northamptonshire Type Series)

| Context No. | Common name | Remarks | Fabric Code | Period | Wt. <br> (g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 003 | St Neots-type ware <br> Sandy coarse-ware <br> St Neots-type ware | x 2 small small sherds, inc. rim of jar, everted, rounded slightly undercut. Much- abraded. From surface of causeway (009) <br> $x 1$ body sherd, fine sand inclusions. Orange fabric with reduced core: Grey unglazed outer surface (slip) with faint incised horizontal bands. Only lightly abraded. From surface of causeway (009) x 1 small rim sherd, bowl, Much-abraded <br> Sherd count = 4; MNV=4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F100 } \\ & \text { F360 } \\ & \text { F100 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C9- C11 } \\ & \text { C12 /C13 } \\ & \text { C9- C11 } \end{aligned}$ | 6 <br> 23 <br> 9 <br> 38 |
| 004 | Late medieval oxidised ware <br> St Neots-type ware Late medieval oxidised ware | x 4 body sherds. Light orange oxidised surface, grey core, 'fresh' historic fractures. Found laying flat at interface of (003) \& (004), on W side of causeway at $S$ end <br> x 1 small rim sherd, Prob. bowl. Abraded. From SW side of causeway surface <br> x 1 small rim sherd. Jar. Light orange oxidised surface, grey core Abraded. From SW side of causeway surface <br> Sherd count = 6; MNV= 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F325/ } \\ & \text { F378/ } \\ & \text { F401 } \\ & \text { F100 } \\ & \text { F325/ } \\ & \text { F378/ } \\ & \text { F401 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C14- C15 } \\ & \text { C9- C11 } \\ & \text { C14-/C15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37 \\ & 6 \\ & 5 \\ & 48 \end{aligned}$ |
| 009 | Shelly coarse-ware <br> Potterspury ware <br> Sandy coarse-ware <br> Late medieval oxidised ware <br> Late medieval oxidised ware | x 2 sherds. Moderately abraded. <br> Inc. rim of jar, ext. dia. 250 mm . Orange-pink fabric with light grey core, moderately heavy wellsorted fine crushed shelly limestone <1mm (form- c.f Blinkhorn, 2018, 272, fig. 10.7, 59-64). <br> x 1 body sherd. Quite abraded <br> x 1 body sherd. Sand-tempered. Grey with light brown outer surface <br> x 1, body sherd, grey with buff outer surface. ?rouletted decoration <br> x 1 body sherd. Light orange oxidised surface, grey core. Abraded. From interface of old ground layer (004) \& causeway surface stone (009), towards SE end of causeway <br> Sherd count = 6; MNV= 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F330 } \\ & \\ & \text { F329 } \\ & \text { F360 } \\ & \text { F325/ } \\ & \text { F378/ } \\ & \text { F401 } \\ & \text { F325/ } \\ & \text { F378/ } \\ & \text { F401 } \end{aligned}$ | C12 /C13 <br> C13/ C14 <br> c. C13 <br> C14- late <br> C15 <br> C14- C15 | 27 <br> 6 <br> 5 <br> 8 <br> 11 <br> 57 |
| 010 | Brill/ Boarstall ware <br> Potterspury ware <br> Late medieval oxidised ware <br> ? Glapthorn ware | x 1 body sherd, mottled olive green glazed, buff unglazed inner surface, grey reduced core <br> x 2 body sherds. Light orange with dark grey reduced core. Unabraded <br> x 1 rimsherd, jug 8 (trace of handle). Unglazed. Light orange fabric with light grey reduced core, abundant quartz grains, rounded and sub-rounded. Unabraded. Poss. from Glapthorn, Oundle, Northants. Form similar to jar with upright neck (c.f. Johnstone et al. 1997, Nos 13 \& 21), or possibly | F324 <br> F329 <br> F325/ F378/ <br> F401 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C13 /C14 } \\ & \text { C13 /C14 } \\ & \text { C14- late } \\ & \text { C15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 9 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ |


| Context No. | Common name | Remarks | Fabric Code | Period | Wt. <br> (g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | a jug (? bung-hole jar) |  |  |  |
|  | Poss. Lyveden/ Stanion ware Sandy coarse-ware | x 1 body sherd. Light orange/buff with light grey reduced core, thin-walled. Unabraded $\times 2$ body sherds, fine sandy. Grey with orange inner surface. Light abrasion. MNV 2 Sherd count = 7; MNV= 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ?F319 } \\ & \text { F360 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C13 } \\ & \text { c. } \mathrm{C} 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 7 \\ & 42 \end{aligned}$ |
| 015 | Late medieval oxidised ware Potterspury ware Shelly coarse-ware | x 1 body sherd, fine sandy. Orange with grey reduced core and grey outer surface (slip) <br> x 1 rim sherd. Hooked / flanged rim, flat top. Light orange with dark grey reduced core x 3, in rim of pitcher, triangular section (c.f Blinkhorn, 283, fig. 10.16, 108) MNV 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F329 } \\ & \text { F330 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} 14-\mathrm{C} 15 \\ & \mathrm{C} 13 / 14 \\ & \mathrm{C} 12 / \mathrm{C} 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 8 \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | Sherd count = 5; MNV=4 |  |  | 44 |
| 017 | Potterspury ware <br> Poss. Lyveden/ <br> Stanion ware | $\times 2$ body sherds. Light orange with dark grey reduced core. Unabraded <br> x 2 body sherds, buff and light orange, light gry reduced core. lightly abraded. MNV 2 <br> Sherd count = 4; MNV=3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F329 } \\ & \text { ?F319 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} 13 / \mathrm{C} 14 \\ & \mathrm{C} 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 12 \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 018 | St Neots-type ware Shelly coarse-ware Sandy coarse-ware Potterspury ware Brill/Boarstall-type ware | x 2 body sherds. Abraded <br> $X 4$ sherds, body/ base. Some lightly abraded <br> $x 2$ body sherds, fine sand inclusions. Lightly abraded <br> X 1 unglazed with reduced core <br> x 1 body sherd, fine thin-walled, light pink-orange fabric with thin transparent light green outer glaze <br> Sherd count =10; MNV=6 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { F100 } \\ & \text { F330 } \\ & \text { F360 } \\ & \text { F329 } \\ & \text { F324 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{C} 9-\mathrm{C} 11 \\ & \mathrm{C} 12 / 13 \\ & \text { c. C13 } \\ & \mathrm{C} 13 / \mathrm{C} 14 \\ & \mathrm{C} 13 / \mathrm{C} 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 45 \\ & 13 \\ & 14 \\ & 4 \\ & 85 \end{aligned}$ |
| 019 | Potterspury ware Lyveden/ Stanion ware <br> Shelly coarse-ware Potterspury ware <br> Sandy coarse-ware <br> Shelly coarse-ware | x 7 body sherds, inc. 5 adjoining from light green lead-glazed jug. 'Fresh' historic breaks. MNV 2 <br> x 3 body sherds, unglazed calcite-tempered ware, oxidised outer surface, thin-walled <br> x 1 sherd, body. shell-tempered coarse-ware. ?finger-impressed decoration. Much-abraded <br> x 1 strap handle, ?wire-drawn, random-sparse incised/stabbed decoration <br> (c.f. Brown A E, 1968, 52-3, figs 13 -16) <br> x 1 body sherd, fine sand inclusions. Grey unglazed exterior with applied horizontal decorative band of light orange clay and oxidised inner surface. Lightly abraded <br> x 9 sherds, body, base and handle. shell-tempered coarse-ware, largely lightly abraded. MNV 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F329 } \\ & \text { F319 } \\ & \text { F330 } \\ & \text { F329 } \\ & \text { F360 } \\ & \text { F330 } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{C} 13 / \mathrm{C} 14$ C 13 $\mathrm{C} 12 / \mathrm{C} 13$ $\mathrm{C} 13 / \mathrm{C} 14$ $\mathrm{C} 12 / \mathrm{C} 13$ $\mathrm{C} 12 / \mathrm{C} 13$ | 11 <br> 13 <br> 47 <br> 13 <br> 103 |

A Medieval Causeway at 1A London End, Irchester, Northamptonshire: Archaeological Excavation Report

| Context No. | Common name | Remarks | Fabric Code | Period | Wt. <br> (g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Sherd count = 23; MNV= 10 |  |  | 230 |
| 021 | Sandy coarse-ware | x 1 body sherd, fine sand inclusions. Grey unglazed outer surface with 3 incised horizontal bands c . 9 mm apart. Unabraded. From from the upper E slope of the causeway | F360 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} 12 / \\ & \mathrm{C} 13 \end{aligned}$ | 23 |
|  |  | Sherd count = 1; MNV= 1 |  |  | 23 |
| 024 | Potterspury ware | x 1 body sherd. Light orange surfaces, dark grey core. Only very lightly abraded fractures Sherd count = 1; MNV= 1 | F329 | C13 /C14 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 026 | Shelly coarse-ware <br> Lyveden/ Stanion ware | x 4 sherds, inc. rim sherd. Shell-tempered coarse-ware. All fairly abraded. MNV 4. Note: they would appear to have been re-deposited. Rim sherd is from a necked jar with everted rim and squared profile. Ext. dia. c. 230 mm (c. $8 \%$ ). Moderately heavy crushed limestone $<2 \mathrm{~mm}$. grey fabric with light pinkish-buff exterior. (c.f. Blinkhorn, 2018, 272, fig. 10.7, 56 \& 63) <br> X 1body sherd. Light orange-buff surfaces, light grey core, thin-walled, 'fresh' historic fractures <br> Sherd count = 5; MNV=5 | F330 <br> F319 | $\text { C12 / } 13$ C13 | 56 <br> 4 <br> 60 |
| 038 | St Neots-type ware <br> Shelly coarse-ware Potterspury ware <br> Lyveden/ Stanion ware | x 1 body sherd. Grey with brown surfaces. Much-abraded <br> x 1 body sherd, thin-walled. Abraded <br> x 1 body sherd. buff surfaces, light grey core. Unabraded <br> x 2 body sherds. Light orange-buff surfaces, light grey core, thin-walled, 'fresh' historic fractures MNV 1 <br> Sherd count = 5; MNV=4 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { F100 } \\ & \text { F330 } \\ & \text { F329 } \\ & \text { F319 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{C} 9-\mathrm{C} 11 \\ & \mathrm{C} 12 / 13 \\ & \mathrm{C} 13 / \mathrm{C} 14 \\ & \mathrm{C} 13 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 041 | St Neots-type ware St Neots-type ware <br> Poss. Stamfordtype ware Shelly coarse-ware Lyveden/ Stanion ware | x 1 body/base sherd. Abraded <br> x 1 rim sherd with rounded profile. Poss. bowl. Thick-walled, light greyish-brown outer surface, dark orange inner surface, grey reduced core <br> x 1 body sherd, thin-walled, buff fabric, faint trace of thin light green lead glaze on outer surface. <br> Recovered from the extreme base of the ditch <br> x 5 body sherds, shell-tempered coarse-ware. thin-walled. MNV1 <br> X1 body sherd, unglazed calcite-tempered ware, oxidised outer surface, grey reduced core, thinwalled | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { F100 } \\ & \text { F100 } \\ & \text { F205 } \\ & \text { F330 } \\ & \text { F319 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{C} 9-\mathrm{C} 11 \\ & \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C} 11 \\ & \mathrm{C} 10 / \mathrm{C} 11 \\ & \mathrm{C} 12 / 13 \\ & \mathrm{C} 13 \end{aligned}$ | 9 <br> 2 <br> 27 <br> 2 |


| Context <br> No. | Common name | Remarks | Fabric <br> Code | Period | Wt. <br> $\mathbf{( g )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Shelly coarse-ware | X 1 small everted rim sherd from a jar. Unglazed calcite-tempered ware. Abraded <br> (c.f. Hall, 1972, Fig. 5, J.1 (C13): Blinkhorn, 2018, 272, fig. 10.7, 61-63) <br> X 1 sherd, rim of lid-seated jar or jug, triangular section. Only lightly abraded. Note: this piece was <br> pitched on the W side of the causeway/upper E side of the ditch <br> Sherd count = 11; MNV=7 | F330 | C12/13 | 16 |
|  | Shelly coarse-ware | C12 /C13 | 6 |  |  |

7.12 Table 2. Medieval Pottery Quantification 2021
(EMNV= estimated minimum number of vessels)

| Context | No. of <br> sherds | Weight <br> (grams) | EMNV |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 003 | 4 | 38 | 4 |
| 004 | 6 | 48 | 3 |
| 009 | 6 | 57 | 5 |
| 010 | 7 | 42 | 5 |
| 015 | 5 | 44 | 4 |
| 017 | 4 | 18 | 3 |
| 018 | 10 | 85 | 6 |
| 019 | 22 | 230 | 9 |
| 021 | 1 | 23 | 1 |
| 024 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| 026 | 5 | 60 | 5 |
| 038 | 5 | 28 | 4 |
| 041 | 11 | 62 | 7 |
| Totals | $\mathbf{8 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 7}$ |

## Post-medieval Pottery by Martin Wilson

7.13 A somewhat surprisingly small amount of post-medieval pottery (7 sherds) was present. All date from the $18^{\text {th }} / 19^{\text {th }}$ century. They were recovered from a dark brown silty gritty subsoil (003) with high charcoal content which extended over the site, interpreted as a former horticultural soil. The majority of pieces came from the either the interface of this layer with the causeway $(007) /(009)$ or its interface with an old ground surface of $14^{\text {th }} / 15^{\text {th }}$ century date (004) alongside the causeway.
7.14 Table 3. Post-medieval Pottery Types and Chronology

| Context No. | Common name | Remarks | Fabric Code | Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 003 | Brown salt-glazed stoneware <br> Non-specific post med oxidised earthenware <br> Black-glazed earthenware <br> Glazed red earthenware <br> Brown salt-glazed <br> stoneware <br> White salt-glazed stoneware | X 2 sherds, jars inc ,rim/ neck. From 003/ 009 interface. MNV 2 <br> X 1 sherd ?plant pot. From 009/003 interface NW side MNV 1 <br> X 3 sherds. From 009/003 interface NW side. MNV 3 <br> X 1 sherd. From 007/003 interface <br> X 1 sherd. From 007/003 interface <br> X 1 sherd. From South Section (4) | F417 <br> F426 <br> F407 <br> F417 | C18/C19 C19 C19 C18/C19 C18/C19 C18/C19 |

7.15 Table 4. Ceramic building material

| Context No. | Description | Suggested Period | Weight (grams) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 037 | Brick fragment: thickness $13 / 8^{\prime \prime}$, dark red-orange with occasional ironstone inclusions $<8 \mathrm{~mm}$ and rare limestone inclusions, partial reduced core <br> Brick fragment: thickness $13 / 8 \prime$ ", dark red-orange with occasional ironstone inclusions $<8 \mathrm{~mm}$ Brick fragment: thickness $11 / 2 / 2$ Dark red-orange Roof tile fragment, light orange | C16 <br> C16 <br> C16 <br> C16 | $\begin{aligned} & 652 \\ & 311 \\ & 254 \\ & 142 \end{aligned}$ |

## Animal Bones by Matilda Holmes PhD

7.16 A small assemblage of animal remains was recovered from the excavation, a summary of which is given in Table 5. Six pieces came from excavated segments through a ditch (contexts 017 \& 041) which is considered to date to the late $13^{\text {th }}$ century. Other pieces were recovered from later medieval deposits above a causeway. Canid gnawing was observed on bones from layer (006), ditch fill (017) and post-hole fill (032) indicating that these elements were not buried immediately following discard, but were available for dogs to chew. Sheep/ goat and cattle were most common, with a few pig and equid remains also recorded. The sample is too small for further comment.

Table 5: Summary of Animal Remains by Context

| Context | N0. | Element | Taxon |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 004 | 1 | Mandible | Cattle |
| 004 | 1 | Metacarpal | Sheep/ goat |
| 004 | 1 | Femur | Sheep/ goat |
| 004 | 1 | Tibia | Sheep/ goat |
| 004 | 1 | Tibia | Sheep/ goat |
| 004 | 1 | Pelvis | Cattle |
| 006 | 1 | Incisor | Equid |
| 006 | 1 | Horn core | Sheep |
| 006 | 1 | Tibia | Sheep/ goat |
| 006 | 1 | Calcaneus | Cattle |
| 015 | 1 | Tibia | Equid |
| 015 | 1 | Calcaneus | Pig |
| 015 | 1 | $1^{\text {st cervical vertebra }}$ | Cattle |
| 015 | 1 | Longbone fragment | Medium mammal |
| 017 | 1 | Tibia | Cattle |
| 017 | 1 | Tibia | Cattle |
| 017 | 1 | Longbone fragment | Large mammal |
| 032 | 1 | Longbone fragment | Medium mammal |
| 041 | 1 | Rib | Medium mammal |
| 041 | 1 | Tibia | Sheep/ goat |
| 041 | 1 | Incisor (lower) | Pig |

## Environmental Samples by John Summers PhD ${ }^{11}$

## Introduction

7.17 Three bulk samples for environmental archaeological investigation were taken and submitted to Wardell Armstrong LLP (WA) for analysis and reporting. The samples were from a causeway ditch of possible late $13^{\text {th }}$ century date (contexts (016) \& (040) and a former ground layer (019) underlying the causeway. This section of the report presents the results from the analysis of the bulk sample light fractions, and discusses the nature and significance of the remains recovered.

## Methods

7.18 Samples were processed at the WA facilities in Bury St. Edmunds using standard flotation methods. The light fractions were washed onto a mesh of $500 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ (microns), while the heavy fractions were sieved to 1 mm . The dried light fractions were sorted under a low power stereomicroscope (x $10-\times 30$ magnification). Botanical and molluscan remains were identified and recorded using reference literature (Cappers et al. 2006; Jacomet 2006; Kerney and Cameron 1979; Kerney 1999) and a reference collection of modern seeds was available as necessary. Potential contaminants, such as modern roots, seeds and invertebrate fauna were also recorded in order to gain an insight into possible disturbance of the deposits.

## Results

7.19 The data from the bulk sample light fractions are presented in Table 6. Preservation of plant macrofossil remains was by carbonisation only, with no evidence for anaerobic water-logging or mineralisation. Shells of terrestrial and aquatic molluscs were frequent and well preserved, which is in keeping with the local lime-rich soils (Soilscapes 2021).

## Ditch fills (017) and (041)

7.20 Carbonised plant macrofossils were recorded as common in both sampled causeway ditch fills, predominantly in the form of carbonised cereal grains. Hulled barley (Hordeum sp.), freethreshing type wheat (Triticum aestivum/ turgidum type), oats (Avena sp.) and rye (Secale cereale) were recorded, with barley and wheat the most numerous. Seeds of pea/ bean (large Fabaceae) were also present in both samples. A single fragment of hazelnut shell (Corylus avellana) in (017)/ [016] could represent food debris but could equally have been burned with fuel wood.
7.21 Seeds of probable arable weeds were only recorded in (041), being represented by goosefoot family (Amaranthaceae), stinking chamomile (Anthemis cotula) and large-seeded wild grass (Poaceae). Stinking chamomile was a common medieval arable weed and is more common on heavy loam and clay soils, although the local soils are predominantly recorded as free-draining. However, it is possible that stinking chamomile was more widespread across a wider ecological range during the medieval period than it is today (e.g. de Moulins 2007).
7.22 The density of carbonised macrofossil remains in (017) and (041) was between 0.5 and 1.2 items per litre, which is relatively low and likely indicates gradual accumulation of material from mixed sources. The absence of chaff and limited occurrence of arable weeds indicates that predominantly clean grain was present, most likely from domestic culinary waste. It is probable that the remains in the ditch fills accumulated as a result of domestic occupation in the vicinity, being deposited with hearth ash and other domestic residues. A few fragments of marine shell in (017)/ [016] are likely to also be derived from culinary waste, while small mammal bones probably result from natural deposition.

[^5]7.23 Mollusc shells included aquatic taxa Anisus leucostoma and Lymnaea truncatula, which are able to survive seasonal desiccation and likely reflect standing water in the ditches on a seasonal basis. Taxa indicative of tall damp vegetation and ground litter included Carychium sp., Cochlicopa sp., Oxychilus sp. and Trichia hispida group, which likely indicate tall vegetation on the ditch margins. Pupilla muscorum and some Vallonia sp. inhabit short-turf calcareous grassland, which probably have existed in the vicinity.

## Former Ground Layer (019)

7.24 The sample from Former Ground Layer (019) was slightly richer than those from the causeway ditch fills at 3.7 items per litre, although is still probably derived from mixed sources of carbonised material. Carbonised cereal grains of free-threshing type wheat, hulled barley and oat were again most numerous, with wheat making up the majority of identified specimens. Also present were pea/ bean (large Fabaceae) seeds, which are likely to have made a contribution to the medieval diet. A single seed of flax (Linum usitatissimum) points towards the local cultivation of this useful crop that can be used for fibre or oil. However, it is not possible to understand the local economic role of flax from a single seed.
7.25 Other non-cereal taxa included knotgrass family (Polygonaceae), brome grass (Bromus sp.) and indeterminate wild grasses (Poaceae). These probably originated as arable weeds but in low concentrations and the absence of cereal chaff do not indicate a significant contribution from crop processing by-products in the sample. Seeds of sedge (Carex sp.) may have been derived from wetland or marsh habitats, although could also have grown in marginal areas of cultivated land.
7.26 Standing water and marshy ground is attested by Anisus leucostoma and Lymnaea truncatula, which support the archaeological interpretation of a possible former marshy ground layer underlying the causeway. Shells of Carychium sp., Cochlicopa sp. and Trichia hispida group may probably indicate tall damp vegetation at this location, although detailed identifications were not made during the assessment to allow more detail.
7.27 Small numbers of coal and clinker (coal ash) fragments were present throughout the assemblage, which could be debris from later (post-medieval) activity on the site.

## Conclusions

7.28 The carbonised plant remains from 1A London End are likely derived from domestic activity in the near vicinity, representing accumulated remains from food processing and preparation activities. Cereal grains were predominant, with free-threshing type wheat and hulled barley the most numerous. However, the assemblage reflects a typical medieval mixed arable economy incorporating cereals (wheat, barley, oats and rye), pulses and flax (c.f. Moffett 2006). Mollusc shells support the archaeological interpretation that the causeway was laid over marshy ground and the causeway ditch is likely to have held standing water, at least on a seasonal basis.

Table 6. Data from the bulk sample light fractions

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ~ } \\ & \frac{3}{3} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \overrightarrow{7} \\ & \frac{1}{3} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{0} \\ & \stackrel{+}{+} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Carbonised cereals |  |  | Carbonised noncereal taxa |  |  | Char coal | Molluscs |  | Contaminants |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{+}{\overrightarrow{0}} \\ & \frac{1}{7} \\ & \stackrel{N}{0} \\ & \frac{3}{3} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\vec{\omega}} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\text {D}}{D} \\ & \text { D } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\vec{W}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { W } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathbb{D}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & \overline{\hat{N}} \\ & \hat{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & Z \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\oplus} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { To } \\ & 0 \\ & \text { 앙 } \end{aligned}$ | 3 읃 ஸ̃ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & \text { O } \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{1}{3} \\ & \widetilde{1} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\widetilde{ज}} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 1 | 017 | 016 | Fill of Ditch | 13 C | 30 | 4 | XX | - | HB (1), <br> Hord (1), <br> FTW (2), <br> Trit (5), NFI <br> (5) | X | Large Fabaceae <br> (1) | 1 | x | $\begin{aligned} & \hline x \\ & x \end{aligned}$ | Anisus <br> leucostoma, <br> Trichia hispida group, Vallonia sp. | x | - | X | X | - | Small <br> mammal <br> bone (X), <br> Marine <br> shell <br> fragments <br> (X), Coal <br> (X), Clinker <br> (X) |
| 2 | 041 | 040 | Fill of Ditch | 13 C | 20 | 8 | XX | - | HB (3), <br> Hord (4), <br> Trit (3), Oat <br> (3), Rye (1), <br> NFI (6) | X | Large Fabaceae <br> (1), <br> Amaranthaceae <br> (1), Anthemis cotula (1), Large Poaceae (1) | - | X | $\begin{aligned} & \hline x \\ & x \end{aligned}$ | Carychium sp., Cochlicopa sp., Lymnaea truncatula, Oxychilus sp., Pupilla muscorum, Trichia hispida group, Vallonia sp., Vertigo sp. | XX | X | X | - | - | Coal (X), Clinker (XX) |
| 3 | 019 | - | Former Ground Layer | 13C | 10 | 4 | XX | - | HB (1), <br> Hord (2), <br> FTW (3), <br> Trit (10), <br> Oat (2), NFI <br> (9) | XX | Large Fabaceae <br> (2), Linum usitatissimum (1), <br> Polygonaceae <br> (1), Carex sp. (2), <br> Bromus sp. (2), <br> Large Poaceae <br> (2) | - | X | $\begin{aligned} & \hline x \\ & x \end{aligned}$ | Anisus leucostoma, Carychium sp., Cochlicopa sp., Lymnaea truncatula, Trichia hispida group, Vallonia sp. | XX | - | X | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Coal }(X), \\ & \text { Clinker }(X) \end{aligned}$ |

## 8. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE \& REVIEW OF RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

## Historic Context of the Causeway

8.1 Both the physical and environmental evidence shows that the causeway was initially laid as a raised track-way above wet ground. The pottery assemblage suggests that this took place in the late $13^{\text {th }}$ century. It is highly plausible that the construction of a higher, more robust causeway (i.e. Phase 2) was a direct response to severe climatic changes which occurred during the $13^{\text {th }} /$ $14^{\text {th }}$ century, the period which in recent years is referred to as the Medieval Climate Anomaly, or MCA. The causeway then underwent extensive repair (Phase 3), the pottery evidence showing that this occurred broadly in the same period. The weather in England during this period is well known to us through the accounts of chroniclers (e.g. grange records), and the reliability of this evidence has long been the subject of much scrutiny by economic historians, particularly in relation to harvest yields and rural depopulation (e.g. Lamb, 1967, Hallam 1984). In more recent years the veracity of the chroniclers' accounts has been attested by the examination of the MCA via the application of proxy records (Diaz et al, 2011).
8.2 Undoubtedly, the period from 1250 to 1350 was a time of climatic extremes, in which there were episodes of successive, excessively wet seasons and floods. According to Hallam the worst wettest weather occurred during the years 1250-1260, 1289-1295, and then 1312-1330 (Hallam 1984, 128). In a study of 34 of Northamptonshire's deserted medieval villages Lamb demonstrated that only $10 \%$ of settlement abandonment could be attributable to plague - "the dates are much more noticeably related to the worst climate shocks than to the Black Death. All appear to have suffered decline in the years of disastrous summers and famine between 1314 and $1327^{\prime \prime}$, with a population decline of $67 \%$ by 1327 (Lamb, 1967, 459).
8.3 The stratigraphy of Sections 1 to 3 appears to show that soil and sediment continued to be washed down and deposited by the brook into the $14^{\text {th }} / 15^{\text {th }}$ century. To illustrate the proximity of the former brook, its approximate course has been plotted from the 1845 map in relation to the excavation areas: this is shown on Figures 16 and 17. This might explain the origin of the bank of sandy pebbly clay recorded in Sections 2 and 3 (Fig. 11, contexts 014 \& 26), as an alluvial deposit on a left bank bend of the watercourse.
8.4 Arguably, the fact that the causeway underwent substantial repair demonstrates that it continued to be an important route-way throughout the period. But from where, and to where? It would have seemed more sensible to have followed the higher ground on either side, unless this was not physically possible (e.g. land-use or different manorial ownership). It is indeed probable that the causeway was associated with a medieval manorial complex located 100-125 m northeast of the excavation site, the existence of which was confirmed during construction of the Wantage Road estate in 1967. The complex would have been on the opposite side of a former watercourse (a brook) mapped in 1845, its remains buried under pasture for centuries until the housing development. Fortunately, an earthwork survey of the site was undertaken by Ordnance Survey in, or prior to, 1923 (ante, 4.7). But it is unfortunate that there are no known surviving written or drawn records of the later archaeological investigation, the only written account being a terse summary (Brown, 1967) which makes no mention of a limestone trackway, causeway or former watercourse. Pottery was recovered from the building site but the physical archive has not yet been released by its present owner for consultation. Without reference to archaeological features located on the ground the usefulness of the material is extremely limited.
8.5 Notwithstanding the above, it is significant that a preliminary analysis of pottery (ante, 4.8) concluded that the manor appeared to have been built in the $13^{\text {th }}$ century and continued in use until the $15^{\text {th }}$ century, which confirms the causeway's co-existence. If $V C H$ is correct in its assumption that the larger of the two Irchester manors was located at the north end of High Street, then it is likely that the manorial site to the northeast of London End was the smaller manor held in 1086 by Count Robert of Mortain, which originated in the Anglo-Saxon period. By the $12^{\text {th }}$ century this manor was held Nicholas Sauvage. The Sauvage family are known to have held land at Irchester in the $13^{\text {th }}$ and $14^{\text {th }}$ centuries, although at some time prior to 1346 had conveyed some of this to Thomas de Pabenham, who held the larger manor. Thereafter, the decent of the smaller manor is uncertain, though may have been a so-called manor in the possession of Richard Bletsoe in 1565, who is known to have held it of the Duchy of Lancaster in 1591 (see Salzman, 1937). The spatial relationship of the causeway at London End and the manorial focus (based on the OS earthwork survey) is shown on Figure 18.
8.6 With regard to the causeway's direction beyond the excavated site, there is inferred evidence of its continuation northwards, whereby it would have passed to the west of the manorial complex. The first indication of this is found on a series of oblique aerial photographs taken in the 1970s (now held by the Northamptonshire HER) of land to the north of Station Road. The photographs reveal a major linear earthwork, c. 135 m long showing as parched or worn ground in pasture land to the west of the brook (canalised since 1845). The feature, aligned northeast-southwest, is feasibly a continuation of a linear earthwork, 140 m long, surveyed by OS on the south side of Station Road in 1923, which in turn, may be a continuation of the causeway found at London End. Figure 18 shows the location of the former earthwork (rectified and geo-referenced) in relation to other landscape features. Examination of current available LIDAR imagery ${ }^{12}$ revealed no trace of the feature as a surface phenomenon: the earthwork appears to have suffered from the construction of a series of pipelines and has subsequently been ploughed out.
8.7 An evaluation trench excavated in 2014 (one of a series excavated in advance of a housing proposal) appears to have encountered a remnant of the former linear earthwork shown on the aerial photographs. It was described as "a compact spread of brownish-grey silty-clay and limestone (17), possibly the remains of a roughly laid metalled surface", from which three sherds of shelly coarseware of $12^{\text {th }} / 13^{\text {th }}$ century date were recovered (c.f. Morris, 2014, Trench 2, pp. 5 \& 12, fig. 12 \& 25).
8.8 Notably, the pitch-stone construction technique of the Irchester causeway is particularly resonant of internal and external surfaces of medieval manorial complexes found elsewhere in Northamptonshire. Examples include: floors and foundation of $13^{\text {th }}$ century buildings at West Cotton, Raunds; a large yard surface bounded by a wall at Midland Road, Raunds, which was constructed at some time in the $14^{\text {th }}$ century (Elston, 2018, 30-31); and at another Midland Road site in Raunds, remnants of internal and external surfaces including an extensive yard constructed of large cobbles with pitched stone repair patches, all of which appear to be broadly of $13^{\text {th }}$ century date (Emra, Leslie \& Carrol, 2022, 20; pers. comm. Iain Leslie 2022).

## Appraisal of Research Objectives

8.9 Overall, the investigation has provided a rare and significant insight to the medieval landscape in this neighbourhood of Irchester. Since one of the key regional archaeological research themes is to understand how manorial centres and their estates developed from the early medieval period, it was anticipated that investigation at 1A London End might shed light on the chronology of the nearby manorial complex or its structural development (ante, 5.2; c.f. URA Research Objective 7F). Given the proximity of the manorial focus, and in the light of the above discussion of the various strands of circumstantial evidence, it is probably fair to say that the investigation at

[^6]London End revealed an integral structural component of the $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century manor, the chronology of which broadly corresponds with what is known, both archaeologically and historically of the smaller manor at Irchester. Analysis of the physical archive from the 1967 site is beyond the scope of the present study, but any future separate study of the material may well benefit from cross-reference to the London End causeway results.
8.10 The investigation was also successful with respect to other research objectives. Moreover, it comprehensively examined the significance of the archaeological remains within the area of excavation and established the nature and extent of past ground usage, providing a broad date for activity and ground formation (ante, 5.4, a \& b). In particular, the palaeo-environmental evidence has provided an evocative glimpse of local ground conditions and ground-use in the locality (ante 5.4, c), which together with the structural evidence may be viewed in the context of climatic anomalies of the mid $13^{\text {th }}$ to mid $14^{\text {th }}$ century. The preceding evaluation has also provided an insight to the potential significance of archaeological deposits buried beneath the retained garden of 1A London End and its level of preservation.
8.11 With regard to finds, the pottery assemblage was fairly meagre with no new forms, types or fabrics that may assist in the development of regional type series (ante, 5.4, d). There is no potential for further analysis of artefacts, faunal remains and environmental data.
8.12 Apart from residual pottery of $9^{\text {th }}-11^{\text {th }}$ century date, which forms a broad background signature of activity of the period in the vicinity, there was no firm evidence of occupation or land-use earlier than the $13^{\text {th }}$ century. A single sherd of possible Romano-British coarseware was recovered from the former marshy ground layer beneath the causeway, but considering the site's proximity to the small Romano-British town at Irchester, the investigation provided no information that might contribute to understanding the relationship of the Romano-British town with its agrarian hinterland (ante, 5.3; c.f. URA Research Objectives 5H, 5G).

## 9. ARCHIVE

9.1 The resultant archaeological archive from the development project (including both artefacts/ecofacts and project documentation) is to be dealt in accordance with the Northamptonshire Archaeological Archives Standard of Northamptonshire Archaeological Resource Centre -NARC (Jan 2020).
9.2 The Northamptonshire Historic Environment Record Event UID ENN110321 is the Archive Accessions Number for the main excavation. The HER UID for the evaluation record is ENN109871.
9.3 Artefacts from archaeologically significant features are temporarily retained by Souterrain. The artefacts will remain the property of the landowner although the landowner will be invited to transfer finds ownership to the NARC. The landowner will be responsible for costs pertaining to long-term museum storage of the archaeological archive.
9.4 The OASIS (Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations) record UID for this project is souterra1-504965.
9.5 In due course, the report is to be uploaded to the Archaeological Data Service (ADS) website and is to become a publically-accessible record, in accordance with the NPPF.
9.6 A hard copy and a digital copy of the report are to be issued to the held by Northamptonshire Historic Environment Record, which is to be made available via Northamptonshire Archives.

## 10. COPYRIGHT \& CONFIDENTIALITY

10.1 Souterrain Archaeological Services Ltd retain full copyright of any commissioned reports, tender documents or other project documents under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 with all rights reserved; excepting that it will provide an exclusive licence to the Owner in all matters directly relating to the project as described in the WSI.
10.2 Souterrain Archaeological Services Ltd retains the right to be identified as the author of all project documentation and reports as defined in the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.
10.3 A licence is to be also granted to Northamptonshire Council's Historic Environment Record for the use of all reports arising from projects for planning purposes and bona fide research requests.
10.4 Souterrain will advise the Applicant of any such materials supplied in the course of projects which are not Souterrain's copyright.
10.5 Souterrain undertakes to respect all requirements for confidentiality about the Applicant's/Owner's proposals provided that these are clearly stated. It is expected that owners respect Souterrain's and the Institute for Archaeologists' general ethical obligations not to suppress significant archaeological data for an unreasonable period.
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Figure 1. General Location of the Application Site
(Contains Ordnance Survey data, © Crown copyright and database right 2022. All rights reserved. Licence number AL 100015565)


Figure 2. Extent of the development plot with proposed location of house and garage
(Contains Ordnance Survey data, © Crown copyright and database right 2022. All rights reserved. Licence number AL 100015565)


Figure 3. Location of known Roman period sites and find-spots within the Study Area
(Contains Ordnance Survey data, © Crown copyright and database right 2022. All rights reserved. Licence number AL 100015565)


Figure 4. Location of known medieval sites, buildings \& find-spots within the Study Area
(Contains Ordnance Survey data, © Crown copyright and database right 2022. All rights reserved. Licence number AL 100015565)


Figure 5. Extract of the OS 25" maps showing London End in 1925, with the approximate location of the Application Site (yellow) and the areas of excavation (red) super-imposed

[^7]Figure 6.
Areas of
archaeological investigation \& projected courses of culverts and other drainage



P1. Soil strip in progress, facing NE. No.1A London End in rear ground


P2. Initial trench on W side with course of culverts exposed, facing NNE. Location of Test Pit 2 in rear ground


P3. Junction of brick culverts in SW corner of site, Facing NE


P4. Medieval causeway. Facing NE


P6. Medieval causeway cut by early post-medieval drain [030] /(012). Facing SE


P5. Medieval causeway. Facing SSW


P7. Early post-medieval drainage through medieval causeway. Facing WNW


Figure 7. Pre-excavation plan of medieval causeway with context numbers


Figure 8. Pre-excavation plan of medieval causeway with relative heights (m OD)


P8. Medieval causeway Facing S. Unexcavated early modern post-holes in foreground


P9. Early modern post-hole through $N$-end of medieval causeway. Facing SSE


P10. Detail of pitched and flat surface stone in the central part of causeway. Facing SE

11. The southern section through the causeway under excavation (Sections 4 \& 6 , showing remains of kerbing (007) and upper layer of surface stone (009). The larger disordered stones were possibly a repair. Facing ENE


P12. The southern section through the causeway under excavation (Sections 4 \& 6), facing SE


Figure 9. Plan of medieval causeway: location of excavated segments with context numbers


Figure 10. Plan of medieval causeway, with relative heights (m OD) and location of drawn sections 1 to 7


P13. The southern section through the causeway under excavation (Sections $4 \& 6$ ). This shows the upper layers of the initial causeway and ditch [016). The former marshy ground layer (019) is visible in the side of the ditch. Facing ESE


P15. Overview of Causeway and Section 6. In the foreground the causeway is stripped down to the former marshy ground layer (019)


P14. The southern section through the causeway under excavation (Sections 4 \& 6): partial removal of the initial causeway layers ( $024 \& 038$ ). Facing SE


## Figure 11. Sections 1 to 3

SECTION 4


Figure 12. Section 4: Stratigraphic relationship of the track and ditch and the later causeway

## SECTION 6

(009)
surface layer of causeway:
surface layer of causeway:
limestone, crushed ironstone


Figure 13. Section 6: Stratigraphy of medieval causeway


Figure 14. Section 5: Stratigraphy of causeway repairs / widening ( $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century)


P18. The northern section through the causeway (Section 5) under excavation: exposure of the upper repair /widening layer (018). Facing SW


P19. The northern section through the causeway (Section 5), facing ENE. In the foreground. The surface stone (009) has been removed, exposing the make-up layer (042)


P21. Section 7. Ditch [040] alongside initial causeway. Facing NE

## SECTION 7



Figure 15. Section 7: ditch alongside initial causeway


P21. Overview of excavated causeway and ditch. Facing NNE


P22. Overview of the area of excavation within the former garden of 1A London End. Facing WNW

## Figure 16.

Extract of the 1845 'Map of Old Inclosures in the Parish of Irchester Liable to Tithes' (NA T183) with areas of excavation superimposed (red)

This shows the meandering course of the brook at London End to the west of the early $17^{\text {th }}$ century cottage (blue). South of the house the course of the brook is uncertain



Figure 17. Location of medieval causeway and possible midden shown in relation to the approximate course of the former brook at 1A London End (based on the 1845 map)


## Appendix 1: List of Contexts

KEY: Relationships: a. above; abt. abuts; adj. adjoins; b. below; c. cuts; cub. cut by; co. contains; wi within
Dimensions: le. length; wid. width; de. depth; th. thickness

| Context No. | type | Description and Interprétation | relationships | dimensions | drawing | Finds | Suggested period | Soil Sample | Date of record |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 001 | layer | Topsoil. Loose dark brown/black loamy garden soil, turfed. Above subsoils (002) \& (013). | a.(002), (013) | th. 0.2-0.25m | $\begin{aligned} & \text { S1, S2, S3, } \\ & \text { S4 } \end{aligned}$ | - | Modern | - | 28.07.2021 |
| 002 | layer | Subsoil. Loose mid orange brown sand. Contains flecks of charcoal, modern pottery. Not extensive over whole site, mainly N area. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { b.(001) } \\ & \text { a.(003) } \end{aligned}$ | th. c.0.1m | S1 | - | Modern | - | 28.07.2021 |
| 003 | layer | Subsoil. Loose dark brown silty gritty soil. High charcoal content. $18^{\text {th }} / 19^{\text {th }}$ century pottery found. Extensive over whole site. Above causeway surface stones (007), (008), (009) \& layer (004). | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { b.(002) } \\ & \text { a. (004), (007), } \\ & (008),(009) \end{aligned}$ | th. 0.3-0.4m | $\begin{aligned} & \text { S1, S2, S3, } \\ & \text { S4 } \end{aligned}$ | Pottery: Late Saxon / early medieval, C12 / C13 \& C19 | C19 | - | 28.07.2021 |
| 004 | layer | Subsoil. Compact mid yellow- sandy clay with small to medium sized fragments of limestone. Not proper natural | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { b. (003) } \\ & \text { a. }(005) \end{aligned}$ | th. 0.1-0.3m | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Plans 1, 3, } \\ & 4 \\ & \text { S1, S2, S3, } \\ & \text { S5, S7 } \end{aligned}$ | Pottery: Late Saxon / early medieval \& C14-/C15 | C14/ C15 | - | 28.07.2021 |
| 005 | layer | Geological stratum. Mid orange-brown sandy clay. Very few stone inclusions. Encountered in sondage in E part of excavation area, but must be present under (004) over whole of the site. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { b. (019) } \\ & \text { cub. [016] } \end{aligned}$ | - | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { S2, S3, S4, } \\ & \text { S5 } \\ & \text { Plan } 3 \end{aligned}$ | - | - | - | 28.07.2021 |
| 006 | layer | Very localised deposit of loose mid orange/yellow-brown silty sand with frequent small to medium-sized stones. Located at the $S$ end of site in Section 4 Material either accumulated or dumped at the side of the causeway | b.(004) <br> a. (020) <br> abt. (009) | th. 0.08 m | S4, Plan1 | animal bone | Late medieval | - | 29.07.2021 |
| 007 | structure | Line of stones. N-S aligned. Road surface. | b.(003) | le. c. 10 m | S4, S5, S6 | - | Medieval | - | 29.07.2021 |


| Context No. | type | Description and Interprétation | relationships | dimensions | drawing | Finds | Suggested period | Soil Sample | Date of record |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Initially thought to be a wall foundation, but turned out to be the kerbstones of a causeway | a.(020), (024) <br> ?same as (009) |  | Plans 1-5 |  | Prob. C13 |  |  |
| 008 | structure | Line of stones. Road surface. Initially thought to be a short wall foundation E-W aligned, but turned out to be a break in the construction of a road. Notably, the stones to the $S$ have been pitched against it, in a manner which shows that construction of this section began from N to S. Possibly a culvert through the causeway | b. (003) | le. c. 0.85 | Plan 3 | - | Medieval <br> Prob. C13 | - | 29.07.2021 |
| 009 | structure | Causeway surface. Consisting mostly of quarried limestone slabs, with a few large glacial pebbles lumps of ironstone and crushed ironstone. Soil matrix similar to (004) i.e. mid yellow- sandy clay. Initially thought to be demolition debris of a building. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { b. (003) } \\ & \text { a. }(020) \end{aligned}$ | th. up to 0.25m | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Plans 3, 4, } \\ & 5 \\ & \text { S4, S5, S6 } \end{aligned}$ | Pottery: C12 to C14/ late C15 from causeway surface | Medieval <br> Prob. C13/ <br> C14 | - | 29.07.2021 |
| 010 | fill | Possible fill of a cut feature [039] in SE corner of site. Mid yellowish-brown silty clay. Lighter than surrounding material into which the feature is cut. Not fully excavated on account of a tree stump | b.(004) <br> a. [039] | de. $0.2 \mathrm{~m}+$ | S 4, plan 1 | Pottery latest sherd C15 | C15 or later | - | 29.07.2021 |
| 011 | structure | Drain (stones of). Stone-lined drain W to E-running drain. Cuts (007). Comprised of material derived from (007). Side stones set on edge with capstones surviving in places. Forks into two (see 012) Cut of drain $=[030]$, fill $=(037)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wi. [030] } \\ & \text { b. (037), (003) } \end{aligned}$ | wid. up to 0.3 le. c. 5 m | $\text { Plan } 4$ S2 |  | Postmedieval | - | 29.07.2021 |
| 012 | structure | Drain (stones of). Stone-lined drain SW to NE portion of drain. Side drain off (011). Cuts (007). Comprised of material derived from (007). Side stones set on edge with | Wi. [030] <br> b. (037), (003) | $\mathrm{le} .<1 \mathrm{~m}$ | Plan 4 <br> S2 | - | Postmedieval | - | 29.07.2021 |


| Context No. | type | Description and Interprétation | relationships | dimensions | drawing | Finds | Suggested period | Soil Sample | Date of record |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | capstones surviving in places. E portion has been lost <br> Cut of drain $=[030]$, fill $=(037)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 013 void |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 014 | layer | Subsoil. Visible in section of machine sondage. Mid orange-brown sandy clay with frequent small pebbles, esp. along top of layer. A banked deposit - slopes down to N \& W | a.(004) <br> b.(015) <br> c. [030] | th. up to c. $0.26 \mathrm{~m}$ | Plan 2, S2 | - | Late medieval | - | 29.07.2021 |
| 015 | layer | Subsoil. Compact dark orange-brown sandy clay with occasional fragments of small to medium-sized limestone. Visible in S part of E-W section. Probably an accumulation of soil and vegetation alongside former watercourse. C14/ C15 sherd from surface | $\begin{aligned} & \text { b.(003) } \\ & \text { a.(014), (004) } \\ & \text { cub. [030] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { th. c. } 0.25- \\ & .0 .28 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | S2, S3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pottery: C12 / } \\ & \text { C13 / C14 } \\ & \text { C14/ C15 } \end{aligned}$ | C14/ C15 | - | 29.07.2021 |
| 016 | cut | Cut of trackside ditch, W side of road. Steep smooth sides to flat base. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { b.(020)c. } \\ & (024),(038), \\ & (019),(005) \\ & \text { Co.(017) } \end{aligned}$ | Wid. c.1.2m De. c. 0.5 m | Plans 2, 4 | ${ }^{-}$ | C13/ C14 | - | 02.08.2021 |
| 017 | fill | Fill of trackside ditch on W side of road. Mid grey-brown sandy clay with occasional small to medium sized stones. A gley deposit. | b. (020) <br> wi. [016] | de. c. 0.5 m | S4 | Pottery: C13 \& C13/ C14 | C13/ C14 | (1) | 02.08.2021 |
| 018 | layer | Upper layer of surface stones to E of road as worked by MDW 02.08.21. Limestone fragment and small pieces of ironstone set in matrix of greyish-brown clay. Layer is equal to (043) in Section 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { b. (004) } \\ & \text { a. (027) } \end{aligned}$ | th. up to $0.25 \mathrm{~m}$ | Plan 3 S5 | Pottery: Late Saxon / early medieval; C12 / C13 \& C13/ C14 | C14 | - | 02.08.2021 |
| 019 | layer | Dark grey brown, compact silty clay. 'wet' soil under (018) as worked by MDW, 02.08.21. This deposit turns out to extend right across the site. Considered to be remains of a marshy landscape next to a | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { b. (004), (027), } \\ & \text { (038) } \\ & \text { a. (005) } \\ & \text { cub.[016] } \end{aligned}$ | th. btwn $\begin{aligned} & \text { c. } 0.25 \mathrm{~m} \& \\ & 0.32 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Plan 2, } \\ & \text { S2, S4 } \end{aligned}$ | Pottery: possible Roman; C12/ C13 \& C13/ C14 | C13 \& earlier | (3) | 02.08.2021 |


| Context No. | type | Description and Interprétation | relationships | dimensions | drawing | Finds | Suggested period | Soil Sample | Date of record |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | stream. Underlies all road layers. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 020 | layer | Lower, second level of road-stones, as visible in $N$-facing Section 4. Dark greenish-brown sandy clay matrix. Some stones laid, others randomly-placed. Clay matrix extends over ditch fill (017) | b.(020) <br> a. (024), (025) cub.[016] | th. gen. up to 0.15 m | S4, S6 | - | C13 | - | 03.08.2021 |
| 021 | layer | Second level of stones (under (009) in trench/section 5 | b.(009) | th. up to 0.15 m | S5 | Pottery: <br> C12 / C13 | C12 / C13 | - | 03.08.2021 |
| 022-023 | not used | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 024 | layer | Road construction layer. Medium-sized stones, mostly limestone fragments, some pounded-down/ compacted ironstone | b. (020) <br> a.(038) <br> abt. (025) | th. 0.05 m | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Plans 2, } 4 \\ & \text { S4 } \end{aligned}$ | - | C13 | - | 03.02.2021 |
| 025 | layer | Road/track construction layer. Mid orange-brown sandy clay, frequent small to medium-sized stones, limestone fragments, compacted | b. (009) abt. (024) <br> a. (038) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { th. gen. } 0.06- \\ & 0.07 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Plans 2, } 4 \\ & \text { S4, S6 } \end{aligned}$ | - | C13 | - | 03.02.2021 |
| 026 | layer | Mid-grey-brown clay, very claggy, with occasional limestone fragments. Under (009) in SE part of trench. Possibly a repair, though more likely a natural accumulation through erosion. Poss. same as (027) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { a.(025), (019), } \\ & \text { (038) } \\ & \text { b.(043) } \\ & \text { cub. }[039] \end{aligned}$ | th. up to c. 0.4 m | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Plan 2, } \\ & \text { S4, S6 } \end{aligned}$ | Pottery: $\begin{aligned} & \text { C12 / C13, C13 } \\ & \text { / C14 } \end{aligned}$ | C13/ C14 | - | 04.08.2021 |
| 027 | layer | Dark brown clay with occasional fragments of limestone. Poss. same as (026). Possibly a later repair, though more likely a natural accumulation through erosion | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { b.(018) } \\ & \text { a.(019) } \\ & \text { cub. [029] } \end{aligned}$ | th. up to 0.15m | S5 | Pottery: C12 / C13 to C14/ C15 | C13/ C14 | - | 05.08.2021 |
| 028 | cut | Possible cut/base of ditch on E side of road. Very indefinable, showing in section only | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { c. }(027) \\ & \text { b. }(018) \\ & \text { co. }(029) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { De. up to } \\ & 0.15 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | S5 | - | Medieval | - | 05.08.2021 |
| 029 | fill | Possible fill of ditch [028]. Lighter than surrounding and underlying soil (027), though same constituents | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wi. [028] } \\ & \text { b.(018) } \end{aligned}$ | th. up to 0.15 m | S5 | - | " " " | - | 05.08.2021 |


| Context No. | type | Description and Interprétation | relationships | dimensions | drawing | Finds | Suggested period | Soil Sample | Date of record |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 030 | cut | Cut of drain. Cuts across the road (009). Lined with vertical side slabs of limestone (011) and capped with horizontal slabs. Fill $=$ (037) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Co.(011), } \\ & \text { (037) } \\ & \text { c. (015), (014), } \\ & \text { (004), (009) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { De. c. } 0.3 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { wid. c. } 0.28 \text { - } \\ & 0.32 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { Le. } 7.3 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | Plan 4 | - | Postmedieval | - | 05.08.2021 |
| 031 | cut | Cut of post-medieval post-hole. Subcircular | $\begin{aligned} & \text { c. }(009) \\ & \text { co. }(032) \end{aligned}$ | Dia. c.0.5m De. c.0.2m | Plan 3 | - | Late postmedieval/ modern | - | 05.08.2021 |
| 032 | fill | Fill of a post-hole [031]. Dark brown silty clay, very loose, contains small fragments of coal. | Wi. [031] | th. c. 0.2 m | Plan 3 | Tile/ brick frag, clay tobacco pipe stem | " " " | - | 05.08.2021 |
| 033 | cut | Cut of post-medieval post-hole. Subrectangular | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { c. (009) } \\ & \text { co. }(034) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25 \times 0.1 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { De. c. } 0.15 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | Plan 3 | - | Late postmedieval/ modern | - | 05.08.2021 |
| 034 | fill | Fill of post-hole [033]. Dark brown silty clay, very loose, contains small fragments of coal. | Wi. [033] | th. c. 0.15 m | Plan 3 | - | " " " | - | 05.08.2021 |
| 035 | cut | Cut of post-hole, sub-oval | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { c. (009) } \\ & \text { co. }(036) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.25 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { De. } 0.15 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | Plan 3 | - | Late postmedieval/ modern | - | 05.08.2021 |
| 036 | fill | Fill of post-hole [035]. Dark brown silty clay, very loose, contains small fragments of coal. | Wi. [035] | th. 0.15 m | Plan 3 | - | " " " | - | 05.08.2021 |
| 037 | fill | Fill of drain [030] stone-lining $=(011)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wi. (011) } \\ & \text { b.(003) } \end{aligned}$ | th. c. 0.3 m | Plan 4 | - | Postmedieval | - | 05.08.2021 |
| 038 | layer | Layer under road, part of road foundation. Compact mid greenish brown clay with crushed ironstone fragments. Base layer of road construction. Increases in thickness to the east | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cub.[016] } \\ & \text { b. }(024),(025) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Th. gen. c. } 0.08 \\ & -0.2 m \end{aligned}$ | S4, S6 | Pottery: Late Saxon / early medieval; C12 / C13, C13 \& C13/ C14 | C13 | - | 05.08.2021 |
| 039 | cut | Possible cut feature of on $E$ side of road. Very indefinite, disturbed by tree roots only partially visible. Possibly cuts through layer (009) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { c. (026) \& } \\ & \text { poss. (009) } \\ & \text { Co. }(010) \end{aligned}$ | De. c. 0.25 m | S4 | - | Medieval | - | 05.08.2021 |

A Medieval Causeway at 1A London End, Irchester, Northamptonshire: Archaeological Excavation Report

| Context No. | type | Description and Interprétation | relationships | dimensions | drawing | Finds | Suggested period | Soil Sample | Date of record |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 040 | cut | Cut of ditch (segment) on W side of road. Steep smooth sides to flat base. Same construction as [016] | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { b. (019) } \\ & \text { c.(041) } \end{aligned}$ | De. c.0.5m Wid.c. 1.2m | S7 | - | Medieval <br> Prob. C13 | - | 06.08.2021 |
| 041 | fill | Homogeneous fill of ditch [040]. Mid greybrown sandy clay | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wi. [040] } \\ & \text { b. }(004),(020) \end{aligned}$ | th. c. 0.5 m | S7 | Pottery: C10/ C11 \& C12/ C13 | " " " | (2) | 06.08.2021 |
| 042 | layer | Compacted ironstone and small (occasional medium) fragments of limestone. Road construction layer exposed (and unexcavated) in Section 5. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { b.(009), (004), } \\ & (018) \end{aligned}$ | Th. U/K | S5 |  | " " " |  | 06.08.2021 |
| 043 | layer | Causeway surface layer revealed in Section 4. The surface layer of compacted fragments and limestone, and small lumps of ironstone. This in soil matrix of mid yellow- sandy clay. The layer tapers down and thins out to the east. <br> A western extension to the causeway. This layer is probably equal to later (018) in Section 7 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { b.(003) } \\ & \text { a.(026) , (009), } \\ & \text { (020) } \\ & \text { cub. [039] } \end{aligned}$ | Th.c. $0.26 \mathrm{~m}>$ c. 0.16 m | S4 | pottery | C13/C14 | - | 28.07.2021 |
| 044 | layer | Same as (043) \& (018). Small area exposed ?confirmed between N side of drain [030] and tree stump. | b.(004) | u.k | Plan 4 | - | C13/C14 | - | 05.08.2021 |

## Appendix 2: Medieval Pottery Recovered from the 2020 Test Pits

by Martin Wilson

1.1 Layer (103) in Trench 1 produced 20 sherds of medieval unglazed, shelly limestone-tempered coarse-wares (fabric 330), which date from the $12^{\text {th }} / 13^{\text {th }}$ century (Table 1). The pieces were generally small in size, with a total weight of 260 g and a minimum vessel count of 9 . Surface colour varies from grey or buff to light orange and they have a light grey reduced core. Most sherds are too small to determine vessel forms, although the assemblage includes 5 rim sherds ( 130 g ) from jars and bowls (Fig. 11, 1-5). Approximately half of the assemblage has light to medium abrasion, suggesting exposure to the elements, or even re-deposition. An additional sherd of was found at the interface of layer (103) and a probable $17^{\text {th }} / 18^{\text {th }}$ century layer (102). There are three known production centres of medieval shelly coarse-ware in the southern vicinity of Irchester: Yardley Hastings (Northants), c. $13 \mathrm{~km}^{13}$ to the south west; Olney-Hyde (Bucks), c. 13 km to the south-southwest, and; Harrold (Beds) c. 11.5 km to the southeast.
1.2 Four sherds of Potterspury-ware (fabric 329) were recovered from layer (103) (Table 1). These were all unglazed body sherds, of small size, yet seemingly representing four individual vessels; a total weight of 22 g . This type of pottery was being produced in the $13^{\text {th }} / 14^{\text {th }}$ century. In addition, two body sherds of medieval sand-tempered, unglazed, coarse-ware (prob. fabric 360) were recovered from layer (103); with an overall weight of 46 g . They derive from two different vessels, probably cooking pots. A further two body sherds of unglazed Potterspury-ware were recovered from a post-medieval context (102).
1.3 In Trench 2, a single body sherd of probable late medieval oxidised ware (c. 14-15 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ century) was recovered from a clay layer (204) covering a probable building foundation layer (205/206).

## Chronology

1.4 The presence of Potterspury-ware seems to suggest that deposition (i.e. layer 103) took place in the $13^{\text {th }}$ century.
1.5 Table 1. Medieval pottery types and chronology
(Note: Fabric codes used in descriptions refer to the Northamptonshire Type Series).

| Context <br> No. | Remarks | Common name | Fabric <br> Code | Period |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 102 | x 2 body sherds, unglazed sand-tempered <br> coarse-ware with reduced core. Abraded. <br> Residual | Potterspury <br> ware | F.329 | C13-C14 |
| $102 / 103$ <br> interface | x 1 body sherd Shell-tempered coarse- <br> ware. Much abraded. Residual. | Shelly coarse- <br> ware | F330 | C12-C13 |
| 103 | x 14 base \&body sherds, x 6 rim sherds. <br> Shell-tempered coarse-ware. Buff to <br> orange-grey, reduced core, some with light <br> to medium abrasion; sherds. | Shelly coarse- <br> ware | F330 | C12-C13 |
| Rim sherds comprise: <br> x 3 jars (Fig.11, 1-3) <br> x2 bowls (Fig. 11, 4-5) |  |  |  |  |

[^8]| Context <br> No. | Remarks | Common name | Fabric <br> Code | Period |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | x 2 body sherds, fine sand inclusions <br> x 4 body sherds, unglazed sand-tempered <br> coarse-ware with reduced core, 3 with <br> sooted outer | Sandy coarse- <br> ware <br> Potterspury <br> ware | F360 | C. C13 |
| 204 | X 1 body sherd, lightly abraded, sooted <br> exterior | Late medieval <br> oxidised | F401 | C13-C14 - C15 |

### 1.6 Table 2. Medieval Pottery Quantification

(EMNV= estimated minimum number of vessels)

| Context | No. of sherds | Weight (grams) | EMNV |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 102 | 1 | 11 | 1 |
| $102 / 103$ interface | 2 | 7 | 2 |
| 103 | 26 | 535 | 15 |
| 204 | 1 | 9 | 1 |
| Totals | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 9}$ |

# Appendix 3: Environmental Samples from the 2020 Test Pits 

by Dr John Summers ${ }^{14}$

1.1 A bulk sample was taken from medieval layer (103) for environmental archaeological assessment. The sample was taken in order to provide further information on the nature of the deposit, and its potential origin and formation.

## Methodology

1.2 The sample was processed at the Archaeological Solutions Ltd facilities in Bury St. Edmunds using standard flotation methods. The light fraction was washed onto a mesh of $500 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ (microns), while the heavy fraction was sieved to 1 mm . The dried light fraction was scanned under a low power stereomicroscope (x 10 - x 30 magnification). Botanical remains were identified and recorded using reference literature (Cappers et al. 2006; Jacomet 2006) and a reference collection of modern seeds. The heavy fraction was also sorted for the recovery of archaeological materials. Potential contaminants, such as modern roots, seeds and invertebrate fauna were also recorded in order to gain an insight into possible disturbance of the deposits.

## Results

1.3 The data from the bulk sample light fraction are presented in Table 1. Material recovered from the heavy fraction is detailed in Table 2. Preservation of plant remains was by carbonisation only, with no evidence of anaerobic water-logging or mineralisation. A small number of terrestrial mollusc shells and bone fragments were present, which may have been influenced by the free-draining nature of the sediment. A significant number of modern rootlets dominated the light fraction and, although every effort was made to disaggregate the root masses, some items may have been obscured and overlooked.
1.4 The sample contained a significant number of carbonised plant macrofossil remains, with cereal grains being overwhelmingly dominant. Wheat grains, many of which were identifiable as free-threshing type wheat (Triticum aestivum/ turgidum type), were most numerous. A small number of free-threshing type wheat rachis internodes were also present but were too fragmentary to identify to species. Barley, including a number of hulled grains (Hordeum sp.), were also numerous, followed by a smaller number of oat grains (Avena sp.) and two rye grains (Secale cereale). As noted, a small number of wheat rachis internodes were present, along with two cereal-sized culm nodes (straw). However, the number of chaff elements was low and likely to indicate predominantly clean grain in the deposit. In addition to cereals were seven pea/ bean seeds (large Fabaceae), although preservation was insufficient for precise identification.
1.5 The remaining non-cereal taxa were largely those that are likely to have grown as arable weeds. These included vetch/ tare (Vicia/ Lathyrus sp.), medick-type (Medicago sp. type), common chickweed (Stellaria media), dock (Rumex sp.), red bartsia (Odontites vernus), plantain (Plantago sp.), stinking chamomile (Anthemis cotula) and wild grasses (Poaceae). These are likely to be associated with the cereal and pulse crops. The number of non-cereal arable weed seeds was considerably lower than the number of cereal grains and again suggests a deposit of predominantly clean grain. Common vetch (Vicia sativa) was a common fodder crop during the medieval period (e.g. Moffett 2006) but precise identification of the medium-seeded legumes in the sample was not possible.

[^9]1.6 The plant macrofossils in the sample are indicative of domestic material, most likely culinary waste. The predominance of wheat, which was the primary bread grain of the medieval period (e.g. Stone 2006), further supports this hypothesis. Other remains in the deposit included oak (Quercus sp.) charcoal, which is likely to represent fuel debris. Remains of coal and clinker (coal ash) were also present, which is perhaps less consistent with a $12^{\text {th }}-13^{\text {th }}$ century date and may suggest the intermixing of post-medieval material in the deposit. How this may have affected the composition of the carbonised plant macrofossil assemblage is uncertain because medieval and pre-industrial post-medieval arable economies can be quite similar, especially when seen only as carbonised debris. The remains of fish bone in the light fraction and a small number of other bone fragments from the heavy fraction would also suggest the presence of domestic culinary waste. An iron nail and a small amount of slag were also recorded in the heavy fraction (Table 2).

## Conclusions

1.7 The carbonised plant remains from layer (103) were dominated by carbonised cereal grains, in particular those of free-threshing type wheat (likely bread wheat). The dominance of cereal grains and pulses, and the associated limited presence of chaff and arable weed seeds indicate a deposit of primarily clean grain from a domestic origin. The remains are consistent with the medieval date, although the presence of coal and coal ash may indicate intermixing of later material. It is difficult to separate medieval and pre-industrial post-medieval arable economies using carbonised remains, particularly a single grain-dominated deposit such as this.
1.8 When considered in combination with the presence of fuel residues (charcoal, coal and clinker) and the small amount of bone, the remains in the sample indicate the deposition of domestic refuse, with an emphasis on debris from food preparation activities. As noted above, there were very few shells from terrestrial molluscs in the sample and it would seem likely that the deposit was unfavourable for the preservation of calcium based materials (i.e. bone and shell). It is probable that such remains are under-represented within this deposit, most likely due to its free-draining composition, which could have caused mineral leaching.

### 1.9 Table 1: Results from the bulk sample light fraction

Abbreviations: $\mathrm{HB}=$ hulled barley (Hordeum sp.); Hord = barley (Hordeum sp.); FTW = free-threshing type wheat (Triticum aestivum/turgidum); Trit = wheat (Triticum sp.); Oat (Avena sp.); Rye (Secale cereale); NFI = not formally identified (indeterminate cereal grain). X - present, XX - common, XXX - abundant.

| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{7} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{7}{0} \\ & \frac{+}{3} \end{aligned}$ | Cereals |  |  | Non-cereal taxa |  | Charcoal |  | Molluscs |  | Contaminants |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { zo } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\oplus} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{D} \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \stackrel{+}{D} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathbb{N}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & \underline{\overline{0}} \\ & \overline{\hat{N}} \\ & \hat{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & Z \\ & \stackrel{Z}{0} \\ & \stackrel{N}{D} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \text { O } \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & \underline{0} \\ & \overline{\sqrt[n]{n}} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \text { O } \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{7}{\sim} \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{ज} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 103 | Layer | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} 12 \\ & - \\ & \mathrm{C} 13 \end{aligned}$ | 40 | 40 | 100 | 104 | XXX | X | HB (11), Hord (22), FTW (74), Trit (84), Oat (16), Rye (2), NFI (75), FTW rachis (2), Culm (2) | XX | Large <br> Fabaceae <br> (7), Vicia/ <br> Lathyrus sp. <br> (2), Medium <br> Fabaceae <br> (5), <br> Medicago <br> sp. type (5), <br> Stellaria <br> media (1), <br> Rumex sp. <br> (1), <br> Odontites <br> vernus (1), <br> Plantago sp. <br> (1), <br> Anthemis <br> cotula (1), <br> Large <br> Poaceae (4), <br> Medium <br> Poaceae (1), <br> Small <br> Poaceae (2) | XX | Quercus sp. | X | Vallonia sp. | XXX | X | - | - | - | Fish bone (X), Coal (XX), Clinker (XX) |

1.10 Table 2: Archaeological remains in the heavy fraction

| Sample | Context | Pot Qty | Pot (g) | A. Bone (g) | Other (g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 103 | 6 | 34 | 9 | Fe Nail -5 g |
|  |  |  |  |  | Slag -62 g |
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