EDITORIAL

Martin Ecclestone

An Editorial in Gleensis is a sure sign that there will be a new incumbent next year. I have been the Editor for only three issues, far less than some of my distinguished predecessors - Nigel Spry and Don Mayes, Bernard Rawes and Bill Chouls - so I must apologise for a certain lack of stamina. Nonetheless, I am proud to have contributed something to the good reputation that GADARG has derived from Gleensis. The layout and appearance of our journal are at least as important as content, and we are grateful to Don Mayes, and now Les Comtesse, for producing issues to a high professional standard.

The sting is in the tail, of course. As Secretary, I took on the editorial responsibility to avoid a hiatus, in the absence of a willing volunteer. Now, we really do need one or more members to put themselves forward as a possible Editor, at the next AGM. I will be happy to discuss the job with anyone who is interested, and the new Editor can of course rely on Committee members, David Aldred, Russell Howes and myself for any help they may need.

Reader, please do consider this opportunity to become more involved in GADARG's continuing progress.

The cover illustration will be familiar to all those who have dug at Frocester with Eddie Price. The hut on the left was used by 19th century shepherds caring for sheep on the Cotswolds; that on the right was a more recent chicken house. They will be always associated with the Frocester excavation.

THE GODDESS CUDA

One of our members, Stephen Yeates, was the author of an article in Gleensis 37 entitled 'The Cotswolds, the Codeswellan and the goddess Cuda' which explored the evidence for Romano-British religious cults in the Cotswolds. This represented a small part of the research he carried out for a D.Phil degree at Oxford supervised by Martin Henig. It is with great pleasure that we can record that Stephen’s work has now been published by British Archaeological Reports, as BAR (British Series) 411 (2006) with the title ‘Religion, Community and Territory: Defining religion in the Severn Valley and adjacent hills from the Iron Age to the early medieval period’. Gleensis's editor had the good fortune to notice it on the New Books display at the National Monuments Record library at Swindon this summer.
I do not usually begin my report in the time-honoured way, but tonight I will, because I do want to thank Jan Wills and her staff for providing a meeting place at Shire Hall, as well as their representative giving up an evening to attend. We are grateful to have such a convenient meeting place, and also for the discipline of having to finish the meeting by 9 o’clock; the only serious drawback is that we can no longer look forward to the cakes and biscuits that were so generously provided by our host (or his wife) when we used to meet in each other’s homes.

At the beginning of the year we moved our Cheltenham lectures to the URC church in Montpellier Street, and I think this has proved popular, as was the move to the Record Office. I would like to thank Heather Forbes, the County Archivist who succeeded Nicholas Kingsley during the year, for continuing to make this room available to us. While I am speaking about lectures, may I thank Marta Cock on behalf of the Committee for arranging the lecture programme, which is a considerable task. The lectures by Mark Bowden on General Pitt-Rivers and by Neil Holbrook on the end of Roman villas in Gloucestershire were, I thought, especially interesting.

Marta Cock also organised the excellent coach trip to Much Wenlock and Wroxeter last summer, and we are grateful to David Aldred for guiding a group around Winchcombe. The financial viability of the summer coach trip is a recurring problem, so I very much hope that this year’s visit to Northamptonshire will be well supported.

Since Richard Sermon left Gloucester to take up his post as the Bath & Northeast Somerset Archaeologist, the committee has lacked any input from the city, though Annette Hancocks of Cotswold Archaeologist contributed a description of recent work in and around the city for Glevensis 38. We are therefore pleased that the City Council has now agreed to fill Richard’s vacant post. Committee members have worked with GSIA to improve the Council’s plans for the Docks area; it is now agreed that the course of the old tramway will be suitably marked, and that a replica tram will be built and exhibited there.

Members of the Committee have worked on a number of projects during the year, with the help of group members. Eddie Price’s work at Frocester must take first place, and as always, I urge all able-bodied members to take the opportunity of working there at weekends. We are grateful to Nigel Spry for producing a report on excavations at St Mary’s Street during the 1970s, that we hope to publish later this year. Other projects have been Ann Maxwell’s work at Dymock, investigations at Hartpury and Tewkesbury led by Terry Moore-Scott, and a survey of the Randwick long barrow for the National Trust, the first since 1883. There are plans for future work at Winchcombe, Harescombe and Iron Acton. Members also got extremely wet during National Archaeology Week in July, when we contributed to an exhibition at Crickley Hill.

Next year GADARG will have been in existence for 40 years, and we intend to mark this achievement with a suitable celebration. It could be said that we are entering on respectable middle age after an active and adventurous youth, GADARG’s ‘glory days’ remembered fondly by some of our older members. Archaeology has changed a lot since 1967 and the division between the professionals and voluntary groups like our own has become more clear cut. For the professionals there is now a great deal more money available, but most of this is directed to commercial development projects, rather than to carefully chosen research. The voluntary groups are seldom able to participate in these contractual projects, and their own projects are necessarily limited by financial and manpower constraints. So if GADARG is to make a useful contribution to Gloucestershire archaeology in the future, we have to decide what kinds of project we can realistically tackle, what kinds of skills we need to develop, and how best to encourage more members to participate.

In some respects I believe we are doing very well. We are extremely fortunate to have the opportunity to work at Frocester, year after year, on what has become a classic exploration of an Iron Age/RB site, directed and recorded by an acknowledged expert. Quite a number of our members have taken part in academic courses at Bristol and elsewhere, that have widened their knowledge and practical experience, and helped to maintain the necessary link between archaeology and local history. We have purchased a resistivity meter.
that has already been used quite effectively on a number of sites. We have periodically carried out field-walking and earthwork surveys, and the results have been published with commendable accuracy and speed. But we could do even better if more of our members took part in these activities, or could take the lead in organising new projects. Committee members are happy to be involved, but reliance on them does limit the number of projects. As Editor of Glevensis, I should also say that it would be good to have more contributions from members. That said, GADARG has much to be proud of, and will, I am sure, continue to flourish. At present we have 200 members, of whom 23 are Associates and 5 are juniors.

BOOK REVIEW

Michael Milward


In this slim volume, Terry Moore-Scott, presents for the interested general reader the results of his extensive research in the Gloucestershire Records Office and elsewhere into the history of Minsterworth. Context is provided by a general chapter setting the village in its landscape and showing how it developed by reference to the river Severn and other passing routes, and to agriculture, fishing, seafaring and other core occupations. The very brief chapter on prehistoric Minsterworth up to the Anglo Saxons reflects the paucity of information available for this period on this once marshy and inhospitable riverside, the only notable feature of which were the three human burials of the Roman era uncovered in the 1930s.

The richest periods for documentary material on Minsterworth are the medieval and later and these constitute the bulkiest chapters in the book. Although Minsterworth does not appear by name in the Domesday Book, scholars have been able to identify the entries that between them account for the village’s status at that time. The author moves on briskly from the obscurity of the end of the Saxon period and gives a very readable account of the changing fortunes through the Middle Ages of the manors that became Minsterworth, including the useful advantages of ownership by the Duchy of Lancaster.

The final chapter covering the time from the Reformation to Queen Victoria is necessarily parochial, but in a good way, illuminating the development of the local squirearchy and their impact on the landscape and buildings of the village, but not forgetting the working life of its inhabitants, as shown by the churchwarden’s notebook or the still extant field boundary stones demarcating individual tenants’ strips in the open fields.

Interest in the history of any locality can be greatly enlivened by the appearance of real people, here the generous use of appendices introduces us to many former villagers by quoting documents which list the names of most of the population at various times and in various contexts, with details of their occupations, military usefulness or the value of their property. While many of these names will resonate only with their descendants, more famous names with a Minsterworth connection do emerge - including Sir Robert Atkyns, Richard Pate and even Sir Arthur Conan Doyle.

The author has provided a bibliography and copious references, although there are always those who could do with more - where for instance can we read more of the Roman flood defences identified by archaeologists. Like all good, information-packed books on local history, this one satisfies much curiosity but also raises more questions, ranging from what is the scope for increasing knowledge of prehistoric Minsterworth - do the discoveries of mesolithic footprints in the Severn mud downstream at Caldicot offer a new line of enquiry? - to the more mundane - why so many tailors in Minsterworth in 1608?
LIDAR

Martin Ecclestone

Harold Wingham is a long-time member of GADARG, distinguished for his aerial photography over many years - a recent study of the Malvern's1 reproduces photographs he took in 1951 and 1958. In June 2006 he brought to a GADARG committee meeting an aerial picture of High Brotherridge in Cranham parish. Obtained through the good offices of his friend William Hanley, his picture is a montage of Lidar images covering about 500 ha of the Cotswolds, much of it heavily wooded. Unlike all previous air photographs of this archaeologically interesting area, Harold's1 montage shows the ground surface under the trees, so that previously hidden ditches and banks are clearly visible (compare fig 1 and fig 2, which depict an area of about 340 ha, in black & white format).

On the west side of the Severn, a Lidar image was produced in 2004 by the Cambridge Unit for Landscape Modelling (funded by the Forestry Commission) of the Iron Age hillfort of Welsbury, long covered by trees and undergrowth2. In 1996 the RCHM had produced a detailed plan of the archaeology there3, based on a ground level survey. This allowed an accurate comparison to be made with the results of the Lidar survey, confirming that despite the tree cover, it clearly revealed both the major earthworks and the less obvious traces of a contemporary field system and scattered charcoal burning platforms.

Since this ground-breaking comparison was made, the techniques used to see through the tree cover have been refined by the Cambridge Unit. Even for open landscapes, such as Stonehenge, Lidar has proved superior to vertical air photographs, revealing new details in already well-researched landscapes and providing new ways of presenting the results. Bob Bewley of English Heritage believes that the use of Lidar in archaeology will, over the next decade, be as significant as the introduction of aerial photography was in the 1920s. Conventional air photography will of course continue to provide a complementary archaeological tool, particularly for locating buried features revealed by crop marks.

So how does Lidar work? Its name is an acronym for light detection and ranging, by analogy to Radar, which refers to radio waves. At its simplest, a pulsed laser beam scans an object such as a stone carving and measures the time before the reflected light from each pulse returns. The spatial positions of a large number of points on the surface of the object to be calculated, to provide a digital image of the carving. For landscape surveying, an infra-red laser is carried on an aircraft whose position is recorded every second by GPS, while the laser's orientation is also continuously recorded by inertial navigation devices. The laser beam typically scans an arc of about 15 degrees either side of the flight path, about 35 times a second, to produce around 35000 readings a second. Depending on the aircraft's speed and altitude, this enables the height above ordnance datum of the object to be calculated at one or more points per square metre, and their location on the National Grid to within 15cm. This collection of 3-D coordinates defines the topography of a strip of ground below the flight path. Further computer processing can produce contour plots, or more often images that show banks and ditches as if they were illuminated by low sunlight from any desired direction. This facility is particularly valuable, because normal air photography can seldom ensure ideal lighting of earthworks. In its original form, Lidar can therefore produce very precise and revealing images of barely detectable earthworks, but tree cover, as on a conventional air photograph, will obscure any underlying features. However, because part of the laser light can reach the ground through tree branches and between trees, especially in winter, the reflected light from a single pulse will include a slightly delayed (and weaker) component. By 2005 the Cambridge Unit had developed a vegetation removal algorithm for computers that exploits this effect, by combining the information on a group of nearby data points4.

Gloucestershire is now at the forefront in making use of this enhanced version of Lidar. Since 2002 the County Archaeological Service has been engaged on an archaeological survey of the Forest of Dean, led by Jon Hoyle. Experience with this project has shown how difficult and time-consuming surveys can be on ground covered by undergrowth. Lidar has now made much faster progress possible. In March 2006, two days flying produced Lidar data for the whole wooded area of the Forest, and this data was then processed at Cambridge using the latest vegetation removal techniques. For the purposes of the Forest of Dean archaeological survey, this represents an enormous improvement in data collection, at a much reduced cost compared with ground level surveys. It does not entirely replace field work, since features still need to be identified, but the Lidar images can be used in the field like an accurate map, so that every feature can be quickly found.
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Fig 1: Image of High Brotheridge in Cranham (North is to the left)

Fig 2: Image of High Brotheridge in Cranham with vegetation cover removed
This article outlines the results of the 45th consecutive year of excavation of the prehistoric and Romano-British occupation site at Frocester Court Farm (SO788029). I am particularly grateful for the help given by two of my sons, Matthew and Richard Price. The former removed the modern ploughsoil over the 320 sq m marked out in anticipation in autumn 2004; the latter backfilled it at the end of the season. Excavation, occasionally hampered by the weather, began on 30th April 2005 and, with the much appreciated assistance of a total of fifty-four volunteer diggers, continued every weekend until 9th October.

During the course of the excavation it became apparent that the furrows of the mediaeval field system were particularly shallow in this north-eastern part of the field. The resulting slight build-up on the ridges meant that almost all traces of earlier occupation, except of features dug into the subsoil, had been destroyed by the action of the plough. The disappointing barren, slightly stony, disturbed deposits which survived on the ridges were cleared, but most furrows were not excavated (Fig. 1a). However, all was not lost! At the SE edge of the excavation the earliest feature, Ditch 64, continued NE, but unexpectedly turned N before reaching the boundary of the site (Fig. 1b). A junction with either Ditch 49/62 or 38/39, a major E-W ditch known from the geophysical survey to lie beyond this year’s trench, is almost certainly in the strip of woodland alongside the field.

Ditch 64 may have been contemporary with an unexplained group of small hollows and twelve, apparently random stake holes which underlay the truncated remains of a T-shaped kiln, Zz30 F3. This small, square structure was based on the natural gravel, and built almost entirely of local marlstone infilled with a white, lime mortar. The kiln had been fired from the NW, and the ash in its slightly eroded flues had been backfilled with rubble. The structure appeared to have been partly dismantled and incorporated into one side a later kiln, Zz29 F4.

Two paving stones, set against and carefully laid level with the top of Zz30 F3, formed an extension to the SE. The first, of sandstone, measured 1.1m x 0.78m, was carefully bedded on a skim of lime mortar, and may have been part of the structure. The other, a less regular 1.02m x 0.47m slab of limestone, 60mm thick, had been sunk into the natural gravel. It may originally have served as an anvil on which to crush clay roof tile for making the *opus signinum* used in the replacement kiln Zz29 F4-F5. A large piece of tile, stamped with ARVERI (Fig. 2), the name of its maker, was found underneath the stone, and many tiny fragments in the infill around its edges. More came from an irregular hollow dug into the fill of Ditch 64, as did another ARVERI stamp and a nearly complete, but broken TPF *tegula*. Part of a second example of the latter was found in the stony backfill of hollow Xx/Yy 28 F1.

The rubble seen in the 1993 exploratory trench proved to be mostly demolition infill. This included fragments of thin flat sandstone slabs, which presumably once overlay the main flues of an underlying double T-shaped malting or drying kiln Zz29 F4-F5. The surviving lower courses of its walls consisted of up to two courses of limestone blocks, hid on and in part consolidated with *opus signinum* mortar; their upper surfaces were scored in places by the plough. The much-damaged cross-flues of both survived at the bottom of a mediaeval furrow. That of F5 was cut through by a mid 19th century field drain. Ditch 65, dug at the rear of the kilns to prevent them being flooded, ran NW towards Ditch 49/62. Both F4 and F5 were fired from the south-west from a deeply eroded, interconnected double stoke-hole. These heavily burnt hollows extended into both main flues, where they were infilled with ashy rubble. This had been levelled and covered with two c.0.7m square sandstone slabs, one set between the jaws of each furnace. Such large nearly complete paving stones are a noteworthy exception to the scattered fragments recorded elsewhere on the site.

The remains of two furnaces, Xx30 F6 and Yy30 F5, survived on the tops of adjoining mediaeval ridges. They were separated, both from the kilns and each other, by intervening furrows, but despite this, their close proximity and similar pottery finds imply that they were broadly contemporary. Their reddened sides suggested intensive use, and the infill over their primary ash deposits included fragments of reddened clay or baked earth. This, combined with the evidence of a flue extending beyond the first-named, and what is almost certainly the base of a vertical chimney at the end of the second, shows that they were covered.
Although obviously intended as in situ heat sources, their purpose is not known, but seems likely to have been connected with the malting or grain parching processes of one or other of the two kilns. If from Zz30 F3, possibly even the small scale brewing of ale. The close proximity and construction of Zz29 F4-F5 suggests that it was built as a single unit. This would probably have included an overlying rectangular working floor covering c.5.2m x 4m. The paving stones laid to the SE of Zz30 F3 may have been its point of access. It can take up to three weeks to process grain into malt, but no post-hole evidence of a roofed building covering the kilns was found. One can only postulate on the existence of sill beams set at or above present ground level. The purpose of the two isolated post-holes found close to Xx30 F6 and Yy30 F5 is also not known.

Five unstratified 4th century coins came from the disturbed layers over this part of the site but, with the exception of some pottery neither the truncated spread of dark occupation soil between Xx/Yy28 F1 and Yy30 F5 nor the kilns produced any firm dating evidence. Despite this, it is worth noting that in the villa, Building A, an opus signinum mortar was more commonly used for building purposes in the latter part of the century. In Room 5 the conversion of the T-shaped kiln A2 F1, into a trench furnace (Vol. 1, 167), may also have been related to the construction of kiln Zz29 F4-F5.

The short length of ditch which ran diagonally across the N part of the excavation was an extension of a major landscape feature incorporating both late IA & RB alignments and labelled Ditch 48/49. This was last sectioned about 50m further west, and it is not known how far the earlier phases of it continue beyond that point. Its junction with Ditch 62, just beyond this year’s trench, has yet to be examined so as to establish the relationship between the two. The present length is now tentatively listed as Ditch 49/62. It was sectioned twice and near the bottom produced clear evidence of at least two distinct, but undated alignments. The dating evidence provided by the twenty-two coins from its overall 0.5m thick abandonment upper backfill of black soil and domestic rubbish, suggests that it was probably deposited between about AD 350-375. It produced exceptionally large quantities of pottery, notably Oxford colour-coated bowls, Dorset black-burnished vessels, and local micaceous greywares, but only three sherds of late 4th century Midland shelly ware. The forty artefacts from it included a black glass gaming counter with one red and three white spots, a square piece of bone inlay, several bronze bangles, a small, graduated balance arm, and a pair of tweezers. The ironwork was mostly fragmentary offcuts, the best piece probably the shank and greater part of the blade of a pruning hook. Evidence of metalworking consisted of a scatter of corroded wire and strip offcuts, a fragment of a slag encrusted crucible, and a few small basal slag masses.

Structure 27, part of which included a stony rubble surface uncovered in an extension at the east corner of the excavation trench, lay almost directly under the modern ploughsoil. It was associated with a shallow post hole, BB30 F1, and bounded on its N side by what are interpreted as two U-section sill beam slots, BB30 F2-F3 (Fig. 3). It post-dated the mid C19 field drain which ran W across the site, but was almost certainly contemporary with Structure 28. This consisted of an irregularly spread alignment of shallow stone holes which emerged from the NE baulk and continued N for about 13 m. These are interpreted as the slight remains of a shallow dry stone wall footing. The soil associated with both structures produced late 19th-early 20th century china and coarse glazed earthenware, clay pipe fragments and thin brown bottle glass. Neither were completely uncovered so their full extent is not known, but their proximity close to the field’s boundary combined with my own farming experience suggest that both were once part of some semi-permanent livestock housing, probably intended to shelter ewes and lambs in the early spring.

My thanks to those who took home the large bagfuls of pottery and duly returned them with the contents carefully washed and dried. I am particularly grateful in this respect to Peggy Fowler and Angela Newcombe, who as in previous years, shouldered the task of dealing with most of this material.

Next year we propose to examine the area immediately to the NW of this year’s trench. It should cover both the E & W extensions of Ditch 49/62, with the chance to check the junctions with Ditches 62 and 65. The geophysics suggests that the E part of the prehistoric trackway lies close alongside, and the furthest extent of the excavations may just reach Ditch 38/39.
A number of archaeological discoveries have been made over the years in and around the village of Kemble, approximately 6km to the south-west of Cirencester, including the remains of human burials dating from the Iron Age, Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods. At Clayfurlong Farm, just to the north-east of the village, 26 Anglo-Saxon burials with accompanying grave goods were recorded in 1856. In 1986, two more Anglo-Saxon burials were found in the garden of 40 Clayfurlong Grove, about 200m to the south of the earlier discoveries. Further archaeological work in Clayfurlong Grove in 1989 found evidence for prehistoric activity in the form of six worked flints (including a late Neolithic or early Bronze Age scraper), as well as several Roman pottery sherds and another Anglo-Saxon burial was excavated from the garden of 40 Clayfurlong Grove following chance discovery this year.

A second focus for burial is around Fosse View House, West Drive, in the centre of the modern village, where a Romano-British stone coffin was discovered in 1983 and further graves were excavated between 1990 and 1993. In all, a total of three Iron Age pit burials, eleven Romano-British burials (including the stone coffin) and eight Anglo-Saxon burials, as well as a single undated burial, were recorded. There was also evidence for a later medieval building.

Set against this archaeological background, the proposed redevelopment of land at Station Road, about 200m south-west of Clayfurlong Grove, prompted archaeological evaluation in 2001 and resulted in the excavation of approximately half a hectare of land at the southern end of the development site in 2005.

**Fieldwork results (Fig 1)**

The evaluation and excavation revealed a few features cut into the natural substrate, dating to the Early Bronze Age, Roman and medieval periods.

Early Bronze Age features comprised two pits (18 and 20) about 5m apart from each other. Both were approximately 1m in diameter and 0.2m in depth, with a rough 'U' shaped profile. As well as containing small fragments of worked flint, animal bone and fired clay, the silty fills of these pits yielded sherds of Early

---

**Fig 1:** The site, with excavated features
Bronze Age Beaker pottery. The majority of this material came from pit 20, which also contained frequent charcoal fragments. This feature was initially interpreted as a cremation pit, but on excavation was found to contain no burnt bone. To the east, a 3m-long ditch (1005) with an irregular, 0.85m-deep profile yielded a flint flake consistent with an Early Bronze Age date.

The only feature of Roman date was an 'L'-shaped ditch (1035) to the south-west of pits 18 and 20. Ditch 1035 was up to 1.5m wide and 0.9m deep, with a 'U'-shaped profile, and yielded a number of 2nd-century AD potsherds. This appears to be the remains of a Romano-British enclosure, which extend beneath Station Road to the south of the site.

Two highly truncated plough furrows (1042 and 1046) were recorded in the northern half of the site, one of which contained a single sherd of later medieval pottery. There were also two undated pits (1007 and 1018). Pit 1007, measuring c. 0.6m in diameter, was identified during the evaluation but had been left unexcavated as it appeared to contain a child burial. Upon full excavation this feature was found to contain the skeleton of a young sheep. Pit 1018, which was 5m long and 0.3m deep, was lined with large fragments of limestone. This feature may have been a small pond or watering hole.

The Beaker pottery and worked flint
A total of fourteen sherds of early prehistoric pottery was recovered from pits 18 and 20, nine of which are recognisable as Early Bronze Age Beaker type, dating from c. 2400 to 1700 BC. The pottery from pit 20 comprises five joining bodysherds from a Beaker fine ware vessel, and two joining bodysherds from a second, thicker-walled vessel (Fig 2). Two bodysherds from pit 18 complete the group. All occur in a fine grog-tempered fabric characteristic of Beaker material.

The fine ware sherds seem to derive from the waisted central portion of a small vessel. Decoration is indistinct due to heavy weathering but appears to be typical of Beaker fine ware from the region and elsewhere, consisting of bands of 3 or 4 lines (scored or incised rather than impressed) separating narrow zones left plain or with diagonal stab marks. The thicker sherds are similarly weathered, but faint traces of repeated stab-and-drag type decoration are indicative of the larger, utilitarian 'coarse ware' vessels that are a feature of domestic Beaker assemblages. Although neither of the sherds from pit 18 appear to be decorated, both are heavily worn. The fabric of these two sherds is very similar to the 'coarse ware' material from pit 20.
A total of 13 pieces of worked flint was also recovered. The majority of this material was either residual or unstratified, however, a multi-platform core was retrieved from pit 18, a button/thumbnail scraper was recovered from pit 20, and ditch 1005 yielded a single struck flake. All of this material could also date to the Early Bronze Age.

Discussion

The discovery of what was thought to be a child burial and a cremation pit during the evaluation suggested the presence of another former burial area at Kemble. While excavation showed this not to be the case, the recovery of a number of sherds of Early Bronze Age Beaker pottery from a pair of pits is of some note.

Find-spots of non-funerary Beaker pottery from Gloucestershire have increased significantly in recent years, and this has gone some way to redressing the north Cotswolds and Lechlade area distribution bias apparent from earlier surveys. Larger Beaker assemblages remain elusive and much of the newly identified material occurs residually in later features. Three sites within 5km of Cirencester, excavated as part of the A419/A417 road scheme, produced Beaker pottery, the largest group being 11 vessels from Trinity Farm, Bagendon. To these can be added small groups from Whiteway, Cirencester, and from Shorncote and Cotswold Community, Somerford Keynes.

The Kemble group provides further evidence for Beaker-period activity in the south-eastern Cotswolds and Upper Thames gravels. The precise nature of activity represented is difficult to discern, with most groups being small and related features few and ephemeral. Like much of the newly identified Beaker material from the area, it is possible that the assemblage and associated flints were residual within later features associated with the adjacent Romano-British enclosure. Domestic activity is perhaps the most likely interpretation of the Beaker assemblage from Station Road, given the presence of probable coarsewares. The scraper from pit 20 is of a type also commonly associated with Beaker-period domestic sites.
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The first published notes on the presumed Roman Villa in Westfield near Chipman’s Platt at Eastington, (at SO 779066), were by W St Clair Baddeley in 1923 in the BGAS Transactions and in JRS. He also wrote a short item about it in the Stroud Journal in 1925, but it has not been possible to locate this. From a note by C F Gardiner in the CNFC Proceedings for 1930-32, we learn that it was St Clair Baddeley who called the site the ‘Whitminster Villa’ misnamed because in reality it is in the adjoining parish of Eastington. These early accounts tell of Mr Edward Armitage pointing out where his ploughman had turned up Roman pottery, coins, roof and flue tile, mortar and tesserae. Attention was drawn to a patch, 2-3 ft long, of coarse mosaic pavement of red sandstone, repaired with local white freestone ... probing revealed merely the remains of wall foundations and an abundance of mortar; the structure, like so many others, has been almost entirely ploughed out of existence. From this it is possible to suggest that some exposure of the remains took place at the time.

In the early 1960s John Lees, at the request of the landowner, Mrs Martin (later Hersey), examined a small area in the field and in situ mosaic paving was uncovered. Mrs Martin had in her possession a group of nine 4th century coins found in association with a pottery vessel, possibly recovered during earlier construction of a Dutch barn on the site. Rescue fieldwork undertaken by GADARG 250m north-west of the site in the late 1960s, during the construction of the M5 motorway, revealed clear evidence of 1st to 4th century, and possibly later, Romano-British occupation. The opportunity was taken to auger over the presumed area of the villa, and at the time this seemed to show its location was centred some 25m north of the barn. Figure 1 shows the general location of the site, as identified by auguring, and of the Romano British occupation on the line of the motorway, at junction 13.

Bill Chouls carried out exploratory excavations in 1975-6 in an attempt to locate the position more precisely and to ascertain the condition of building remains at the site. The hope was then, if the stratigraphy of the site proved uncomplicated, to organise a training excavation for GADARG junior members. After opening evaluation trenches in the area...
augered six years before, between the believed location of the 1960s mosaic paving exposure and the presumed coins find site at the Dutch barn, he encountered buried structures some 18m north-east of the barn. This fieldwork was reported in *Glevensis* 27.7 Excavation revealed a T-shaped corn drying/malting kiln in a structure overlying earlier furnace remains. The excavator recognised three phases of construction. Some of the stones used in the final phase were tool-worked and the structure was of a higher standard than the stoke holes and channels of phase 1 and 2. The excavation plan (reproduced as figure 2) identified these phases and the photographs published in *Glevensis* 27 show the nature of the structures.10 The original excavation results have been re-interpreted in an appendix to the present account.

At the end of his second season Bill Chouls decided that no further work would be done, so after covering with plastic sheet the remains were backfilled. Three decades later, the purchase by GADARG of CIA TR Systems Ltd resistivity surveying equipment prompted the Group to apply to the new Westfield landowner, Mrs Prentice of Syde Manor and her farming tenant Mr Gus Prentice for permission to return to the site to undertake non-intrusive fieldwork. This permission was readily granted and GADARG gratefully acknowledges it.

Study of Geoff Gwatkins’s redrawing, at 1:10,560 (6 inches to 1 mile), of the 1839 Eastington tithe map11 and of the ordnance survey pre-war, pre-motorway plan12 together with ground surveying, allowed reconstruction of the earlier field boundaries at Westfield, figure 3. It is possible that the field called Stanborough or Sauls Patch and another called Warnings Tyning were both part of an earlier Westfield, as also may have been Side Mead. However, the latter is on the opposite side of a partly hollowed field road or headland running north-west to south-east. Historically the local fieldname Stanborough could be given to areas where Roman structures had been ploughed up. The most significant and major nearby example of this is Great Stanborough at Frocester, where the allusion is to the Frocester Court Villa. At Eastington the field name Stanborough originally may also have included the area of Romano-British occupation found to the
north-west on the line of the motorway, as well as the area of Warners Tyning at the south-east.

Resistivity surveying was undertaken by GADARG members in two four-day stages. Initially in October 2003 a grid of 20m squares was laid out to the north-east of the barn, encompassing the area of the 1975-6 excavations and the supposed site of the paving exposed in the early 1960s. For continuity this grid was directly related to that previously set out by Bill Chouls. After completing the resistivity surveying of 19 squares (7,600 m$^2$) a minor trial survey followed at the north-west end of Stanborough. The plotted results indicated linear ditches, probable areas of gravel extraction or other such disturbance and traces of ridge and furrow ploughing. The orientation of the ditches differed from the overlying ridge and furrow.

Nothing showed of Roman structural remains, not even those observed in the 1970s. So, with the intention of validating the resistivity survey results, in April 2004 eight c0.25m square exploratory holes (A to H on figure) were systematically excavated on a line set out at right angles from the central posts of the barn, approximately north-east. Three other similar holes (J to L) were dug to the south of the line. This activity confirmed the position of part of the 1970s structures 17m from the barn. Beyond this, away from the barn, was a natural gravel surface, the fill of a quarry and what was presumably the top of a ditch. On the centre line in the opposite south-west direction, augering 3m within the barn merely revealed 1m of made-up ground.

A box, (I on figure 4) c0.6m square was opened near the supposed site of the 1960s pavement, 28m from a cowshed and 34m from the exploratory right-angle base line. In this box the base of a probable robbed out hypocaust channel was recognised. Although in situ paving was not observed, a single small white tesser of oolitic limestone, with mortar attached, was recovered. The results of this investigation seems to confirm the position of the 1960s exposures - although in 2003 John Lees, the original excavator, remembered his work was closer to the barn.

In September 2004 resistivity surveying was renewed and completed. In order to check if an increased survey resolution would yield better results and allow identification of the structures examined earlier by Bill Chouls, the measurement pitch was reduced from 1m to 0.5m, for one 20m by 20m area over his former excavation site. This produced four times more measurements but took consequently increased time to undertake. The plotted results, though finer and more detailed, did not justify the effort by revealing the known remains.

The 2004 work enlarged upon that of the previous year by completing a 60m wide survey up to the motorway fence at the standard 1m measurement pitch. In
Fig 4: Location of earlier exposed features and 2004 test holes in relation to resistivity grid

addition, part of Side Mead immediately south-west of the barn and the cowshed was surveyed and linked into the area on the other side of the former field road. This second survey covered 21 squares (8,400 m²). More ditches at right angles to those found in 2003, patches of negative fill and wide spaced ridge and furrow ploughing were plotted. Other linear features were noted, some curving and discontinuous and probably geological rather than archaeological in origin. The combined survey results are shown in figure 5 and a tentative schematic interpretation is given in figure 6.

In view of the lack of new evidence for Roman buildings, and despite the existence of remains demonstrated by the 1975-6 excavation, it is not intended to undertake further resistivity measurements at the site. However, it may still be worthwhile, even with the proximity of the barn and the cowshed, to seek a magnetometer survey of the area of the likely greatest interest around the earlier observed remains and to their north-east, and also at the only area of possible indicated structural interest, immediately south-west of the barn. The fieldwork archive has been deposited with the Gloucestershire County Council Archaeology Service.
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Fig 5: Resistivity Survey Results (2003 & 2004)
Fig 6: Schematic Interpretation and Possible Dates
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Appendix

Reinterpretation of the Documentary and Excavation Evidence presented in Glevensis 27

Eddie Price

The scatter of Romano-British building and occupation debris based on the fluvial gravel deposits on both sides of the River Frome extends southwards from Junction 13 of the M5 motorway. The site known as the Whitminster Villa is probably part of this settlement. What St Clair Baddeley observed was indeed the remains of a stone-built Romano-British structure, described as almost ploughed out of existence. The effect of the medieval ridge and furrow ploughing would most likely have been much the same as it was at the Frocester Court Villa, where later levelling revealed what had survived on the ridges. Did St Clair Baddeley probing actually locate recognisable wall foundations of a structure with stone footings, possibly based on natural gravel at a depth of c.0.7m, or was he just guessing at the evidence of a general spread of mortared demolition debris? The white tessera and the ash fill of what was interpreted as the base of a robbed hypocaust channel found in 2004 test pit I, together with the earlier record of fragments of flue tile and traces of a simple repaired red sandstone mosaic pavement, confirm the possibility of heated accommodation. What we know suggests it was in a relatively simple 4th century cottage type farmhouse, the approximate location of which seems fairly certain, but whose scanty remains are now unlikely to be recognised without careful extensive excavation.

The Glevensis 27 article featured the report of 1975-6 excavations in the same field of a well-preserved group of corn drying/malting kilns. The area was limited and more evidence, particularly from a south-west extension of the trench, would probably have helped with the interpretation of the results. Unlike what appears to have happened to the house, the identified features survived at a depth of c.0.35m below the present ground surface, at which level they did not appear from the photographs to have suffered undue damage from medieval ploughing. The report illustrated three phase of construction, but suggested an alternative in the accompanying notes. On the basis of this, the Phase 1 trench furnace S1/C1 (like those at Frocester), is more likely to have been contemporary with the rubble surface originally shown as phase 2 and the rectangular structure, the extent and purpose of which is not known. The only clue illustrated in the original report figure appears to be a small slot between its north-west wall footing and the unexcavated central area of the structure. The whole could have been demolished and replaced by a second group consisting of trench furnace S2/C2 and associated T-shaped kiln S3/C3, as recorded at three similar layouts at Frocester

Despite the overall general scatter of materials found in the 1975-6 test trenches, the distance of at least 25m which separates the location of the house from the group of kilns, makes it unlikely that they were physically connected. The fire risk associated with the furnaces was probably the reason why, as at Frocester and elsewhere, these tended to be located well way and downwind from the occupied building.
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THE PARLIAMENT OF GLOUCESTER IN 1378
Russell Howes

During the middle ages parliament sometimes met in places other than Westminster. It met at Gloucester on three occasions, 1278, 1378 and 1407. The meeting of 1378 was prompted by the killing of two men in Westminster Abbey by government officials. The young King Richard II had succeeded in 1377. Although parliament named a continual council to advise the king, government was effectively in the hands of his uncle, John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster. It was he who decided to summon parliament to Gloucester. Gaunt had recently faced an angry rebellion of Londoners; the deaths in the abbey were an added reason making London and Westminster unsuitable for parliament. Why Gloucester was chosen, rather than any other provincial town, is not clear.

The story behind the killings went back several years. In 1367 Edward, the Black Prince, won his last victory at Najera in northern Spain. The campaign was an extension of the Hundred Years War between England and France. The English and the French supported rival contenders for the throne of Castile. In the battle two English esquires, Robert Hauley and John Shakell, captured a Spanish nobleman, the count of Denia. The two Englishmen determined to hold the count to ransom, but it proved to be a protracted and troublesome business. King Edward III and the Black Prince had an interest in the capture. In 1376 a complicated agreement was made by which one third of the ransom money was to be assigned to the Black Prince as commander, the remaining two thirds going to Hauley and Shakell. They promised to give one third of their share to the king. The count of Denia had been allowed to go home by this time in order to raise the required money, and his son Alfonso was held as a hostage by Robert Hauley.\(^1\)

A year later Hauley was still trying to get the money. He was given a protection while he prosecuted business for the king and himself in England and overseas. The Spanish sent a demand for the liberation of the hostage and the English government sought to get possession of him. It was noted in the Rolls of Parliament for October 1377 that Hauley and Shakell held the son of the count of Denia as their prisoner, in whom certain persons claimed… right and part... the matter had been referred to the court of chivalry held before the constable and marshal of England;\(^2\) but Hauley and Shakell had caused the prisoner to be concealed and refused to bring him before the king. For their contumacy they were committed to the Tower of London. The writer of the Anonimalle Chronicle believed that it was by bad counsel and without judgement or cause that the king was induced to put Hauley and Shakell in the Tower. The two men sent a petition to parliament, requesting that four bishops, four earls, four barons and four knights learned in the law might hear their evidence and determine their right.\(^3\)

Before that petition came before parliament Hauley and Shakell succeeded in escaping from the Tower. They took sanctuary in Westminster Abbey. The abbey at this time was the scene of a great building operation. King Henry III had rebuilt the east end a hundred years earlier; about 1375 Abbot Nicholas Litlington began the rebuilding of the nave. The two fugitives were pursued by the constable of the Tower, Alan de Buxhill, and a band of armed men, who entered the church. There was a fight, described by several chroniclers, when Hauley was killed. The Anonimalle Chronicle wrote that Hauley defended himself boldly. The Continuatio Eulogii wrote that it was actually during mass that the fight happened, and that Hauley was killed when the deacon was reading the gospel. The Chronicon Angliae wrote that Hauley was murdered in the choir near the altar. A sacristan of the abbey was also killed. Hauley was buried in the abbey church, apparently straight away. In the south transept may be seen a grave slab which bears the indentation and studs of a missing brass depicting an armed man. An inscription placed there in 1881 reads, Robert Hawley murdered in the choir August 11 1378.

The authorities of the church were appalled by the sacrilege. They hesitated at first, because government officials were concerned; the Chronicon Angliae wrote that the duke of Lancaster was said to have confessed that what happened in the abbey was done by his order. But then the archbishop of Canterbury, Simon Sudbury, and the bishop of London, William Courtenay, and the abbot and monks of Westminster joined together in excommunicating those who had taken part in the outrage. Services in the abbey ceased, and no mass or matins were chanted. The action of the churchmen angered the government; the council sent messages to the abbot questioning the abbey's right to
receive these fugitives; the archbishop was summoned, but refused to appear. These were the questions which came before the parliament of Gloucester.  

Summons to parliament were sent to the two archbishops, 18 bishops and 25 abbots and priors. The abbots of St Peter's, Gloucester, Winchcombe and Cirencester were normally summoned to parliament; the abbot of Gloucester was John Boyfield, who had been elected in 1377. John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, Edmund of Langley, earl of Cambridge and Thomas of Woodstock, earl of Buckingham (and later duke of Gloucester) received summons, as did 59 other earls and lords. Presumably Thomas IV, Lord Berkeley, was among the lords. A man prominent in parliaments of this time was Sir Guy de Brian; he had been constable of St. Briavel's castle since 1335, and eventually was to be buried in Tewkesbury Abbey; however his native county was Devonshire, and he does not seem to have taken much part in the affairs of Gloucestershire. Knights of the shire and representatives of the towns were elected afresh for each meeting of parliament, for it was rare for a parliament to be prorogued. Expenses were paid to 72 knights of 37 shires, and to 26 burgesses of 13 boroughs. The knights for Gloucestershire were paid for 28 days. The account of expenses does not include all boroughs represented in the parliament of 1378; it omits the burgesses for Gloucester, who are known to have been present. Usually about 80 towns were represented by two burgesses each. The full parliament comprised between 250 and 300 people.  

The knights for Gloucestershire were Sir Peter Veel and Sir Edmund Bradeston. Veel was lord of Tortworth and had been constable of Gloucester castle from 1370 to 1376; he was one of those named in 1377 to array men when French invasion was apprehended, and was later one of the commission appointed to punish the rebels of 1381. The Bradeston family lived at Winterbourne; Sir Thomas Bradeston, uncle of Sir Edmund, had been constable of Gloucester castle from 1330 to 1360. Both men served in several parliaments. Gloucester was the only Gloucestershire borough represented in medieval parliaments; the members in 1378 were Richard Baret and John Dulep. Baret was a draper, and was a member of parliament also in 1377, 1397 and 1399; he was bailiff of Gloucester in 1387. When expenses were paid knights received 4s. a day (compared with 2s. a day when they served in war) and burgesses 2s. a day. A further name is of interest; one of the members for Southwark was Henry Bailly, who had been a member of parliament also in 1376; was he the original of Harry Bailly of the Tabard Inn, the host of Chaucer's Canterbury pilgrims?  

Parliamentary procedure in the fourteenth century was different from what it later became. The king was present in person, although he made known his requests and decisions through his ministers. Important business was done in the full parliament, king, prelates, lords and commons meeting together. The commons were often instructed or permitted to go to a separate place to consult among themselves, leaving the prelates and lords to do likewise. The commons reported back to the full parliament through a spokesman; at Gloucester it was said that he had the speeches (avoir les paroles) of the commons; later in the century he began to be called the speaker (parlour). The spokesman or speaker at Gloucester was Sir James Pickering, one of the members for Westmoreland and probably a dependant of Gaunt. The separate meetings of the commons were not strictly speaking part of parliament, and their proceedings were not recorded in the Rolls. After they met to choose Pickering it was said that the Commons returned before the King, the Prelates and Lords in Parliament. Often a small number of lords and commons were chosen to treat with each other; this was known as intercommuning. At Gloucester the commons asked for the representatives of the lords to have discussion with the whole body of commons; but the lords said that they would choose six or ten from themselves and insisted that the commons should choose a similar small number; these could then intercommune in an easy manner without murmur, shouting or noise. The record of parliamentary business in the Rolls of Parliament was kept in French, although speeches were probably in English. It was noted expressly in 1362 and 1363 that the opening speech was made in English (en Anglais). A statute of 1362 made English the language for pleading in law courts. Royal clerks travelled with the king and his ministers to Gloucester; John Peake, keeper of the rolls, was paid 100s. for the carriage of rolls and memoranda from Gloucester to London.  

After the opening of parliament the king's business was first considered. This normally included a request for taxation. Before proceeding to other business parliament routinely confirmed the liberties of the church and renewed Magna Carta and the Forest Charter. Statutes were said to be made or ordained by the king with the assent of the prelates, lords and commons; the Rolls of Parliament did not record statutes, only the advice given by parliament. Much of the attention of parliament was given to the consideration of petitions. These came from counties, singly or in groups, towns and even individuals. At the beginning of each session receivers of petitions were appointed, who were government clerks, and triers of petitions, who were prelates, lords and knights; the latter answered
individual petitions which were not brought before the full parliament. The most significant petitions were common petitions also called hills which were presented by the commons as a whole. It was the king, advised by his council, who gave responses to petitions; this was usually done on the last day of parliament. The king’s responses were often that the king would consider the matter, or that statutes already made should be put into force; occasionally the king said that a new statute should be made. Statutes were not passed by parliament, but drawn up and published after the meeting of parliament; those resulting from the parliament at Gloucester were made known in a letter to all sheriffs dated from the palace of Westminster on 28 November 1378, five weeks after the parliament began. There were eight statutes, only four of which were a consequence of discussion at Gloucester 14.

When parliament came to Gloucester in 1378, according to the Rolls, the full parliament met in the great hall (la Grant Sale) of St. Peter’s Abbey, and the commons had their separate meetings in the chapter house in the great cloister, while the triers of petitions had their place in the lady chapel; where the prelates and lords met was not stated. 15 The Historia of St. Peter’s Abbey, using less exact language than the Rolls, said that the guest hall was assigned to the general or full parliament (aula hospitum communi parliamento erat deputata); the great hall appears to be meant, for earlier the Historia had written that Abbot Horton, who became abbot in 1351, built the great hall in the courtyard where afterwards the king held his parliament. The present Parliament Room occupies the site of the great hall, which was originally longer, and was much altered in the fifteenth century. The Historia continued that in the chapter house was the common council (commune consilium), presumably meaning the commons. It was also said that in the refectory the laws of arms were treated of; this probably described the court of the constable and marshal, to which the matter of Hauley and Shakell had been referred. In the guest chamber (camera hospitii), which in old times was called the king’s chamber because of its beauty, met the secret council. This was presumably the king’s council. The chamber was probably the present Laud and Henry Rooms in Church House; the two rooms were originally one, and the building had been the abbot’s lodging, until a new abbot’s lodging was built earlier in the fourteenth century. 16

The king and his household stayed, according to the Historia, sometimes in Gloucester Abbey and sometimes in Tewkesbury. John of Gaunt and his people lodged at Llantony Priory; one of his grooms killed another during their stay; the fact that the inquest was held by the king’s coroner and not the town coroner was noted in the register of the priory among a list of precedents proving that Llantony was not within the town of Gloucester. During the meeting of parliament a road and bridge were made for the king’s convenience between Llantony Priory and Gloucester castle through the priory gardens; the canons requested that the road should not be considered as a public thoroughfare, and this was granted. One of the canons, William Newenham, apparently stole silver vessels belonging to John of Gaunt, but in 1380, at Gaunt’s request, he was pardoned. 17 The Historia lamented that during the parliament all places in Gloucester Abbey were so frequented that it was like a fairground; the green of the cloister was worn bare by wrestlers and those playing with spears. The writer’s discontent seems to have been allayed by the splendid mass which was celebrated; it was attended by the two archbishops, 12 bishops, the duke of Lancaster and his two brothers, and earls, barons and knights, besides the common people.

The parliament of Gloucester began on Wednesday 20 October 1378; but, as usual, not everyone was present on the first day, and the opening was adjourned until the day following. On Thursday the opening speech, explaining the causes of summons, was given by the chancellor, Adam Houghton, bishop of St. David’s. He spoke of the king’s need for money. There were great wars in all parts; the Hundred Years War against France continued, and the Scots had become the ally of France. The chancellor’s declaration that the laws of the land and the laws of arms ought to assist each other probably referred to the case of Hauley and Shakell. He complained that bad people were spreading false, horrible and dangerous lies about lords and great officers, presumably Gaunt and members of the council; such people were called schysters and the lords and gentlemen should pray the king for remedy. A statute against devisors of false news was subsequently made.

On Friday a further speech expressing the king’s requests was made by Sir Richard Scrope. Later during the parliament, on 29 October, he succeeded Houghton as chancellor. There was a formal ceremony in a chamber of the abbey, when Bishop Houghton delivered the great seal in a white leather bag into the hands of the young king, who presented it to Sir Richard. Scrope used it for the first time the following Saturday in the church of St. Mary de Lode to seal charters, letters patent and writs. 18

Following the speeches from the government the commons consulted among themselves. On their return Sir James Pickering made what came to be the standard protestation of the commons’ speaker. He said that he spoke not for himself but for all, and if he did not truly express their opinion he begged them to correct him. He
went on that, although the king demanded an aid of the commons, it seemed to them that the king should have great plenty of money. During the war the income from alien priories was in his hands; he had the taxes on wool, and the revenues of his father, the Black Prince, besides the revenues of the realm; and there were the proceeds of estates in the king’s hands during the minority of the heirs of several great lords. Answer was given that the expenses of the recent coronation had been great, and money had not come in as quickly as was needed for the next season’s military campaign. The commons protested that they were now poorer than at any time before, and they could not for pure poverty bear any further charge. Scrope spoke of the tax on wool granted by the previous parliament, when at the insistence of the commons two citizens of London, William Walworth and John Philipot, had been appointed treasurers, and said that every penny had been spent on the wars. The commons demanded to see the accounts. Scrope said that Walworth and others would show the receipts and expenses to them in writing, but this favour was not to be a precedent. Eventually the commons agreed to renew the subsidy or tax on wools, leathers and woollfells, and to add a novel increase of 13s. 4d. on each sack of wool, and a corresponding increase on the other two; they also renewed the tax of sixpence in every pound on merchandise imported and exported. No direct tax in the usual form of a tenth and fifteenth was granted. This was remarked upon with satisfaction by the writer of the *Historia* of Gloucester Abbey, who wrote that happily no taxation was made of the common people, nor was the church oppressed by tenths, but the merchants, because they were wealthy, served the king with money for war. The Gloucester parliament, wrote Ronald Butt, of exceptional interest because of the Commons’ stubborn resistance to the government’s demands for more money and for the self-confidence with which they stood their ground. This attitude contrasted with that of the other parliaments of Richard II’s first four years, who showed, according to Nigel Saul, a record of generosity almost without equal in the middle ages.

Parliament now turned to the outrage in Westminster Abbey and the right of sanctuary. The abbot and convent of Westminster had presented a petition stating that it was among their privileges and liberties that if any fugitive came within the precinct of their church he should be safe; but men had entered the church and killed Robert Hauley, a fugitive, and a servant of the church. In parliament Simon Sudbury, archbishop of Canterbury, said that the church of Westminster had suffered villainy when these two men were killed during high mass at the high altar. The king was young and not to blame, but the archbishop demanded satisfaction. The government however was well prepared to defend itself by mounting an assault on the privilege claimed by the church. A petition was submitted which said that the king’s subjects suffered great wrong by the franchise claimed by Westminster Abbey, for some people fled there for debt, who owed great sums and stayed as long as they pleased. The petition asked for due interpretation of the abbey’s charter to avoid ambiguity, and that masters in theology, doctors of canon and civil law and justices learned in the law of the realm should give their opinion. Certain lords said that the king’s rights must be preserved; and they declared that there was no immunity for debt. Debt was the issue because Hauley and Shakel owed the king a proportion of the ransom of the count of Denia. Doctors of theology were brought in to address parliament. These said that immunity or sanctuary could be claimed only by a man liable to lose life or limb, and that it was a sin to keep a creditor from recovering his debt.

The descriptions of the parliament of Gloucester given by monastic chroniclers reflect the consternation which such arguments caused among churchmen. The most interesting was the *Anonimulle Chronicle*, kept at St. Mary’s Abbey, York. It related how the abbot of Westminster spoke to the commons in the chapter house, and went on to record that one of the doctors of theology was none other than John Wycliffe. John of Gaunt had previously made use of Wycliffe’s talents in a dispute with the bishop of London. The chronicler said that the king and council were very angry with the claims and complaints of churchmen; the lords who called in Wycliffe were Sir Simon Burley, the king’s tutor, and one of King Richard’s most trusted associates in later years, and Sir Thomas Percy, a younger brother of the earl of Northumberland. To the arguments of the doctors no clerk could make reply. The *Continuatio Eulogii*, probably compiled at Canterbury, similarly noted the strenuous response of the government. It said that the abbot of Westminster, who did not come to the king when summoned, was deprived of his temporalities. He was blamed because he had not quickly reconciled his church after the bloodshed, as had been done previously when a monk was killed. Sanctuary was a custom tolerated by the king, which could be revoked. And the king could not grant liberty to the fraudulent detainer of another man’s goods; to do so would be (in a play upon Latin words) not a *privilegium* but a *pravilegium*.

The *Chronicon Angliae*, usually one of the most informative sources for this period, was vague in its coverage of the parliament of Gloucester, but clearly reflected the alarm of churchmen. Parliament was held at Gloucester, it said, at the instigation of the duke of Lancaster, for he believed that the bishops, the common people and Londoners would be less likely to oppose him there. Common fame reported that the church was
to be despoiled of its possessions. But the bishops were strengthened to declare that nothing should be granted to the damage of the church, and the duke transformed himself into an angel of light. The *Historia Anglicana* of Thomas Walsingham, monk of St. Alban’s, repeated almost word for word the *Chronicon*, and it is now thought that Walsingham was probably the author of both, the *Historia* being a revision of the *Chronicon* expunging all pejorative references to John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster. So in the account of the parliament of Gloucester it was *perverse persons* who caused it to be summoned there, and *malignant persons* who became angels of light. The revised *Historia* was compiled after Gaunt’s son had become King Henry IV. The *Historia* of St Peter’s Abbey, Gloucester, said that it was feared beforehand that parliament was held in so remote a place for the subversion of the English church.

The church and its privileges were under constant criticism in the later fourteenth century. This was the time of Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales*, with its unflattering portraits of all churchmen except the poor parson of a town. William Langland’s *Piers Plowman* heard Reason preach in the field full of folk: prelates and priests, what you preach, do; religion, keep your rule, lest king and council take your wealth and put stewards in your place. In Gloucestershire John Trevisa, vicar of Berkeley, adding his own comments to his English translation of Ranulf Higden’s *Polychronicon*, wrote that now monks were the worst of all, and secular lords should take away the superfluous of their wealth.

The question of sanctuary had been raised in parliament as recently as the last parliament of Edward III in 1377. A statute was made against people who fled to Westminster Abbey, St. Martin le Grand and other privileged places, and there lived for a long time with a high countenance on the goods of other people. In Richard II’s first parliament in the same year there was complaint about debtors who were sent to the Fleet prison, but then permitted to go at large. The lawlessness of the liberty of the abbots of Westminster appeared in 1380, when two men assembled evil-doers and many times entered the liberty to maim and slay.

After the parliament of Gloucester the government took action, but it was scarcely drastic. The abbots of Westminster was ordered to proceed with speed to the reconciliation of his church and to restore the services which had been withdrawn, for the abbey was a royal foundation, and the monks were bound to pray for the souls of the king’s forefathers and heirs. In 1379 a statute was made regarding debtors who took sanctuary. Proclamation was to be made at the gate of the place where they were every week for five weeks, calling on them to come before the king’s justices; if they did not then their goods might be seized. G. M. Trevelyan wrote that from mountains of talk at Gloucester the statute of 1379 emerged as a legislative mouse. The *Chronicon Angliae* wrote that debtors able to repay their debts fled to sanctuary and spent joyful days feasting and carousing. Sanctuary continued until the end of the middle ages; it was abolished for murder, rape and robbery with violence or on the highway in 1540, and altogether in 1628.

The statute about the right of sanctuary did not settle the dispute between the king and John Shakel. Thomas Walsingham wrote that in 1379 the king undertook to give Shakel land worth 100 marks a year and 500 marks in cash, and to found a chantry for the two men killed in Westminster Abbey. In return Shakel was to surrender the hostage, and he astonished everyone by producing the servant who had attended him during his imprisonment. There was indeed an order to the constable of the Tower of London to set Shakel free. However Alfonso remained in Shakel’s possession for several more years. For in 1380 Shakel was granted a protection while he had custody of the hostage Alfonso. Later that year a detailed agreement provided that Shakel was to pay the king 20,000 francs of the ransom of the count of Denia and to deliver Alfonso to him; in return the king would pay Shakel 2,500 marks and give him lands to the value of 100 marks a year. Sir Guy de Brian gave security for payment by Shakel.

This did not end the affair. In 1382 Shakel still had the hostage; in 1383 he was granted a pardon for the concealment, removal and detention of the hostage and for breaking prison. It seems that in 1384 money was at last paid to the king and the hostage released. The ransom money for the count of Denia was immediately used to pay the ransom of another prisoner, Florimund, lord of Lesparre. This place was in Gascony, and Florimund had evidently been captured during the ongoing war between England and France. Florimund had already acknowledged receipt of 20,000 francs from John Shakel. Sir Guy de Brian was discharged of his obligation. Even now disputes arising from the ransom of the count of Denia were not at an end. In 1390 Matilda, sister and heir of Robert Hailey, complained to the court of the constable and marshal, and Shakel was summoned to appear before a commission appointed to determine the matter. By 1396 both John Shakel and Matilda had died, but her proctor continued to pursue the matter in the court of the constable. The case was still before the courts in 1409.

Of the fifty or so petitions presented in parliament some would have been of particular interest to the members from Gloucestershire. Law and order were of perennial
concern to parliament; the lords, knights and burgesses who attended parliament were the same people who were responsible for local government in the shires and towns. The commons in 1378 petitioned that malefactors in various counties formed confederacies and made extortions on the poor; they killed and ransomed people, ravished their daughters and carried them off, and came to fairs and markets in affray. The chancellor's speech had already urged action against these mischiefs. Reply was made on behalf of the king that he well knew of the trouble from the notoriety of the matter, and by complaints especially from the people of Wales, Herefordshire, Cheshire and adjoining counties, that armed men and archers gathered in great numbers, rode in great routs, and maimed, murdered and killed as if in a land at war. The statute of Northampton of 1328 against riding armed should be kept, but in addition certain sufficient and valiant persons should be appointed with the power to arrest offenders immediately, without awaiting indictment or other process of law those accused were to be imprisoned without bail until the coming of the justices to the county. A statute was enacted accordingly.

Gloucestershire had recently suffered from such lawlessness. In 1375 a commission had been issued to arrest a band of malefactors in the Forest of Dean led by a man with the impudent nickname of Sir William Reach-me-never. He was Richard Shayt of Ruardean, and his accomplices were William Smith of Micheldean, called the Admiral, John Smith of Littledean, called Sir Richard Misadvised, and others. Richard Shayt lived up to his nickname, for he was again at large in the Forest of Dean in 1384, and a further order for the arrest of him and his comrades was made in 1387.

Anxious as the commons were that good order should be maintained, they were also mindful of the principles enshrined in Magna Carta, which was regularly confirmed at each session of parliament, and were much disturbed by the proposed remedy. A statute of 1354 had reiterated that no man should be imprisoned without being brought to answer by due process of law. When parliament met in 1379 they declared that judicial action without indictment or other process of law was very horrible and perilous and prayed for the recent statute to be repealed. It was repealed: the statute of Northampton remained in force and was deemed to be sufficient. In 1380 further articles were added to the commission of the peace, empowering justices to enquire into extortions, confederacies, maintainers of quarrels and those who rode with great routs.

People of Gloucestershire and other counties bordering upon Wales complained about the Welsh. When merchants of these counties journeyed into Wales to buy victuals and other merchandise they were, they alleged, seized for debts which they did not owe and which were recovered by force, so that they dared not travel to those parts. The government replied that the king would take advice from his council and the lords of the Marches and provide a remedy. In the first parliament of 1380 the commons complained that Welshmen came into the English border counties to kill, rob and ransom. They asked that pure Welshmen should be forbidden to purchase freeholds in those English counties. It was ordered that Welshmen should not purchase land in the counties of Hereford, Gloucester, Worcester, Salop or Stafford unless they gave security for good behaviour. An official letter putting this measure into force said that it did not apply to Welshmen of good fame. In 1394 Richard Baret, the member for Gloucester in 1378, was assaulted between Monmouth and Usk by malefactors who mistook him for some one else. The disturbed relations of English and Welsh in Richard II's reign were a prelude to the revolt of Owen Glendower in the time of his successor, Henry IV.

Another concern of the counties on the Welsh border was the state of the River Severn. Weirs on rivers had long been a subject of contention between fishermen who used them and boatmen who found them an obstruction. A clause in Magna Carta sought to regulate them. Parliament in 1347 complained that the four great rivers of England, the Thames, the Severn, the Usk and the Trent were stopped and crossed by weirs, mills, piles and pales. Renewed complaints were about flooding. In 1377 the commons said that, because weirs were so narrow, lands adjoining were flooded, and women and children were drowned. A petition in 1378 in the names of the counties of Gloucester, Bristol, Worcester, Hereford and Shrewsbury said that weirs and fisshtraps (gorces et kidelx) in the River Severn were so long and strongly made that they caused flooding, and women and children were perishing from one day to another. The commons prayed for existing statutes to be enforced for God and as a work of charity.

Ever since the Black Death of 1348 and the resulting shortage of manpower the classes who made up parliament had been anxious about the increasingly independent attitude of labourers and servants. The ordinance and statute of labourers of 1349 and 1351 attempted to keep wages down to their level before the plague. The execution of these measures was a further duty imposed upon justices of the peace. The legislation was frequently confirmed and amplified by parliament. A variety of petitions in parliament revealed a worsening situation. Several complaints were voiced at Gloucester. It was difficult to punish labourers and servants who ought to be chastised because they fled from one county to another. The commons complained
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that many justices did not take action; the result was that labourers were more outrageous in their demands and victuals became dearer. It was suggested that payment of justices might encourage their activity; the government agreed that, for one year only, justices might have a sixth part of the profits of their sessions. Another complaint was that great numbers of labourers refused to work on the land, but took themselves to towns, where they became artificers, mariners or clerks, with the consequence that husbandry could not be maintained nor the land cultivated. The government simply promised due remedy. Existing statutes were yet again confirmed. The growing discontent exploded in the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381.\textsuperscript{34}

One reason why disorder was not suppressed, the commons alleged, was that the right people were not appointed justices of the peace. Commissions of guardianship of the peace were directed to lords who could not attend the sessions and assigned poor and insufficient men to take their place. In consequence malefactors were more bold; they rode on the roads by day as well as by night, made affray at fairs and markets, took people in their own houses, and killed, beat and maimed the poor. The commons wanted ineffective justices to be put out. They were promised that the council would appoint more sufficient men.\textsuperscript{35}

In 1380 the practice of paying justices of the peace was applied more widely. The commons proposed that justices for a day at the sessions should receive half a mark each and their clerk 2s., the money to be raised from fines and amercements. The government preferred a scale according to rank, 4s. for a knight, 2s. for an esquire, and 12d for a clerk.\textsuperscript{35}

The year of the parliament of Gloucester was the year when the Great Schism in the church began. Since 1309 the popes had resided in Avignon. In 1378 the Italian pope Urban VI was elected in Rome. A rival French pope, calling himself Clement VII, was elected by French cardinals and established himself in Avignon. It was announced to the parliament at Gloucester that the king had heard by common fame of the crisis in the church, and he had received letters from the rebel cardinals, intimating their endeavour to depose Pope Urban. These letters were considered by the prelates and lords in parliament, where it was decided that Urban was duly elected pope and ought to be accepted and obeyed. One of the envoys sent to England by the French cardinals was Roger Focaut; he was summoned before the king’s council at Gloucester, who ordered him to be held in safe custody in Gloucester castle; he was subsequently moved to Windsor castle. The Continuatio Eulogii wrote that nuncios from Pope Clement came to the parliament in Gloucester asking for assistance. The archbishop of Canterbury was deputed to hear them, and, taking advice from the clergy, to decide who should be recognised. The archbishop heard speakers on both sides, and returned to parliament and said clearly, ‘As I wish to answer before God, Urban\textsuperscript{36} Parliament approved measures to take into the king’s hands income from benefices and possessions claimed by the adherents of the French pope.’

The schism in the church exacerbated the already uneasy relationship between the English and the church. This was an age of vocal criticism of the papacy and the clergy, as was apparent in the debate at Gloucester on the right of sanctuary. In 1351 the statute of provisors restricted the pope’s power to appoint aliens to positions in the English church, and in 1353 the statute of praemunire limited the authority of papal courts. Nevertheless complaints about foreigners holding office in England continued. At Gloucester it was said that many of the greatest benefices were occupied by foreigners, who drew profits out of the realm, allowed houses to fall into ruin, held no hospitality and sustained no divine services. There was objection to the extortion of church officials: they were entitled to 8d for proving a will but charged much more; summoners, who summoned people to church courts, acted maliciously by summoning men at work ploughing the fields; they demanded what were called the bishop’s alms or they would order an individual to appear in a distant court. Such complaints were to continue for another century and a half before they were drastically addressed in the upheaval of the Reformation.\textsuperscript{37}

The circumstances which caused the parliament of 1378 to be held at Gloucester were unusual; but the outrage in Westminster Abbey did not lead to a great loss of privilege by the church. The parliament of Gloucester was not one of the most significant in Richard II’s reign. The petitions presented illustrate the usual concerns of people in the counties and towns of England. Complaints about disorder produced a statute which suspended the ordinary process of law. This was disturbing to the classes who composed parliament, and at the next opportunity they had the statute repealed. The arbitrary rule of Richard II in later years led to confrontations between the king and parliament, which resulted eventually in his downfall.
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RESISTIVITY SURVEYS ARCHIVE

Ann Maxwell

Several surveys were carried out in Dymock (SO 702 313 to 706 312) during 2005.

An area immediately west of the sewage works was surveyed to look for evidence of building structures. No structures were visible, but the line of the Roman road was picked up, continuing northwest from the area surveyed in 2004.

Further surveys were carried out in the cricket field, where the line of the Roman road running east/west is already known. The area immediately north of the cricket square was very disturbed, so the possible road junction suggested by Gethryn-Jones (1991) could not be identified. However, grids in the southern section of the field have revealed the line of a road with a ditch on both sides. This road runs south and lines up with the modern road leading to Portway Top and on towards Newent.

Eight 20-metre squares were surveyed immediately north of the churchyard, where Roman building materials have been found during field walking, but there was no evidence of structures. This could be because any surviving foundations are too deep to be picked up by resistivity survey. The field has been ploughed regularly over the last fifty years.

Details of all the surveys have been given to the Sites and Monuments Record.
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Recorded interest in the archaeology of the Leckhampton moated site (located just NW of St Peter’s church at NGR SO94151950) appears as early as the 1870/1880s. Private papers of the noted 19th century antiquarian G B Witts held by Cheltenham Art Gallery and Museum reflect the interest he personally was taking in the site in 1879. A little later in 1881 members of the Bristol & Gloucester Archaeological Society (BGAS) visited there and noted the presence of masonry on both sides of the moat’s ditch on its eastern side indicative of foundations for a bridge. It was not until 1933 however that an excavation of the site was carried out at the request of the BGAS.

The findings of that excavation were fully reported in B&G Transactions and a plan of the excavation, taken from the Transactions article, is shown in fig.1. For the present purpose a brief summary of its findings will be adequate. The excavation focussed mainly on sectioning the ditch at a number of points around the moat but the island platform was also investigated by means of probing and two test trenches in the eastern
half. Good evidence was found of a bridge having existed towards the north east corner of the moat together with dry stone abutments at each end of the bridge. From pottery fragments found immediately beneath the bridge’s timber sill beams in the bottom of the ditch, the bridge could not have been earlier than the 14th century, although the existence of an earlier structure cannot be excluded. A short distance back from the face of the abutment wall on the island side, a length of stone walling was found and in front of, and bonded into it, was a stone-built structure identified as a latrine seemingly fed by a chute from an upper story. Further investigations indicated the presence over the eastern half of the island platform of unstratified broken masonry and roof tiles dating variously from 14th to at least 16th centuries and pottery fragments from the 12th century onwards. The eastern scarp of the island was littered with similar materials. By contrast, over the western half of the island platform, the clay soil was largely undisturbed below about 9ins. depth. It appears therefore that in addition to the bridge, a building or buildings had also existed at the site from at least the 14th century.

In the Spring of 2004, the moat was again the object of interest when GADARG members carried out a geophysical survey at the site using the Group’s own resistivity equipment. This was done in collaboration with the Leckhampton Local History Society who, on the basis of the 1933 excavation findings, were interested in finding out more about the extent of any buried buildings on the moat’s platform and their nature and purpose. Since the site is a Scheduled Ancient Monument, a Section 42 licence had to be obtained from English Heritage; permission had also to be sought from the landowner. The area covered by the survey amounted to four 20m by 20m grid squares and a fifth square of 10m by 20m (see fig.1). In this way, most of the moat platform was covered together with parts of the ditch (although all of the ditch to the south and much of the western ditch had been filled in by the property owner some years ago). The resulting overall plot is shown at fig 2. (Note: the darker areas are more conductive and wetter layers, lighter areas are less conductive and drier layers whilst white squares are 'dummy' readings). Interpretation of resistivity plots can be highly subjective, even so this plot produced
several interesting characteristics. The oval area around the centre of the plot appears to reflect the largely undisturbed western half of the island platform referred to in the excavation report. The lighter areas down the eastern side, whilst failing to show precise lines of walling, nevertheless indicate the presence there of concentrations of building debris. In particular, there appears to be a correlation with the bridge at its island end suggesting the presence there at one time of some kind of gatehouse. The larger of the lighter areas to the south of that measures roughly 8m. by 8m. (around 680 sq. ft.) which, even allowing for debris spread, could still reflect a sizeable building (especially taking into account the excavation evidence of a latrine chute in this area indicative of a second storey). The other lighter area to the south and still at the edge of the moat probably reflects another building but smaller in area, possibly around 5m. square (about 270 sq. ft.). There is just the hint that the area of higher resistance may run continuously down the eastern edge of the platform which, if correct, could suggest a single range of building down that side of the platform. The darker (wetter) areas over the western and southern parts of the plot would be consistent with an in-filled ditch and the occasional random patches of higher resistance with stony materials that we know were dumped into the ditch as filling.

Another feature of interest is the group of concentric bands of alternating high and low resistance at the NW corner of the platform. They are a slight distance in from the supposed edge of the ditch as shown on the excavation plan but they actually line up with the approximate edge of the platform indicated by resistivity. One explanation may be that they reflect a series of ditch abutments constructed over a time (at least around the western side of the platform), representing attempts to expand the area of the platform. The bands appear not to continue around the south side of the platform but that may be due to the heavy disturbance of that part of the site.

The Leckhampton moat is one of a large number of moated sites in Gloucestershire, the majority located in the Vale. Many of these were the centres of manorial estates and the Leckhampton site may well have fulfilled this function. We can only speculate though as to which of Leckhampton’s historic manors the site was associated with. One possibility is that it was a precursor to Leckhampton Court which was built in the 14th century as the centre of Leckhampton’s main manor, although the evidence is that the moat continued in occupation for another 200 to 300 years. Leckhampton’s second manor seems likely to have been located where in modern times Leckhampton Farm stood (NGR SO938215). This leaves us with the possibility that it was the centre of Leckhampton’s third, so-called Broadwell, manor identified in records from Domesday until possibly the late 15th century, before eventually becoming absorbed into the main manor.
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A GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY OF PART OF THE SITE OF ST MARY’S ABBEY, WINCHCOMBE

Martin Ecclestone

Introduction

In April and August 2006 parts of two properties on the north and east sides of St Peter’s Church at Winchcombe were surveyed using the GADARG resistivity equipment, with the consent of English Heritage and their respective owners. The intention was to find evidence of any buildings belonging to Winchcombe Abbey, which were systematically destroyed in 1540 after the Abbey was dissolved. The houses now on these two properties incorporate some of the pre-Dissolution structures, but above ground there are no signs of the Abbey church and its associated claustral buildings.

The Abbey church was first excavated in 1815, when E T Browne of Winchcombe made some notes of what was found, but no plan has survived. In 1892-3 E P Loftus Brock, Secretary of the British Archaeological Association, carried out another excavation of the west part of the church and published a brief report and a plan in the BAA Journal. The original large scale version of his plan (1: 97.5) is in the Gloucestershire Archives, together with Brock’s notes on the excavation between 6th and 14th February 1893. His work provided no information on the claustral buildings, and his plan has proved to be poorly defined in terms of identifiable points on OS maps, other than Brock’s statement that the central line of the Abbey Church is to be defined by two tablets - one on the east face of the church-yard wall, and another on the west face of the wall ... of Mrs Newman’s land. In addition, the position of the great central tower will be marked by another memorial. The latter memorial is a stone cross on a metre square plinth (at NGR SP 02402 28272), and the tablets also survive, though OS maps do not mark them.

Analysis of Loftus Brock's plan

It was clearly necessary to relate Loftus Brock’s published plan, shown in Fig 1 with the addition of a metric scale and letters defining Brock’s boundary lines, to the 1st edition (1883) OS 25” map. It seemed

---

Fig 1: PLAN OF THE 1893 EXCAVATIONS BY LOFTUS BROCK
reasonable to assume that the line X-X along the centre of the nave should pass through the plaque on the churchyard wall (9.6m from its NE corner) and the memorial cross some 70m to the east. Brock’s plan also shows that the west face of the nave’s west end is 75m west of the wall C-C, measured along X-X. This information should have been sufficient to determine the location of Brock’s plan on the OS map, a location referred to here as the assumed position. However, this position is not consistent with the location of the boundary D-D as shown on the 1883 OS map; the south wall of the church is about 2m closer to D-D than is shown on Brock’s plan. The assumed orientation of the church also differs significantly from the orientation of the more obvious linear features shown by the resistivity survey, as discussed below. Since the lines A-A and B-B do not appear on the 1883 OS map, a more reliable location for the church seemed out of reach.

Fortunately, the 2nd edition 25 inch OS map (1902) does show a boundary corresponding to A-A. The Land Tax of 1910 required a nationwide valuation of properties, that produced a mass of documentation (now at the National Archives and County Record Offices) that provides good evidence of property boundaries, marked by officials on specially enlarged copies of the 2nd edition OS maps. For Winchcombe, the documents and map⁵ show that A-A was the boundary in 1914 between properties 1122 and 1128, and this boundary can be reliably located on OS maps. Since Loftus Brock also stated that in 1893 A-A was the boundary between two properties, and his plan shows precisely where it intersected the north and south walls of the nave, this evidence provides enough data to fix the position of the church (the revised position). On this basis, the nave centre line is found to point 75.7 degrees east of north, and the west face of the nave’s west end is 72m west of the wall C-C, not 77m as shown by Brock. This discrepancy of 5m is so large that it suggests that Loftus Brock only estimated the position of the wall C-C, because it lay on the east side of land used by George Smith to cultivate flowers and strawberries, which prevented any excavation or even access by Loftus Brock. Certainly, Brock’s plan shows the wall as much straighter than it actually is. However, the key difference between the assumed and the revised positions is the direction of their centre lines, which differ by 4 degrees. Although Brock’s plan does show a north direction, this does not help much, because it could be true north or magnetic north; for the assumed nave line it points 2.5 degrees west of grid north, and for the revised nave line it points 1.7 degrees east of grid north: either is possible.

It has to be accepted however that the revised position presents a serious difficulty, in that the nave’s centre line now meets the churchyard wall 9.5m north of the plaque, and the memorial cross lies 3m south of the centre line; it is also 18m west of the centre of the church tower - though it was 9.5m west even for the originally assumed location of the centre line, through the cross and the plaque. We are left with a choice: either the plaque and the cross were properly placed in relation to the excavation (though it would then have been backfilled), or Loftus Brock’s plan does locate the line A-A accurately. Figs 2 and 3 show the revised position of the church, based on the latter alternative. One final observation, that adds to the credibility of this choice, is that there is a clearly defined bank in the field, shown on Fig 3, that lies slightly west of the west end of the church; this bank could mark the western end of Brock’s excavation, which after backfilling meant that the land surface was lower than before.

The extent of the Abbey’s lands south of the church is probably indicated by the course of the village street up to the 1830s. In 1835 a public footpath through the Abbey grounds was replaced by one further south, which later became the pavement on the north side of a much widened Abbey Terrace⁶. The large scale 1835 plan shows the contemporary roadway, which at one point was only 17’9” wide. From this plan it can be deduced that the Abbey’s boundary pointed 72 degrees east of grid north, and lay 47m south of the nave centre line at the churchyard wall, diminishing to 39m along the south transept. It should be noted that the nave centre line as determined by the plaque and the cross is 37m to 39m north and very nearly parallel to the south boundary, which may be significant.

The resistivity surveys

The area surveyed in April 2006, in the garden of Winchcombe Abbey house, lies north of the churchyard of the parish church of St Peter. The house, though greatly modernised, is often identified with the Abbey’s malthouse. The survey, centred on NGR SP 023283, was severely constrained by garden features and a paved drive along the property’s eastern boundary. The first survey covered c.800 square metres; a subsequent survey on a different orientation covered c.200 sq.m. adjacent to the drive and partly overlapping the first survey. The surveys show a linear high resistivity feature (possibly a wall?) running south from the south-east corner of Winchcombe Abbey house towards the east wall of the churchyard, with a clear, low resistance gap 25m north of the NE corner of the churchyard. There are also less distinct high resistance features on the east side of the possible wall (Fig 3). It is known that the main access road to the Abbey ran along the east side of the churchyard wall and was thirty feet wide in 1246 ⁷. The continuation of this road northward probably ran east of the area surveyed, but a
Fig 2: WINCHCOMBE ABBEY: RESISTIVITY SURVEYS 2006

Fig 3: WINCHCOMBE ABBEY 1893 EXCAVATION AND POSSIBLE GEOPHYSICAL FEATURES

Based on OS Master Map, licensed to Gloucestershire County Council 100019134, 2004.
Crown copyright Ordnance Survey. All Rights Reserved.
branch running northwest may be associated with the low resistance gap in the possible wall.

In August 2006 part of the land belonging to Abbey Old House was also surveyed geophysically. Permission was given for only one day’s access, which limited the area surveyed to 0.23 ha, centred on NGR SP 024283, lying north of what was, at the time, assumed to be the centre line of the Abbey church, through the plaque and the memorial cross. The intention was to locate the north and west walls of the nave and examine the area north of the nave, that Loftus Brock had ignored. The rectilinear area surveyed had the same orientation as that assumed for the Abbey church, with its southeast corner 6m north and 7m east of the centre of the cross. Fig 2 shows the resistivity results together with the revised position of the church, while Fig 3 combines Loftus Brock’s plan with the more significant linear high resistance features.

It was to be expected that the resistivity plot would show a good deal of rubble, dating from the 1540 demolition and the backfill of two 19th century excavations. What was unexpected was the clear evidence that the orientation of the recognisable features differed by 4 or 5 degrees (clockwise) from that of the assumed centre line of the nave, which runs 71.7 degrees east of north. This was too large a discrepancy to be explained by inaccurate surveying, since the surveyed area agrees well with the current OS 25 inch plan. The other cause for concern was that there was no evidence of a high resistivity line near the assumed position of the nave’s north wall, but rather at about 4m further north. All this led to a re-appraisal of Brock’s plan, as discussed above, and the decision to locate the church as shown on Figs 2 and 3. The excavation plan and the resistivity plot now appear to be consistent and an interpretation of the latter’s features becomes more feasible. In particular, a linear high resistivity feature appears to coincide with the north wall of the nave. Emeritus Professor Mick Aston has examined the results, which he describes as ‘rather good, with clear indications of north cloister, west range and (probable) north range. Also the north wall of the church is good.’

Conclusions

The resistivity surveys have added a little to our knowledge of the abbey’s layout, and it is unfortunate that a much more extended survey of the Abbey Old House land was not possible. Perhaps the most useful outcome is the analysis of Loftus Brock’s plan, required to locate the position of the Abbey church. This suggests a quite different orientation and position than that usually assumed without question, but this could only be fully confirmed by excavations, which are unlikely to happen in the short term.
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A STUDY OF THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN UPTON ST LEONARDS AND PAINSWICK AND CRANHAM: PART 2

Cedric Nielsen

Introduction

This paper, based on archive sources and field work, supplements one published in Glevensis 32. Additional dated information is provided about parts of the southern boundary of Upton St Leonards, including the ragstone wall which ascends the face of the much eroded ancient Idle Barrow Quars. This quarry may have been one of the many providing stone for medieval Gloucester and its churches.

The boundary study commences at the Red Quarre on Spoonbed Hill, the traditional starting point for the perambulations of the bounds of the manor of Upton St Leonards, and ends at the wall of Prinknash Park by the Portway, a distance of 3.1 km (Figs 1 and 2). To follow the route of the perambulations, the markers described in the text are shown by the letters A to N on these figures; grid references for these boundary points are given at the end of the paper.

The 1589 Boundary Perambulation

This perambulation forms the preface to a very detailed account of land ownership and tenure (which the document calls the 'second survey') for the whole manor of Upton, copied in 1718 from one made in 1589. Anglo-Saxon perambulations often started in the east, and the Norman grant of 1121 to the Abbey, noted in Part 1 of this paper, described only a small portion of the manorial boundary; the later surveys went anti-clockwise and covered the entire circuit of the manor. The relevant portion of the 1589 description is:

The View of the Manor of Upton Saint Leonards taken the 21 day of April in Anno Reigne Elizabeth 31. By Edward Mill esq, Surveyer to the Right Honorable Lord Cobham, Lord of the same, with the assistance of the tennants there according to his Honor's warrant in that behalfe Directed.
The Circute of the manor of Upton St Leonards Doth begin at the Read Quarre at the Fladders on the end of Spoonbedd hill in the west part of the same hill, Leading all a long the edge of the said hill even unto Kimbsbury hill. Then from thence all along the Edge of Popewood to the Procession way and so to Winstone stile being on the part South of Prinknish Park. And from thence all along by the East side of Prinknish Park pale unto high brotheredge .... and from thence to Mansbeach and to the Fladders and so up to the Redd Quarre on the west side of Spoonbed hill aforesaid.

The Red Quarre (A) is first recorded in a lease of 1525 by St Peter's Abbey to St Bartholomew's Hospital. This allowed the Hospital to take stone for its repairs for sixty years. The quarry is still a significant feature and its base is filled with water during the winter months, probably because the Oolitic limestone was quarried down to the level of the Lias clay. Parts of the Hospital still remain at the foot of Westgate Street.

The Fladders (B) is the name of a field at the west end of Spoonbed hill. The name is still retained but was incorrectly recorded as the Bladders on the Upton tithe map. On page 55 of the 1589 survey it is called the Flathers. Kimsbury Hill was the earlier name for Painswick Beacon.

The Procession Way features in the accounts of the later perambulations, but it is uncertain whether the boundary followed it for any distance, or simply crossed it in Popes Wood near point H. The recorded perambulations carried out by Upton were serious occasions, attended by the surveyor and gentry. Elsewhere, for example at Cheltenham's beating of the bounds of 1823, beer, cider and other refreshments were served to the followers at designated stopping points. The presence of children from various schools seems to have been encouraged to ensure the bounds were remembered by future generations.

The reference to Prinknash Park pale reminds us that the boundary was made of vertical wooden planks which were a cheap method of retaining deer in a park. The wooden pales were replaced in the 18th century, when the price of wood was higher than that of the local stone. The Winstone stile (near M) is an important landmark, mentioned in all three surveys.
Fig 1 Boundary of Upton (west side) from 1884 OS map

Fig 2 Boundary of Upton (east side) from 1884 OS map

KEY
- Walls and hedges
- Falsh boundaries
- Main tracks
  (FW = probable procession way, OPR = old Fairwick road)
The 1787 Boundary Perambulation

The second perambulation, carried out in 1787, appears to follow the same route as that in 1589, but is more detailed.

The View of the Manor of Upton Saint Leonards, Taken on 27th and 28th Days of June Last and in the Yeare of our Lord 1787 In the 27th Yeare of the Reign of His Present Majesty, King George, the Third, by John Morris Surveyor; to the Righte Honourable Lords of the said Manor, Sir John Guise Bart, Robert Raikes Esq., Daniel Lyconce Esq., and Richard Frankis Gent.

The circuit of the Manor of Upton Saint Leonards Do begin at the Red Quar at the top of Mr Selwens Fladders on the End of Spoobedhill in the weaste parte of the Same hill Leadeing all along the Edge of the Same hill to the Stone on Cudhill Parteing Panswick and Upton, from that stone across the Turnpike Roade Leadeing from Glouc to Panswick, and from thence along the edge of Kingsbury Hill to Madam Blissetts wall, and along the Overside of Madam Blissetts Wall, and along the overside of Mr Howells Wall to the Procession way in Pope wood, leading from Upton to Panswick and from thence Up to the Idle Barrow Piece, Property of Mr Selwen and Down the Idle Barrow Quars to the Gospele Beech, and from thence to Prinknash Cross, and so to Winston Stile Being South of Prinknash Parke, and thence along Prinknash wall to Highbrotheredge ....

The survey mentions several boundary markers, some of which still exist. It is interesting that the top of the escarpment of the Cotswolds known as the Edge was used as the boundary between the Upton and Painswick. The boundary stone mentioned in the perambulation at Cud Hill is probably that shown on the 1884 O S map near the summit of Cud Hill (C), being close to the Blow family burial ground that was built c.1920. However, there is another stone nearby known as the King Charles stone, which is roughly shaped as a horse mounting stone and still remains in situ. The boundary is then said to cross the turnpike road (i.e. to briefly turn south) and then run east along the edge of Kingsbury Hill as far as Madam Blissetts wall (E). It seems possible that the road was crossed at C', where the present boundary becomes undefined, because this would be consistent with Upton's claimed boundary in 1880, discussed below in The 1880 OS Perambulation.

Madam Blissetts wall (E to F), was originally built around 1623 following a lengthy court case between the Lord of the Manor of Painswick, Sir Henry Jerningham and his tenants about their customary rights of common. It came before the Court of Chancery in 1614, and part of the settlement was that Sir Henry would build a wall to protect the trees in Kingsbury wood from animals grazing on Painswick Common. The Blissett family owned the wood in the 18th century, when its name appears to have become Madams Wood, and in 1787 Richard Frankiss of Castle End (near D) was Madam Blissett's tenant. From E the boundary ran along the Painswick Common side of Madam Blissett's wall to the point (F) where Mr Howell's Popes Wood begins. From this point the manorial and parish boundaries were clearly separated, for the perambulation says that the manorial boundary runs along the overside of Mr Howell's wall (i.e. the south side) until it meets the Procession Way (near point H), whereas all the maps, from 1799 onwards (i.e. Figure 3, and then the 1839 Tithe map for Painswick) show that the parish boundary runs up to 20m north-west of the wall between Popes Wood and Painswick Common. The Procession Way, mentioned next, led all the way from Upton to Painswick, first along the Portway to the north end of Popes Wood and from there it probably ran southwards, following the present track between 8750 1318 and 8760 1267, whose route appears well chosen to avoid steep ascents and wet ground. At point H it would have left Popes Wood, reaching Painswick by the old road across the

The Idle Barrow Piece (from I to J) was first recorded on a 1799 map of Matson parish, which until 1885 included Popes Wood as a detached part. This map (Figure 3) was one of several drawn following the 1796 Inclosure Act for Gloucester, and it records that Idle Barrow Piece (2.29 acres) was owned by Lord Sydney (who had inherited it from Mr Selwen), and that Mr John Howell owned the surrounding wood (54.86 acres in Matson). The Piece covered about one hectare at the summit of Kites Hill, and was treeless until c.1910. The O.S. map of 1923 shows that it then reverted to woodland. This area can still be identified by the ash trees which grow there. In 1799 it extended south-east only as far as the parish boundary, which today appears to be marked by a very low bank. The 1799 map also shows that east of point H the wall-wood lay a significant distance south of the parish boundary.

The Idle Barrow itself may have been near the junction of the boundaries of Painswick, Upton and Cranham parishes (at 87626 12767, between H and I), though this point lies south-west of the Idle Barrow Piece. It was also the junction of the three hundreds of Dudston Kings Barton, Bisley and Rapston, as each of the parishes lay in a different hundred. Numerous attempts to locate a tumulus were made in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, but no definite evidence was ever found. The 1923 six inch O.S. map appears to be the first to locate the Idle Barrow at the meeting place of the
Fig 3  Popes Wood in 1799, from the Inclosure map of Matson

Fig 4  An exact map of all the Demesne and Copyhold Lands in the Manor of Cranum with Cranhum Brockworth and Upton Wood, the property of the Rev the Dean & Chapter of the Cathedral Church of St Peter's Gloucester, in lease to William Johnsons Esq. 17506 Copy of the area near the Upton boundary.
parish boundaries, but this cannot be taken as convincing evidence. It is possible that the line of the Painswick/Cranham boundary, as it runs north-west from the valley of the Painswick stream, once pointed directly towards the tumulus, though if this lay where the boundaries now meet it would not have been visible from the south, but more likely from the Severn Vale.

After Idle Barrow Piece, the boundary between Upton and Cranham manors descends the face of an old quarry (the Quarrel to a tree called the Gospel Beech and then north-east-east towards High Brothedge. This boundary is recorded on a 1750 map copied from a survey carried out in 1650 by virtue of a commission for the abolition of Deans and Chapters. It was updated by the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of St Peter in Gloucester in 1750 to show the demesne and copthold lands in the manor of Cranham then leased by William Johnstons; the relevant part is shown in Figure 4. The land north of Cranham manor was divided between Popes Wood and Prinknash Park, both owned by Henry Bridgeman of Prinknash. It is unfortunate that the inaccuracy of this map makes it impossible to say whether the dividing line shown there coincides with the wood-wall or with the parish boundary shown on later maps. The map also shows a Great Beach at bottom of bank/on a location that appears to be high on Kites Hill, though the 1787 and 1834 perambulations imply that the Gospel Beech lay further east on the parish boundary and therefore lower. The location shown on Fig 4 is therefore probably inaccurate.

The 1834 Perambulation

The third perambulation was carried out on 16th April 1834. The decision to do so was at the direction of the Jury at the Upton Court Leet, Court Baron and the Court of Survey which was held from 15th to 17th of April.

We find and present that the Bounds of the said Manor are as follows that is to say Beginning at the top of Lord Sydney’s Fladders where there is an old Quarry on the End of Spoonbed Hill to a place on Cudhill where a stone formerly stood parting Painswick and Upton and where the Road leading from the Fladders now joins the Turnpike road and from thence right across the Turnpike road leading from Gloucester to Painswick and from thence along the hedge of Cudhill to Castle End Grove and from thence along the hedge of Kinsbury Hill to Joseph Blissetts Wall and along the overside of Mr Blissetts Wall opposite the Yew tree in that wall along the footpath on the side of an old Road up to a high Tump on the Hill and thence to an upright Stone in an angle of Mr Blissetts wall and so close along the overside of that Wall, and along the overside of Mr Howell’s Wall to a Pier built in that Wall, and then over the Wall along the wood by some Stones which separate Mr Howells Land from land of Lord Bexley’s (the latter of which is in Painswick and Cranham) to another piece in the Wall marking the parting of Upton, Cranham and Painswick in the possession way in Popewood and from thence up to the Idle Barrow piece (property of Lord Sydney), and including that piece down the Idle Barrow Quarrel to where the Gospel Beech formerly stood but which has been long since destroyed, and from thence to Prinknash Cross in nearly a straight line, and so to Winstone Stile now marked by a Stone Pillar being south of Prinknash Park and from thence along by Prinknash Park Wall .... and so up Lord Sydney’s Fladders by Gooding’s Leaze Hedge to the Red Quarrel on the west end of Spoonbed Hill.

The 1834 description is similar to that made in 1787, as far as the Blissett’s Wall at E, though Castle End Grove (at D) was added. The Grove was divided up to form several properties erected during the 1930s and more recently replaced by larger masonry buildings. The high tump on the hill was probably Painswick Beacon. Unfortunately the yew tree in Mr Blissett’s wall has now gone and so has the upright stone which appeared to mark the boundary between his wood and Mr Howell’s Popes Wood. At this point (F) the remains of the wall dividing the two woods, going north-west down the escarpment, still survive. Quarrying on both sides of it has left the wall on a raised embankment, which indicates that the quarries were in different ownership. The quarry faces are much eroded but still very steep. The wood-wall from this point onwards is made of ragstone blocks and follows the top edge of the quarry before continuing in a straight line for c150 metres to the ragstone pier (G) mentioned in the perambulation. The 1834 perambulation confirms that the manorial boundary ran along the south face of this wall from F to G and along its north face from G to H. In time, the quarry near F must have extended southwards over the line that divided Painswick parish from Matson, but no further than the existing wood-wall that marks the manorial boundary, located where the ground begins to fall steeply to the north.

In 2000, I was able to get the capstone remounted on top of the pier that stands at point G. Later that year vandals prized a vertical rectangular stone from beside the pier and left it in the wood (Figs 5 and 6). Examination of the stone revealed faint traces of the letters O H E crudely gouged on one side. Several members of GADARG were consulted, who suggested that it was a late 18th century landowner’s boundary stone, recording it was erexit by O H O. A possible candidate is John Howell, who bought Popes Wood and Prinknash Park from Henry Bridgeman in 1770. It is possible that this
Fig 5  The pier in the wall at point G
(Note: the stone on the left of the pier was later moved, as shown in Fig 6)

Fig 6  The engraved stone near the pier
stone was the missing upright stone where the two woods met and was placed by the pier at a later date. Its position beside the pier with the letters concealed, facing towards the pier would not have served the purpose intended.

The stones marking the boundary between Lord Bexley’s land and the rest of the wood have disappeared, but they were probably near H. Today there is a metal shack dating from the 1930s and some attempts at levelling the ground in this area. From this point the parish boundary shown on the OS map is up to 50m north of the wall within Popes Wood, and this separation continues as far as the Portway. On the 1838 Tithe Apportionment and map for Cranham parish, the area between the parish boundary and the wall forms the piece numbered 1, owned by Thomas Howell and amounting to 3.06 acres. Howell also owned 24.4 acres of woodland in pieces 2 to 4 south of the wall. The 1839 Tithe documents for Painswick are much less helpful, as the area between the Upton/Painswick boundary and the Popes Wood wall, shown as piece 668, adjacent to Painswick Common, is described as waste. The area given for piece 668, 1.17 acres, also appears to be only half that shown on the OS map. It seems probable that Thomas Howell regarded piece 668 as his property, and since woodland paid no tithes, it did not matter much. The identity of Lord Bexley’s land is uncertain, though it may have been the close called Beards Piece that lies south of point H. Lord Bexley or Nicholas Vansittart (1766-1851) lived in Kent, but may have been related to the Vansittart who held Manor Farm in Upton St Leonards in the 18th century.

The perambulation next refers to another piece in the wall marking the parting of Upton, Cranham and Painswick in the Procession Way in Popes Wood. Since the Popes Wood wood-wall lay south of the Upton parish boundary (which was not marked by a wall), this description is difficult to understand. It is the only reference to a boundary wall east of H in the 1787 and 1834 perambulations. Disregarding it would allow the manorial and parish boundaries to coincide here, along the line I, J, K, L. The wall running parallel to this, further south, would simply mark an internal division of the woodland. The reference to the Idle Barrow Piece confirms that all of it lay within Upton manor. The boundary then descends the Idle Barrow Quar (J) about 20 metres north of the wall; despite erosion of the quarry face over the centuries the descent is still extremely steep, and for the next 100m the ground is very disturbed by quarrying. Here the wall has clearly been altered after quarrying ceased.

The probable position of the Gospel Beech was on the more level ground south-west of the Portway, where the boundary changes direction (K), to proceed eastwards with the hillside falling fairly steeply on its north-west side. After the boundary meets the Portway it runs a short distance south-east to a leaning stone pillar (L) on the south side of the Portway, which the Ordnance Survey records as a boundary stone. The Prinknash Cross may have been near this point. Examination of the pillar surface has not revealed any traces of incised crosses, but it is covered in lichens and mosses that are difficult to clear. The pillar has two holes drilled into its east face, suggesting there was a gate here leading onto the summit of the Portway, probably at the north-east end of a road through Popes Wood that was closed in 1787. The stone wall in this section runs east-north-east to L, which marks the end of the wall, where it finally meets the manorial (and parish) boundary.

The boundary then crosses the Portway and runs straight through the woodland to another stone pillar, similar in shape and size to the one beside the Portway, and opposite a stile leading into Prinknash Park (M). It is possible that the stile may be the Winstone Stile referred to in the text. The boundary then follows the park wall to Cranham Corner (N).

The 1880 Ordnance Survey perambulation

In preparation for the first edition of the 25 inch map, the Ordnance Survey consulted the inhabitants of every parish about the location of the parish boundaries; the parish spokesman was called the meresman. The OS officer concerned recorded his findings in the Remark Books in which each part of a parish boundary was sketched with accompanying notes. Where adjacent parishes disagreed about their common boundary, the book has a note referring to a Boundary Report for one of the parishes. The Remark Books form class OS26 in the National Archives, but all the Boundary Reports were destroyed by World War 2 bombing of Southampton.

For the boundary considered in this paper the relevant Remark Books have been consulted, though it must be remembered that they are concerned with parish boundaries, not those of manors. Produced in 1880, they show that only half the length of the boundary from A to N was defined, largely by walls; the undefined half consisted of 570m from C’ to D and 880m from F to L. Not surprisingly, both these sections were disputed, the first by Upton and Painswick meresmen, the second (in Popes Wood) by Matson and Cranham meresmen. The map published by the OS in 1884 shows that Painswick and Matson claims were preferred, but without the Boundary Reports the reasons are unknown. Between C’ and D the boundary claimed by Upton ran along the field walls about 20m south of the accepted boundary.
appears to be consistent with the 1787 and 1834 manorial perambulations, but not with the 1841 Tithe map, which agrees with the OS map. The parish boundary claimed by Cranham in Popes Wood ran slightly north of the accepted boundary from I to near K, and then south of it from K to L, running along the existing wall for the last 100m. Points I and J are clearly identified on the OS sketch plan, which helps to distinguish the rival claims; Matson's claim was accepted and Cranham's rejected. The only boundary stones recorded on the sketch plans are near A (about 30m east, in the roadway) and at L and M.

**Prinknash, Popes Wood and Buckholt Wood**

In 1121 Helias Giffard gave the land called Buckholt Wood in Cranham to Gloucester Abbey. His grant includes a description of the location, but this hard to interpret, as most of the place names cannot be reliably identified; Portway, the road from Gloucester and Upton along the south-west side of Prinknash Park, was almost certainly an ancient boundary. The manor of Upton St Leonards was once part of the royal manor of Kings Barton, which was farmed by the Abbey from 1244 to 1265, and in 1345 granted to the Abbey by King Edward III. The perambulations show that Popes Wood lay in Upton manor, but it was also a detached part of Matson parish until 1885. In 1121 Ernulf de Matson was lord of Prinknash manor, of which Popes Wood probably was then a part; in the 13th century John de Matson allowed Llanthony Priory to dig for stone in the wood. A perambulation of the boundary between the lands in Matson of Philip de Matson and the Abbey's land in Cranham was proposed in 1254; this probably arose from a dispute about the boundary of Popes Wood, but unfortunately there is no record of the outcome.

In 1538 the Abbey leased the manor of Upton to Sir Anthony Kingston, with the right to fell beeches in Buckholt Wood. In 1544, after the Dissolution, Prinknash was granted to Edmund Bridges, later Lord Chandos, from whom Sir Anthony continued to lease the herbage of Prinknash Park, provided he kept at least forty deer in the Park for the King's use.

Popes Wood was part of Prinknash when the Bridgeman acquired it from Sir Thomas Chaloner in 1628, in 1690 when John Bridgeman mortgaged it, and in 1750 when owned by Henry Bridgeman (Fig.4). John Howell then acquired the property, for in 1787 he applied to the Justices for permission to close two roads in Popes Wood. The wood remained part of the Prinknash estate until it was sold to John Workman in 1923.

**Discussion**

The three pre-1880 perambulations described above deal with the boundary between Upton manor and Painswick and Cranham. For much of its length this boundary was described as being marked by a wall, but not within Popes Wood. Here, it probably coincided with the parish boundary, as recorded in 1884 by the Ordnance Survey, running for 1000m almost parallel to the south-east edge of the wood, as defined by a wood-wall (see Fig 2). Though this wall is now decayed, its course can still be followed. Popes Wood therefore included a narrow strip of Painswick and Cranham, whose existence may have led to confusion between the manorial and parish boundaries, which even in 1880 were devoid of permanent markers, apart from the pillars at L and M.

For the length between points F and G, in Painswick parish, quarrying in Upton manor would have required the upkeep of a wall along the quarry edge, both to protect the woodland from livestock grazing on Painswick Common and to safeguard the livestock from falls. Between G and H, the Popes Wood side of the wall is not so steep, but its position means that the Common side is level right up to the wall. From H onwards, mainly in Cranham parish, quarrying is not an adequate explanation for the wall being separated from the parish or manorial boundary, but it should be noted that none of the Upton perambulations suggest that this part of the manorial boundary was ever marked by a wall.

In Cranham, the boundary strip runs more or less along the highest points of the ridge. West of point J the wall along its south-east side is slightly lower, and appears to be located at the change of slope, where the east side of the ridge falls steeply down to the A46 road. East of J the ground has been so disturbed by quarrying that the boundary strip no longer follows a ridge, if it ever did. It seems likely that the wall was constructed to divide the wood into sensible units for management purposes. The parish boundary, of which there is no visible evidence in the wood (and so described as undefined by the OS), was probably chosen (at least in parts) to lie on the skyline, as seen from the Vale when the ridge was not wooded. The fact that it includes the highest point in Popes Wood, Kites Hill, is almost certainly intentional. In 1121 the boundary was said to include a beech tree where robbers were hanged, and a tumulus called Idel Berge, so named because digging had found no treasure there. Although the precise location of this tumulus is now lost, it could have been chosen as the point where Upton, Painswick and Brimpsfield parishes should meet, at a time when Cranham was part
of Brimpsfield. Today, this meeting point is on almost level ground facing west, with no sign of any boundaries or tumuli. When the tumulus was built, it was probably intended to be visible from the Vale, and was therefore close to the Cotswold escarpment.

The Popes Wood wall is built of ragstone and the depth of its footings indicates that it was made by someone who had wealth. In contrast, the freestone wall built c.1623 by Sir Henry Jerningham along the south side of Madams Wood is made of softer limestone which has almost completely eroded away. Both the freestone and ragstone found along the Cotswold scarp edge are of good quality and have been quarried for many hundreds of years. The quarries themselves are difficult to date, as the names given to them when in use are quickly forgotten once the useful stone has been worked out. In some places the wood-wall could have predated the quarry; in others, where it runs down a steep quarry face (as on the north-east side of Kites Hill), it must have been built after these quarries were abandoned.
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GRID REFERENCES OF THE BOUNDARY POINTS (Figs 1 and 2)

A 8559 1246  E 8679 1223  J 8772 1290
B near 856125  F 8733 1242  K 8789 1290
C 8587 1242  G 8750 1258  L 8800 1298
D 8587 1250  H 8758 1266  M 8809 1299
E 8654 1228  I 8765 1280  N 8819 1303
HON TREASURER’s REPORT FOR THE YEAR ENDING 28 FEBRUARY 2006

Receipts and Payments for year ending 28 February 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>2005-2006</th>
<th>2004-2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members’ Subscriptions</td>
<td>1870.22</td>
<td>1642.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions at Meetings inc Non-Members</td>
<td>53.80</td>
<td>67.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glevensis</td>
<td>169.30</td>
<td>125.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Outing</td>
<td>462.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer’s Account</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Interest Account</td>
<td>43.96</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFCash Account for Publication Fund</td>
<td>683.93</td>
<td>572.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax Refund</td>
<td>334.51</td>
<td>334.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction/Raffle at Christmas Party etc</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Lawns Trust</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leckhampton Historical Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,860.36</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,871.04</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>2005-2006</th>
<th>2004-2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer’s Expenses, Fees, Donations and Gifts</td>
<td>165.00</td>
<td>273.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation Fees</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>266.63</td>
<td>263.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>301.77</td>
<td>256.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Outing</td>
<td>407.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glevensis</td>
<td>384.00</td>
<td>498.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>66.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying &amp; Stationery</td>
<td>289.67</td>
<td>108.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistivity Meter</td>
<td>163.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Site Host Rental</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-publication expenses</td>
<td>85.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,183.69</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,837.55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gross surplus
Less CAFCash Interest to Publication Fund, transferred to Accumulated Fund
£992.74 | £461.29

Statement of Assets and Liabilities as at 28 February 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Assets</th>
<th>2005-2006</th>
<th>2004-2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Accounts</td>
<td>2,365.48</td>
<td>1,429.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer’s Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Interest</td>
<td>1,656.95</td>
<td>1,600.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFCash Account</td>
<td>17,283.97</td>
<td>16,600.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,306.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,629.73</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brought forward from last year</td>
<td>3,029.69</td>
<td>2,568.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross surplus less interest on CAFCash Account</td>
<td>992.74</td>
<td>461.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>4,022.43</td>
<td>3,029.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publication Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brought forward from last year</td>
<td>16,600.04</td>
<td>13,027.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus surplus from the year</td>
<td>683.93</td>
<td>3,572.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>17,283.97</td>
<td>16,600.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>21,306.40</td>
<td>19,629.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. The subscription total includes 8 (6) subscriptions £85 (£57).
2. The Publication Fund is the money transferred from the Frocester Publication Fund in 2001 and is earmarked for Vols 3 and 4 and other publications.
3. Nigel Spry is preparing the report on the excavation carried out at St Mary’s some years ago and there has inevitably been some pre-production costs such as drawing preparation.