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**Glevensis**

The Gloucester and District Archaeological Research Group Annual Review
The saddest event for Gloucestershire’s local history community in 2004 was the untimely death of Kate Haslem at a tragically early age. She was widely known for her role as the helpful, enthusiastic and knowledgeable Searchroom Supervisor at the Gloucestershire Record Office where she also had particular responsibility for IT development.

Kate Collins was born at Letchworth, Herts. and after attending the local Grammar school she studied classics at Bristol University, graduating in 1970. She was already active in archaeology, having dug at the Latimer villa site with another GADARG member, the late Arthur Dodd.

In 1970 she became an Archive Trainee at Gloucester Library, an appointment she later claimed was more to do with being able to play skittles, than with any other skills she could offer. Colleagues at the Record Office provided training to become a ‘real’ archivist, and she spent a qualifying year of study at Aberystwyth. Having joined GADARG she became a dedicated digger at the Group’s early-1970s excavation at St Mary’s Street, and later at the city’s Archaeology Unit sites. Early in 1975 she spent three month digging at Carthage with Henry Hurst. Kate joined the Group’s Committee and for two years (1975-76), with characteristic efficiency, she was its Secretary.

Local government was re-organisation in 1974 and Kate swapped her post of City and Diocesan Archivist at the Library for Searchroom Archivist at the Record Office to help the public with their enquiries. In October the following year, she wed ‘this rather nice librarian’ and became Mrs Jim Haslem. Together they went on to share 29 years of happy marriage. They lived at Oakwood, a fine timber-framed house in Newent backed by an extensive garden and vegetable plots, that they spent many pleasant hours together maintaining. At his retirement Jim set himself up as a book dealer - an absorbing hobby which Kate was able to share, though perhaps Kate’s greatest interest was in adventurous cooking; invitations to eat at Oakwood were always eagerly accepted.

The last few years of Kate’s life, as she underwent therapy at Cheltenham, were borne with quiet resilience and courage. She died peacefully at home on 3 December 2004. A Humanist Funeral Celebration of her life was held on December 13. It was no surprise that it was so well attended, and donations to the Macmillan Nurses in Kate’s memory amounted to over £1150. Kate will be greatly missed by those who knew her professionally, but especially by all those who were fortunate to count her as a dear friend. Our sympathies are extended to her husband Jim.

Nigel Spry, Phil & Gill Moss
I want to begin my report this year by thanking our member Nicholas Kingsley, who was the County Archivist and is now about to take up his new responsibilities at National Archives, as head of National Advisory Services and Secretary of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. His generosity in making this lecture room available for our Gloucester meetings has led to a welcome increase in the numbers attending our winter lectures, which I hope will continue. It is a great pity that more of our members do not come to hear the often memorable lectures - such as those by Jon Hoyle on the Forest of Dean survey, and Philip Toms on dating methods. I'm speaking to the converted, but your Committee is disturbed that only a small proportion of our members are engaged in any of the Group's activities.

The Committee is rightly concerned with local and sometimes national affairs. The structural changes in Gloucester's Archaeology and Museums Service are now largely in place, after two years of discussion to which we contributed. We must hope that future work on Gloucester's important archaeological heritage will be well managed, effective and properly published, within the financial constraints that are unavoidable. In the end, the proper financing of museums and archaeology depends on persuading the public of their intrinsic value, and in this context it is depressing that the school curriculum appears to be narrowing, rather than becoming broader.

During the year our resistivity equipment was upgraded, the cost being largely met by a donation from Leckhampton Local History Society for work done by Terry Moore-Scott. Seven projects have made use of the equipment, all organised by Committee members. We would welcome enquiries from any members who would like training to carry out their own work. We have also completed an earthwork survey of a site in Hartpury.

It is now 15 months since Kurt Adams became our local Finds Liaison Officer working under the Portable Antiquities Scheme. This Scheme has certainly helped to give the artefacts found by many metal detectorists added value, in terms of recorded location and agreed identification. Two of our own members have conformed scrupulously to the Scheme and have submitted a great many finds to Kurt, including mesolithic flints. The majority of MD clubs have also acted responsibly, and we already know a great deal more about the distribution of Anglo-Saxon and medieval metalwork in England. It is therefore most unfortunate that the National Council of MD clubs still advises members not to provide 6 figure grid references. It is also clear that MD rallies on unscheduled sites can be very harmful. For example, a rally at Marston Moor in 2003 removed most of the evidence for the battle, though more careful work at Naseby and Towton has accurately located the areas of conflict.

During the year two of our most respected members died, Odette Wylie and Kate Haslem. An obituary of Mrs Wylie by Henry Hurst was published in Glevensis 37; the BGAS Newsletter carries a warm appreciation of Mrs Haslem's work at the Record Office, where she helped a great number of our members. On a happier note, Nigel Spry's friends are delighted that he is now as busy as ever, after his very serious illness. His long-running project on the Severn-side distribution of slagblocks has now been published by GSIA, the Industrial Archaeology Society whose Secretary, Ray Wilson, we are pleased to have with us this evening. I should also record our thanks to Julien Parsons of Cheltenham Museum, now the Curator of Antiquities at the Royal Albert Museum in Exeter, who often helped our members.

Paul Bevan and other Group members were involved in the 'Time Team' event at Standish last August, which I personally felt produced an excellent TV programme, that featured Eddie Price giving good advice to Phil Harding on the effects of ridge and furrow ploughing. Their archaeological techniques are sometimes criticized, but a lot more is now known about Iron Age settlement in this area and the evidence that still survives in field boundaries.

Finally, I should record that the Group currently has 206 members, of whom 24 are Associates and one is a Junior.
NEOLITHIC PITS AT KING’S STANLEY, GLOUCESTERSHIRE
An Interim Report

David C Evans

Introduction

Excavation below the north-west corner of the medieval manor house (site code KS+1) in the orchard of Greystones in King’s Stanley in 2004/5 revealed a Neolithic pit (pit 01 in box H8). A second pit was revealed in 2005 close to the south-west corner of the house (pit 02 in box F7).

The site

The village of King’s Stanley lies near the foot of the Cotswold Scarp face about 16 km south of Gloucester. The site of the discovery was at SO 809041. It lay c.55m north-west of the church and c.100m east of a tributary of the Frome, close to the northern edge of a gravel island which overlies Lower Lias clay.

The excavation

This revealed two elongated pits running approximately east-west and cut through the natural gravel c.1m below the modern surface.

Pit 01 (Fig 1) was 0.8m deep, 3.8m long at the lip and 3.2m long at the base. The feature was irregular in shape but was about 1.8m wide at the lip and the base had a width of 0.3m. It was not symmetrical in cross-section. The north face, which was regular in shape, sloped at an angle of 45 degrees while that on the south, which was very irregular, began at c.35 degrees and became almost vertical for the final 0.25m. The profile was sharp and there was no gravel slip accumulation in the base, suggesting lack of weathering of the open feature, and the base contained no silt. The fill was of reddish-brown clay containing a scattering of gravel; it was undisturbed and appeared to have been deposited over a short period of time. There was a post-hole beside the south-west corner, 20cm in diameter and 15cm deep. The pit was covered by a levelling layer of gravel about 5cm thick containing a few sherds of 12th-century and Roman pottery. Previous excavation has shown that there is no similar feature for at least 21m to the east.

Pit 02 was located 8.2m to the south of pit 01. It was of a similar shape but much smaller. It was 1.8m in length, 0.6–0.9m wide and had a maximum depth of 0.3m. The north face, which was regular, sloped at c.40 degrees while the irregular south side was almost vertical. The profile was sharp and there was no gravel slip accumulation or silt in the base suggesting very rapid refilling. The fill was of the same reddish-brown clay as pit 01 but contained very little gravel and no pottery.

Summary account of finds from pit 01

Pottery

Total number of sherds recovered 67 plus 6 crumbs. They are generally unabraded. Forty-eight non-contiguous sherds have been recovered. A rim sherd (Fig 2) was examined by Gillian Varndell. She reported:

One rim sherd of Mortlake Ware. Internally, coarse twisted cord herringbone beneath rim. Externally, twisted cord herringbone on rim; short diagonal twisted cord impressions above shoulder; concentric twisted...
cord swags below shoulder. Fabric includes grog and quartz sand. Buff to reddish-faced with dark grey core. Impressed Ware bowls fully developed by 3000 BC and begin about 3300 (pers. comm.).

Twenty-nine of the sherds are of a similar fabric and nine conjoin to give a rim section of 22cm and a body depth of 16cm. Probable rim diameter 22cm. Alongside the concentric swags are vertical double herringbone twisted cord impressions. The assemblage represents some eight pots.

Flint
Six hundred and thirty-nine flints were recovered of which 90 from 2004 have been examined by Kate Cramp. She stated in her report that the range of tools represented suggested that the flints in the assemblage were put to a variety of tasks including piercing, cutting, whittling and scraping activities (pers. comm.).

Animal bone
One hundred and seven fragments were recovered of which 20 from 2004 have been examined by Emma-Jayne Evans. These showed the presence of sheep/goat and pig. One of the medium long bones, a tibia, which could well be sheep/goat had been chopped, probably for marrow extraction as had another medium long bone (pers. comm.).

Other finds
Patches of charcoal, pieces of oolitic limestone (some burnt), and lumps of heat-hardened clay.

Summary account of finds from pit 02
Flint
Twenty-nine flints were recovered.

Animal bone
Twenty-six fragments were recovered.

Discussion
This is the sixth site in lowland Gloucestershire which has yielded evidence of Peterborough Ware (now Impressed Ware)\(^3\), with the closest parallel the site at Cam\(^4\). The number of flints recovered which included 290 of less than 10mm\(^2\) indicates the close proximity of a settlement site to the south and/or west of the pits.

There are questions to be addressed, three in particular:

1) Why were the pits dug? Pit 01 could have been for gravel extraction, but pit 02 seems too small. That the pits were storage devices filled in with domestic refuse upon abandonment does not hold true here\(^5\). The shape of pit 01 would hardly be a practical one for storage and pit 02 was far too small. Perhaps they were dug for the formal deposition of seemingly undifferentiated assemblages of domestic debris, principally flint, pottery and animal bone within organic matrices\(^6\).

2) Why was the cross-section profile of pit 01 adopted? It would have been difficult and uncomfortable to obtain. That pit 02 was of similar profile may be significant.

3) What is the origin of the reddish-brown clay fill? Nothing of this colour or nature has been observed before on the site. A sample is being analysed by Heather Jackson.
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APPENDIX

The Neolithic worked stone object
(Report by Fiona Roe)

A piece of worked limestone was found in a Neolithic feature (KS+H8VI) which also produced flints, animal bone and Peterborough ware. The limestone object is small, measuring only 39x23x7mm, and is finely incised on one side with numerous straight lines which are arranged more or less radially and are about 1 mm or less apart. The limestone is light coloured and is not in fresh condition but appears to be oolitic with some fossil shell fragments. The source is likely to be the local Jurassic limestone.

Other examples of incised pieces of stone from Neolithic contexts are not unknown but are usually on a larger scale. Two square chalk plaques found in a Grooved Ware context near Stonehenge Bottom measured up to 72.5mm across and had carefully executed designs. An engraved chalk plaque is also known from Butterfield Down.

An alternative explanation of the small object from King’s Stanley could be that it was part of a limestone cup and that the incisions were made by a flint knife as part of the shaping process. Neolithic chalk cups worked in this way, although again on a larger scale, are known, for example from two causewayed camps in Sussex, the Trundle and Whitehawk Camp.

Interpretation of the enigmatic small object from King’s Stanley must remain uncertain for the meanwhile. Such small items are easily missed in the archaeological record, so that close parallels for this find are barely to be expected, though it is hoped that some in time will be forthcoming.
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NATURAL AND MAN-MADE EROSION OF THE HIGH BROTHERIDGE EARTHWORKS

Harold Wingham

Introduction

The earthworks around the plateau of High Brotheridge (NGR SO 8914) and in the wooded slopes between this plateau and Cranham, called Buckholt Wood, have been the subject of two articles published in Glevensis, in 1977 and 1985\textsuperscript{1,2}. The results of a recent geophysical survey of part of the High Brotheridge earthwork near SO 892135 appear inconclusive\textsuperscript{3}, due to a wet weather history and the geological features predominating. While some of the earthworks almost certainly have an Iron Age origin, their true extent remains uncertain. Figure 1 represents current ideas about their location, in

Gaps in the Earthworks in Buckholt Wood

In the late 1940s the earthworks on the eastern side of the hill going north from Buckholt were fairly easy to find, though difficulty could be experienced where the bank and ditch was broken by a large gully about one hundred yards north of Buckholt House. Here one could more easily trace the earthworks north of the gully by walking south from the point where the bank crossed the road, about 250 yards north of Buckholt House.

The breaks in the earthworks at this gully and also in the Buckholt Wood Loop south of High Brotheridge (breaks identified in Fig.1 by the word "slump") have always puzzled the author. How were the defences completed? Why did the broken ends of the bank and ditch not align with each other across the gap? Why did the earthworks neither cross the gully nor go round the head of it, as all the hollow-ways and tracks do?

It appears to the author that the gullies were caused by slumping that occurred later than the earthworks. The ends do not align because one side had slipped faster or further than the other; the end that was higher would therefore be closer to its original position. The slumping must be related to the springs around High Brotheridge, which may well have influenced the selection of the site for an Iron Age promontory hillfort, one of the largest in the county. The geologist W Dreghorn pointed out that "between the Great Oolite and the Inferior Oolite is the Fullers Earth clay, which forms a spring line on the hill at a high level\textsuperscript{5}. If those who built the earthworks interfered with the drainage from these springs, slumping would have resulted, as it did at Coopers Hill when the A46 was altered in 1939. A farm was partially buried at that time, and the road is still subject to subsidence.

Recent Damage to the Earthworks

In the late 1950s logging operations were carried out on the slope above these earthworks north of Buckholt House, that churned up the soil. A spring and its rectangular cut stone covering were obliterated, and now the place always seems to be wet and muddy.

In 2002 or 2003 logging took place around the Buckholt Wood Loop. Near Buckholt House stone was quarried from the upper bank and used to fill pot-holes in the bottom of the ditch, probably caused by logging operations. The quarry was then filled with brushwood, possibly by English Nature. Logs were also dragged

Fig 1  High Brotheridge Earthworks

The present note is concerned with two aspects of the earthworks, based on recent observations by the author. The first considers the implications of two gaps in the Buckholt Wood earthwork. The second comments on damage inflicted on these earthworks by recent logging operations.
over the counterscarp, lowering two 10 foot lengths there by about two feet.

In February 2005 there was a great deal of logging, with much activity over and along the Loop, using massive machines to move timber. The ground was wet, so deep mud was produced, despite Recommendation 1 of GCC Archaeological Plan, that "vehicles should only be used on the site under dry conditions and movement kept to a minimum."
Background

In November 1950 J P Pexton, a schoolmaster at Naunton, reported to H G Fletcher, Curator of Cheltenham Museum, the discovery of a grave in the same field at Summerhill near Naunton as one that was excavated by G C Dunning in 1934. The author’s father Dr K D Pringle FSA was a Cheltenham physician with considerable experience in assisting the archaeologists of his day, notably Mortimer and Tessa Wheeler at Y Gaer (1924), Raleigh Radford and Donald Harden at Ditchley Roman villa (1936) and Mrs Helen O’Neil at Whittington Roman villa (1949). Mr Fletcher asked for his help in investigating the site on behalf of the museum and the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society.

Excavation commenced on 21 April 1951 and work continued at intervals for 21 days until 5 August, with assistance from H G Fletcher, his son A J Fletcher, W N Terry (Assistant Curator of Cheltenham Museum) and Mr Bramwell of St Paul’s College Cheltenham with his students D T Smith, H E Ricketts, V M Collins, J S Westcott, D J Kempsey, C R Smith, R Barratt, D Wall and J C F Hawnt. Help and technical advice was provided by Miss N B Stevens (Cheltenham librarian and later Dr Pringle’s second wife), Dr and Mrs R Bowers, Miss Mary Douglas, Miss Joan Bate and Mr Pexton. Mr Rupert Douglas, aeronautical engineer at GAC Brockworth was the site photographer and as a Land Survey student at University College London the author carried out the survey work and drawing.

This report is based principally upon the detailed site diary and notes which Dr Pringle kept at the time, the draft report that he prepared for the BGAS Council, and a summary of grave descriptions that he compiled between 1951 and 1954. Other sources are two reports in the Gloucestershire Echo of late 1951, Dr Pringle’s surviving correspondence and papers, the excavation photography and air photographs from NMR Swindon, and the author’s own records, field notes, diaries and letters. The Corinium Museum will hold all the surviving archive.

When he could find time between 1951 and 1954 Dr Pringle carried out extensive anatomical analysis of the excavated bones. Nevertheless he felt the need for a second opinion and his close friend Dr Bowers took three sets of remains to the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. There they were mislaid! Dr Pringle felt acutely embarrassed at this loss and regrettably, but understandably, came to the conclusion that publication would be invidious, at least in his lifetime. Following his death in 1980 a major part of the site archive was transferred to the Corinium Museum by Mrs Pringle. In August 2000, having retired from practice as a Land Surveyor, the author was able to review and reassess with Corinium Museum staff all the available material. The existing plans have been revised and redrafted, and with the permission of the present owners of Summerhill the author has revisited the site and carried out further survey work and field examination.

The Site of the Graves

The site lies one km. northeast of Naunton in the Cotswolds, near NGR SP 120246 at a height of 229m OD. The bedrock is oolitic limestone at about 0.4m. below ground level. The graves were found about 100m. west of Summerhill Farm (Fig.1) on gently rising ground.

It should be noted that an area centred on SP 117245 and of diameter c.350m. (c.10 ha in area) was scheduled by the DOE in 1986 (Glos. SMR 92). It was then described as an area with abundant prehistoric finds, with a probable Romano-British settlement near SP 120245 on level ground above a slope falling south to the river Windrush. Traces of an almost ploughed out earthwork here were reported by Dunning in 1934.

In the course of the 1951 excavation Mr Fletcher and Dr Pringle collected Romano-British sherds and tiles in Area 1 of Fig.1. Dr Pringle also dug a trench in October 1951 near SP 1185 2450, beginning 15ft from a field wall to the west and extending 30ft eastwards; no evidence of occupation was found. In December 2000 the author collected four sherds on the south side of Area 1 and some additional sherds in Area 2 of Fig.1. This material is discussed under the heading Potsherds below.

Because contour and break-line patterns sometimes show up features not readily visible, the author commissioned Mr Graham Collins to prepare a contour plan of the area at 1m. intervals, using stereoscopic vertical air photographs and a Kern DKM photogrammetric plotter. The resulting contours are shown on Fig.1, and show some evidence of a ditch or valley south of the excavation site and a bank under the field wall further south, that possibly predates the wall.
Description of the Graves

GRAVE A
The first burial to be recorded was found by farm workers west of Summerhill Farm (Fig.1) in the winter of 1933-34, and was excavated by G C Dunning the following August. It contained the skeleton of an adult male aged about 40, laid supine with his head to the west, legs extended, the left arm lying to his side and the right arm bent with hand across the lower pelvis. The grave itself was a rectangular pit cut into the oolite to a depth of 2ft 9in, paved and lined with stone slabs. Dunning did not give the grave's position. Dr Pringle recorded the grave on the then current OS 25in map at a position 36.6m west and 64m north of the eastern and southern boundaries of the field (SP 1201 2461), as shown by A on Fig.1.

GRAVE B
This was discovered by the farm bailiff and his wife, Mr and Mrs Roberts, in the spring of 1950, when we were putting in the potatoes. They and others later identified its location to Mr Fletcher and Dr Pringle at the time of their first site visit in January 1951, as the length of a cricket pitch west of the field gate at SP 1205 2462, and on the south edge of the farm track, now ploughed-out. The skeleton was described as being that of an adult and the grave had cover stones but no footstones. Instead of the latter there was a little wall built up of small stones. The bones were apparently put back into the grave en masse. This grave was not rediscovered.

GRAVES C TO I
During the summer of 1951 two longitudinal trenches and ten cross trenches, each three feet wide, were opened on the south side of the farm track in the supposed neighbourhood of Grave B (Fig.2). Seven inhumations, of six adults and one child, were uncovered. All were oriented approximately east (mean orientation 86 degrees), and cut into the oolitic bedrock to a maximum depth below ground level of 2ft 7in (Grave C). In most cases the skeleton's arms were crossed, and Dr Pringle remarked that this characteristic and the graves' orientation, as well as the absence of grave goods, gave a strong impression that these were Christian burials.

Details of the individual graves are set out below. Measurements are given in decimal feet, as L (length), HW (head width) and FW (foot width). These measurements apply to the top edges of the grave slabs; about 0.2ft should be subtracted to give the space at the floor of each grave. A full set of grave measurements is in the archive report at Corinium Museum.

GRAVE C: L 4.8, HW 1.2, FW 1.0
Supine, head to west, extended with arms crossed at right angles over abdomen. The skull was broken off on its left side. The long bones, spinal column and ribs...
were moderately intact, but the radii and ulnae had disintegrated. Anatomical analysis in 1984 by Dr Juliet Roberts indicated a male aged 19-20. The grave itself showed signs of disturbance, with the capping stones broken and scattered within and outside the grave. Single vertical slabs formed the head and foot of the grave. The side slabs were upright, two on the north side and three on the south. The floor was of small irregular rammed oolite chips and coarse sand.

GRAVE D: L 5.3, HW 2.1, FW 1.1
Supine, head to west, extended with arms crossed at right angles over abdomen (Fig.4). Analysis in 1984 by Dr Roberts indicated a female in her mid-twenties, height 5ft 1in, with no apparent abnormalities. Single vertical slabs formed the head and foot of the grave (Fig.3). The side slabs were folded in with their top edges touching, to form an inverted V.

GRAVE E: L 6.0, HW 1.4, FW 1.3
Supine male, oriented west but decapitated; the skull and cervicals 1 to 5 were laid near the feet, cervical 5 being broken. Left arm lying at right angles across the abdomen; the right arm may originally have lain in the same way. Dr Pringle noted that the radius had fallen back during decomposition and this may have dragged the ulna down to the pelvis. Femoral measurement from photographs of the grave indicates a height of 5ft 10in. A sherd of black pot was found between the knees. The grave structure was similar to that of Grave D, the sides forming an inverted V.

GRAVE F: L 5.9, HW 1.3, FW 1.2
Very well constructed grave, with a slab floor that held water; described by the excavators as the wet grave. One of the cover stones had collapsed into the grave over fragments of the skull at the west end. The construction was so watertight that little skeletal material remained, making its configuration uncertain.
Fig 3 Plans, elevations and sections of graves D, G and I

Fig 4 Grave D skeleton
The grave contained two nails, a sherd of black pot, a fragment of yellow glass and a fragment of copper alloy plate.

GRAVE G : L 5.6, HW 1.4, FW 0.8
Supine, head to west, left forearm across breast, right arm to the side. The skeleton was identified as a male about 18 to 20 years old, height (from photo analysis) about 5ft 4in. The grave cover stone in one piece, with no headstone (Fig.3).

GRAVE H : L 5.7, HW 1.2, FW 1.0
Supine, head to west. The skeleton was examined in 1954 by Dr Pringle and the author, and found to be of a young person, under 25 years of age. Grave description incomplete, but two very heavy cover stones.

GRAVE I : L 2.8, HW 1.0, FW 1.0
Supine, head to west. Skeleton of a child of about 4 years, height (from photo analysis) about 2 ft. Only fragmentary remains of the long bones. Floor of grave well paved, with each side wall of two overlapping slabs (Fig.3).

The human remains from Graves C and D are at the Corinium Museum. Enquiries to the Ashmolean Museum produced three boxes of adult and adolescent remains (I, II and III), identified as possible Summerrhill provenance. Examination of these in an attempt to match them with the descriptions and photographs of Graves E to H was inconclusive. Box II could be Grave G or H and Box III might be part of Grave E.

The Graves: Discussion (by Linda Viner)

Of the nine graves, seven (A to C, F to I) were constructed from flat stones set vertically on edge to line the sides and ends of the grave pit, with slabs set horizontally to act as a cover. All had slabs to form the floor, except Grave C whose floor was made of rammed stone. This type of stone-lined grave corresponds to Type 2 of Philpott’s analysis of Romano-British burial practice.

Graves D and E in their construction match Philpott’s Type 4, with flat stones set gable-wise to form a chamber with a triangular transverse cross-section. The floor of the chamber for Grave D was of rammed stones, whilst for Grave E slabs were used.

Type 2 cists have a widespread distribution stretching from Dorset through Gloucestershire to Yorkshire, along the limestone belt, taking advantage of local stone which can be easily split into thin slabs. Dating evidence for such cists is scarce, but where it does survive the graves are 4th century or later in date, as is the case of a cist at Lower Slaughter that contained a coin of Magnentius (AD 350-353).

The gable shaped cists (Type 4) are less common than Type 2 but often occur with them, as at Temple Guiting, where one possible Type 4 cist was associated with three of Type 2.

As might be expected on the Cotswolds, a number of comparable stone-lined cists have been recorded from Compton Abdale, Notgrove and Willersey. In the parish of Naunton two Romano-British burials edged with stones were found in 1876 north of Stanborough Lane during the construction of the railway.

The full extent of the Summerhill cemetery is not known, but it can be suggested that this discrete group of graves was part of a small rural burial ground, sited away from the settlement core, which was most probably a little agricultural establishment rather than a villa. A group of seven burials has recently been excavated at Bishop’s Cleeve, where three of the inhumations were in graves lined with blocks of oolitic limestone. The excavators identified the site as one of a string of small agricultural settlements scattered along the gravel terraces of the Severn Vale.

Potsherds (by Paula Gentil)

Two groups of surface finds have been collected and are deposited in the Corinium Museum. The first group (from Area 1 on Fig.1) was collected in 1951. It comprises 15 vessel sherds in locally produced fabrics. While two sherds may be late Iron Age, the majority span the length of the Roman period. Oyster shell, vessel glass and a fragment of brick were also recovered. The sherds from Area 2 (Fig.1) were collected in December 2000. This group consists of five heavily abraded vessel sherds including a sherd from a flanged imitation Samian bowl and a piece of burnt limestone. A further four sherds of Severn Valley type ware were recovered at the same time from the south side of Area 1.

Coins

Two Roman coins found near SP 120245 were purchased for Cheltenham Museum. They were described in 1951 by Mr Anthony Thompson of the Ashmolean Museum as follows:

2. Vespasian. A very worn dupondius. Reverse unreadable except for C.0

In the pre-war period the scheduled area (SMR area 92) also produced a number of Dobunnic coins, of which two are in Bristol City Museum.
Acknowledgements

To Mr and Mrs John Eagan of Summerhill for allowing access and giving their help. To Paula Gentil (Corinium Museum) and Linda Viner for their major contributions and their generous help, advice and encouragement. To Alison Roberts (Ashmolean Museum), Dr Juliet Roberts, Graham Collins, Chris Neale, Ian Medhurst and the staff of the Corinium Museum, the Cheltenham Museum, the Gloucestershire Echo, the Ordnance Survey, the National Monuments Record Centre and the Gloucestershire Sites and Monuments Record, for their contributions and assistance.

References

2. PRINGLE, K. D. ‘Gloucestershire Echo’ 1951.
5. ROYCE, D. ‘Finds on or near to the excursion of the Society at Stow-on-the-Wold, July 2 1882’ TBGAS 7 1882-3. 77.
7. Ref.5, 77-80.

RESISTIVITY SURVEYS ARCHIVE

Ann Maxwell

Surveys have been carried out in three areas during the period March 2004 - December 2004. Details of these have been supplied to the Sites and Monuments Record.

LOCATION  Dymock - SO 702 313 to 706 312
LEADER    Ann Maxwell
DATES     February, March and June 2004
OBJECT    To find the route of the Roman road from the east (where it shows as a parchmark in the cricket field on aerial photographs) into the settlement, and to look for evidence of occupation outside the area of the modern village.
RESULTS   The line of the road was successfully traced, from the western boundary of the cricket field to the rear of properties fronting the Ledbury Road. The surveys produced no evidence of building structures.

LOCATION  Harescombe - SO 837 103
LEADER    Martin Ecclestone
DATE      22 May 2004
OBJECT    To locate any archaeological features on and around a 25 x 50m level platform in the field south of Harescombe church, reputed to be the site of a manor house. An earthwork survey of the area was made by Mark Bowden (EH) and two students in 2001.
RESULTS   No clear indication of stone foundations was found in the area surveyed, though there were higher than average readings along the south and east edges of the platform, probably geological features.

LOCATION  High Brotheridge - SO 885 135
LEADER    Angela Newcombe
DATES     March and October 2004
OBJECT    To see if there were any anomalies that would confirm the attribution of the earthworks to the Iron Age.
RESULTS   The survey showed anomalies that could be man-made, but equally they could be geological features.
A resistivity survey was carried out on the site between 21st November and 16th December 2003 to the south, east, and north of the area excavated during the previous summer. The results obtained were similar to those of the magnetometer work done in 1995/96, and it is intended to confirm at least part of them by excavation. The alignment of Ditch 61 appears to continue towards the NE boundary of the settlement, and that of the drain, Ditch 62 (found in 2003), north towards Ditch 48/49 through what is almost certainly an extension of a series of known gravel pits. An attempt to obtain some information on parts of the west and south corners of the site and a possible field system, none of which had previously been surveyed, was unfortunately less successful. I am most grateful to those GADARG members who took part in the survey, and to Don Mayes in particular for his meticulous computer printouts of the results.

The 44th consecutive summer season of excavation started on 24th April and ended on 27th September. My thanks to Matthew Price who removed the topsoil and backfilled the site, and to all who responded to the call and once again excavated so much barren soil.

The 300sq.m uncovered was situated immediately to the NE of that examined in 2003, and lay between 10m north to 20m south and 20-30m east on the current grid layout. Only a very few traces of occupation deposits survived on the natural gravel subsoil, which here lay close to the surface and had been truncated by both the mediaeval and modern plough. Most of the complex of unphased, eroded features, filled with the same yellow/brown soil devoid of finds that was found last year, are again tentatively interpreted as prehistoric, probably dating to around 800BC (Fig. 1). The principal features of this period, which include Tt34 F3, Tt34 6 F1, Tt38 F1 and possibly Tt39 F1, formed an irregular, disconnected alignment of trenches about 0.5m deep. In the bottom of each, generally close to one side, was a narrow, longitudinal soil-filled slot which extended down into the natural gravel for up to a further 0.4m. The slots are interpreted as the result of driving planked timbers vertically into the gravel to form a fence or windbreak. It was probably associated with the circular Structure 25 excavated last year. What may have been an entrance gap was partly screened by Ss34 F3. To the east of the alignments the gravel was very loose and mixed with soil, whereas to the west it lay firm and almost undisturbed. The purpose of most of the other hollows (some of them possibly gravel holes), and groups of post or stake holes is not otherwise known, but those comprising Uu38 F3 suggest a fence alignment. At the north end of the excavation the group Uu31 F1 was situated on a small, undisturbed patch of natural gravel surrounded by erosion hollows. A similar, but smaller group of four postholes was located about 4m to the north.

The Romano-British features are illustrated in Fig. 2. They include Ditches 61 and 64 (the latter was described as the drain Rr32 F1 in 2003), which predate the gravel pits situated alongside them. The dark upper fills of Tt31 F1, a series of interconnected pits part of which was dug last year, and known from the resistivity survey to extend further north, overlay part of Ditch 64 and produced two coins of the House of Constantine, a bronze brooch pin and two iron fittings. The gravel was probably used in the construction of Building A. The small stakeholes found in the base of the pits suggest some form of fencing. The remaining six features labelled as gravel pits were devoid of finds, but their regular outline suggests that they are probably contemporary with the two ditches. The stone packed posthole Ss35 F3 is almost certainly roman, but the other six which suggest an alignment are undated.

Perhaps the most unusual feature is Uu36 F1. The best evidence for this consists of three narrow, closely associated parallel ruts sunk in the dark fill of a hollow which produced some RB potsherds, a large stone and a fragment of smithy slag. The whole suggested part of a possible wheel alignment, traces of which were found in the E corner of the 2003 trench and which were cut into the gravel over, and probably beyond this year's excavation site. One of the ruts had some small stones squeezed sideways into its fill, suggesting that these features may possibly have been formed individually.

None of the early features produced any finds. I am grateful to Angela Newcombe and Peggy Fowler who washed the small amounts of pottery from the RB and mediaeval deposits. A small flint blade and a few flakes and four more coins came from the same residual contexts.

It is proposed next year to open up a similar sized area slightly further to the north and nearer the field boundary where a narrow exploratory trench to check some dowsing done in 1995 exposed some evidence of stone wall footings.
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We will remove completely from their offices the kinsmen of Gerard de Athée, and in future they shall hold no offices in England. The people in question are Engelard de Cigogné, Peter, Guy, and Andrew de Chanceaux, Guy de Cigogné, Geoffrey de Martigny and his brothers, Philip Marc and his brothers, with Geoffrey his nephew, and all their followers. Magna Carta, clause 50.

Magna Carta promised that King John would remove from office a number of named individuals, who were described as the kinsmen of Gerard de Athée. Gerard and his kinsman Engelard de Cigogné served as sheriffs of Gloucestershire during the reign of King John. Some of the others were also active in Gloucestershire. This article explores the lives and work of these men and considers why they were thus singled out in Magna Carta.

Gerard de Athée took his surname from a village near Tours. In the war against Philip Augustus, king of France, in which John lost Normandy, Gerard was in command of the castle of Loches, one of the last to hold out. When it finally fell Gerard was captured. John valued him so highly that he paid 1,000 marks for his ransom in 1207. Gerard was brought to England with his wife and son and other relatives. Two of Gerard's kinsmen, Engelard de Cigogné and Andrew, Guy and Peter de Chanceaux were granted the manor of Hurstbourne in Hampshire to support them.

Gerard was quickly appointed to office in England: sheriff of Gloucestershire on 5 January 1208, constable of Bristol castle on 6 March, and sheriff of Herefordshire on 23 May. As sheriff he was entrusted with large sums of money; he received 17,000 marks of the king's treasure containing 1,500 marks. Queen Isabella stayed at Gloucester, Cirencester, Winchcombe and Tewkesbury and the prior of Llantony were permitted to have their lands back, but they were to answer to the king for them, that is, make some payment. However Gerard dispossessed Cirencester abbey of the seven hundreds of Cirencester, an extensive area over which it had been granted jurisdiction.

The most notorious example of John's harshness against his enemies was his persecution of William de Braose. Gerard led a campaign against him in Wales, and William was ordered to pay 1,000 marks for the expenses of the expedition. William fled to Ireland and was given aid by Walter de Lacy; his wife and son were imprisoned in Windsor castle and were believed to have been starved to death there. Gerard was present with the king and his ministers at Bristol when Llewellyn, prince of North Wales sent letters of submission to King John. Gerard died probably about 1210, and was succeeded as sheriff of Gloucestershire by Engelard de Cigogné, who similarly became sheriff of Herefordshire.

Engelard de Cigogné was said by the St. Alban's chronicler Roger of Wendover to be the nephew of Gerard, and was sometimes called Engelard de Athée. He took his name from another village near Tours. He had a wife called Agatha and a son named Oliver. Engelard remained sheriff from 1210 until 1215. In 1210 the town of Gloucester had to contribute 500 marks towards John's successful Irish expedition and paid Engelard at the treasury in Bristol. Engelard served in this year as itinerant justice, presumably in Gloucestershire, for he rendered account of £22 6s. 8d. in amercements. Magna Carta demanded that sheriffs should not be justices in their own county. Another of Engelard's duties was to pay Elene, nurse of the king's son (the future Henry III).

When King John refused to accept Stephen Langton as archbishop of Canterbury, and Pope Innocent III put England under interdict, Gerard had to deal with the consequences in Gloucestershire. The king confiscated ecclesiastical property, and allowed monasteries to buy it back; the abbeys of St. Peter's Gloucester, Cirencester, Winchcombe and Tewkesbury and the prior of Llantony were permitted to have their lands back, but they were to answer to the king for them, that is, make some payment. However Gerard dispossessed Cirencester abbey of the seven hundreds of Cirencester, an extensive area over which it had been granted jurisdiction.

Another grievance was the difficulty and cost of obtaining royal justice. The sheriff's accounts of Gerard and Engelard in the Pipe Rolls illustrate how men were accustomed to bargain with the king to secure
rights and privileges. It was common for money to be offered to have the goodwill (beneuolentia) of the king; for example Nigel Hathewy, a forester, offered 40 marks and two palfreys, and Philip de Bello Monte five marks. William Peitaun had been outlawed, and owed 20 marks for having the king’s peace. Two men had offered money to be delivered from prison; William de Parco owed 30 marks, and Elyas Kokerel 16 marks. Roger Fitz Nicol offered all the lampreys he could acquire, that the king might request Earl William Marshall to grant him a manor at farm. J. C. Holt, describing the situation leading to Magna Carta, wrote that men came to think that what they obtained by purchase should be theirs by right, and what some could buy should be equally available to all.15

Sometimes money was offered to have a trial in the royal court. Geoffrey de Cumpton had been accused of an unspecified crime, and had offered three palfreys that he might be held in the custody of lawful men until the first assize when the justices came into the county and then stand trial (et tunc stet recto). Creditors seeking repayment of a debt offered one third of the value of the debt to the king in order to have the judgement of a royal court; for example, John de Abbodeston seeking repayment of 17½ marks, and John Fitz James seeking 12 marks. Walter de Stokes owed one mark for having judgement on Albreda de Canvill that she should do the services due for her tenement.16 Robert de Berkeley of Berkeley castle was in dispute with King John, apparently about a debt he owed for being excused military service. In 1211 he owed, besides 2,000 marks for a fine, 100 marks for having his reasonable judgement by his peers (pro habendo rationabili judicio suo per pares suos).17

King John came to terms with the pope in 1213, and granted to him the kingdom of England and the lordship of Ireland, an astute move, for it brought him a powerful ally. John began his greatest effort to win back his overseas lands, and again prepared an expedition. Engelard sent to Portchester 35 crossbows of various sorts and 20,000 quarrels. However, the expedition had to be postponed; John distrusted his subjects, and further alienated some of his barons by demanding hostages. Walter de Lacy had had his lands confiscated for aiding William de Braose; these were now restored to him, except for Ludlow, but he had to give four hostages, who were entrusted to Engelard. Engelard also held hostage William, son of John of Monmouth; John of Monmouth had been the ward of William de Braose. John gave bail (manucepit), and Engelard was ordered to commit William to his father.18

In 1214 the expedition planned for the previous year took place. John himself spent from February to September in Poitou. An army commanded by the earl of Salisbury was sent to Flanders to join John’s continental allies. John requested several towns in England, including Gloucester, to lend him aid, promising that the loan would be repaid. Engelard paid for the carriage of the king’s treasure to Portsmouth, and sent there 30 anchors for the king’s galleys, a quantity of iron and 45,000 quarrels. He was ordered to have 300 Welshmen at Portsmouth ready to cross the Channel. However the allies were defeated by Philip at the battle of Bouvines in Flanders.

The defeat brought discontent to a head, and in the winter of 1214-5, the barons were threatening war against the king. John attempted to pacify them, as instructions given to Engelard indicate. He was ordered to deliver the town of Ludlow to Walter de Lacy, who was to have all his liberties restored. On the petition of John’s illegitimate daughter Joan, the wife of Llewellyn, prince of North Wales, the king ordered Engelard to restore four hostages held for Llewellyn. He was to let go free two men who were held hostage for Richard Beket of Jersey. John de Feypo, who had been taken in the castle of Carrickfergus, paid a fine of 10 marks, and Engelard was instructed to deliver him to Walter de Lacy, who went bail for him (eum plegiavit). Roger de Tuit, probably a knight of Walter de Lacy, hostage for his brother Richard, was released when he paid a fine (finem jeciti) of 20 marks and Walter and the prior of Llantony outside Gloucester went bail for him. William de Lacy, half brother of Walter, was freed after Walter, John of Monmouth, Robert de Berkeley and others gave bail (manuceperunt).19 Engelard carried out some of the king’s measures to strengthen his position. He was paid £100 for works to be done at the king’s castles. He was ordered to make an advance (prestitum) and give warhorses to Walter de Lacy and John of Monmouth, and other barons and knights who had been summoned to come to Cirencester with horses and arms and all the men they could get. Three knights were sent to Engelard. As constable of Gloucester, he was instructed to send a mangonel and a petraria to Corfe.20

In other parts of England the barons were arming themselves and fortifying their castles. In particular the northerners led by Eustace de Vesci and Robert Fitz Walter, prepared to defy the king; Fitz Walter was declared marshal of the army of God. Robert de Berkeley was still loyal when on 10 February he was one of three men sent to expound the king’s business in Gloucestershire.21 Subsequently he joined the rebellious barons. There were armed gatherings at Stamford and Brackley; the barons besieged Northampton and they occupied London. Churchmen, especially Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, and Peter des Roches, bishop of Winchester, endeavoured to maintain negotiations, but the most weighty voice counselling King John to come to terms was that of William Marshal, earl of Pembroke; he had been sheriff of Gloucestershire from 1198 to 1207, though he may never have come to the county.
John agreed to meet the barons at Runnymede; peace was made in the form of Magna Carta, which was dated 15 June 1215. One of the most celebrated clauses, and one of the few which remain unrepealed today, was number 39, which declared: no Freeman shall be arrested or imprisoned or deprived of his freehold or outlawed or banished or in any way ruined, nor will we take or order action against him, except by the lawful judgement of his peers or by the law of the land.

Letters patent were sent on 19 June to all sheriffs, including Engelard in Gloucestershire, in which the king declared that we have restored peace between us and our barons, as you can see by our charter. The king ordered the charter to be read publicly, and all to swear to obey the 25 barons whom the charter named to enforce it. King John carried out the demand of clause 50, and Engelard was replaced on 8 July as sheriff of Gloucestershire; significantly the new sheriff, Ralph Musard, was a local man, who held the manor and castle of Miserden. On 9 July John restored the seven hundreds to the abbey of Cirencester. Engelard was replaced as sheriff of Herefordshire on 19 July by Hubert de Burgh, the justiciar.

The other kinsmen of Gerard d'Anthée named in Magna Carta were all active officials for King John. Peter de Chanceaux was constable of Bristol castle, which was a centre for despatching arms and supplies; for example coats of mail (loricas) and boots to Tewkesbury in 1212, coats of mail and helmets to Portsmouth in 1214. Peter had charge of the royal treasure at Bristol castle, and from it he sent sums of 500 marks and £100 to Engelard in 1215. The importance of this castle is indicated by the sending there of six knights with soldiers and crossbowmen in the tense months before Magna Carta. Guy de Chanceaux was Peter's brother. He served as constable of Gloucester castle, receiving sacks of the king's treasure there in 1208. He was responsible for the revenues of the honour of Gloucester (the lands of the earldom of Gloucester, then in the king's hands), which he probably administered from Tewkesbury. Andrew de Chanceaux seems to have exercised Engelard's authority in Herefordshire; it was he who was commanded to hand over the castle and county of Hereford to Hubert de Burgh. He and Engelard were sent £100 to pay knights and sergeants in Hereford castle. Of Guy de Cigogné scarcely anything is recorded. Geoffrey de Martigny was constable of Northampton, and held the town when the barons besieged it. Philip Mark was sheriff of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire. Three of these kinsmen were ordered to surrender castles to new castellans following Magna Carta: Geoffrey de Martigny, Northampton on 2 July 1215, Andrew de Chanceaux, Hereford on 19 July, and Peter de Chanceaux, Bristol on 20 July. Members of the Chanceaux family were not in the royal service after the time of King John. Geoffrey de Martigny went overseas at the end of 1215. Philip Mark remained in post into Henry III's reign, so John did not completely fulfil the barons' demands.

The peace made at Runnymede lasted for only a few months; each side suspected the other. John got the support of Pope Innocent III; the pope declared Magna Carta null and void, and excommunicated all who opposed the king. John had dwrung-footed the barons. Hostilities began again. After a bitter siege John captured Rochester castle from the barons in December 1215. In 1216 there was open warfare. The barons had declared John to be deposed, and invited Louis, son of King Philip of France, to be king of England. Louis and his army landed in Thanet in May, and he was welcomed into London by the barons.

In this new war Engelard de Cigogné emerged as one of the king's most stalwart defenders and he proved his military abilities. He was appointed constable of Odiham castle on 21 April 1216, and constable of the more important Windsor castle on 22 April. He was ordered to be in readiness, night and day, with horses and arms and supplies. Louis besieged Odiham castle; it was defended by only three knights and ten soldiers, but they held out for eight days. Engelard with sixty knights and their retainers defended Windsor castle in a long siege by the count of Nevers, who was sent against it by Louis. There was much fighting in many parts of the country, including a siege by Louis of Dover castle, defended by Hubert de Burgh. The rebels captured neither Windsor nor Dover; the besieging army left Windsor to pursue the king into Norfolk. In Gloucestershire there was little or no fighting. On 18 and 19 August King John was at Berkeley castle, which had been taken into the king's hands because Robert de Berkeley had joined the rebels. From Berkeley John wrote letters about measures to be taken, should Louis besiege the castles of Worcester and Hereford.

Ceaseless travel wore out John. He returned to Norfolk and moved from there towards Lincolnshire, losing his baggage train in the Wash. He died at Newark, and his body was carried to Worcester cathedral. Wendover said that this was the king's wish, since John had commended himself to God and St. Wulstan. Wulstan had been bishop of Worcester at the time of the Norman conquest, and was the most recent English saint, having been canonised in 1203. The Barnwell chronicle explained that Worcester was chosen because it was a safe part of the country for royal supporters.

Gloucester also was a safe place for the king's ministers to meet. Chief among these was William Marshal, who was made rector of the king and kingdom by King John. Son, Henry, was hastily crowned. The archbishop of Canterbury was out of the country, and Gualo, the papal legate, and Peter des Roches, bishop of Winchester,
presided at the ceremony. Thomas Wykes’s chronicle relates that, because of the haste, the barons placed upon the young king a sort of wreath instead of a crown (sertum quoddam eidem loco diadematis imponentes). 31

The new king’s ministers moved to Bristol, and there on 12 November 1216 Magna Carta was re-issued, with the approval of Honorius III, the pope who had succeeded Innocent III. Several clauses were altered and many were omitted altogether. The clause which ordered the removal of the kinsmen of Gerard d’Athée disappeared, regularising the position of Engelard, who remained constable of Windsor castle; such an experienced administrator was invaluable to the new government. The substitution of the old tyrant, as the barons regarded John, by a young child removed the cause of the barons’ rebellion. Many barons returned to their allegiance, including Robert de Berkeley. 32 More returned to the king after William Marshal and the king’s forces inflicted a defeat on the rebels at Lincoln, a defeat so crushing that it was called Lincoln Fair. Engelard was one of the officials who were ordered to restore lands to men who returned to their faith and service; he carried out the re-instatement of five men, and assisted in that of ten others. 33 Robert de Berkeley had his lands, but not his castle, restored. 34

Engelard was rewarded in 1219 for his loyalty and usefulness. He received a grant of £50 a year from the exchequer, and, after he sent a letter urging his great services, the manor of Benson in Oxfordshire was assigned to him. In a grant to one who was a colleague of Engelard in the defence of Windsor castle the king noted that both men had faithfully served the Lord King John our father and ourselves in the time of war. 35 As peace returned, Henry III received a more formal coronation in Westminster Abbey in 1220. Engelard had to supply 30 beasts for the celebration. 36

England was slowly returning to order. In 1221 six justices went on eyre (or circuit) in the western counties. 37 This was the first eyre for several years, and the judges heard cases which went back to the years before 1215. Its records throw further light on the activities of Gerard d’Athée and Engelard de Cigogné and on the complaint against them in Magna Carta. These records are difficult to interpret; their purpose was often not to declare who was responsible for a crime, but whether as a result of the crime any money was owing to the king. Money might be owing for a fine paid by an individual or from a murder fine, which was exacted from a community where the perpetrator of a violent death fled or could not be found.

Gerard d’Athée was said occasionally to have released prisoners for money. Eve de Pendebriria [Pinbury] was killed during the night at her house; two men were accused, and were imprisoned by Gerard, but released for five marks. An unknown man was found strangled in a lake, badly mutilated; two women were imprisoned but later released, it was assumed by Gerard. Agnes, sister of Nicholas le Bindere, accused three of his servants of beating him to death, though it was a year after the attack before he died, and judgement of accident (infornitium) was pronounced; yet Gerard took from one of the men 50 marks for his own use and ten marks for Agnes. 38

Similar behaviour was attributed to Engelard de Cigogné. Adam Ried was killed; Hugh de Bromtone was suspected, but he fled and became an outlaw. Gunhilda Petit and William Red were taken and imprisoned at Gloucester; William said that he paid 20 shillings to Engelard to be let out of prison. He was tried before twelve jurors (ponit se in veredicto xii juratorum), who said that he was not culpable. Geoffrey Molendarius was killed coming away from an ale drinking; Hugh Miles and Walter de Ochamtone were arrested (attachiati) because they came away with him; but they came before the justices and were tried before twelve jurors, who said that they were not culpable; yet Engelard had taken from Hugh and Walter two marks for releasing them on bail (de ipsis replegiandis) and 15 marks from the rest of the unidentified town. 39 These men received the judgement of their peers in the form of the verdict of twelve jurors, but they had in some way to pay. Engelard took money in two instances where death was the result of accident. A boy was found drowned at a mill in Coln Rogers; a verdict of accident was found; yet Engelard took 18 marks from the community (villa). In a similar situation, where a boy was found drowned and a verdict of accident was given, Engelard (or Guy) de Cigogné took 18 pence from each hide of the hundred of Bradley and 20 shillings from certain other land. 40

Other cases suggest a perversion of the course of justice. An unknown youth was found dead in the street of Stratton. Martin de Eggelewde [Edgeworth] and Richard his son were taken for this murder and they paid a fine to (finem fecerunt cum) Engelard of 6½ marks, although they were not suspected. All the county testified that Jordan Scotmodi (apparently a friend of Engelard) took them because Martin was not willing to sell some sheep to him. Engelard was said to have ordered violence carried out against Katherine de Hunldaneside: five men, including John the clerk of Jordan Scotmodi, came to her house and carried off 3 horses, 6 animals, 14 pigs and 46 sheep and some other property, because she would not give her daughter to be married to Stephen de Muclitone [Mickleton], one of the five. 41 Finally there was a general complaint from jurors that Gerard d’Athée and Engelard de Cigogné took a ransom (redempcionem) of all pleas of the crown. Other jurors gave instances of which
these sheriffs took by reason of the pleas of the crown. Gerard took 25 marks from Hinton (Hunitone), and Engelard 18 marks from Coln (evidently referring to the drowned boy), 21 marks from Welford and ten marks from Bourton. 41

At this point it is appropriate to consider why Gerard d'Anthée and Engelard de Cigogné and their other kinsmen should be singled out for condemnation in Magna Carta. The records of the justices suggest that they may have been guilty of abusing their position of authority, but it is not clear that they were worse than other sheriffs of that time. However it is much more significant that they were foreigners. In the thirteenth century many Englishmen had Norman ancestry and connections, but Gerard and his kin were Frenchmen, recently brought over from France. The clause in Magna Carta following that demanding the removal of Gerard d'Anthée kinsmen called for the removal of all foreign knights, crossbowmen, serjeants and mercenaries (alienigenas milites, ballistasios, servientes, stipendiarios). Complaints against foreigners were persistent during the thirteenth century.

Engelard acknowledged loyalty makes it surprising that, when some barons rebelled in 1221, and gathered troops at Castle Bytham in Lincolnshire, he was said by Roger of Wendover to be one of those who instigated the rebellion. Six prisoners taken in Castle Bytham by the king’s men were consigned to him for safe keeping. At the time he was occupied with repairs at Windsor castle. Then in the autumn he was sent on a diplomatic mission to Poitou and transacted business with the mayor and commune of La Rochelle. He continued to have connections with Gloucestershire, and was granted the custody of the land and heir of Henry de Berkeley, who was the son of Roger de Berkeley of Dursley. In 1222 Engelard was still settling his sheriff accounts at the exchequer; the king acknowledged that he had spent more than he owed, and he was declared to be quit of his large debt. 42

However at the end of 1223 he lost Windsor and Odiham castles. The government, in order to keep in check those who had grown powerful in the war against the barons, carried out a policy of taking back royal castles into the king’s hands. Fifteen important barons were required to deliver their castles to new keepers and Engelard had to give up his two castles to Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury. 43 It was at this time that Berkeley castle was restored to the Berkeley family; Robert de Berkeley had died in 1220, and it was Thomas, his brother and successor, who received back the castle. 44 There was some resistance to the resumption of castles, led by Faukes de Breauté, one of King John’s captains, but the recalcitrant barons were forced to submit. Roger of Wendover named Engelard among the rebels. 45 Again this appears improbable, for Engelard was not in any way disgraced, and continued to receive £50 a year from the exchequer; and careful arrangements were made for him to retain, or receive compensation for, his own stock, corn and cattle at Windsor and Odiham. Some of the men who gave up castles, including Engelard, were summoned to the king at Gloucester in December 1224. 46

Henry III was in 1225 declared by Pope Honorius to be of full age. Magna Carta was re-issued in what proved to be its final form. Engelard continued to enjoy the confidence of the king, and joined in the expedition to Gascony led by Richard, the king’s brother. In 1227 and 1229 he was pardoned a whole series of debts, some relating to his service in the war between King John and the barons. 47 Engelard was brought back into office in 1233, when he was appointed sheriff of Oxfordshire, though the king retained Engelard with him and a deputy was authorised to render his account. Engelard link with Gloucestershire was revived this year, when he was granted £60 a year in rents of the manor of Hailes. 48 At this time there was bitter rivalry between Hubert de Burgh, the justiciar, and Peter des Roches, bishop of Winchester. Peter des Roches was a foreigner, and was accused of bringing édouois of people from Poitou who ousted Englishmen from their posts. Hubert de Burgh was dismissed as justiciar and imprisoned. Richard Marshal, the second son of William Marshal, rebelled against the king in 1233, and Roger of Wendover presented him as the champion of native Englishmen. The rebellion was suppressed, and barons implicated gave hostages; Walter de Lacy gave John, son of Roger Pichard as hostage for himself, whom the king handed over to Engelard for safe keeping. The bishops advised the king against reliance on Peter des Roches, and he was sent to his diocese. In Gloucester on 28 May 1234 Henry III gave the kiss of peace to Hubert de Burgh and received him into his grace and love. 49

It was now, when feeling against foreigners was running high, that Engelard was restored to his former position, being appointed constable of Windsor castle and of Odiham castle on 26 May: he had already been named as sheriff of Berkshire on 22 May. 50 In 1236 other men were appointed to the custody of Berkshire and of the forests of Windsor and Odiham, but Engelard remained constable of the two castles. In 1237 he was again given custody of Windsor forest. Another old link with Gloucestershire was apparent in 1238, when one of Engelard’s servants was named as William Brito of Dursley; he was sent to the sheriff of Gloucestershire with two robbers. 51

Engelard was approaching his last years, and they were marked by further honours from the king. He was made constable of Odiham castle for life, rendering £20 a year, in 1241, and he was still being paid his annual fee of £50 from the exchequer. He was to receive a gift of
robes from the king for Christmas in 1243. Engelard received licence to make his will of moveables and corn on 10 March 1244, and probably died soon afterwards. Valuable concessions were granted to Engelard's executors, who were not required to render his account at the exchequer and were declared quit of all arrears and debts which the exchequer might exact on his account. These privileges were accorded because of the good and honourable service which he gave to the king during his life - a final testimony to Engelard's worth.

There was an Engelard de Cigogné in the next generation, but whether he was related to the former sheriff of Gloucestershire was not recorded. In 1260 he was made knight by the king, when he was described as one of the esquires (vadlettos) of the queen. He was paid a yearly fee of 20 marks. In 1262 he was in garrison at Gloucester castle with six crossbowmen. Subsequently he received sundry grants from the government.

Engelard de Cigogné, who, together with the other kinsmen of Gerard d' Athée, was proscribed by Magna Carta, went on to have a long and honourable career in the royal service. His foreign origin and the exploitation for his own ends of his office of sheriff created enemies among the barons. But his loyalty and usefulness to the king enabled him to survive their opposition; and twenty years later, when there was a campaign against foreigners during the dispute between Peter des Roches and Hubert de Burgh, Engelard was restored to his former position of trust. Some foreigners, like Simon de Montfort, came to be accepted by the English as one of themselves; Engelard seems to have been one of these.
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THE SITE OF KINLEY CHAPEL AND CHANTRY: PART 2

Martin Ecclestone

Introduction

An outline history of the chantry chapel and its endowed lands at Kinley in Nympsfield parish was published in Glevensis 35, together with a rough survey of the visible earthworks at its presumed site. That article was unable to provide definitive answers to two, possibly unrelated, questions: was the chapel founded as part of a small priory, and why was much of its lands apparently free of tithes? These questions are still unresolved, but the present article provides some additional documentary evidence. It also gives more attention to the geographical history of the Kinley area and its post-Reformation owners and farmers. Finally, the archaeology of the presumed site of the chapel and its associated buildings is considered with the help of evidence from a resistivity survey.

Discussion of the documentary evidence

The earliest new evidence relevant to the question of whether Kinley chapel was originally the home of a small monastic community was found quite fortuitously. The Minchinhampton court roll for 1272 includes fines for trespass in Avening, Wynewudd, now Windsoredge between Nympsfield and Nailsworth. One such trespasser was the prior sive capellanus de Kynley indicating that there was some uncertainty whether the man's appropriate title was prior or chaplain. The same doubts surfaced in 1279 when the bishop of Worcester described a newly appointed chaplain as a canon of the Priory of Kinley though the subsequent legal dispute with the King referred only to a free chapel of Kinley. One explanation may be that a small religious house at Kinley, perhaps Augustinian, occupied in the early 13th century only by a hermit, was appropriated by the lord of Nympsfield manor as his free chapel. St Twrog chapel at the furthest end of the Beachley peninsula near Chepstow is an example of a 13th century hermit cell that became a chapel, with incumbents until 1519; it is not recorded as a chantry chapel, but its later purpose is obscure.

Kinley chapel does not appear in the Taxatio Ecclesiastica of 1291, either as a priory or a chapel, but benefices worth less than 80s. p.a were not liable for the tax. It was not described as a chantry before 1332, though the 1185 agreement with St Peter's Abbey for Frocester parish to have a chapel-of-ease in Nympsfield allowed its lord to have his chantry there, a rather surprising anachronism.

It may be that there never was a priory here, but that at some time before 1271 the lord of the manor employed more than one chaplain, the so-called prior being the most senior. A well documented example of this was the chantry of Kilve in Somerset founded in 1329, which had a college of five chaplains.

Before the Reformation, the advowson and patronage of Kinley chantry were owned by the lords of the manor of Nympsfield, held of the King by knight service. In the early 16th century successive lords were John Walsh, Sir Edmund Tame of Fairford and his son Edmund. When Sir Edmund Tame junior died in 1544 his heirs were his widow Katherine and (after her death) his three sisters, of whom the eldest, Alice, married to Sir Thomas Verney of Compton Verney in Warwickshire, inherited the manor of Nympsfield. Four generations of Vernes followed, until Richard Verney and his son Greville granted the manor in 1613 to Sir John Bridgman. Nympsfield manor house was leased in the late 16th century to the Siddenhams of Frampton, then to John Poyntz, who married Anne Siddenham, and from 1609 to William Smyth of Nympsfield.

Following the Crown confiscation of the lands of Kinley chantry in 1548, they were purchased on 17 January 1549 by Anthony Bourchier of Barnsley along with other property in Gloucestershire belonging to no fewer than nine other dissolved chantries. In June 1549 he sold Kinley to William Stumpe of Malmesbury. These sales provide the first detailed description of the chantry lands, which included four virgates in the common fields and about 120 acres of pasture surrounding the chapel, all held of the Crown in socage as part of Berkeley Hundred. The property single tenement was probably in Nympsfield village; a mansion house near the chapel in 1545 was by that time ruined, but appears to have been rebuilt and occupied by a Tobias English in the early 17th century.

When William Stumpe died in 1552 his son James inherited Kinley and other property in Woodchester and Stinchcombe listed in the Inquisitions post mortem for William and James. In 1561 James sold Kinley to William Smyth of Nympsfield and the foot of fine summarises the transaction as messuages, 2 gardens, 200 acres of land, 40 acres of meadow, 40 acres of pasture and 40 acres of woodland in Nympsfield and Hampton. William Smyth had in fact leased...
the lands in 1545 for 21 years from the chaplain, James Rathbone, on condition that the existing copyholders should retain their holdings peaceably, provided their rents and heriots were paid to Smyth. In 1558 five new tenants were admitted at a court held by Smyth by right of his 1545 lease, though the property was still owned by James Stumpe. When William Smyth died in 1577 his son William was only ten years old, so it was not until 1589 that his property was released from the Crown wardship. The release was accompanied by a survey stating that William Smyth, a yeoman, held the manor of Kinley (worth 60s p.a.) of Henry Lord Berkeley as of the castle of Berkeley Hearnes in free socage, together with a pasture close called Priors Wood worth 13s 4d p.a. and two acres of land in Nympsfield called The Greens worth 2s p.a., the last being held of the King.

It is not entirely certain where the two latter holdings lay. Priors Wood was described in the Stumpe inquisitions of 1552 and 1563 as 9 acres of pasture and 3 acres of meadow in Clingre, near Lorrenge; the probable location is near ST 720995, in a detached part of Leonard Stanley now in Stinchcombe. This was once held by Leonard Stanley Priory and on the Tithe Map it appears as Friars Wood. Since it was not included in the Kinley lands granted to Stumpe in 1549, it was probably Stumpe land well before 1549, when it had no connection with Kinley, and was sold to Smyth by the heir of James Stumpe, his daughter Elizabeth Knevett.

The Greens, on the other hand, was probably another name for Priests Croft, that was part of Item 12 of the Kinley lands in 1549. The alternative names also occur in the glebe terriers of 1704-5 and 1807; these record that when Sir George Huntley enclosed 17 acres of the Rector's glebe within Woodchester Park, he gave the Rector in exchange Priest Croft (in the earlier terrier) or pasture ground called The Greens (in the later terrier). The Greens lay in the village of Nympsfield (Tithe map number 132), and unlike the other chantry lands was held of the King as part of Nympsfield manor in 1548.

As shown most clearly by the Crown's 1589 survey, made when the Crown ward William Smyth came of age, the chantry lands appear at times to have been regarded as a separate manor. John Smyth of Nibley described it c1638 as a manor: 'for soe is the chantry often written', but he evidently believed its lands were in fact part of Nympsfield manor. The outcome of the protracted dispute in 1597-1601 over who owned Kinley is uncertain, but at some point Sir George Huntley of Frocester and Woodchester became the owner (the relevant foot of fine has not yet been found) and in 1616 he sold the property to Sir John Bridgman, then lord of Nympsfield manor. The property was described as two messuages, 15 acres of land, 20 acres of meadow, 140 acres of pasture and 20 acres of woodland in Nympsfield and Kinley. This agrees with the 1561 foot of fine that there were two messuages, and the total acreages are very similar (320 acres in 1561, 330 acres in 1616), though feet of fine quantities are notoriously unreliable. The Huntleys (later the Duces) continued to hold some freehold land in Nympsfield, along the southern edge of Woodchester Park, for an annual rent of 2 3/4 pounds of pepper. This recalls a rent of 3 2/3 pounds of pepper (then valued at 12d a pound) in 1323, possibly for much the same land.

Why was part of the Kinley lands tithe-free?

The origin of the tithe-free status of the lands surrounding Kinley chapel was discussed in Glevesis, but no firm conclusion was reached, other than it pre-dated 1705. In some parishes where a landowner had acquired (or improperly appropriated) the tithes, he might take the opportunity to extinguish tithes on certain lands by what was called a merger. In the neighbouring parish of Horsley most of the land appears to be tithe-free on the 1840 Tithe Map, but according to its Tithe Commissioner's report it was in fact all titheable. The Commissioner explained that the inappropriate Rector [a layman] having sold off from time to time the tithes of certain lands to the respective landowners - since which, by descent or otherwise, they have been divided into smaller portions - at the present time more than three quarters of the landowners in the parish possess the tithes of their own lands. It is unlikely that this could have happened in Nympsfield, because after the dissolution of St Peter Abbey at Gloucester, which had held the advowson of the church, the Crown appears to have presented the rector's. Neither abbey nor Crown would be inclined to allow lands to be tithe-free, just because they were or had been a chantry endowment. It is conceivable, however, that when the Crown held the Kinley lands in wardship (1577-89) tithes were not paid to the rector, but there is no evidence for this. It is unfortunate that the 1584 glebe terrier, unlike that of 1705, makes no reference at all to tithes. In any case, the tithe-free lands in 1761 were only a part of the chantry endowment, which in 1548 had included four virgates of land in the common fields that were all titheable in 1761.

The records of two actions in the Diocesan court, in 1609 and 1614, both concerned with non-payment of tithes arising from land at Kinley, throw some light on the problem. The litigant in both cases was John Paine, who had leased the tithes arising in Nympsfield parish from Edward Browne, the rector of Nympsfield. It was stated that the rectorial tithes were of grain, hay, wool, lambs and herbage. In 1609 Paine's action was against William Parsloe of Rodmarton, who was said to farm a large but undefined area of Kinley. In 1614 the action
was against Sir George Huntley of Frocester who refused to pay tithes for grazing his cattle on 108 acres of pasture and meadow he owned at Kinley. According to Paine, Parsloe’s arable crops in 1608 were 200 bushels of wheat, 500 bs of barley, 200 bs of oats and 100 bs of peas and beans, all of which were said to be worth £131 13s 4d. He also mowed 60 loads of hay worth £40 and kept 200 sheep, that produced 200 flocks and 120 lambs, together worth £45. Finally, he pastured 200 barren beasts (i.e. young cattle and colts) between 3 May and 29 September, their herbage being worth 20s a head. The total tithe due from Parsloe, according to Paine, was therefore worth £41 13s 4d. The schedule attached to the court papers records that for the crops, Parsloe’s own estimates of the titheable number of bushels and their value per bushel were respectively only 42% and 50% of Paine’s, while for the other issues there was an even greater disparity. Using Parsloe’s figures, he was liable for £5 18s 4d, only 14% of Paine’s total claim.

If we assume that a reasonable contemporary wheat yield was 10 bs per acre and that the corresponding yields for barley, oats and beans were 8 bs, 6 bs and 7 bs, the crops estimated by Paine and Parsloe would imply a total sown acreage in 1609 of 130 and 57 acres respectively. Paine’s estimate seems much too high, for in 1671 only 48 acres of Kinley’s tithe-free lands were arable. On the other hand Parsloe valued a bushel of wheat at only 20d, whereas Paine’s valuation was 4s, equal to Hoskin’s estimate from historical sources. The only safe conclusion is that neither Paine nor Parsloe produced trustworthy figures; more significantly, Parsloe does not appear to have claimed the land was tithe-free. The evidence is heavily biased in favour of Paine, however, because any depositions by Parsloe have not survived; they are contemptuously referred to by Paine in a stray scrap.

Turning to Paine’s action in 1614 against Sir George Huntley, the court records explicitly state that it concerned the herbage of particular pastures (pratum pascuam sive pasturam) in Kinley: Bawltleys 50 acres, Parke Field 12 acres, Greenehill 20 acres, Maisters Wretchley 8 acres, Peglars Wretchley 8 acres and Freethes 10 acres. These 108 acres represent the major part of Kinley south of the arable closes near Tinkle Lane, and in 1761 they were all claimed to be tithe-free. Huntley valued the herbage at 1s an acre, but Paine claimed it was worth 13s 4d; in 1584 the whole 44 acres of glebe land were valued at only 80s a year.

Unlike Parsloe, Huntley asserted that he owed the church nothing, because the pasture was grazed by barren cattle, that is runts, bullocks, young beasts, colts and horses ... as did yield no benefit or profit. If Huntley did make such a statement, he implied that if his sheep or cows had grazed the pastures, he would be liable to pay tithes. The court papers include a separate document dated May 1614 that quotes Huntley as saying, Mr Colwall, I will attend nor follow this cause noe longer in your court because he had sold the land in question to Mr John Bridgman; so doth him defend yt as he list. In fact this sale was not recorded until Michaelmas 1616.

These two disputes over tithes arising from lands in Kinley are not conclusive proof that they were titheable, though it seems odd that the diocesan court records nowhere suggest that the lands were tithe-free, if they were. The lack of any later appeals to the diocesan court by Nympsfield rectors suggests that they accepted that Kinley was tithe-free, as the churchwardens did in 1705.

The lands adjoining Kinley Chapel

As its name implies, Kinley began as a clearing in woodland, that is still prevalent on the steep northern side of the valley running east from Kinley to Nailsworth. Until the 1550s more than 100 acres on the south side, called Lutheredge or Ludredge, were described as waste. It was then demesne land of the lord of Horsley manor, who leased it in numerous small parcels to his tenants (of various trades), encouraging them to cut down the trees and convert the land to pasture.

It could never have been an attractive area for settlement. The only known habitation sites are on the ridge near the chapel (shown on Fig.1), a site 200m. further east in the valley (shown Fig.1), and at Tinkle Farm (SO 824002) on the Nympsfield to Nails worth road, at the northern edge of the Kinley area, where there is arable land, absent elsewhere. The fact that one of the Lords of Nympsfield was named Ralph de Kinley (died 1280) implies that he lived in the area, and Tinkley - another woodland clearing - is a possible site. But the earliest reference to Tinkle (or Tinkyat) is a deed of 1723, so Ralph’s message may have been near his chapel, or at a fourth, undiscovered site.

Figure 1 shows the area around Kinley chapel (which lay in the rectangle marked A), based on the 1922 OS map with the addition of certain earthworks outside A. The most obvious of these earthworks are at B, where half an acre of level platforms on the south side of Kinley Mead (C) indicate that this was the site of buildings, by 1733 known as Kinley Farm (see tenants below). West of Kinley Mead and forming the north bank of the Kinley promontory ridge was Hill Side (D), the only titheable enclosure near Kinley in 1761. It may be significant that Hill Side cannot be identified with any of the closes named in 1548. It was bounded on the west by a stream and a hedge that still survives, and on the north-east by a still visible track (H) that led down to a small bridge at J, now destroyed.
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South-east of A was the enclosure (E) called Little Fatting Leaze in 1761, which formed the south bank of the Kinley promontory. Its name in 1631 may have been Calves Leaze, which together with Chapel Leaze probably constituted the certain closes called Kinley within the wales [walls] 48. Its western boundary (F) was a wall, now almost completely destroyed; its eastern boundary is uncertain, but may have followed the still visible track (G) that led over the ridge to join track H. Alternatively, the eastern boundary of E was much closer to B, though the areas drawn on the 1761 map (admittedly inaccurate) imply that the six acres of E plus B were divided 72:28, making the area of B much greater than half an acre.

The remaining earthworks shown on Fig.1 are (or were) all artificial watercourses, of unknown date, that channelled the two eastward flowing streams, north and south of the Kinley ridge. On the north side, the natural stream is channelled for 280m. to run along the north edge of Kinley Mead, from J (the old bridge at 8207 9960) to K. The water is confined on its south side by a low clay bank, but between K and L there is a stone-built channel and flight of steps, 38m. long. A few metres north of K to L is a dry valley which was probably the earlier watercourse from K eastwards.

On the south side of the ridge a channel similar to J - K begins at M (8225 9941) and runs 240m. north-east to Q, along the south-east edge of Kinley Mead. Along this channel the water is confined by a bank on its north side. At Q the water descends an 18m. flight of stone steps to R, the confluence of the north and south streams today. Before the artificial channels were constructed, the confluence probably lay in Kinley Mead, up to 100m. west of R. The channels' purpose must have been to improve the meadowland of Kinley Mead, and encourage early growth by controlled watering of the meadow in the spring. The technology of creating such "water meadows" was developed in the 16th century, but this example may be much later. The purpose of the stone steps K - L and Q - R is uncertain, but they are likely to date from the 19th century; their construction appears to be linked to rapid erosion of the stream beds just west of R, now known as Kinley Roar.

The remaining channel, shown on Fig.1 by + + + extends from the ford at N (8231 9951) 300m. north-east to P. It lies entirely in Horsley parish, at the natural foot of the hillside rising to Lutheredge; it is wider than the other channels and is now dry. Its probable purpose was to water the two acres of level grassland between the channel and the edge of the stream gully to its north. This grassland may have been the 1.5 acre close called "Kinley mead in Horsley" that was leased in 1648 49. The positions of N and P were dictated by the topography of the hillside; the 3 per cent inclination of the channel (except near P) would have ensured a steady flow, but this would have taken water away from the channel between N and Q. This suggests that it was constructed when the land either side of the stream had a single owner, such as Lord Ducie of
Woodchester who held the Horsley lands from 1810-11\textsuperscript{50}. In this case the parish boundary was unaltered, but when the channel M - Q was constructed, the earlier boundary must have been relocated to the centre line of the stream, by mutual agreement.

The tenants of Kinley

The 1638 inquisition into the lands of Sir John Bridgman\textsuperscript{51} incorporates a description of the part granted to his son as a marriage settlement in 1631, that includes Calves Leaze and Chapel Leaze. Chapel Leaze contained a messuage date in the tenure of Tobias English presumably the messuage near .. the chapel in ruins\textsuperscript{6} though Chancellor Parsons c.1700 thought that the chapel had been burned into a house\textsuperscript{6} It was the only messuage in Kinley in 1548 and 1631. When Chamber\textsuperscript{6} property in Nympsfield was mapped in 1761, copying a plan of 1733, the ruins of the chapel may be indicated by a small square, but there was now a farmhouse at or near B (Fig.1). A note added to the 1705 glebe terrier says that the tenant of Kinley was John Howell\textsuperscript{52}, who died in 1712 in Nympsfield. The previous tenant may have been his father David, who died in 1679\textsuperscript{53}. John\textsuperscript{6} will, made in 1711\textsuperscript{54}, includes bequests to his sons Henry, Joseph, John and David; Henry (of Horsley) died in 1714\textsuperscript{55} and John (also of Horsley) died in 1718, apparently childless\textsuperscript{56}. This John\textsuperscript{6} will is interesting because he bequeathed to his wife land in Horsley joining the grounds of William English and is called Long Lotherige\textsuperscript{6} (probably today\textsuperscript{6} Lower Lutheredge Farm). Another William English tenanted Lower Lutheredge in 1660\textsuperscript{57}, and its proximity to Kinley suggests that he was related to the Tobias English who lived at Kinley before 1631. The residue of John Howell\textsuperscript{6} property was bequeathed to his two surviving brothers Joseph (of Kingscote), and David who died in 1757, almost certainly the David Howell who was the tenant of Kinley Farm when the Bridgman property was being broken up in 1733\textsuperscript{58}.

Archaeological surveys

Figure 2 is a survey of the earthworks within the rectangle A of Fig1; it also shows the area covered by a resistivity survey at half metre intervals. The latter survey (Figure 3) was largely carried out in March 2004, with additions in March 2005; 10,400 points were recorded. Figure 4 is derived from Fig.3 to show the linear features of high resistance (H), some of which are accompanied by areas of low resistance (L). Some other features that may be geological are shown on Fig.4 by dashes. Possible gateways are indicated by arrows.

Comparison between Fig.2 and Fig.4 shows that the major high resistance features H1 to H8 are usually associated with linear banks, but the areas of low resistance are less obvious, being shallow depressions. The area surveyed geophysically appears to be divided between the west end, which has six generally straight banks H1 to H6, and the east end, which has a short length of wall

Figure 2  Kinley: the chapel site (A on Fig 1), with resistivity survey boundary
Figure 3  Resistivity Survey

Figure 4  Interpretation of resistivity survey
constructed in June 2005. Late 17th century sherds were found when a new farm track was
under its eastern bank. There is a disappointing lack of evidence for buildings, possibly caused by the shallow soil above the limestone bedrock, though features L5 and L7 may be significant.

Looking at Fig.4 as a whole, H1 and H6 can be regarded as part of the pasture close lying south of the site. This leaves a shield shaped enclosure 60m. long, oriented east-west, with low resistance features along the inner side of its boundary bank or wall. The west end of this enclosure is close to the prominent earthwork described in the following paragraph, that may postdate the main enclosure. There is a disappointing lack of evidence for buildings, possibly caused by the shallow soil above the limestone bedrock, though features L5 and L7 may be significant.

Outside the geophysically surveyed area of Fig.2 there are banks on the north side that are probably natural features, and a prominent circular feature to the west, about 30m. across. Clay banks one metre high surround features (ditches?) L1 and L2 on the north sides of H1 and H2, and between the parallel banks H4 and H5 (L3). The major non-linear low resistance feature at the west end is L4, close to the short bank H6 that may belong to a small, recent building. At the east end the main linear low resistance feature is L8 on the west side of H8; L5 and L6 are circular features of diameter 3-4m., and L7 is a sub-rectangular feature adjacent to H8, about 10m. long and oriented a few degrees south of east. In the wall H8 at its east end is a large dressed stone, in situ. Feature L7 appears to be the most likely site of the chapel, and L5 may be the site of a dwelling house. At the west end, the function of the diagonal banks H2 and H3 is obscure, though the parallel banks H4 and H5 may have enclosed a hollow way, leading to an entrance to the site between the east end of H4 and H7. On the south side of the site there appears to be an entrance at the east end of H1 (from the close marked E in Fig.1), and on the east side there may be an entrance through H8, parallel to H9.

Apart from some in situ dressed stone, no artefacts have been found. This is not unexpected, since the land is permanent pasture, but the pre-Reformation buildings (other than the chapel itself) must have produced some domestic rubbish when they were inhabited. However, at the Kinley Farm site, 25 late 17th century and 18th century sherds were found when a new farm track was constructed in June 2005.
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Figure 5   Aerial view of the site in January 2003, looking east from above ST 819994
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IDENTIFYING SOME 12TH CENTURY LAND HOLDINGS IN FROCESTER

Eddie Price

Introduction

Frocester was originally in the diocese of Worcester. In 1185 the patron of the parish church was Cardinal John de Columpna, who transferred his rights of appointment of its chaplain to Gloucester Abbey. An entry dated to 1225 reads that at the time of Abbot Breedone, William de Blys, Bishop of Worcester, at de Columpna’s request, gave possession of the church at Frocester and the chapel at ‘Nymdesfield’ to St Peter’s church, Gloucester; reserving a sufficient vicarage at the same

The income of the vicar was to be derived from the Lesser Tithes and, perhaps more unusually, some specified Great or Corn Tithes. These were to be from five virgates of land, occupied by six Frocester tenants, and described as follows:

One virgate held by Robert de Porta & Alicea his widow.
One virgate held by Adam Rivegore & Robert Bok
One virgate each held by Hugh le Bule, Richard Long & Robert Scot.

(The virgate, or yardland as it could be called, in Frocester was nominally forty acres, but could vary from this figure).

Tithes were a levy in kind of a tenth of the annual increase of the fruits of the soil, to be used for the benefit of the church, and for almost a thousand years they were the heaviest form of taxation on farming and the method of its collection eventually became most repugnant to all concerned. They were payable to the rector of the parish, who if a non-resident kept the Great or Rectorial tithes on grain, hay and wood, and allotted a resident vicar the Small or Vicarial tithes on the remaining produce. Details of these were recorded with varying degrees of elaboration in the documents called Terriers that survive for the Vicarage of Frocester from 1572 to 1828.

There is no known record of the above named holdings with which to span the gap of three hundred and fifty years between 1225 and the terrier of 1572. However, the extracts given below, from this and later terriers, suggest a direct connection with the land, description, and number of the original holdings. Fuller details (not reproduced here), including those of the Steane or High Meads which were first listed in the voluminous terrier of 1680, relate directly to the individual fields named in both 1807 and 1828.

Extracts from Frocester terriers.

1572 Fragment …… Terrier of all the Landes Meadowes…[in the] Vicariadge of frocester ……Tythes of the Corne and Haye of …land. with the tithinge of a meadow called Highe Meadowe with Corne and haye as we have knowne to be payd tyme out of mynde and beyond all remembrance (to the Vicar) is now detayned and kepte backe from our vicar that now is, and also from the last incumbent who is dead, by George Huntleye Esquyre and Patron of the said benefice

1584 Terrier of the glebe lands and Tithes belonging unto the vicariage of Frowceter …

Item. The Tythe of the corn of five yardlands within the Parise of Frocecter abovesaid and the Heye of all the Stone Meadowe within the Precincte of the sayd Lordship whereof a greate parte wee knowe to have been payd unto the vicar, and wee have heard our Ancestors reporte that the whole tithe of all the Stone Meade, that is to say that all such meadow gronde as hath not ben used to bee turned unto tillage hathe ben belonginge to the Vicarage also.

1613 Terrier of such …Tythes that belong to the Vicarage of Frocester…..

Item The Tyth of corn & hay of all that copyholds of Richard Ellond, Widow Heaven, John Wilkins, Georg Tullie, Walter Taylor, Georg John Pegler, Thomas Browne, and also the Tythe hey of Steanemeades…and the Tythe of one pasture ground containing four acres or thereabouts called Huntleys in the occupacon of one other John Wilkins and the Tythe of one close called Felbrook in the occupacon of William Taylor and all the Tythe of the ground of Henry Stevens that Lieth in Steane Meades aforesaid.

1680 … As to the Teythes belonging to the Impropropriator, he has teythes of hay and corn of all the parish excepting the tyeth of those five Livings which are hereafter excepted, and do belong to the Vicar. Viz William Nurses livinge, the tyeth hay and corne whereof doth wholly belong to the Vicar.
Secondly, Mathew Smyths Liveing (ditto)
Thirdly, William Heavens Liveing (ditto)
Fourthly, Mr Samuell Hollidayes Liveing (ditto)
Fifthly, John Taylors Liveing (ditto)
Sixthly, Mistress Wilkins, widow, her liveing (ditto)
Seventhly, John Peglers Liveing (ditto)

1807 & 1828 ...A terrier of the Vicarage of Frocester ... The following lands pay tithe to the Vicar; mowed or grazed. The Arkhome ground, Illbridge, Holm or Ham, Westfield Tyning; Late Pooles at bottom of Westfield, the Homestead & orchard, the Mead, Great & Little Rail grounds, and one acre in the Tyning; late Pooles up in the village, The Orchard, Home Close, a Close West of the former & Stanley Leys, the Bucketwell home Close, Little Close, High Meads, New Leys, Hallpits, Broadcroft Hill and Stanley Leys, Days ground, the Mead, the Middle Close & the Great Close, two acres in Upper Longerland and one acre in the New Tyning adjoining: The late Holbrows Sloughcroft and Trotmans Mead: The late Holidays garden patch, Home Close and Farther Close; Late Heavens Orchard, Great Close, Hern Yates, the West Hill Close, Lower Ground and the Upper & Lower Crampknowles: Late Linneys Dunley and Stanley Leys: Drivers Orchard, Home Close, Meadow by Agherrows, 5 acres, High Meads & Church Leys: Late Peglers Sloughcroft, part of the meadow belonging to the pound Estate: Late Taylors, the orchard, Westfield Close and meadow, Horpitts Tyning, Hilk Mead paddock and Lyptat: Late Webbs Hallings Mead and Steanmead: Wetmores estate, the Orchard, Home Close, Harvey Land, Lyde, Longcroft and Church Leys: Late Taylors Southfield Tynings, [Giddyford land, Church field land, Harvey land, Blackmoors and seven acres and a half in the Upper Broadmead.] There were seventy acres and a quarter of arable ...in different fields ...now changed for whole tithe of three fields called Breadcroft, Nockalls & Chargest amounting to the same measure.  

Fig. 1 The locations, based on the 1680 and 1828 terriers, of the seven farmsteads and lands which are shown to be directly related to the five virgates listed in 1225, and the Steane or High Meads, from all of which the Great Corn and Hay tithes were paid directly to the vicar. Some data taken from the 1613 terrier included.
Note. Taylor’s fields listed between the square brackets replaced some of the closes shown in Figure 1 after the 1801 exchange of outlying Frocester lands by the Ducie and Warwick estates.

Discussion

Tables 1 and 2 contain information from other sources relevant to the identity of the seven named copyholds in 1613, beginning with some information from the detailed estate inventory of 1547. In this they were individually described as two tenants holding one virgate each, one with two half virgates, and four more who each held half a virgate, giving a total of five virgates. This, combined with the long-term conservative nature of monastic estate management, suggests that they may well have been the same holdings as those recorded in the original 1225 grant. Details of the continuity of occupation from 1680 are included with the names and acreages of their fields in the site records in my archive list of Frocester Houses. With the exception of Site PS 8 in 1680, probably sublet to William Nurse, they confirm almost every detail of the other terriers. The locations of the seven listed farmhouses and the fields named in 1828, identified from the estate plan of 1754, which was reused in the sale schedule of 1803, are shown on Fig. 1. The location numbers 1 to 7 correspond to the Sites CR 4, CR 8, Dn 5, GR 8, GR 9, PS 8 and SL 1 documented in the 1547 inventory. The area covered by the villeins’ hay tithe in the Steane or High Meads may not be complete, but is certainly in the area of what was originally the tenants’ common hay meadow. The original location of the seventy acres of arable that belonged to the five virgates and lay in scattered strips across the open fields prior to 1807, cannot now be identified.

Conclusions

The results of the analysis of the terriers suggests very strongly that the five virgates listed in 1225 for the maintenance of the vicar are the same as the five yardlands listed in 1584 for the same purpose. These are identified from the 16th to 19th centuries with the yardlands or half yardlands held by seven copyholders whose farmsteads are identified in Figure 1. The record of continuity of development of these tenancies has been sufficiently full to show that when some of the land passed into other holdings the tithe liability passed with it. It must, however, be noted that this did not apply to some lands exchanged in 1801. A small less readily identified percentage of individual plots, most of which relate to the High Meads, does not detract from the accuracy of these findings. The 1572 terrier reference confirms the identity of Steane Mead with that of the common meadow in the upper part of Southfield. The original extent of this is not clear, but it is certainly included in the 1777 inventory as field numbers between 460 and 480. The continuity established by the terriers suggests that the dwellings and land associated with the corn and hay tithes payable to the vicar from 1572 are the same as those connected with it from 1225. In the words of the first terrier they were known to be payd tyme out of mynde and beyond all remembrance for over 600 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1 OCCUPIERS AND HOUSE SITES IN 1613</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Tullie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR4 (Half virgate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR8 (Half virgate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Ellond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dn5 (Half virgate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wilkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR8 (Virgate equivalent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR9 (2 Half virgates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George &amp; John Pegler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS8 (Half virgate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL1 (Virgate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2 OCCUPIERS AND HOUSE SITES IN 1680</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mistress Wilkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pegler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dn 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Smyth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Nurse, not listed in PS 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and probably a sub tenant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Holliday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SURVEY OF 18th CENTURY COPPER SLAG BLOCKS

Nigel Spry

The fieldwork project to locate where copper slag construction blocks were used in Gloucestershire in the 18th century has now been completed. An illustrated report on the survey and its conclusions was published in 2004 in the Gloucestershire Industrial Archaeological Society (GSIA) Journal for 2003. This report included a review of the history of copper production at the two works at Redbrook in Newland and at the three Bristol works. A five page simplified catalogue of known locations was included. The forms, sizes and use of the various block types were considered and conclusions were drawn about production and distribution. The County Archaeology Service now has the survey’s card index and documentation, together with a ‘user-friendly’ version of the computer database, presently holding 184 records. Other copies of the database are at the County Record Office, the NMR at Swindon, and with the three relevant Severnside district councils’ planning offices.

Since the survey was formally completed in August 2004 only one further site has been discovered. Local history research by Terry Moore-Scott at Minsterworth has produced photographs (Fig 1) of Bodnums Cottage which used to stand on the north side of the main road at Minsterworth, east of the junction with Oakle Street Lane, at SO3762321665. Until the cottage was demolished for road widening in the mid-1960s, its front wall incorporated slag blocks at the front and a two storey gable wall was built with them; the lias stone plinth also had slag block quoins.

Fig. 1 Bodnums Cottage showing side and front elevations
Description of the monument and its verse

On the north aisle wall of St Margaret’s church within the village of Alstone, Gloucestershire (SO 983 324) are two stone tablet monuments, flanked by classic style columns with broken pediments and blank heraldic shields above (see Fig 1). The western one, which has Corinthian columns, is in memory of D D and bears the date 1671. The most interesting thing about this tablet is its crumbling inscription, which due to exfoliation is now disappearing. The prospect of losing the inscription prompted the authors to record it during 2004 and research the family history of the people concerned.

The inscription reads (in our transcription the 17th century ‘long S’ has been used in place of the 17th century ſ):

F: D MDCLXXI

Here are the Attoms of as faire a face
As nature ere fram’d, made fairer yet by grace
This temple late like Solomons richly drest
With beauty in it felfe more from its queste
Whoſe ruins rest in hope here; to Returne
Like th[at] more faire & glorious from its vnne
Thus Shee shall Change not dye ye good nere dyes
But like the day star only sets to Rife
Let them with feigned virtues fortify
Their tombes, whoſe fickly virtues feem to dye
But fpare her Tombe, as needles & vnſafe
Her virtues shall out live her EPITAPH

Temporis Ergo pofuit: T: D: Coniux Amantifimus

The Motivation to Memorialise

The literal translation of the concluding line is D a most loving husband placed [this] for the sake of time. This form of words (ergo meaning out of or for the sake of preceded by a motivating word in the genitive case) is found on many contemporary memorials, particularly those to spouses or parents. The most common motivating word is doveſ (Amoris). For example, at Ashton under Hill Church, Worcestershire, a monument dated 1651 contains a short verse and the words: AMORIS ERGO POSVIT I.S. (I.S. placed [this] here out of love). There are similar Latin inscriptions on a number of other Gloucestershire church monuments including examples at Quedgely (1651), Tewkesbury Abbey (undated), Titherington (1709), Stanton (1675) and Upper Swell (undated). Other motivating words appearing on monuments with ergo include gratitudo, piety and respect. In Dumbleton Church, Gloucestershire, there is a monument erected by Sir Richard Cocks to his grandfather Charles (died 1654). The Latin inscription ends RICHARDUS COCKS ERGO MONUMENTUM AMORIS & GRATITUDINIS RICHARDUS Cocks which translates as Richard Cocks raised this monument out of love and gratitude. Other Cocks memorials in Dumbleton Church repeat this wording in English: out of just remembrance and gratitude. These inscriptions clearly show that part of the motive in erecting these monuments was to preserve a public memory of the Cocks family.

What is unusual at Alstone is the choice of the word time as the motivation. Why did TD choose time rather than doveſ or gratituđ. Time could have been the motivation insofar as he may have wished to keep his dead wife’s memory alive for future generations (over the passage of time) or he may have been thinking of his own funeral arrangements, when at some future time they would be reunited.


**Discussion of the verse**

The anonymous verse on the memorial is a competent amalgam of 17th century epitaph commonplaces in the minor metaphysical manner. Prattinton noticed that the first six lines of the Alstone verse also occur locally at Eldersfield Church, Worcestershire; on a monument originally brightly painted and richly decorated. On either side of the broken pediments are two female mourners dressed in white, and across the top of the inscription is a skull wearing the laurels of victory, while the apron of the tablet is decorated with a winged cherub. The monument is in memory of Anne Turton (died 1661), the wife of Richard Turton of West Bromwich and daughter of Thomas Browne of the neighboring village of Corse.

Across the broken pediment are the words:
Watch and pray do not delay

Across the top of the tablet are the words:
Eft tva vita brevis, modo vivis, cras morieris (Translation: Your life is brief, you live a short time, tomorrow you will die)

*Here lies interred the body of Anne Turton: Wife of Richard Turton of Wé/bromwich in the County of Stafford Gent Daughter of Thomas Browne of Cors* in The County of Glou Gent Shee departed this life the Faithfull Servant of the Lord the 30th of Sept 1661. *Here are the Attoms of as fayre a face As Natur’ere fram’d made fayyer yet by Grace This Temple, late like Solomons richly drest With beuty, in it felfe: more, from it’s guest Whofe ruines Rest in hope hence to Returne (Like That) more fayre, and Glorious fró it’s Vrne.*

The occurrence of the first six lines of this distinctive verse ten years earlier than the Alstone example could imply that an anonymous local poet or clergyman was producing epitaphs to order during the 1660s and 1670s. Also it is possible that someone merely copied and expanded the Eldersfield verse, as there is a natural break at the end of line six. The final four Alstone lines, with very minor variations, appear in the anonymous 18-line poem titled *Barclay his Epitaph* and printed in *Parnassus Biceps*, a 1656 anthology of poems by university men; the same epitaph, headed *Barkley* also appears in abbreviated form on an undated wall tablet in the south aisle of Canterbury Cathedral. The lines end:

Let them with feigned titles fortifie
Their tombs whose sickly virtues fear to die
And let their tombs belie them, call them blest
And charitable marble faigne the rest.

He needs not, when lifes true story is done,
The lying proscript of a perjured stone,
Then spare his tomb, that needless and unsafe
Whose virtue must outlive his Epitaph.

Alstone lines 7 and 8, with very minor variations, conclude an anonymous epitaph on James I queen, Anne of Denmark, who died in 1619:

Then she is chang’d, not dead; no good Prince dyes,
But like the Sun, doth only set to rise.

An almost identical version of line 8 appears in the 1664 verses on William Rogers memorial in Dowdeswell Church, Gloucestershire; the lines end:

Noe more then Earthe can Earthe make Man inherit
But Heaven a Guift of Grace not gained by Meritt.
Reader be confident noe Good Son dies
But, as the Day Sun, only Setts to rise.

There is a very distinguished working of the sentiment of the Dowdeswell last line and the Alstone line 8 (basically, comparing resurrection to the sunrise) in Milton’s *Lycidas*, a 1637 elegy on the drowned Edward King:

For *Lycidas* your sorrow is not dead,
Sunk though he be beneath the watry floar,
So sinks the day-star in the Ocean bed,
And yet anon repairs his drooping head,
And tricks his beams, and with new spangled Ore,
Flames in the forehead of the morning sky.

The Dowdeswell reference to Heaven gift of Grace not gained by merit reinforces the impression that line 2 of the Alstone verses is meant in the theological sense of free and unconditional divine favour for FD.

The two themes of the Alstone and Eldersfield verses are the promise of resurrection and the remembrance of the dead through their good name and reputation rather than an elaborate monument. The image of the body as the temporary dwelling place for the soul is almost a commonplace of 17th century English verse, though the Alstone/Eldersfield comparison with Solomon’s temple is quite a sophisticated variation. For instance, the opening line of Sir Walter Raleigh’s *The Lie* (1608) is: *dio, soul, the body guest* in Edmund Waller’s poem *Of the Last Verses in the Book* (1686), lines 13 and 14 are: *The soul dark cottage, battered and decayed, Lets in new light through chinks that time has made* Thomas Shipman wrote in *The Apparition* (1659) concerning the occasion of Cromwell’s funeral:

é The Marbles now discharge their trust,
And faithfully return their Dust
Behold the quickning *Attoms* play,
é Form’d to a Temple fitly drest
To hold the bright descending Guest.

Shakespeare, in the opening lines of his 146th sonnet (composed before 1609), wrote:
The Alstone church register records the baptism of Thomas Darke on 15th May 1628 and his burial on 18th November 1686. Nothing is known of his early life or education, but by 1660 he had married Frances (maiden name unknown). The Beckford church register for 1663/4 records the baptism of Richard son of Thomas Darke; as there no further references to Richard it is probable that he died during childhood. Both Thomas and his surviving son John lived in Pershore, but they also owned property in Great Washbourne, where the Darke family had acquired the rectory estate in the early 1650s. A churchwardens’ Ferrier of 1680 stated that all the Great Washbourne corn tithes were paid to Mr Thomas Darke Impropriator[who ought to pay] five pounds and ten shillings per annum to the Minister. According to Prattinton the Alstone burial register for 1670-71 was wanting by which he probably meant that he could find in it no record of Frances burial. However, he did record a number of broken ex-situ grave slabs in the north aisle. One of these was for Frances the daughter of Robert Ele[unreadable], by which he probably meant that she died on 21st March 1671/72, aged 31. In Thomas Darke 1681 will he is described as married to Hester, a widow with two daughters. His main heir and executor was his only son John. He may have been Thomas’s third wife. We have no secure record of his second marriage, but it is recorded that Frances, daughter of Thomas Darke was baptized at St Andrew[unreadable], Pershore, on 30th March 1674 and was buried there the next day. The wording of Thomas mother[unreadable] will of 1680 strongly implies that he had no wife at this time.

John Darke, in his will of 5th August 1690, asked to be buried in Alstone Church. He was buried in the north aisle and on his grave slab (directly below the western monument) it states that John Darke, Gent of Washbourne, died on the 24th September 1690, aged 29 and that he was the son of Thomas Darke. On the lower portion of the same slab it is recorded that Mary,
the wife of Richard Dark, Gent was buried on 2nd April 1705, aged 64. Mary was the daughter of William Adams of Chevington near Pershore and her eldest child Anne’s birth at the neighbouring farm of Cadicroft in the parish of Pershore on 2nd December 1666 is recorded in Alstone register.

More recent Darke family members are commemorated on the eastern tablet (1798-1830), which has Ionic columns. These individuals were buried in a vault or vaults under the north aisle. A grave slab which is partly obscured by the organ in the north aisle mentions a Mrs Ann Darke, buried 26th October 1763, aged 60, while another slab, now largely covered by the font in the north aisle, mentions a John Dark, Gent of Bangrove, son of John Dark, Gent of Bangrove, died 15th February 1790, aged 77.

Conclusions

Alstone today is a relatively small rural community as it was in 1671. Yet its church contains a monument erected by a member of its leading family which shows some awareness of contemporary trends in funerary verse. The relatively plain design of the Alstone monument (compared with the one at Eldersfield) could be intended to reinforce the somewhat puritanical sentiments expressed in the verse concerning the avoidance of elaborate monuments and excessive praise. As for the motive for erecting such a monument, one contemporary writer noted that of all funerall honours (saith Camden) Epitaphs have always been most respective; for in them love was shewn to the deceased, memorie was continued to posterity, friends were comforted, and the Reader put in minde of human frailties.  
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In the nearby hamlet of Bengrove SO 97 32 is Bangrove Manor, an unusually large T-shaped, timber-framed, two-storey house. It is constructed of small square panel work with some ornamental infill (ogee braces) typical of the late 16th or early 17th century, except for part of the ground storey, which has narrow vertical panelling with a middle rail and is probably of 15th century date.

Traces of a burial vault were seen in 1992 during floor replacement in part of the nave adjoining the north aisle and the Victorian vestry.

Richard was born on 22 Feb according to the register. Alstone Register (Ref 23).

Richard Wood in his will proved at Pershore 13 July 1557, WRO BA 2585 1562 II/9 and PRO PROB11/86 SCOTT.

Richard was born on 22 Feb according to the register. Beckford parish includes Bengrove and had close connections with Great Washbourne. Richard apparently died before his father as in Thomasâ€™ will (1681) he refers to John as his only son. There is no mention of Richardâ€™ burial in the Beckford register..

Great Washbourne village has its own church, St Maryâ€™. See Verey (Ref 1) 1976, 255-56.

In 1661 Thomas Aynsworth of Pershore died and left his son John property in Bredonâ€™ Hardwick and his daughter Hester property in Pershore. Fryâ€™s Wills Index, WRO and Stainesâ€™ Pershore Area Wills 1996. In 1668 William Hope, an innholder of Pershore, died and left property in Pershore and Colwall to his wife Hester and daughters Elizabeth and Frances. PRO PROB11/327.

Joan Darke, Thomasâ€™ widowed mother, in her will of 1680 left a token one shilling to each of four sons – Richard, Thomas, William and Jonathan – and clothes to the named wives of three of them, excluding Thomas; this suggests that he had not remarried at this date. Separate arrangements were made for her unmarried fifth son, John. WRO BA 9028.
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The people listed on the eastern tablet are:- John Darke of Bredon, died 18 July 1805 aged 70, and his wife Anne, died 16 Sept 1798 aged 65; their grandson John Darke Sheppard, eldest son of Edward Sheppard of The Ridge, Bredon and Mary his wife, aged 14 years; also of their two infant children Hulbert and Berkley Sheppard; Richard Darke MA Rector of Colwall to his wife Hester and daughters Elizabeth and Frances. PRO PROB11/327.
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RECENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK IN GLOUCESTER

Annette Hancocks (Cotswold Archaeology)

Introduction

Over the past few years Cotswold Archaeology has carried out a number of archaeological fieldwork projects in and around the City of Gloucester. Some of these have been reported upon in previous issues of Glevensis, including the Roman South Gate cemetery at Parliament St\(^1\), a Roman penknife handle from Gloucester Docks\(^2\) and Llanthony Priory at Gloucester Quays\(^3\). Reports for the majority, however, exist only in typescript format, and the intention of this brief report is to provide accessible summaries to six projects, the locations of which are shown in Fig. 1.

![Figure 1: Cotswold Archaeology fieldwork in Gloucester City](image)

1. Archdeacon Street to Priory Road
   SO 8284 1892 to SO 8298 1907
   A watching brief was carried out in January and February 2004 during the installation of a natural gas pipeline from Archdeacon Street to Priory Road. A charnel pit, the remains of a burial ground and building foundations were recorded. The burial ground was that of the Church of St Catherine, which lay on the north side of the ruins of St Oswald's Priory. The burial ground fell out of use in the mid 19th century and was cleared sometime in the third quarter of the 19th century. The church was demolished in the 1920s when Priory Road was widened. The charnel pit is believed to have been associated with the clearance of the burial ground. Limited dating evidence recovered included four residual sherds of Roman pottery, of broadly 2nd to 4th century AD date, and some Roman building material including imbrex and tegula roof tile. A single sherd of residual 16th to 18th-century Frechen stoneware was also retrieved.

2. St Oswald's Park
   SO 8316 1906
   A watching brief was undertaken in November 2004 during redevelopment of the former cattle market at St Oswald's Park. The site lies close to a former channel of the River Severn (historically known as the Old Severn), however, no features or deposits of archaeological significance were observed and no artefactual material pre-dating the modern period was recovered.
3. The former Kwiksave site, Worcester Street
SO 8343 1881
A two-staged evaluation in July 2004 and early in 2005 comprised ten trenches, which revealed well preserved deposits including metalled surfaces, cultivation soils, bank material and demolition debris. Metalled surfaces of crushed gravel were encountered in three trenches, typical of Roman street levels, with layers of silt roadwash sealed by later metalled resurfacing. The limited amount of pottery recovered from these layers suggests a 3rd-century or later date. Evidence for a bank of probable medieval date was also revealed, in a position and on an alignment consistent with the postulated outer boundary of the medieval town (incorporating the 13th-century suburb of St Peter’s). A section through the bank revealed several phases of construction, the earliest of which contained sherds of Roman pottery. The majority of the Roman pottery recovered was residual, dating to the late 1st to 2nd century AD but associated with material of 3rd to 4th-century date. It is possible that an earlier Roman bank was replaced by the later medieval bank. In six trenches, these deposits were sealed by layers of dark earth up to 0.9m thick, which contained post-medieval ceramics including Frechen stoneware, as well as quantities of residual medieval and Roman pottery. Such a depth of an apparently homogenous deposit with pottery of a wide date range suggests a gradual build up of this material beginning in the late Roman or post-Roman period.

4. Junction of St Catherine’s Street and Park Street
SO 8340 1900
An evaluation took place in September 2004 on land at the junction of St Catherine’s Street and Park Street. Three trenches were excavated, one of which revealed an early Roman pit and ditch containing 1st to 2nd-century AD pottery, along with features likely to have been associated with medieval/post-medieval tenements fronting St Catherine’s Street/Park Street.

5. ‘Clutch Clinic’ at Blackfriars
SO 8290 1840
A watching brief and building recording survey was undertaken between May and August 2004 during the demolition of buildings and structures associated with the ‘Clutch Clinic’ (Fig. 2). The site still contains the upstanding remains of the medieval friary of Blackfriars, although much of the cloister has been destroyed and the western range greatly altered to create a row of terraces. The main alteration has been the removal of the south eastern corner of the cloistral range and the construction of a single-storey building, last occupied by a garage and car showroom. The ‘Clutch Clinic’ was located within the area of the central cloister and eastern range. Deposits of redeposited alluvium was recorded during groundworks, possibly associated with the infilling of the outer ditch of the Norman castle previously on this site. Laid upon this were in situ medieval tiles from the friary cloister floor. A large amount of reused medieval masonry was also
recovered from the demolition of the 19th and 20th-century buildings.

6. Gloucester Docks
SO 8287 1824
Two archaeological evaluations were undertaken at Gloucester Docks in November and December 2002 and July 2003. A total of nine trenches were excavated. A number of excavations have taken place in the dock area which identified Roman, post-Roman and medieval buildings fronting onto the road, which formed the main route to Sea Mills in the Roman period. Cultivation soils dated to the medieval and later periods were revealed in all the evaluation trenches. These deposits sealed a series of ditches and beam slots dated to the Roman and medieval periods. In some instances the cultivation soils were sealed by layers of rubble associated with the demolition of 19th-century buildings which formerly stood on the site. In one of the trenches a large quantity of Roman and medieval pottery was recovered during fieldwork, as well as a fine Romano-British carved bone clasp-knife handle, carved in the shape of a horse, and medieval copper-alloy crotal bell were recovered too (Fig. 3). The Roman material was quite abraded compared to the medieval sherds, and it was difficult to assert whether the Roman material was residual or not.
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Figure 3: Deer antler knife handle
## HON TREASURER’S REPORT FOR YEAR ENDING 28 FEBRUARY 2005

Receipts and Payments for year ending 28 February 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members’ subscriptions</td>
<td>£1642.50</td>
<td>£1626.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions at meetings inc non-members</td>
<td>£67.97</td>
<td>£46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glevensis</td>
<td>£125.70</td>
<td>£346.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Outing</td>
<td>£496.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Interest Treasurers' account</td>
<td>£1.77</td>
<td>£1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Interest account</td>
<td>£41.67</td>
<td>£35.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAF Cash Account</td>
<td>£572.20</td>
<td>£398.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax Refund</td>
<td>£334.23</td>
<td>£245.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Party/Auction</td>
<td></td>
<td>£26.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations Publication Fund</td>
<td>£3000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leckhampton Historical Soc</td>
<td>£75.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>£10.00</td>
<td>£63.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>£5871.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>£3285.93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>2004-2005</th>
<th>2003-2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers’ expenses, fees, donations and gifts</td>
<td>£273.00</td>
<td>£196.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>£97.50</td>
<td>£91.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation Fees</td>
<td>£70.00</td>
<td>£68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>£263.45</td>
<td>£262.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>£256.91</td>
<td>£354.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>£479.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Glevensis</td>
<td>£498.00</td>
<td>£426.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>£66.56</td>
<td>£64.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying &amp; Stationery</td>
<td>£108.79</td>
<td>£211.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>£10.00</td>
<td>£10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistivity Meter/Slide Projector</td>
<td>£163.34</td>
<td>£805.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet site Host Rental</td>
<td>£30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td>£88.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1837.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>£3057.21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gross Surplus/Loss**
Less CAF Cash Interest and donation to Publication Fund, transferred to Accumulated Fund

| **£ 461.29** | **-£169.39** |

**Statement of Assets and Liabilities as at 28 February 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Assets</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank Accounts Treasurer's Account</td>
<td>£1429.20</td>
<td>£1009.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Interest Account</td>
<td>£1600.49</td>
<td>£1558.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAF Cash Account</td>
<td>£16600.04</td>
<td>£13027.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>£19629.73</strong></td>
<td><strong>£15596.24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accumulated Fund**

| Brought forward from last year                      | £2568.40   | £2737.79   |
| Gross surplus less                                   |            |            |
| Interest on CAF Cash Account                         | £461.29    | -£169.39   |
| **Sub Total**                                        | **£3029.69** | **£2568.40** |
Publication Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brought forward from last year</td>
<td>£13027.84</td>
<td>£12629.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus surplus from the year</td>
<td>£3572.20</td>
<td>£398.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£16600.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>£13027.84</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>£19629.73</strong></td>
<td><strong>£15596.24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. The subscription total includes 6 payments for 2005/6 (£57)
2. The Publication Fund is the money transferred from the Frocester Publication Fund in 2001 and is earmarked for Frocester Vol 3 and other publications
3. The Publication Fund is held in the CAF Cash Account and interest derived accrues to this fund, and is not transferred with the surplus/loss on the other activities to the Accumulated Fund.

Mr J Newbury reviewed the accounts set out above that were prepared from the accounting records of the Group and in his opinion they accurately reflect the surplus for the year and the assets and liabilities of the Group as at 28 February 2005.