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OBITUARY

DONALD JOHN MAYES (1926-2013)

With the death of Don Mayes at his home in Churchdown on 10th March 2013, GADARG (now GlosArch) lost a dedicated, highly valued and much admired member. A variety of adjectives have been used to describe him: intelligent, helpful, unassuming, to name just a few. Don was born in London in 1926 and was evacuated to Cornwall at the outbreak of war. Involvement with aeronautics started when he joined the Royal Observer Corps. When the war was over he studied physics at Durham University and graduated with honours. He did National Service in the RAF and qualified as a service pilot in 1947. He flew Lancasters in Coastal Command. Don obtained a further degree in aeronautics. In 1954, the same year that he married Austrian born Eva Zoref on Lundy Island, he secured a job at Smiths Industries at Cheltenham. He was a test pilot and on the ground one of the minds behind the development of vertical take off and landing. He recounted that on one occasion he took the controls of a Vulcan bomber during a test flight.

Don was truly eclectic, with many study interests stemming from a love of the countryside, bird watching, archaeology, geology and history. He was a practical man who was capable of undertaking a full range of household refurbishment and maintenance tasks; Don was an enthusiastic cook. He was an accomplished clock, model and instrument maker and any spare time he had was devoted to a current project. Retirement opened up his world to many other activities to explore, including personal computing - as a scientist and engineer he had a programming background dating back to the 1960s.

His wife Eva died in 1994 and, about this time, he first became an invaluable member of GADARG. As the group's IT specialist he set up the members' database. From 1995 until 2003 he was the assistant editor of Glevensis, being particularly responsible for its layout, typesetting and for processing photographs and figures. This gave him the confidence to take on the major task of designing and assembling Eddie
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Price's four volume series of reports on Frocester village history and the excavations participated in by group members there over forty years. Don willingly and helpfully took on similar, but less complicated, publication roles in support of individual's and the group's research and fieldwork. Especially notable was his masterminding of our acquisition and use of resistivity survey equipment; he also fabricated and maintained all the grid lines and pegs etc that were so invaluable in its efficient use. Until recently all processing and printing of results was done by Don.

When he left the Committee in 2004 group members at the AGM unanimously approved the proposal that Don should be made an honorary member of GADARG in recognition of his various contributions. He trained and mentored his replacement and never ceased to take an active interest in the work of the group.

This obituary was compiled with the help of the Mayes family's Eulogy read at Don's funeral on 25th March 2013, at St Andrew's Church, Churchdown

THE BRYAN JERRARD AWARD

Angie Newcombe

We are delighted to inform readers that Diane Charlesworth (editor of Glevensis) has been awarded the Brian Jerrard Award for her article in Glevensis, 44, entitled 'Medieval Tibberton'. She received her award from Brian Jerrard at the Gloucestershire Local History afternoon on the 12th October 2013.

For previous articles published in Glevensis that were either winners or runners up of this award please refer to Glevensis 43. This run of success has culminated in another winner from Glevensis. Many congratulations Diane!

SECRETARY'S REPORT FOR 2011-12 TO THE 2013 AGM

Marta Cock

GADARG members continued our own fieldwork despite the terrible weather, joined other organisations' excavations and ran a well-supported summer and winter programme. A highlight has been the excellent Kingsholm Project. We do need more help on or off the committee, so please contact us if you have a little time to spare to explore what you could offer, even if only occasionally.

We congratulate Tim Darvill, Professor of Archaeology at Bournemouth University, who joined us as a boy, on becoming President of the Bristol & Gloucestershire Archaeological Society (BGAS). We were sad to hear of the very recent death at 86 of Don Mayes, who set up our membership database; we will miss him very much. A full obituary will follow (see page 2- ed). We were also notified of the death of long term member Derek Shorthouse.
Your small Committee met on five evenings during the year. We welcomed Andrew Armstrong, Gloucester City Archaeologist to the Committee ex Officio. We continue to benefit from the advice of Tim Grubb, Gloucestershire County Council Archaeology Service (GCCAS). We are now represented on the new Gloucestershire Local History Association (GLHA). Although Ann Maxwell had to withdraw from attendance at committee she will continue as our Fieldwork Co-ordinator.

A Saturday daytime sub-committee meeting was set up to start to examine how we might improve GADARG's future. Because our current name appears to be a barrier we are asking this AGM to agree to change our name to a simpler, more memorable one which better reflects the area we cover and is more appealing to tentative members without disadvantaging our current membership. We are also looking at how our website might be improved. We are very grateful to our webmaster, Julian Rawes for all the work he undertakes. The result of our recent call for a Publicity Officer looks promising.

The first annual grant of £850 from the new Frocester Fund was awarded to David Evans to pay for further expert examination of the remaining fills of pits in dated Neolithic features at King's Stanley to help determine how open the countryside was then. The resulting report will be published. We have one pending application for the new financial year.

The full report of the Linton excavation of March 2012 is in production for submission to the County Archaeologist. Potential archaeological sites indicated by our LiDAR project in Upton St Leonards and in Brockworth did not find anything that needs further investigation. There were surveys around Woeful Lake and assistance was given to Andrew Armstrong, the new Gloucester City Archaeologist, to help document and move files. We thank Churchdown Parish Council for its permission to widen the search for the Saxon Church at Chapel Hay in Churchdown reported in Newsletter 132. We also participated in fieldwork in Gloucester organised by other organisations. An archaeological watching brief during ground works on a site in Hucclecote, conducted by Nigel Spry is being published in Glevensis 45. Tony Roberts will lead a requested survey in Sherborne village on 2 to 4 April thanks to the National Trust.

We are indebted to Diane Charlesworth for editing Glevensis 45, out today, helped by Les Comtesse and his IT skills. Copies up to 2002 are uploaded on our website and all may be consulted in Gloucestershire Archives.

Our Summer 2012 visit to Stanton Drew & Charterhouse on Mendip in Somerset was very successful culturally and financially. All the evening visits attracted a good turn out with the lowest number being twelve and there were good turnouts for our lecture programme. The Members evening elicited a discussion that could point the way to different types of self-financing meeting in future in different parts of the County. We thank the management of St Andrews URC in Cheltenham and Sandy Woodcock of Ribston Hall High School for our welcome and facilities in each meetings venue.

Newsletters for 2012-13 can be found on our website. They were emailed to 86 members via 74 addresses. The rest were posted. More email addresses would be welcome. Members on our email list are alerted to selected opportunities and events of interest. Sadly we cannot afford postage of these alerts to the sixty or so for whom we only have postal addresses. Angela Newcombe has mounted displays at a variety of public events mainly in Gloucester and Cheltenham. Please join her to help at these enjoyable events. Contact details can be found in our newsletters and our website.

The County Council has not changed its plan to reduce the Archaeology Service to five posts. There is currently an internal consultation on the proposed new structure. There has been discussion between representatives of the County Council and the City, our Chairman, Mike Milward and John Loosley, Hon. Secretary of Bristol & Gloucestershire Archaeological Society (BGAS) about a mutually useful way ahead provided there are no County or City resource implications. A first meeting to take this further will take place shortly. Your committee, while welcoming dialogue, would not wish to replace paid staff and doubt that we could or should bid for the level of external resources enjoyed by GCCAS, e.g. for its Kingsholm Project. We do not see ourselves as employers. Our previous successful bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund for the Lidar Project stretched us to the limit.
THE SEARCH FOR THE EARLY MEDIEVAL CHAPEL OF CHURCHDOWN -
INTERIM REPORT

Mick Philpott

Introduction

There is a widely held belief that the early medieval chapel of Churchdown stood in Chapel Hay field in the centre of the old village. A recent archaeological investigation revealed evidence to bring us closer to finding its location. This consisted of geophysics surveys on the accessible parts of Chapel Hay, to establish if any trace of building foundations could be found, and the excavation of an evaluation trench during May and June 2013, to recover any dating evidence for the reported burial ground within the Churchdown Club grounds.

The first work conducted here was by Murray. The report records the excavation of a previously unknown burial ground, within the grounds of the then, Churchdown and District United Services Club. He attempted to date the burials from the skull characteristics of the disinterred human remains to around the 14th. century, which has since been proven to be wholly unreliable. The material described in that report and the excavation results of St Andrews church (Fig 1) during later work by Nichols suggests the cemetery could date from the Roman period.

The geophysics surveys, conducted in October 2012 and April to June 2013, were mainly on the Chapel Hay recreation ground, where it has been suggested by Smithe that at sunset 'the traces of some outlines of a building are pretty visible'. However, no written record has so far been found to substantiate the existence of any medieval buildings on Chapel Hay.

Site Location

The Chapel Hay recreation ground, is centered on SO 88401970. The evaluation trench positioned in the south west corner of the Churchdown Club premises is bounded by Church Road to the north and Chapel Hay recreation ground to the south (Fig 1). The site was a steeply sloping unkempt bank bounded on the south and west sides by a 2m high fence, on the north side within 0.5m of the tennis court chain link fence and on the east side within 1m of the tennis hut. The geophysics areas were in Chapel Hay, adjacent to the
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**Fig 1: Excavation Site Location and Geophysics Survey Area**
south and west boundaries of the Churchdown club premises, which also constrained the boundaries of the evaluation trench (Fig 1). The available area for the geophysics survey was approximately 0.7 hectare (1.7 acres) of level grassed ground.

**Historical and archaeological background**

The Tithe map and Apportionment of 1840 identifies the field called Chapel Hay, which at that time was an area of about 2.8 hectares (7 acres) owned by the then late John Thatche. The 1880 ordnance survey (OS) map shows a pond at the western edge of the field and the transit of two public footpaths across the field, one from the north east corner diagonally south west for the most part to avoid the pond, the other north south at the eastern boundary of the field.

Swift records that until the mid 19th century the pond stood in the western side of the field, and that the village stocks were placed on the north eastern side, probably close to where the Churchdown club stands today. He also records attending a fete on Chapel Hay in July 1878, and recounts that there had been older inhabitants of the village who remembered the ruins of a building in Chapel Hay, believing it to be a chapel that once stood there, where according to Smite ‘they say human bones have been dug up’.

There are three recorded excavations within the original field boundaries, the first recorded in 1923 by Murray. This was the result of an impromptu excavation that resulted from the discovery of further human remains, some articulated, beneath the ground being levelled for the Churchdown Club tennis courts. In his report Murray records that 'in 1920 a few human remains were uncovered' during the erection of the United Services Club-house. The second, an archaeological evaluation in 1999 and the third, an excavation in 2000, were both undertaken by Gloucestershire County Council Archaeology Service in the grounds of St Andrews Church. The evaluation established the presence of a possible rubble wall foundation and a pond containing medieval and modern fills. The excavation recorded a series of ditches, pits and post holes dated to the late Saxon and medieval periods and some Romano-British ceramic building material (CBM), suggesting that the CBM was sufficient to indicate a building of that date in the vicinity.

**Geophysics**

Two geophysics surveys were conducted during October 2012 and April 2013 in adjacent areas of the recreation ground. A further survey was later conducted in the garden of a private residence Greenbank (Fig 1). These first surveys utilised standard configuration resistance equipment with a 0.5m probe separation. Greater depths can be surveyed if the probe separation is widened to 1m. Since it was believed that any structural remains may be at depths in excess of 0.5m a follow up survey was then performed in May 2013 using the wider electrode separation. The area surveyed for this latter exercise covered both the October 2012 survey and the April 2013 survey areas.

On both the geophysics images (Figs. 2 and 3) the dark shades are low resistance, normally areas of good moisture retention e.g. pits, ditches, loam deposits etc. The light shades are high resistance, normally areas of poor moisture retention e.g. walls, foundations, cobbled areas, building rubble, natural rock formations, etc. The interpreted high resistance geometric features are highlighted with broken lines. There would appear to be a series of sub-surface features across a large part of the area surveyed. Both sets of results (Figs 2 and 3) indicate a triangular low resistance area to the north east of the plots adjacent to the boundary with the club. This could represent an area of disturbance due possibly to further inhumation burials. The high resistance sub rectangular signatures in this area appear to indicate an area of laid out structures or enclosures. It was noted during the survey that there is a change in ground level around the area indicated by the furthest east sub-rectangular outline (Fig 3). Toward the centre of the results plot is a zig-zag edge to a high resistance signature that gives the appearance of a corner to a structure with an abutting wall. Further to the west is a linear feature running roughly north south across the site and about 2m wide, possibly the remains of a collapsed wall. Adjacent to it at the far western end of the site is what appears to be an associated interrupted semi-circular feature on the 0.5m probe results, but on the 1m probe results its outline is more sub-rectangular, and it is clearly segregated from the linear feature by a continuous intersecting darker low resistance path (Fig 3).

**Excavation**

Since the Churchdown club boundary fence had been re-aligned in the late 20th century to enclose a small parcel of land along the southern boundary, it presented an opportunity to explore an area adjacent to the cemetery site discovered in 1923, with the aim of recovering dating evidence. A 1.5m by 3m trench was planned out as near as possible to the Churchdown club boundary fence (Fig 1) in order to avoid the area that would have been previously disturbed when the ground was levelled for the tennis courts and associated facilities.

The excavation of the human remains was subject to the Ministry of Justice licence number 13-0086, which allowed the sampling of two sets of articulated...
Fig 2: Combined results for the 0.5m probe survey superimposed on a satellite image of the area, together with all other known archaeological features. These include the Saxon and medieval features found at St Andrews church\textsuperscript{13,14} and the plan of the Churchdown Club burials.\textsuperscript{15}

Fig 3: Results for the 1.0 probe survey superimposed upon a satellite image of the area.\textsuperscript{16}
remains for radio carbon dating, on condition that all remains were re-interred by the end December 2013. Due to the density of in-situ remains the final phase of excavation down to the natural soil level was achieved by sinking sondages at three points in the trench area. Context numbers were allocated for each stratified layer and each set of remains that were recognisable, Figs 4 - 8. Where prominent remains were revealed the height above ordnance datum was measured to the uppermost surface of the subject. Dr Heidi Dawson, Senior Associate teacher from the University of Bristol Department of Archaeology and Anthropology, examined the human remains where possible, for evidence of pre-mortem trauma or disease and determined their approximate age and likely gender. Her comments and interpretations formed the basis of the observations on the human remains given later in this section. Where practical, bone measurements were made to allow the stature of individuals to be estimated. As the excavation proceeded through the burial contexts every attempt was made to identify grave cuts, but due to the frequent inter cutting between graves and the disturbance created by superimposition in the type of sandy loam encountered, none were positively identified, with two possible exceptions.

The first significant context, 9, was a layer of friable brown sandy loam, possibly a post medieval cultivated layer (hill wash), sealing almost all lower layers except context 12, it contained a variety of residual materials including both ceramic pottery, ceramic building material (CBM), human bone fragments, iron working slag and some iron objects, mainly nails.

Below context 9 were post medieval contexts 10, 11 and 15. Context 10 was a grey brown stony deposit containing both lias stone and limestone. Context 11 was a grey brown stony loam containing possible demolition debris, consisting of a quantity of stone roof tile and medieval CBM, including a piece of green glazed cockscomb ridge tile, and both human and animal bone fragments. Context 15, was a brown sandy stony loam containing a significant quantity of medieval CBM which was mainly ceramic tile, much of it green glazed, some with a combed linear pattern. Other artefacts from this context included a 13th/14th century reckoning counter (jetton), some medieval ceramic pottery, stone roofing tile fragments and some formed lead fragments, one piece interpreted as window lead, there were also some human bone fragments.

Beneath those contexts was a late medieval layer, context 20, which was a brown sandy loam containing many bones, including both articulated and frequently dis-articulated human remains (Figs 7 and 8), representing both genders and ranging in age from infant to middle aged. There were also apparently unrelated human cranium/part craniums randomly placed generally facing to the east. This context also yielded a variety of other material types e.g. a quantity of medieval and some Saxon ceramic pottery and medieval CBM, a lead fragment, interpreted as window lead, some iron, possibly roofing nails, metal working slag and some lime mortar. Within context 20 there appeared to be evidence of a grave cut in the south section, context 20a, defined by a slightly darker area of loam.

There are occasional bones illustrated in Figs 7 and 8 that were not allocated a unique context number within context 20, hence they have no annotation.

Context 13 was an exploratory sondage cut through context 20 that revealed an articulated inhumation, context 16, at a height of 52.66m above ordnance datum (AOD), protruding from the south west corner of the trench (Fig 7). This was an adult male possibly 30 - 40 years of age with a nominal stature of 1.65m +/- 3.3cm. (5ft. 5ins. +/- 1.3ins.). Only the lower two thirds of the torso were visible, however there was some pathology evident in the form of osteophytes on lumbar vertebra 2 (L2) to the bottom of the spine. The right femur was subsequently removed for sampling to obtain a radiocarbon (RC) date. The artefacts recovered from contexts 13 and 13a consisted of human bone fragments, two pieces of Roman and medieval ceramic pottery and some iron, possibly roofing, nails. Context number 13a was allocated post excavation since it appeared in section as a possible grave cut. Next to context 16 and apparently cut through longitudinally to allow his interment, was context 18a (Fig 7), possibly an adult of slight build. To the north of context 16, truncated just below the neck, again possibly to allow his interment, was context 17 (Fig 7) probably an adult male, possibly aged 25 - 35 years, with some pathology evident in the form of small osteophytes on the lower spine.

Protruding midway along from the south wall of trench was context 25 at a height of 52.83 AOD (Fig 7), this was apparently the highest inhumation. This was an adult female with robust bone structure, with a nominal stature of 1.65m +/- 3.7cm. (5ft. 5ins. +/- 1.3ins.), truncated just below the right knee and the left lower leg missing, possibly to allow another interment; however there were no obvious remains that could confirm this observation. Two small fragments of Saxon pottery were also recovered from this context. Opposite context 25 protruding from the north wall was context 30 (Fig 7), with an almost intact skull, but no vertebra had survived. The radius and ulna in situ measurements on these bones indicated a child with an age of between 2 and 7 years.
Fig 4: Evaluation Trench South Section

Fig 5: Evaluation Trench East Section

Fig 6: Evaluation Trench West Section
Fig 7 Plan of Higher Human Remains

Fig 8 : Plan of Lower Human Remains
In the north east corner of the trench was a set of remains context 47 (Fig 8), a female, possibly over 35 years of age, truncated above the shoulders but with an apparently deformed spine. It is possible that the spine may have been deformed in situ, L2 to L5 have osteophytes and L2 is a wedge shaped possible compression fracture. Adjacent to context 47 protruding from the north wall of the trench was context 29 (Fig 8), a poorly preserved set of juvenile remains, truncated above the shoulder. Adjacent to context 29 protruding from the north wall of the trench with an intact skull was context 46 (Fig 8), a young female of 7 to 12 years of age. A small fragment of Roman CBM was also recovered from this context.

In the north-west corner of the trench and partially within and above the natural were articulated human remains, context 44 in figure 8, at a height of 52.38m AOD which was the lowest inhumation in context 38. These were the leg bones of a robust adult, probably male, with a nominal stature of 1.84m +/- 3.3cm. (6 ft. 0 ins. +/- 1.3 ins.). The right femur was subsequently removed for sampling to obtain a radiocarbon date.

The lowest excavated soil deposit was natural clean orange sand with orange clay beneath, which was visible in three sondages, contexts 38, 42, and 48 at a height of between 52.17 and 52.45m AOD.

There was no evidence of grave goods or the use of coffins for interment i.e. no coffin furniture or nails. Generally the more complete remains were supine with hands and arms extended and parallel to the torso, the heads were to the west but facing east and feet to the east (Figs 7 and 8). No evidence of apparel or shrouding of the inhumations was apparent e.g. no pins or fasteners were discovered.

Results

Bone Analysis
The radiocarbon dating measurements were undertaken at Scottish Universities Environmental Research Centre (SUERC) using accelerator mass spectrometry. The radiocarbon dating results from the analyses of the two bone samples are given in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Calibrated RC date (95.4% confidence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context (44)</td>
<td>Cal AD 669-860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context (16)</td>
<td>Cal AD 981-1153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Radiocarbon Results (Figs 9 and 10)

Summary Analysis of Ceramic Materials by Dr. J. Timby

The archaeological work resulted in the recovery of 86 sherds of pottery weighing 714 g in weight accompanied by 102 fragments of CBM weighing 4065 g and two small fragments of fired clay (4 g).

Ceramic Pottery
Pottery of prehistoric, Roman, Saxon, medieval, and post-medieval date is present; in total, pottery was recovered from 18 defined contexts.

Two small sherds were recovered from context 20 as residual finds which are oxidised and quite soft with inclusions of grog. Grog tempered pottery of this nature is characteristic of the Bronze Age. Three sherds of Roman pottery are present, from contexts 13 and 2. All three are from the Gloucester kilns and thus
likely to date to the 1st or 2nd century. They are all deposited in later contexts. Eleven sherds of potentially Saxon date are present. The range of fabrics present is diverse and apart from the two similar sherds from context 38, each is slightly different. These include various combinations of quartz, quartzite, calcareous inclusions (or voids) and organic-matter. Dating of these sherds is quite problematic given their residual nature. Just over half the assemblage, 52%, comprises wares of medieval or later medieval date. These include many wares familiar in Gloucester at this time including jars from Malvern Chase, Gloucester limestone-tempered ware, Minety ware, Herefordshire Border ware and eight sherds of glazed jug, some, or all of which, may be Worcester products.

Ceramic building material
In total 102 fragments of tile were noted most of which appear to be plain or glazed fragments of medieval or late medieval date. These include a few fragments of glazed ridge tile and a number of plain flat tiles. Also present are four fragments of Roman roof tile at least two of which are tegulae.

Metal Objects
The copper reckoning counter (jetton) token from context (15) has been dated to the 13th/14th century. It has on the obverse (Fig 11) the inscription + AVE " MARIA " GRASIA " PLENA (Hail Mary Full of Grace) and the Châtel-Tournois (a conventional representation of the town, castle and church of Tours) with a lys on the spire a variant of Barnard. On the reverse (Fig 12) is a cross of three strands fleuronné with a quatrefoil in the centre all with a tressure of arches fleuronné at each angle, a variant of Barnard.

Discussion
The articulated remains revealed were all supine inhumations on an east - west orientation, with no evidence for the use of coffins and no grave goods, as was similarly reported by Murray in 1923. From the carbon and nitrogen stable isotope analysis of the human bone collagen, established during the RC dating, it may be inferred that the two individuals sampled had a diet typical of an English agrarian economy during the early and high medieval periods. Since there were no artefacts that could be related to these inhumations it was not possible to assess if they were either clothed or shrouded when interred. Due to the nature of the site there were only two possible grave cuts identified and there was no evidence of grave markers, probably accounting for the frequent intercutting of burials and the quantity of fragmented bone recovered. There was a roughly even ratio of males to females and the assemblage included the remains of all expected age groups for a community cemetery i.e. from infant to adult; although the presence of infant remains, implying burial in the same area as adults, in a probable Saxon cemetery, does not necessarily equate to the norm for all cemeteries of that period. It is considered that the inhumations revealed during this excavation are typical of those described in the 1923 Murray report; they lie between the western most articulated inhumation illustrated on the 1923 plan and the group further to the east. They are similarly interred without grave goods or evidence of coffins and they have the same east west orientation. Therefore the evidence suggests an early Christian cemetery used for the burial of the local inhabitants of the manor, in use possibly from the 7th to the 12th century, probably being abandoned when the churchyard at St. Bartholomew’s on Chosen Hill was established, thought to be about AD1175. This dating evidence coincides with a period when Chapels were being
constructed to accompany cemeteries and consecration of graveyards was becoming common; this implies some form of boundary could be expected.26

The geophysics results indicate that all the major subsurface high resistance features are similarly aligned, i.e. roughly east west or north south, as was the main ditch recorded in the Nichols report.27 Whether these features are all contemporary and form part of the same structure cannot be determined. Some of the archaeological evidence suggests that there may have been different periods of use of the site. Therefore the proposed alignment might have been determined by the sequence of occupation respecting and reusing existing feature lines.

Although this excavation was a microcosm of the cemetery area, from the evidence it has revealed together with the geophysics, the earlier excavations and evidence from some historical records,28 it is possible to formulate a hypothesis of what the wider site may hold. Unlike the earlier excavations we did not discover any significant Roman material. Most of the ceramics were from the medieval period, including a small group of Saxon pottery. The reckoning counter, ridge tile fragments, limestone mortar, window lead, roofing slates and nails indicate a structure of some importance in the vicinity. Similar ceramic building material was recovered from the Nichols excavation in 2000 which suggests that some of the structural signatures detected by the geophysics are probably related to that period.

Successive archbishops stayed in Churchdown up until the early 14th century, and held court there since it was both the spiritual and secular centre of the Archbishop of York’s manor.29,30 It would be reasonable to suggest that there was a structure on Chapel Hay suitable for the lodging and entertainment of the itinerate church dignitaries e.g. a manor house overlooking the village nucleus, possibly similar in layout to Prestbury manor house,31 but without the moat. There may have been good reason for the siting of a manor house on Chapel Hay, since if a chapel already stood there, it would be of both a logistical and economic benefit to co-locate the two buildings. Furthermore if the manor were post conquest, which is likely, there would have been symbolic significance in doing so, to announce the new ‘ownership’ of the manor and its spiritual guardianship.32
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All the human remains have now been reinterred on the site of the excavation as required by the Ministry of Justice license.
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BURIAL GROUND

Claire Smith
(Mick Philpott's daughter)

For my Father

Your last beds are made by the earth.
It's hidden you, since the seventh century, in its encrusted coverings.
Covers fashioned from sheets of clay and limestone. The sleep has gradually
Shed all your skins,
   All your muscles,
   And your sinew.
You've been buried among hard soil, pieces of fossils, and shards of pottery.
They've dug deep, gone down plenty of dead ends;
They've broken their backs to locate you.
You've been renamed superimposed inhumations:
Remains found in three layers; one body discovered
   Below yet another body;
   An uncomfortable respite for you all.
They charted your places painstakingly as cartographers;
They learnt twenty humans slumber here in this consecrated ground;
Now you all whisper inaudibly at me from the photographs of your bones.
Your skeletons can speak only a little of your lives' ends,
Stories of infants, children, young girls prematurely dreaming
In these final resting places. The inside of your skulls are scratched,
Engraved, and marked onto your tanned surfaces:
Like ancient artists left umber shapes on cave walls;
Like dry tributaries left imprints on the land;
Like etched lines left on metal plates in map-making.
I've cupped these rounded, small reminders in my hands;
Know they're globes charting forgotten memories -
Shells exposing mysteries - the details of lives lost.

CIRENCESTER HEAD

Mike Milward

I am grateful to Lindy Ramsden-Hare, a previous owner, for bringing this stone head to my attention.

The stone head was bought at auction in Cirencester in the early 1980s (Figs.1-2). In those days it merely passed for a fairly worthless garden curio. The auctioneer stated that it had been entered in the sale by a dry-stone waller, who had found it within a five mile radius of Cirencester whilst he was walling. He had thought it curious enough to put in the auction.

It sold at auction again in May 2013. On this occasion the auction catalogue made reference to published studies of similar objects including work by Professor Martin Henig. Professor Henig has commented to Glevensis, that the head can tentatively be accepted as an antiquity, most probably dating from the Roman period but in an Iron Age tradition, where the sunken eyes are distinctive as is the recession of the lower face with its slit like mouth. Regarding the sunken eyes, he refers to the half length fertility figure (probably female) from Cirencester,¹ a mother-goddess from Baginton, Warwickshire,² a human-headed phallus from Broadway, Worcestershire,³ and more pertinently the male head from a Roman context at Tiddington, Stratford on Avon, Warwickshire,⁴ which is shown for comparison (Fig. 2). The slit like mouth is also to be seen on human-headed phalli from Guiting Power,⁵ and Cirencester or nearby.⁶
The head measures 7” x 4” (18cms x 10cms) and is carved from oolitic limestone, as are the other examples cited above.

There has been no formal documentation of this object because of the inadequate provenance. We are publishing this in Glevensis in order to record its existence and just in case any reader might have more information to offer.
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THE (STILL) LOST CHURCH OF SHERBORNE

Tony Roberts (ARCHEOSCAN)

Introduction

The village of Sherborne, Gloucestershire, is currently served by the church of St Mary located next to Sherborne House. However, it is widely believed that this church was preceded by an earlier church of St John. This latter church had disappeared from the historical records by the 14th century. 'The village is in two parts, separated by Sherborne House and Park. It may have been a more compact settlement at one time, but, by the 14th century, was a large village in two parts distinguished as the West and East Ends'.

Documentary sources appear to make reference to both a church at the east end of the village and a chapel at the west end in the 14th century. 'Today, at the east end of the village there is a 19th century cottage, sometimes called the Old Church, which has two 12th century doorways and other details which appear to have been part of a church.... The doorway facing the street has a carved tympanum, attached shafts, and chevron and zigzag ornament' (Fig.1).

'The chapel of St. John, which existed in the 13th century, was described as the west end chapel in 1549, when, with its two bells, it was included in a grant by the Crown'.

Villagers in the past have suggested that the site of this chapel was along the Farmington Road, immediately after Haycroft Farm, and the small wood to the right was known as 'Cemetery Copse'.

The Gloucestershire HER contains the following: 'The Norman parish church of Sherborne possibly stood until the 14th century at the East end of the village. The existence of a chapel to St John, extant 13th century and recorded in a grant of 1539 as the "West end Chapel", implies that the East end of the village was served by this earlier church. Mr Partlow of No 88 Sherborne understood that the remains of the church were from an orchard at SP17671435'. There is no trace of a former building in the orchard and no other indication of the former existence of a church there. A search of the relevant aerial photographic records at the English Heritage Archive in Swindon did not reveal any significant lead.

Geophysical Survey

The nearest old orchard to the east end cottage that has incorporated the Norman architecture is at Stones Farm. A local resident of Sherborne approached Gloucestershire Archaeology (GlosArch) to assist with investigating the possible location of the church. Archeoscan subsequently took the lead on the investigations. A geophysical survey (Fig. 2) was undertaken, with the kind permission of the landowner, the National Trust.

It revealed a possible stone-walled enclosure within which is a substantial east-west aligned structure. The structure sits in the northern part of the enclosure and there appeared to be a break in the walled circuit to the west that may represent an entrance. From the geophysical survey alone it is impossible to determine the form and age of the archaeology and whether this was indeed the remains of the church. At this point, it was thought a strong possibility that these geophysical anomalies may represent the archaeological remains of the church. Consequently, a targeted archaeological intervention was planned with the aim of providing positive evidence of the location of the lost church and an insight into the heart of the medieval origins of this ancient village.

The Excavation

The Sherborne Church project (SHER13) set out to investigate the nature of the geophysical anomalies and whether they were the remains of the church. It was conducted in association with GlosArch, who
kindly agreed to support elements of the excavation financially. The necessary labour was provided by GlosArch members and members of the public (Fig. 3).

A number of different trenches were planned (Fig. 4) that would determine the age, level of preservation and extent of the features and where possible, an indication of the sequence of activity on the site. However, not all were subsequently opened in the time available for the dig, but nevertheless a pleasant surprise was waiting underground for the excavators. Far from being the site of a medieval church the excavation revealed a significant Roman corn dryer and further evidence of Roman habitation on the site. Trench 1 initially revealed the line of a robbed wall on the same north-south alignment as the geophysical anomaly. Within this alignment, building stones of any substance had been removed and the small/medium waste stones had been backfilled into the robber cut. The presence of pottery ranging from medieval to Victorian within this jumbled fill, probably indicates that this disturbance occurred during the remodelling of this end of the village in the late 19th century; the residual medieval pottery finding its way into the backfill. This medieval pottery may have originally been associated with a small remnant of a gravel surface that survived over the top of the major stone feature subsequently discovered in the trench. The remodelling theory was further strengthened by the presence of a Victorian wall in Trench 3 (Fig. 5) dated by a piece of pottery under the clay that had been laid at the base of the wall. The wall was probably constructed to front the adjacent lane and may have replaced a previous construction, as indeed the modern wall has replaced the Victorian one. The presence of a 16th century sword belt fitment (Fig. 6) in these upper fills started to push the timeline of the site back. The east-west high resistance anomaly that was targeted by trench 2 did not produce a distinct linear feature. However, both trenches 1 and 2 were slowly extended to become contiguous over the high resistance anomaly in the north east corner of the speculated walled enclosure. Hints of a surprise were provided as a few fragments of Roman pottery and a small 4th century Roman coin were found. Soon large masonry blocks
began to emerge. Far from being a medieval church these were the lower levels of a Roman T-shaped corn dryer (Figs. 7 and 8).

In all of the images, the burnt stain betrays the seat of the open fire that would have fuelled the dryer. Indentations built into the stonework close to the seat of the burning probably mark the location of a grill to stop fuel being passed too far down the length of the dryer (Fig. 9). Interestingly, mortared into the centre point of the crossbar of the 'T' was a small marker stone set between the stone courses above the scale (Fig. 10). It is believed that this was a marker used in the construction of the dryer and marked the centreline of the main body of the 'T' around which the dryer could be symmetrically laid out.

Further evidence of Roman occupation on the site was uncovered in Trench 4. Only opened at the very end of the dig and therefore not excavated to a great depth, it provided evidence of domestic Roman occupation with the finding of a shale spindle whorl (Fig. 11) and some painted wall plaster (Fig. 12). Time, on this 2 week project, precluded the opening
Fig. 7: Roman T-Shaped corn dryer

Fig. 8: Roman T-shaped corn dryer

Fig. 9: Grill slot

Fig. 10: Corn dryer with marker stone between ground and first stone course

Fig. 11: Shale spindle whorl (SF401)

Fig. 12: Painted wall plaster from Trench 4
of trenches 5 and 6, but clearly there is a lot more archaeology to be discovered in the paddock of Stones Farm in Sherborne.

The excavation at Stones Farm enabled members of GlosArch to actively participate in a dig. Over the fortnight a number of new people, including many from the village, were introduced to archaeology. Even the local school children had the opportunity to visit the site to wash pottery sherds and discuss their local history. At the time of writing the final analysis of the pottery and bones assemblage has not yet been completed, but it is evident that whilst the lost church of the village remains unlocated, the history of the village has been pushed back significantly. From the Victorian remodelling of the west end of the village, through the medieval occupation of the paddock, witnessed by the pottery and sword belt fitment, to the main Roman structure and evidence of a more important domestic Roman dwelling on the site. Finally, a small piece of worked flint (unstratified, unfortunately) gives us a link to occupation in Sherborne many thousands of years before the writing of the records that led to the search for the church in the first place. The search for the church continues…
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SUMMARIES OF FIELDWORK IN 2012

Oxford Archaeology South

CHELTENHAM, Trinity Church, Portland Street, SO 9525 2277.

Peter Gilbert Scott, on behalf of Trinity Church Parochial Church Council, commissioned Oxford Archaeology to carry out a watching brief and ledger stone survey in the eastern churchyard of Trinity Church ahead of the development of a single-storey toilet block covering the entire footprint of the eastern churchyard. The watching brief on three geotechnical test pits revealed evidence for a number of archaeological features. Subterranean burial structures in the form of brick shaft graves were revealed in all three test pits, and the foundations of the eastern boundary wall were revealed in Test Pits 1 and 3. The foundation of the middle church buttress was revealed in Test Pit 2, as was an unidentified stone structure, tentatively suggested to be the wall of a previously backfilled entrance into the church crypt. The ledger stone survey identified 14 in-situ ledger stones and 11 ledger stones that were not in their original locations. There were a further two ledger stones that were possibly not in situ and five that were possibly in situ.

Helen Webb

DYMOCK, land east of Burtons Farm, SO 7104 3232.

Oxford Archaeology undertook a programme of evaluation trenching on the site of a proposed new dwelling. The trenches were located close to, and over, an area of banks and ditches that had previously been interpreted as a possible moated site. The evaluation recorded no evidence for occupation of the site, and given the location of the earthworks in an agricultural landscape, it is likely that the ditches with external banks, internal ponds, and an open access to a natural water source formed an enclosure for livestock, rather than settlement or defensive structure.

Mike Sims

GLOUCESTER, The Fleece Hotel, SO 383073 218582.

Oxford Archaeology undertook several phases of investigation and recording on the Fleece Hotel (or Great Inn) in the centre of Gloucester as part of its ongoing refurbishment. The Great Inn is a 15th-century, Grade I listed timber framed building with an
undercroft dating to the 12th century and a timber framed extension dating to the 17th century. Various additional buildings dating to the 19th and 20th century form the rear of this complex. Works have included assessment of the potential impact of development proposals, minor watching brief during works inside the Great Inn, and building recording of secondary curtilage-listed structures due for demolition. These structures included the lavatory block, Edwardian block and associated staircase, the link block and the carport canopies within the courtyard. The buildings were photographed and extensive site notes were taken along with annotation of existing drawings provided by the client. Further watching brief has also been undertaken during the demolition of these structures to record parts of the historic building which were revealed.

Jonathan Gill

HARDWICKE, Cursey Lane,
SO 8994 2819.

The first stage of a two-stage evaluation by Oxford Archaeology comprised a detailed geophysical survey that identified extensive ridge and furrow cultivation remains and anomalies of possible archaeological origin that could be targeted during the second phase. The second phase comprised the excavation of nine trial trenches. No features of archaeological significance were encountered, but the presence of furrows within the full extent of the evaluation area was confirmed. Artefacts recovered from the furrows suggest that they were in use into the post-medieval period. Other possible archaeological features included two thermoremanent responses (relating to heating or firing of the soil) within Trenches 6 and 9 and a small undated pit within Trench 7. The thermoremanent responses proved to be of recent origin and visible as cut features within the ploughsoil. Several abraded sherds of Roman pottery and a fragment of tegula recovered from the furrow fills suggest a Roman presence within the vicinity of the site, although no features of this date were encountered. These artefacts may have alternatively arrived at the site as part of a manuring scatter or through other means of importation.

Vix Hughes

OXENTON, Starveall Farm,
SO 940 317.

Oxford Archaeology carried out an evaluation by trenching of the site of a proposed chicken farm at Starveall Farm in the parish of Claydon. Six trenches each 36m long and 1.6m wide, constituting a 2% sample of the development area, were excavated to the natural soil. The trenches were laid out to provide overall coverage of the development area, and also to take account of the results of a magnetometer survey carried out by Stratascan. This had not found any definite archaeological anomalies, but had indicated a number of tentative faint anomalies, which were crossed by the line of the trenches. Excavation of the trenches revealed a topsoil underlain by a subsoil, probably an earlier ploughsoil, overlying the natural.

The only archaeological features were the furrows of ridge-and-furrow cultivation. No finds earlier than the 19th century were seen.

Tim Allen
ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS IN GLOUCESTER
2012 - 2013

Andrew Armstrong (City Archaeologist)
Introduction
Outlined below is a summary of archaeological investigations which have taken place in the City and district between October 2012 and 2013. This list excludes works undertaken by Cotswold Archaeology - which will be listed separately. For anyone interested in any of the individual investigations below digital copies of these reports are available from the City Archaeologist, or a hard copy can be viewed by appointment at the Council offices. Most individual investigations are referenced by HER (Historic Environment Record) number and a brief summary of the results is given.

1. The Fleece Hotel  HER 2094
   NGR SO 8308 1858   September 2012
   Historic Building Recording and Investigation
   Oxford Archaeology

A programme of historic building recording and investigation was undertaken in several structures due for demolition within the curtilage of the historic Fleece Hotel on Westgate Street. The building recording focused mainly on 20th century structures which form later additions to the Fleece complex. The elements recorded include the lavatory block, Edwardian block, the link block and the carport canopies within the courtyard. A photographic, written and drawn record was made of those elements due for demolition.

2. Gloucester Cathedral South Aisle  HER 2132
   NGR SO 8309 1877   1996 - 2012
   Archaeological Recording
   Carolyn Heighway

The HER now holds a copy of Carolyn's report on the archaeological investigation, recording and analysis of repairs and restoration works undertaken in the south aisle of the Cathedral between 1996 -and 2012. The report includes a detailed assessment of the standing fabric and of surviving elements of medieval and later sculpture as well as extensive and detailed photographic and drawn records.

3. 84 Gambier Parry Gardens  HER 2177
   NGR SO 8366 1979   October 2012
   Watching Brief
   Foundations Archaeology

A watching brief was undertaken during building works. No archaeological finds or features were identified within the monitored area.

4. The Old Crypt School Room, Church of St Mary de Crypt  HER 2181
   NGR SO 8308 1841   February 2013-08-29
   Evaluation
   Avon Archaeology

Two test-pits were excavated within the Old School Room, the work was undertaken as a volunteer excavation overseen by Avon Archaeology. The evaluation recovered an assemblage of pottery of Roman, medieval and post-medieval date. Stratified deposits dating to the 12th-13th century were identified in one of the test-pits. Otherwise all features and deposits investigated appear to have been of post-medieval date (often containing residual earlier material). Both test-pits revealed that the lower courses and foundations of the Crypt School walls were of different construction than the wall above and were bonded with a different mortar, this may reflect a distinct and earlier phase of construction.

5. Land at Matson Lane  HER 2193
   NGR SO 8482 1517   July 2013-08-29
   Evaluation
   Foundations Archaeology

This evaluation comprised two trenches located on land to the south east of the medieval ‘Red Well’ on Robinswood Hill. The evaluation identified that the area had been subjected to extensive truncation - no archaeological finds or deposits were identified.

6 - 15. All part of Gloucestershire County Council (Kingsholm Archaeology Project)

6. 114 London Road  HER 2200
   NGR SO 8428 1888   July 2012
   Archaeologists and volunteers excavated a 1.5m by 1.5m test pit in the garden of 114 London Road. The investigation did not reach natural geology nor were any archaeological features identified. Residual pottery of Roman and medieval date was recovered from modern contexts.

7. 92 Henry Road  HER 2201
   NGR SO 8390 1917   July 2012
   Archaeologists and volunteers excavated a 1.5m by 1.5m test pit in the garden of 92 Henry Road. The investigation identified a 1st century Roman ditch. Pottery found in an overlying deposit may be indicative of an adjacent inhumation.
8. 3 Kingsholm Square  
HER 2202  
NGR SO 8344 1944  
July 2013
A test pit excavated in this location revealed two phases of Roman activity, a 1st century occupation layer and two 2nd century pits or post holes.

9. 21 Edwy Parade  
HER 2203  
NGR SO 8337 1938  
August 2012
The excavation of a single test pit in the garden of this property revealed a deposit containing 2nd century Roman pottery which was sealed by a mixed deposit containing a mix of Roman, medieval and post-medieval deposits. The natural geology was not reached by hand excavation but was recorded via auger readings.

10. 5 Lansdown Road  
HER 2204  
NGR SO 8379 1945  
August 2012
A single test pit was excavated in the garden of this property. A cut feature with vertical sides of medieval date was discovered as well as a circular feature dating to the Roman period. Neither feature was fully excavated due to time constraints.

11. 32A Denmark Road  
HER 2205  
NGR SO 8399 1923  
August 2012
A test pit was excavated to a depth of 1.23m below ground level. No discernable features were revealed but two layers of exclusively Roman activity were detected, the lowest dated by 1st century pottery. Pottery of 11th and 12th century date was also recovered from a higher level.

12. Hillfield Gardens, London Road  
HER 2206  
NGR SO 8432 1901  
September 2012
A single trench, measuring 5m by 1.40m was hand excavated in the north east corner of Hillfield Gardens. The investigation revealed a probable Roman feature and two medieval features along with two deposits which were not investigated. These were sealed at depth beneath subsoil deposits of late medieval to post-medieval date.

13. 14 Kingsholm Square  
HER 2207  
NGR SO 8334 1950  
October 2012
The excavation of a single test pit revealed only post medieval and modern deposits, although re-deposited early Roman pottery was also recovered.

14. 90 Kingsholm Road  
HER 2208  
NGR SO 8357 1961  
February 2013
A test pit excavated in this location uncovered a series of post medieval deposits containing some re-deposited Roman pottery.

15. 92 Estcourt Road  
HER 2209  
NGR SO 8403 1957  
April 2013
A single test pit was excavated in this garden. A pit containing Roman and medieval pottery was recorded cutting the natural. Residual Roman and medieval pottery was also recovered from overlying post-medieval deposits.

16. Former Civil Service Playing Field  
HER 2210  
NGR SO 8360 1951  
October 2012
A trial trench excavated in this location identified two pits and a feature dating to the 1st century AD and several other possible Roman features. Large areas of post-medieval sand/gravel quarrying were identified. On investigation these features were shown to contain large quantities of residual Roman pottery and other finds.

17. 31 Matson Lane  
HER 2211  
NGR SO 8486 1482  
August 2013
Evaluation  
Archaeological Research Services Ltd
The excavation of a single trench in this location revealed no surviving archaeological remains. The area may have been disturbed during previous building work on an adjacent site.

18. Gloucester Flood Alleviation Scheme  
HER TBC  
Throughout Kingsholm  
January to June 2013
Watching brief  
Wessex Archaeology
A watching brief was undertaken during construction works for the Gloucester Flood Alleviation Scheme on Kingsholm Road, Denmark Road, Lansdown Road, North Road and Edwy Parade. The watching brief identified a number of archaeological features including a 1st century timber lined pit on the junction of Kingsholm Road and Denmark Road and a metalled surface along Kingsholm Road.
FIELDWORK AT WOEFUL LAKE FARM, SHERBORNE

Ann Maxwell

Introduction

Resistivity and fluxgate gradiometer surveys carried out by the National Trust in 2009 over a scheduled burial mound (NGR: SP 15517 13121) showed linear anomalies over both the barrow and its ditch and continuing beyond the survey area. Prehistoric flint flakes and sherds of abraded Romano-British (RB) pot were picked up at the time of this survey, the pottery being found mainly to the east of the barrow. Three discrete concentrations of stone blocks and RB pottery to the east and south of the barrow were noted. The National Trust invited GADARG (as it then was) to organise field-walking and a resistivity survey to try to identify the precise location and extent of Romano-British activity there. Fieldwork was carried out in 2011 and 2013.

Site description

The site is on a wide ridge at c.175m AOD and the field slopes down to a spring. The underlying bedrock is White Limestone Formation, with a free-draining surface soil. There is a lot of loose stone lying on or just below the soil surface.

Survey method

A total of twenty-seven 20m squares were measured out over the two weekends, on a north/south orientation as close to the east and south sides of the barrow as possible (Figs 1 and 2). GPS readings were taken at a number of points in order to fix the area to the National OS Grid. The western edges of squares 3, 4, 5 and 6 are positioned 10m east of the eastern edge of the National Trust survey.

Survey results

The results (Fig 3), with high resistance pale and low resistance dark, show two c.2m wide lines of low resistance (features A and B) extending southeast from the barrow. They are not parallel to each other and may be ditches or hollow ways associated with the barrow. Feature B seems to finish just below the edge of square 20, as another line of low resistance (feature D) crosses squares 26 and 27 at a different angle. Feature D appears to be aligned with feature A and there are possible rectilinear anomalies between them, in area C - squares 17, 18, 22 and 23, with a line of high resistance (feature E) that might be a western

![Fig 1. Position of survey area](image-url)
edge to this area, and a less conspicuous line (feature G) marking an eastern edge. There was more loose stone on the soil surface in area C than elsewhere, although none of it showed any sign of having been worked. Feature F, in squares 1, 2 and 3, is a band of high resistance, c.10m wide, curving round the southeast edge of the barrow about 20m outside the barrow ditch, and this may be a bank contemporary with the barrow.

Field walking

This was carried out within the twenty-seven squares of the resistivity survey to avoid trampling on any more of the cereal crop that was starting to grow. The crop was further advanced in the more northern squares, which made it more difficult to see the soil surface and might explain the lower number of finds there.

Pieces of flint, both chalkland and pebble flints, were collected from most squares. It had all been worked, but there were no retouched pieces. The assemblage mostly consists of cores and flakes, some with cores and some utilised. The cores could be Late Mesolithic or Early Neolithic, and the flakes are possibly all Neolithic, so they are not necessarily associated with the barrow. The presence of cores suggests that the flint was being worked somewhere on the site. A surprisingly large proportion of the flints have been burnt at some time.

Almost all the other finds can be dated to the Romano-British period. Pottery was collected from every square and includes Severn Valley ware, grey wares, black burnished, Samian and Oxfordshire colour-coated wares. There were 7 sherds of mortaria and one from a strainer. A professional report on the pottery from squares 14-27 gives a date range spanning the 2nd to 4th centuries, with the latest fabric being found in squares 18, and 22-27.
Assemblage is quite diverse, with a range of fine table-wares, specialist wares, storage jars and domestic coarse-wares, with quite a high level of Samian.\(^3\)

Abraded RB ceramic building material was found in every square apart from 9 and 10, with the largest number of pieces in square 22. Pieces of box flue tile were collected from squares 16, 17, 21, 22 and 27. A piece of tile with part of an ARVERI stamp was found in square 11, and it is suggested that this was part of a \(\text{pila}\) for a hypocaust.\(^4\) One piece of possible paving stone (Old Red Sandstone) was found in square 27.

One coin was collected from square 15, and has been identified as an irregular imitation of \(c.\text{AD }350-364.\)\(^5\) A circular copper-alloy object with concentric rings, \(c.30\text{mm diameter, from square 25 has been identified as a furniture fitting of the RB period (Fig 4). \ It is virtually identical to a piece recorded on the Portable Antiquities website (GLO-58D706).\) All other metal finds were made of iron, and include a probable Romano-British knife with a handle (square 21), a leaf-shaped piece that might be another knife, and a number of nails.

Pieces of iron slag were found in squares 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27, with the largest quantities in squares 24 and 25. This suggests that iron-working was being carried out on the eastern side of the surveyed area.

A large piece of grinding stone, approximately one quarter of the complete stone, which would have had a diameter of \(c.520\text{mm, was found in square 22.\) It was made from Old Red Sandstone and was probably the upper stone of a rotary quern. It has been dated to the Romano-British period.\(^6\) This has been sent for expert analysis to discover the source of the stone.

A carved stone 650mm high was found in square 15. The stone has tapered sides with two roll mouldings on each side, and a small depression in the top (Figs 5-7). The back is flat. The front is plough-damaged, but may have had a carved figure. The stone is Oolitic Limestone, probably from Taynton, Oxfordshire.\(^7\) The piece has been identified as a miniature portable altar dating to the 3rd or 4th century AD.\(^8\) and is similar to altars found at Waltham Villa, Whittington (see, Henig, ‘Miniature Altar from Waltham Villa, Whittington,\(\text{this issue}\) and Chedworth.\(^9\)

**Discussion and conclusions**

The flint finds attest to activity on the site in the Neolithic period, but not necessarily to settlement here. Their presence may have no connection with the round barrow.
The presence of ceramic building materials is evidence of at least one substantial building in the Romano-British period, even though the geophysics results do not show the precise location. Flue tiles show that there was at least one heated room. No mosaic tesserae have been collected, but it is possible that any decorated floor could have slumped and disappeared into the void beneath. The lower readings in area C, showing dark on the print out, imply a spread of deeper soil cover that could be the result of such a collapse. The resistivity results and the pottery finds also suggest that there were buildings in area C. Only excavation could discover whether this is the case.

The diversity of the pottery assemblage, including the Samian and fine table-wares, the portable altar and the furniture fitting together with the building evidence suggests the presence of a well-appointed household on the site, rather than just a basic farmstead.

It is hoped that further geophysics and field walking can be carried out. This would show the extent of the site and might produce more precise dating evidence. However, it seems unlikely that resistivity surveys will enable the exact plotting of actual buildings, either because of the quantity of loose stone, or because any surviving foundations are more than 1m deep. Perhaps the combination of geophysics results and the distribution of building materials would justify a small excavation at some time in the future.
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The altar, found during the Time Team excavation on the Waltham villa site in 2000, is carved from a small block of Oolitic limestone. It measures 100 mm in height, 65mm in width and 44mm in depth. On the front face a circle has been cut, which is bisected by a horizontal transverse line and quartered with a saltire cross (Fig 1). Above, and to the left and right, is a roll moulding. On the right this was evidently roughly carved towards the top in order to give the impression of a capital (perhaps of the Corinthian order), although on the left, admittedly, the moulding is not complete and there is no sign of any further embellishment. The left and right faces of the block are scored with three deep vertical grooves (Fig 2). The focus of the altar, for the placement of offerings, is on the top and is approximately 25mm square and 10mm deep, with a central raised umbo measuring 10mm in diameter (Fig 3).

The general impression is therefore that the front of the altar was being treated architecturally as though it were an aedicula shrine housing, instead of an anthropomorphic deity, an abstract motif which might have been understood by the dedicator as the (solar) wheel. While, of course, the altar is self-evidently to be associated with religious activity, this might just as easily have been in the context of a simple household shrine as in that of a public temple.

The closest parallels are the votive altars from the complex at the National Trust site at 'Chedworth', actually in Yanworth, generally regarded as a villa though the main building possibly served as the guest house for a sanctuary. One of the altars, is cut with a simple saltire cross between mouldings; another, has a standing figure on the front with a quincunx of dots on its body, which when joined up together would have created a saltire, while on its right side is a circle bisected by a horizontal line and on the left a circle quartered by a cross. These have already been noted by Miranda Aldhouse-Green as representing solar wheel symbols. A third miniature altar from Chedworth figures on its main face a warrior figure with a quincunx of dots on its belly; it is said to be inscribed with the name of the Treveran god Lenus Mars, though this has been doubted by both Henig and Tomlin. It should be noted that a fourth miniature altar, from Corinium, has a standing figure of perhaps a warrior-god carved in low relief on its front face. The newly discovered miniature altar from Woeful Lake, Sherborne, (see Fieldwork at Woeful Lake Farm, Sherborne Ô this issue), although apparently plain apart from its focus and the mouldings towards the top on its two sides, may also belong to this same discrete group.

There is a strong possibility that the standing figure on three of these miniature altars and the symbols on the others represents a local, Cotswold deity who can be equated with the much more Classical looking figures in the likeness of the Roman god Mars, shown on altars from Bisley Common, Chalford and Kings Stanley. In this regard it may be noted that a miniature statue pedestal from the former site is scored on the front with three saltire crosses, the same device we have noted at Chedworth. In addition one of the limestone hounds from the temple of Mars Nodens at Lydney Park likewise has a saltire cross scored between its paws.

Intriguingly, too, a relief from Lemington near Dorn, in the site museum at Chedworth, portrays a standing figure, evidently female, with on her left side a spear resting on a base cut with a similar cross. An accompanying inscription describes her as Dea Regina, 'the queen goddess'. Might the cross imply that this goddess was regarded by her votaries as the female aspect, or the consort, of the same Mars-like deity? Such simplistic identifications of the saltire cross with the god Mars may rely too much on our striving to interpret native, 'Celtic' concepts in Classical terms. Interpretation was never straightforward and, a figure of genius type from Custom Scrubs near Bisley, is said to have been named Mars Olludius on its accompanying inscription (not now visible, and apparently weathered away, see Collingwood and Wright).

Were two miniature reliefs showing figures standing within what may be intended as wickerwork excavated at Wycomb, Andoversford, very close indeed to the Walton villa, in fact simply other versions of the same deity? They have been described in publication as genii loci, but that simply means that they were gods of a particular place, as indeed all these Cotswold deities were.

The employment of symbols on our altars may be a survival from a pre-iconic age. Apart from the miniature altars, saltire crosses continued to be engraved on votive metal axes like an example from the Romano-Celtic temple at Woodcote, Oxfordshire.
another site where Mars was certainly venerated. It is also displayed in a far more sophisticated context in the mosaics attributed to the 4th-century Corinian Saltire school, represented not only at Cirencester, but for example at Whittington, as well as at Chedworth and North Leigh, Oxfordshire.\textsuperscript{14} Even more intriguing is the use of the saltire cross as an element incorporated into the ubiquitous early Christian motif, the chi-rho. The little votive leaves embossed with chi-rho symbols from the Water Newton Treasure may have appealed to votaries, accustomed to invoking Mars and other deities, precisely because of the presence of this traditional element.\textsuperscript{15} Closer at hand there are the stone slabs, probably from around the nymphaeum at Chedworth that were Christianised with incised chi-rho symbols,\textsuperscript{16} which might mark less a break with the pagan past than an attempt to blend it with the new religion.

While many questions remain to be answered it is virtually certain that the main purpose of the symbol was to protect people, animals and crops. Cotswold religious art with its Mars and Mercury figures, its genii cucullati and mother goddesses overwhelmingly projects the same message and thus brings us very close to the hopes and fears of the peasantry who inhabited the Romano-British countryside.
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EXCAVATIONS AT BRIDGES GARAGE, TETBURY ROAD, CIRENCESTER: INTERIM REPORT

E.R. McSloy and Martin Watts (Cotswold Archaeology)

Introduction

Between September and December 2011, Cotswold Archaeology carried out an archaeological watching brief and subsequent excavation on the site of Bridges Garage, just to the south of the junction of Tetbury Road and Hammond Way in Cirencester (NGR SP 01930177; Fig. 1). The work was undertaken on behalf of St James Place Wealth Management in advance of planned development of the site (currently in use as a car park). The site, which in the Roman period would have been just outside of the town walls and adjacent to the course of the Fosse Way (Tetbury Road), was known to be within the area of Corinium's western cemetery, but little in the way of archaeological remains was thought to have survived the construction of the 1960s garage, a development which itself was subject to an archaeological watching brief undertaken by Richard Reece, when 46 cremations and 8 inhumations were recorded. However, as work progressed it became clear that considerable numbers of Roman burials had survived the garage construction, and by the end of fieldwork a further 71 inhumations and 3 urned cremations had been recovered (Fig. 2), making this the largest investigation of a Roman cemetery in Cirencester since the early 1970s.

Ceramics and other artefacts recovered from some of the graves indicate that the cemetery was in use from the late 1st century to the 4th century AD. It was organised into different areas divided by ditches that were generally parallel or perpendicular to the Fosse Way (see Fig. 2). There was also evidence, in the form of two robbed-out wall foundation trenches, for a rectangular or (more probably) a square enclosure within the cemetery, possibly the remains of a mausoleum. Detailed analysis of the human remains and of the stratigraphic record from the site continues, but current phasing of the graves suggests that most of those from within the projected square enclosure (and some of those adjacent) were of earlier Roman date, with later Roman graves more evenly spread across the cemetery.

A total of 39 inhumations contained artefacts interpreted as grave goods, though in 28 instances these were simply iron hobnails or other fittings representing the remains of footwear. However, a few of the graves, of both earlier and later Roman date, also yielded some exceptional grave goods.

Earlier Roman

A cluster of 11 graves contained within or respecting the square enclosure are from the early or middle Roman period (c. AD 100 to 225). Two of these graves, both children of indeterminate sex, contained notable grave goods: Grave 715, of a child of about 8 years, contained a complete pottery flagon of earlier 2nd-century type (Fig. 3); and Grave 729, of a child of 2 to 3 years, contained a pottery tettine (or child's feeding cup) and an enamelled cockerel figurine (Figs. 4 and 5). The cockerel is the single most significant object from the site. It is 125mm in height, and originally may have been mounted on a pedestal as it is broken below the lower legs. It consists of three parts; body, wings and tail which were soldered together. The breast, wings, eyes, comb and tail are inlaid with enamel which now appears blue and green. Only nine figurines of this type are known, from British sites, Germany and the Low Countries; the Bridges garage example is the only one to survive with its tail and the only known British example from a grave. The association of the cockerel with the god Mercury is well known and statuary commonly features a cockerel by Mercury's foot. Thus the presence of the cockerel figurine in a grave may denote adherence to the cult of Mercury, one function of whom was as 'herdsman for the dead', accompanying the souls of the recently deceased to the afterlife.

Later Roman

The majority of the burials containing grave goods are dated to the later Roman period, after c. AD 225/250. Of these, nine contained items other than hobnails, mainly consisting of small personal or decorative items. The six adult female burials among this group included single or multiple arm ornaments of copper alloy, jet, shale or bone/ivory. The single male burial containing grave goods was accompanied by a fragmented glass vessel. Two burials of indeterminate sex (one a child of approximately 6 years) contained bracelets and beads of glass or jet. The child burial in Grave 735 was notable for the quantity of jet/shale, glass and copper alloy ornaments (below and Figs. 6 and 7). The 347 jet beads (many 2mm in diameter) come from two or more necklaces and a wrist ornament. Grave 735 also included the only coin recovered, a barbarous radiate of c. AD 270-90. It is probably significant that Grave
735 was located close to the earlier Roman Grave 729 containing the cockerel figurine. Although separated by a period of a century or more, the close proximity of these two richly appointed graves is unlikely to be coincidental. The later burial was probably located intentionally close to a marked burial of some status, perhaps one associated with a renowned and locally important official or family.

Among the accompanied adult female burials, that in Grave 802 was notable in including six arm ornaments of copper alloy, bone, jet, shale and a composite of copper alloy, glass and bone (Fig. 8). A hollow tubular bracelet from this burial (Fig. 9), and a second from Grave 1141, are rare examples of a type dateable to the second half of the 4th century AD.

One of very few non-decorative items recorded from a burial is an iron 'lift' key from the adult female burial in Grave 741. Its position in the burial suggested that it hung from a belt. Keys are not uncommon from Romano-British and later (post-Roman) burials and their presence may denote the status of property ownership, or may symbolise a religious adherence, the key being an attribute of the Celtic goddess Epona.
Evidence for burial ritual

Possible evidence for burial ritual came from the projected square enclosure, which featured a number of graves located within or otherwise respecting its projected limits (Fig. 2). The nine graves within the structure were remarkable in containing significantly large quantities of pottery within their fills (704 sherds, equivalent to 57% of the total recovered from grave fills).

This grave-fill pottery is heavily fragmented and is unlikely to have been deliberately deposited, and so probably represents broken material discarded within the walled enclosure that became incorporated into the grave soils. The pottery groups are consistent in
their compositions, indicating a date of the 2nd century AD. Samian is uncommon (11 sherds, or 1.4% of the Roman pottery) but occurs as south and Central Gaulish types; none of the forms need post-date c. AD 150.

Most striking compositionally are the quantities of amphorae sherds, almost all comprising flat-based Gallic wine-carrying types (73 sherds, or 10% of the total), that were recovered from each of the nine graves, ranging from two to 20 sherds. No cross-context joins have been found and it is clear from the number of handle fragments recovered that several vessels are represented. Flagons are well-represented (14 vessels; 23% of the total), however cups/beakers are uncommon (4 vessels; 7%); as are platters/dishes (4 vessels; 7%). Most unusual are the rimsherds from no fewer than six *tazze* (10% of the total); these are distinctive vessels with frilled rims, thought to have functioned as incense burners.

The combination of wine amphoras, flagons and particularly *tazze* are untypical characteristics of 2nd century AD pottery groups elsewhere from Cirencester. Given its location, the most plausible interpretation is that the pottery relates to funerary or post-funerary ceremonies that were undertaken within the walled enclosure, involving the consumption of wine or its pouring as libations.
Anglo-Saxon activity

There was also some evidence for Anglo-Saxon activity, from a single feature that was partially exposed to the south-east of the walled enclosure, and which is interpreted as a Sunken-Featured Building (Fig. 2). A total of 34 sherds (265g) of Anglo-Saxon pottery was recovered, making this group one of the largest recorded from the town. The range of undecorated sherds in handmade organic and limestone-tempered fabrics within the group is typical for the early to middle Anglo-Saxon period in the region, and the group is broadly dateable stylistically across the 6th to 8th centuries AD.
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Introduction

This paper emanates from an ongoing landscape archaeology study of Hazleton Manor (NGR ST 927 983) situated 7km/4 miles north-east of Tetbury (Figure 1). It primarily focuses on the results of documentary research and a map regression exercise that is being used to inform a programme of fieldwork.

Several years ago the author conducted an analysis of the 1795 and 1828 estate plans of Hazleton to place the estate within its wider landscape context. During the course of that research a 1617 survey of the property by John Norden, the Crown surveyor, enabled some individual buildings and fields, as well some agricultural practices, to be broadly traced back until that time. Norden's survey also provides a valuable link to the medieval landscape history of Hazleton which had been held by the Cistercian community of Kingswood Abbey from c.1140 until 1538. Kingswood's monastery was located at Hazleton between c.1140 and c.1158 and then the estate was retained as the abbey’s largest grange until...
Dissolution. However the community ceased to occupy Hazleton in the early 14th century when the grange became leased.

Cistercian communities are frequently characterised, incorrectly in this author's view, as seeking to locate themselves in virgin, remote, or at least isolated locations with poor quality land they could develop. As will be illustrated Hazleton was not remote, and less than sixty years earlier Domesday shows it to be a relatively valuable manor with an annual revenue of £16. The form of that Domesday manor, the Cistercian monastic grange, and the post-medieval estate of Hazleton were probably established during an early post-Conquest redistribution of Norman manorial holdings around Tetbury. This article analyses and discusses the post-Conquest landscape history of Hazleton and its environs but does not attempt to explore in detail the possibility of landscape continuity from earlier periods.

Location, description, and geology

Hazleton Manor lies between 130m and 155m Ordnance Datum in an undulating landscape on the south-eastern dip slope of the Cotswolds (Figure 1). The landscape of the area is currently characterised as 'Dip-Slope Lowland' and described as a 'productive agricultural landscape of mixed arable and improved pasture, together with more limited areas of permanent pasture, mainly within the valley bottoms'. The estate straddles the post-medieval parishes of Rodmarton and Cherington, with that boundary meandering north to south through the estate past Shepherds Cottages (Figure 1). The estate currently comprises c.200ha/494 acres of agricultural land, a manor house, eleven other residential properties, and a number of farm buildings.

The geology of the estate differs somewhat from that of the surrounding area which is mainly on Forest Marble. Outcrops of Great Oolite and Athelstan Oolite are prominent throughout and a Quaternary head deposit lies just within its north-western boundary. A geological fault runs northwards through the estate, passing along the eastern side of a small dry valley where the manor house lies (Figure 2). The main farm buildings are situated above the manor house on the opposing higher ground. There are several disused springs and ponds on the estate, and at least one spring was used for human consumption during the 19th century. All of the properties on the estate are currently supplied by a single private well, reputedly of medieval origin, located next to the manor house.

Estate boundaries

The estate's current boundaries are relevant to any understanding of its landscape history and therefore merit detailed description. The northern estate boundary follows the modern ecclesiastical and civil parish boundary with Cherington. However prior to 1935 this boundary was with a detached part of Avening parish that encompassed the settlements of Aston and Lowesmoor. This had been held by the Crown in 1086 but probably shortly afterwards was granted to L'Abbaye aux Dames, Caen, and then to the Nuns of Syon from 1415 until Dissolution in 1539. The eastern boundary is delimited by a byway running NNE to SSW that was the former Tetbury to Cheltenham road which fell out of use when a plan to
turnpike it through to Tewkesbury was abandoned in 1785. Figure 1 illustrates that the full extent of Rodmarton parish's western boundary with Cherington (and previously also with Avening) lies along this route - except at Hazleton. The antiquity of the route is difficult to gauge but it is suggested that it may have been an ancient ridgeway and/or salt way. The southern estate boundary is the former Romano-British, or pre-Romano-British ridgeway route from Cirencester towards Chavenage Green, later the Longtree Hundred meeting place. There, one route carried on to Bath and another to the small Roman town of Kingscote and then towards a Severn crossing point. The estate has a linear western boundary within Cherington parish which was established under a 1730 private enclosure Act after the owner of Hazleton and the principal landowner in Cherington had exchanged some open field lands. Hazleton was not included in the 1793 Rodmarton and Coates joint enclosure award. Norden's survey shows that all of Hazleton now within Rodmarton had been enclosed before 1617. This suggests either monastic enclosure or that at an even earlier date this core part of the estate had been held in severalty.

In this area of Gloucestershire ancient routes and prehistoric barrows appear to have been frequently employed as medieval boundary markers. In this respect Rodmarton Long Barrow (also known as Windmill Tump) is adjacent to and overlooks the crossing of the two routes that partially form Hazleton's boundary. Two Bronze Age barrows also lie beside the former Romano-British route at Hazleton (Figure 1). Another Bronze Age barrow recently identified by the National Mapping Programme lies on the Rodmarton/Cherington parish boundary within Hazleton. These prehistoric barrows may have been employed as both routeway and boundary markers.

### Hazleton's medieval environs

From the above it can be seen that the medieval and post-medieval landscape history of Hazleton cannot simply be considered within the context of a single ecclesiastical or civil parish. That is one reason why Hazleton has been described above as being situated near Tetbury rather than 'in Rodmarton and Cherington'. Another reason for doing so, discussed in more detail below, is that at least during the 11th and 12th centuries Hazleton's history was directly linked to that of Tetbury. In general there has been little archaeological or historical research into the medieval settlement and field patterns in the wider landscape around Hazleton or Tetbury. Settlement descriptions framed within the loaded terms of 'parish', 'village', and 'hamlet' may therefore be misleading, as would any assumption that agriculture in this area was predominately arable until the 15th century. For example, Moore rather confusingly observes that Rodmarton was one of the most fragmented Gloucestershire villages in 1086, containing ten separate estates (including Hazleton) in two separate hundreds. Jurica also describes Rodmarton as a village but the other settlements in that parish as hamlets. He also presumes that Rodmarton was the oldest settlement as a priest is recorded there in 1086. However the 'village' of Rodmarton only consisted of four houses and a church in c.1710.

A different, although perhaps no less confusing portrayal of the settlement pattern around Hazleton emerges when data from the Domesday Book is considered. See Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domesday Place</th>
<th>Heads of Households</th>
<th>Value to Lord/s in 1086</th>
<th>Taxed Hidage</th>
<th>Ploughs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton (1 manor)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>£16</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherington (1 manor)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodmarton (2 manors)</td>
<td>6 (inc. priest)</td>
<td>£3 10s</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culkerton (4 manors)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>£7 10s</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarlton (2/3 manors)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>£6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

The Domesday places names correspond with the names of the medieval tithings, except for Hazleton which has never been described as a tithing. Although no tithe maps are available for Rodmarton or Cherington most of the tithing boundaries can be roughly reconstructed from parish and estate maps, surveys, and documentary descriptions. Figure 3 shows these tithings, the names and general locations of open fields, and the postulated extent of common downland in c.1200. It only shows the extent of Hazleton's 'enclosed' land that is now in Rodmarton parish. The medieval field system which had been employed there is not known, but the map indicates the location of a particularly large single field of 32 ha/80 acres called 'Inlande' that was in existence before 1617. As the exact locations of all medieval settlements in the area are unclear and require further research, none have been shown.
The Domesday manor

Hasedene (‘the valley where hazels grow’, OE haesel + denu) was held by Elnoc before 1066.\textsuperscript{25} After 1066 it was first granted to Bishop Odo, then by 1074 to Robert d'Oilly who then held the adjacent manor of Cherington.\textsuperscript{26} By 1086 Hazleton had passed to d'Oilly's sworn 'brother-in-arms' Roger d'Ivry who also held the manors of Tetbury and Tetbury Upton. He also owned a small manor in Culkerton and leased the principal one there from Durand of Gloucester who owned the adjoining manor of Ashley, then in Wiltshire. As ‘brothers-in-arms’ d'Oilly and d'Ivry appear to have acted in concert, exchanged lands, and held lands jointly.

Hazleton was assessed at three hides and three yardlands plus fifteen acres of meadow (c.190ha/465 acres).\textsuperscript{27} No other meadow is recorded in any Rodmarton or Culkerton manors and only four acres in Cherington. Hazleton's demesne had seventeen serfs and four ploughs and there were seven half-villeins and one bordar who together had three ploughs. The estate was also assessed with half a mill although there are no streams within Hazleton lands ‘in Rodmarton’ nor elsewhere in Rodmarton or Culkerton manors. However there is a stream in Cherington and in 1086 a mill was assessed for Miles Crispin's manor there.\textsuperscript{28} The number of serfs at Hazleton appears to have greatly exceeded that normally needed for demesne plough teams, and the estate had an exceptionally high revenue of £16 compared to its taxed hidage. This suggests that a number of the serfs may have contributed economically other than as ploughmen and arable labourers. They may have been shepherds, cowherds, swineherds, dairymaids, or household servants. Although not covered by Domesday, later evidence shows that the common downland in Cherington was shared with the owner of Hazleton manor until its enclosure in 1730. When Kingswood Abbey acquired the manor in c.1140, two carucates (hides) of Hazleton arable land (c. 97ha/240 acres) lay in Cherington open fields.\textsuperscript{29}

The key to understanding the Domesday and subsequent landholdings at Hazleton, and perhaps as importantly other landholdings around Tetbury, is the post-Conquest relationships and obligations between Robert d'Oilly, Roger d'Ivry, and Miles Crispin, all of whose principal landholdings lay in Oxfordshire and Berkshire. It has already been mentioned that d'Oilly and d'Ivry were sworn 'brothers-in-arms'. Before the Domesday survey Robert d'Oilly had held Tetbury and Tetbury Upton manors before transferring them to d'Ivry, and had held Cherington manor before it possibly passed in marriage to his son-in-law Crispin. Robert d'Oilly built Oxford Castle in 1071 and before 1086 both he and Roger d'Ivry endowed the castle's St. George's Chapel with most of the tithes from all of their lands in Tetbury, Cherington, and Hazleton. These tithes were later transferred to Osney Abbey.\textsuperscript{30} This early post-Conquest grouping of landholdings around Tetbury under Robert d'Oilly and Roger d'Ivry, when considered in conjunction with Kingswood Abbey being granted the parcum (park) at Tetbury to move its monastery to in c.1158, suggests that an early Norman castle-park or manorial-park complex may have been created in Tetbury by either d'Oilly or d'Ivry.\textsuperscript{31} From a landscape perspective this
proposal is reinforced when the location and topography of the park granted to the abbey is viewed in relation to the site of ‘Tetbury Camp’.  

Several other points might also be postulated from the foregoing. Firstly, the owners of Hazleton and Cherington manors were both assessed in Domesday as holding two hides in Cherington. This suggests that there may once have been a combined estate jointly held by d'Oilly and d'Ivry before the manor of Cherington and half of the open fields and rights to downland were transferred to Miles Crispin. There was possibly only a single mill in Cherington in 1086 that was assessed as one for Crispin and as one-half for d'Ivry. The half-villeins referred to in Hazleton in 1086 may not have held half tenements as suggested by Jurica, with the term instead being used to represent villeins who worked for two lords. This also leads to the possibility of a more general double counting of the number of households during the Domesday survey, and that the population of Hazleton and Cherington may have been located in more than just two settlements. Therefore when Kingswood Abbey acquired Hazleton it would not necessarily have been as large or have been developing as a single 'nucleated village' as proposed by Dyer.  

**The Cistercian monastic holding**

**Establishment at Hazleton**  
Details of Kingswood Abbey's foundation, and the circumstances, chronology, and frequency of the community's various early moves, including that to Hazleton, are vague, very fragmentary, and often contradictory, resulting in differing interpretations of these being made in current literature. The following is therefore based on this author's research that is being prepared as a new interpretation of Kingswood Abbey's early years.  

By 1115 the d'Ivry barony based in Oxfordshire had passed to the St. Valery family. However, during the Anarchy all of Reginald de St. Valery's English lands were confiscated owing to his support for the Empress Matilda. As a consequence King Stephen granted to John de St. John of Oxfordshire a number of St. Valery properties there, but only Hazleton in Gloucestershire. With Stephen's approval, therefore before early 1141 when St. John joined the Angevin cause, he granted Hazleton to Kingswood Abbey. Kingswood Abbey had only been founded in 1139 by a minor lord, William de Berkeley, and had initially been established at an as yet untraced location near the present village of Kingswood, near Wotton-under-Edge. Until now it has been widely accepted that Kingswood Abbey purchased and moved to Hazleton because the hostilities of the Anarchy threatened them at their original location. However no one has questioned how a newly formed Cistercian house could have financed such a purchase, especially when its founder gave no further support after the house's establishment. It is therefore probable that Hazleton was a pure grant to the abbey and that the community moved to Hazleton because it offered better resources and opportunities for expansion. The original site was completely abandoned at that time as the new community may have not had the manpower, ability, or even the desire to maintain two properties some distance apart, especially during troubled times.  

A newly formed Cistercian house, such as Kingswood, would normally consist of an abbot, at least twelve choir monks, and a number of lay brothers. Most of the latter would have been expected to be recruited locally. A new Cistercian community was required to have an oratory, a refectory, a dormitory, a guesthouse, and a gatekeeper's cell, although in practical terms these features might initially be housed within just one or two buildings, usually of wooden construction initially. However, unlike many other Cistercian sites, building limestone was readily accessible at Hazleton, making the construction of some stone buildings, foremost their church, more likely. Alternatively, the community may have initially taken up residence in the buildings of any existing settlement. If so, there is the issue of what happened to the inhabitants. However they cannot have been moved out to another abbey property in Culkerton as suggested by Dyer, as Kingswood owned no property there until ninety years later. Any individual secular settlement within Hazleton lands may not have been particularly large, and some of the existing inhabitants would no doubt have been welcomed into the new community as lay brothers, servants, or hired labour. There is also evidence that some of the abbey's lands, particularly those in Cherington, continued to be worked by villein tenants for some time. Indeed Kingswood's lands in Cherington never seem to have been fully consolidated into a single large holding in the way that Cistercian communities are frequently perceived as having desired. Therefore after being acquired by Kingswood in c.1140 Hazleton may have been operated on a quasi-manorial basis until the 13th century.  

In c.1158 Kingswood moved its monastery to a new location at Tetbury and Hazleton was retained as a grange, managed and partially worked by some of the community's lay brothers. The period of perhaps sixteen to eighteen years when the entire community was based at Hazleton may have provided sufficient time for them to construct some substantial buildings. However no traces of any remain. Gradiometer and resistivity surveys around the present manor house
produced no valuable results, probably as the area has been landscaped several times over the last few centuries.

**The problem of mapping Cistercian granges based on tithe-free lands**

The relationship between Cistercian lands and tithes is far more complicated than is often portrayed, and although a record of tithe-free lands might betray the existence of Cistercian grange holdings, and partially help identify their extents, it may not provide a complete or correct picture due to the complicated history of monastic and in particular Cistercian tithes. This issue is relevant to Kingswood’s initial acquisition of Hazleton and the later expansion of the grange’s landholdings.

When Kingswood acquired Hazleton c.1140 it had to pay tithes to St. George’s Chapel, Oxford, which was acquired by Osney Abbey in 1149. As a consequence a ‘villein tithe collector’ held half a virgate of land in either Cherington or Hazleton. In the early 13th century these tithes were quitclaimed in lieu of an annual pension of £2 to Osney Abbey and the half virgate returned to Kingswood Abbey. When Kingswood later purchased Culkerton manor from St. Oswald’s Priory, Gloucester (see below) these tithes were quitclaimed for a pension of £1 to Llantony Secunda Priory. Kingswood also purchased or was granted tithable lands in Cherington, Culkerton, and Rodmarton. It is also possible, but less likely, that the abbey was able to cultivate and therefore create additional ‘tithe-free’ land out of waste land in Cherington. The grange’s holdings were therefore a mixture of ‘tithe-free’ and tithable lands.

**Expansion and demesne farming**

From c.1158 until 1538 Hazleton remained Kingswood’s largest grange. It is mentioned in a papal privilege of 1174, ‘totum in Haseden in Chiretuna duas carrucatas terre’ (all in Hazleton and two carucates of arable land in Cherington), and in another of 1203, ‘grangiam de Haseldone cum omnibus pertinentiis, duas carucatas terre cum pasturis in villa de Therinton’ (the grange of Hazleton with all its appurtenances, and two carucates of arable land with pasture in the vill of Cherington). In the early 13th century the abbey bought more land in Cherington, which it then let. Sheep farming and wool export is indicated by 1212 when Kingswood had contacts with merchants in St. Omer. Figure 3 suggests that Hazleton and Cherington shared a relatively sizeable tract of downland compared to arable land. Large numbers of sheep could have been grazed on the downland and then cotted in Hazleton’s arable fields. The former Romano-British route running through Cherington would appear to have delineated the common downland from the main arable fields in both Cherington and at Hazleton.

The extent of Hazleton grange increased in 1231 when Kingswood bought the nearby manor of Culkerton with 48ha/120 acres of arable from St. Oswald’s Priory, Gloucester for £100. Further grants of land in Culkerton during the following years added c.9ha/22 acres, with the abbey also leasing some land. These acquisitions and leases also provided Hazleton grange with additional common pasture in Culkerton tithing.

By 1241 Kingswood appears to have been an important wool house, selling its old sheep and buying in Lincolnshire (Lindsey) rams for breeding. The relative numbers and distribution of lay brothers and servants between Kingswood’s seven granges at that time can be identified from the expenses for drink in 1240 and 1241. Hazleton accounted for one-third of the abbey’s total expense for lay brothers at granges and one-half of that for servants. However it is very unlikely that there were seventeen ‘living-in servants’ at the grange in 1240 as suggested by Dyer. Calculations based on the expenses for drink suggest that there may have been only seven lay brothers and three ‘living-in servants’ at Hazleton at that time.

The degree to which the grange employed the local population is illustrated by the abbey’s wage accounts for 1255-6. In 1255 there were seven ploughmen, five ox-drivers, three horse-drivers, two carters, two harvestmen, a horseman, a cowherd, a swineherd, a cook and boys of the grange, and a cook’s boy; at least twenty-six staff in total. In 1256 three of the ploughmen were described as ‘horseploughmen’. The seven ploughmen suggest that seven plough teams were employed, thus indicating that the grange may have had c.340ha/840 acres under arable. Although seven ploughs were also recorded for Hazleton in Domesday the three villein teams possibly worked for two lords. The 11th century teams are also unlikely to have been as effectively employed as those of the Cistercians one hundred and fifty years later.

The wages of Kingswood’s thirty-five shepherds were not allocated between granges and therefore the extent of sheep farming on any particular grange cannot be easily determined. Shepherds are shown under the separate accounting heading of ‘Pagenses’ which may be a reference to ‘Pagenses’, in the sense that the shepherds were a mobile group normally to be found ‘out in the country’, centrally managed from the monastery, and not attached to any particular grange. The lack of a specific reference to shepherds being employed at Hazleton has, however, led Jurica to suggest that there is no evidence for sheep farming...
As the grange then held lands across Hazleton, Cherington, and Culkerton, the twenty-six staff in 1255-6 and some of the shepherds are likely to have come from several different settlements. Kingswood was employing staff at all of its granges by this time. This may have been necessitated by its relatively fast acquisition of landholdings, particularly at Hazleton, Tetbury, and Kingswood without a corresponding growth in the number of lay brothers. Alternatively, the employment of staff may simply have been an expediency to more fully exploit the abbey’s assets. The purchase of Culkerton manor in 1231 may therefore have primarily been intended to secure a larger workforce for its Hazleton grange rather than to acquire more land.

The growth and importance of Hazleton during the 13th century is illustrated in the *Taxatio P. Nicholas IV* of 1291. Temporalities were assessed as nine carucates of land (c.435ha/1,080 acres) at 10s each (£4 10s 0d), a windmill at 6s, a fixed rent of £12 13s 2d, and stock at £3; in sum £20 9s 2d of Kingswood’s total assessment of £47 17s 2d for all of its properties. Hazleton was the only grange with any rental income. The mill mentioned was not the same mill as assessed for Hazleton in 1086, the subsequent history of which is unknown. At some time before 1274 the grange built a windmill that is said to have been still standing in 1559. Its location appears to have been on the rise between Hazleton and Culkerton that is now named Windmill Hill (Figure 1). The windmill was included in a 1535 abbey lease of Hazleton but it was transferred to Culkerton manor post-Dissolution. This might suggest that the mill was built after Kingswood purchased Culkerton manor in 1231 and that the purpose of it being built there was to serve Hazleton grange, manorially serve Culkerton and possibly Cherington, and perhaps also to commercially serve the market at Tetbury.

It has already been mentioned that none of the earliest monastic buildings at Hazleton have been identified. There is also no record or evidence for the existence of a grange chapel at Hazleton despite it being Kingswood's largest and most distant grange and it being strongly postulated, but not substantiated that there were grange chapels at Kingswood’s Tetbury and Calcot granges. Cistercian legislation allowed an oratory for lay brothers at granges, but initially opposed the provision of chapels for servants and hired staff to avoid conflict with local churches. However that rule was sometimes ignored and then later relaxed.

In 1290 Abbot Henry built a large new stone barn at Hazleton that subsequently burnt down in 1889 leaving only 38m/125 feet of walls remaining. It was said to have been the largest barn in Gloucestershire. Measurement of the remains estimated that the barn may have originally been about 41m/135 feet long and 13m/43 feet wide. The location and demise of this barn can be traced from the comparative mapping shown in Figure 4. There are three other extant buildings at Hazleton that appear to have medieval elements; these are currently being researched and surveyed by the author. It has
not so far been possible to associate any extant buildings in Cherington or Culkerton with Hazleton grange. However, Janik et al. suggest that earthworks at Hazleton and Culkerton may represent deserted medieval and/or post-medieval settlement associated with Hazleton grange.\textsuperscript{61} What these earthworks represent is still to be investigated but there are no earthworks near the grange complex at Hazleton that might suggest a large workers settlement.

\textit{14th century until Dissolution}

Little is known about Hazleton grange during the 14th and 15th centuries. In 1313 Brother Gilbert was the granger assisted by Brother William Le Ferour (blacksmith) when Cherington manor accused them and some grange staff of trespass, tree-felling, killing sheep, and assault.\textsuperscript{52} They would appear to be the last two lay brothers who inhabited the grange.

Kingswood Abbey had financial problems in the early 14th century and in 1318 leased the granges of Hazleton (including Culkerton manor) and Tetbury (including its open field lands at Charlton) to the Florentine but London citizen, Bernard Aringi.\textsuperscript{63} However he is not recorded as a partner in the Peruzzi Company as indicated by Dyer, who proposes that from 1318 Hazleton was a Peruzzi centre for large-scale wool dealing and which is perhaps evidenced by the possible construction of new sheepepotes.\textsuperscript{64} This proposition necessitates discussion as it may give the impression that the agricultural landscape of Hazleton was restructured from 1318 and predominately, if not entirely, given over to sheep farming. If so, such a change would have had a dramatic effect on the grange’s workforce and on local communities.

The Peruzzi Company was a Florentine quasi-permanent multiple partnership that specialised in merchant banking and commodity trading, both in grain and wool. In 1318 the Company only had a small presence in England and made a single contract with Kingwood Abbey for only eight sacks of wool.\textsuperscript{65} However Boniface de Peruch (Bonifazio di Tommaso Peruzzi) held the leases of both Hazleton and Tetbury granges by 1327 when he was personally assessed for the tax on them. He was the son of the chairman of the Fourth Peruzzi Company and its London manager for only a few years during the 1320s, but he was not then a partner.\textsuperscript{66} Boniface de Peruch therefore probably held the leases in his or in his family’s own right.

The 1327 Lay Subsidy Tax, levied at the rate of one twentieth of movable property, basically corn, wool, and livestock, mentions Peruch but also provides a very interesting and useful comparison of the agricultural values and therefore possible local importance of Hazleton and Tetbury granges compared to adjoining secular vills.\textsuperscript{67} The figures for Hazleton are shown in Table 2.

The 1334 Lay Subsidy Tax, levied at a fifteenth, was not assessed on individuals. Whilst the total amounts taxed for Cherington, Rodmarton, and Culkerton bear close relationship with those in 1327 no amount is shown for Hazleton.\textsuperscript{68} This is also the case for Tetbury grange, and therefore suggests that both granges were back in ecclesiastical hands by that date. The Peruzzi Company bought wool for export at Culkerton and Tetbury in 1338 but there is no indication that it exported any of its own.\textsuperscript{69} It should also be remembered that much of Hazleton’s arable land was spread throughout diverse open fields and that it also possessed a valuable windmill and a massive new grain barn. In summation, whilst Hazleton may have enabled Peruzzi interests to have a presence in Gloucestershire with possibly a trading centre for a very short term, there is no evidence this resulted in changes to agriculture practices at either Hazleton or Tetbury granges.

Dyer and Aldred conducted a very useful earthworks survey in the linear valley at Hazleton and identified two sheepepotes, a possible shepherd’s hut, pens, some field walls, and a terraced road.\textsuperscript{70} Dyer suggests that the sheepepotes were capable of holding c.650 sheep and that they possibly date from the early to mid 14th century when the grange was in Italian hands. However, the result of a map regression exercise which included the 1795 estate map (Figure 5) only partially supports that interpretation, instead suggesting that the area contains quite a palimpsest of multi-period features which can only be disentangled by detailed archaeological research and dating. No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vill/Grange</th>
<th>Individuals taxed</th>
<th>Total Tax</th>
<th>Highest Taxed Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46s 0 ½ d</td>
<td>Boniface de Peruch 46s 0 ½ d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherington</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35s 11 ¾ d</td>
<td>Adam Neel 7s 6 ¾ d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodmarton</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17s 3 ½ d</td>
<td>Stephen de Clenchcham 2s 0 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culkerton</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26s 3 ½ d</td>
<td>William le Duk 4s 9 ¾ d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
sheepcotes have been excavated in Gloucestershire for over fifty years and little is known about their internal arrangements. Therefore, if permitted, those at Hazleton could be excellent candidates for such an investigation.

From the mid 14th century lands in Culkerton began to be leased out to local tenants, and by the abbey's Dissolution in 1538 there were a dozen different tenants in Culkerton. However a large part of what had formed Hazleton grange in the later 13th century, including lands and pasture rights in Rodmarton, Cherington, and Culkerton, appears to have been singularly let until Dissolution. Whilst virtually all of the abbey's properties, including those immediately surrounding the monastery itself at Kingswood, were being rented for cash by 1538, perhaps unusually for that period Hazleton was being farmed out for rent in kind. A 1535 indenture describes Hazleton as comprising houses, arable lands, meadows, pastures, woods, underwoods, and windmill. The indenture also provides a detailed inventory and valuation of the agricultural stock of oxen, cows, sheep and grain, as well as listing the domestic goods owned by the abbey. The fifty-one year lease required that the annual payment of nine weys (about 104 hectolitres) of wheat and twelve weys (about 140 hectolitres) of barley was to be delivered well winnowed and threshed to the abbey's barn at Calcot. It would appear that Hazleton, despite its distance from the monastery, was still being regarded as the community's 'home farm', that is one providing some of its basic food supplies. One also cannot ignore the possible spiritual connection between the monastery at Kingswood and one of its earliest locations at Hazleton. At Dissolution this Hazleton lease was valued at £32 8s 0d out of a total valuation of £245 8s 8d for the abbey and its lands.

The post-medieval estate

The manor of Culkerton was sold in 1543 but Hazleton with its lands in Culkerton, Rodmarton, and Cherington was retained by the Crown, and then by the Prince of Wales's Commissioners until 1628. Hazleton had 344ha/851 acres of arable when surveyed in 1617. The Ducie family owned Hazleton from c.1660 until the early 19th century. During the latter part of that period the holding was split into two separate farms, one which is best described as the 'original' Hazleton estate and the other based around Trull Farm (initially named Down...
Farm) which was mainly formed from the enclosure of downland in Cherington, Rodmarton, and Culkerton.

Norden’s 1617 survey of Hazleton, when linked to information from the 1795 post-enclosure estate plan of the ‘original’ Hazleton estate shown in Figure 5, together with other documentary information, possibly helps identify the composition of Hazleton grange (excluding Culkerton manor) immediately prior to Kingswood’s Dissolution. The initial result of this work is shown in Figure 6. The names and locations of some of the field names are quite informative. A meadow named ‘Grankers Croft’ may be a corruption of ‘granger’s croft’, ‘Pigion House Leaze’ points to the earlier existence of a dovecote which has yet to be established archaeologically, where Dyer and Aldred identified field boundaries or sheep pens the single larger field named ‘Cunygre Meade’ suggests a rabbit warren, and ‘Grinding Stone Meadow’ perhaps suggests millstones, a very stony meadow, or one beside a stone quarry.

Overall, when the information shown in Figure 6 is considered in conjunction with the earlier and later sources discussed above there appears to be a remarkable degree of similarity between the extent of Hazleton’s enclosed and arable land in 1086 and when acquired by Kingswood in 1140 (c.190ha/465 acres), the amount of ‘tithe-free’ land in 1617 (180ha/444 acres), the estate’s size in 1795 (190ha/470 acres), and its current size (200ha/494 acres). However, it would be wrong to read too much into this, although when Ducie split the estate in the 18th century he appeared mindful to keep all tithe free, and therefore early acquired land, within his Hazleton estate.

**Conclusion**

From what started out as a straightforward documentary research and map regression exercise to inform archaeological fieldwork, new sources were discovered that add to and question a number of existing historical interpretations. It has been suggested that the early post-Conquest landscape in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norden’s 1617 Survey</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
<th>1795 Estate Plan</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House and gardens etc.</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>House &amp; Gardens etc.</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grankers (Grangers') Croft</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>The Croft</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigion House Leaze</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>Pigeon Leys</td>
<td>14.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Parke Field</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>Great Park Field</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parke</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grindling Stone Meadow</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Parke Field</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>Little Parke Field</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistle Leaze</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>Thistle Leys</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlands</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>Inn Lands</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowe’s Moor Meade</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Lowe’s Moor</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowe’s Moor Corner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lowe’s Moor Corner</td>
<td>28.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay Hill</td>
<td>28.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forty Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forty Acres</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Field names in 1617 and 1795 with field sizes converted to hectares. Hazleton’s enclosed fields and tithe free lands in Cherington ‘common fields’ (as described by Norden) are shown above the dotted line as are the equivalent enclosed fields in 1795. The landholdings and rights below the dotted line were part of Hazleton in 1617 but were no longer so by 1795.
and around Tetbury should be considered as a single entity and that there perhaps was a castle or manor/park complex at Tetbury. The locations of Cistercian monasteries were not necessarily remote, nor did they always seek to establish their granges in areas of poorer quality land. In addition Cistercian granges did not always, if ever, comprise of a single consolidated tithe-free landholding worked entirely in severally, and mainly manned by lay brothers. The above implies that the degree of settlement nucleation and the proportion of arable lands in this part of the Cotswolds in the 12th and 13th centuries may not have been as great as is sometimes generally assumed. Furthermore it suggests that the influence of Italian lessees in the 14th century may not have been as great as currently portrayed. The historical record also shows that the core part of Hazleton estate has remained virtually intact for over one thousand years.

For the programme of archaeological fieldwork these results raise more questions than they answer. However, as indicated above, some small-scale work has already been undertaken with more currently being carried out. From the results of the documentary research this fieldwork is now being focused on the current farmyard, manor house and the small valley at Hazleton shown in Figure 2, by employing buildings, earthworks, and geophysical surveys. No work is planned at Culkerton although the earthworks identified there by Janik et al. present a tempting proposition for future archaeological research. It is hoped that this article also illustrates the potential for further medieval landscape and settlement research in the wider area around Tetbury, including more targeted archaeological research to test whether a Norman castle or manor/park complex had once been located there.
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GLOUCESTERSHIRE CHURCH GOODS LISTED IN THE 1552 DIOCESE OF WORCESTER INVENTORY: THE PAROCHIAL IMPACT OF THE REFORMATION

Bruce Watson

Introduction

The impact of the English Reformation (1533-53), which ranged from a theological break with the Roman Catholic Church to the suppression of the monasteries, represents a very dramatic break with the material culture of the medieval world and traditional religion. While Henry VIII (1509-47) started this process, it is sometimes overlooked that Edward VI's reign (1547-53) produced the changes in doctrine that dramatically affected the liturgy of church services and therefore the contents of parish churches also underwent a radical alteration. In December 1547 the Chantry Act abolished all chantries and allowed the government to confiscate the endowments that had funded them. Many of these chantries were based inside parish churches and the larger ones were served by their own priests, who also held or assisted at parochial services. The Royal Visitation Injunctions of 1547 had already banned sacred images and religious sculpture. Then, after Pentecost in 1549, priests were forbidden to celebrate the Roman Catholic Mass and the adoration of the Host was banned, so objects like holy water pots and pyxes (see glossary), or vestments, such as copes, were suddenly surplus to the liturgical requirements of the new Protestantism. Mass was replaced by Holy Communion, which was to be celebrated with a single chalice and paten. These instructions were enshrined in an Act of January 1550, 'for the defacing of images and bringing in of books of old service in the church'.

In 1547 and 1549 the Privy Council had ordered surveys of church goods. Officially this was to protect church property from private embezzlement as valuable goods were sometimes being disposed of by concerned parishes to prevent their confiscation, while other items were being seized by local people or sometimes stolen (discussed later). However, in March 1551 the Privy Council ordered that 'for much as the King's Majestie had neede presently of a mass of money' all remaining church plate in England was now to be confiscated. This process did not start until 1552, when commissioners were appointed to make inventories of all church plate, vestments, ornaments and hand bells for the Privy Council. The confiscation of these church goods was intended not only to enrich a cash-strapped government, but also to ensure that parishes followed the new doctrine. When the Diocese of Worcester was surveyed in 1552, it included a number of parish churches and chapelties, which are now within the civil jurisdiction of Gloucestershire. Most of these examples had formed part of the Bishop of Worcester's estates in the Domesday Survey and remained part of Worcestershire for centuries after. Some of these parishes today still remain part of the Diocese of Worcester, as a reminder of the pattern of land holding over a millennium ago. It should be noted that this inventory is not a complete list of the Diocese of Worcester churches and chapels in 1552 that are situated in modern Gloucestershire, as there are some obvious omissions such as Blockley. It appears that a number of parishes were omitted when the diocesan inventory was drawn up for the Commissioners. These omissions may have been simply errors, as many of them occurred within the Evesham area, implying that at least one part of the survey was mislaid during its compilation.

The aim of this article is to describe and discuss the contents of the ten Gloucestershire churches and chapels which were included in the 1552 Diocese of Worcester inventory. The contents of these inventories provide a unique record of the possessions of these places of worship shortly before almost all of these goods vanished. Presumably, any images of saints had already been removed from these churches during 1547-50, hence their absence from this survey.

Gloucestershire parishes inventories

The contents of each inventory are cited verbatim. The names of any rectors, curates and church wardens who supplied the information are also cited, but the names of those of the seven commissioners who signed the inventories have been omitted. The text in square brackets consists of explanations of selected items and terms. All words marked with an asterisk (the first time they are mentioned in the entries) are included in the glossary. The original punctuation has been altered to improve readability.

1. Alstone

'Awstone in the parysshe of Owerbyrry' Inventory d viij daye of Auguste of all the belles plate juelles and ornamentes belonging or apperteynyng to the sayd chapel presented by Thomas Hytches clerk curratt there Richard Wood & John Wyllys churche wardens. One chalice with A paten parcell gylt*, one...
The 'steeple' must refer to a wooden bell-turret; one was recorded by Dr Prattinton in 1818. Today the church possesses a rebuilt version of this structure. Allstone (with Teddington and Little Washbourne, see below) has always been a chapelry of Overbury and all are now part of the Beckford group of parishes in the Diocese of Worcester. However, in 1844 Allstone transferred from Worcestershire to Gloucestershire for civic matters.

2. Chaceley

'iij grete bells, a liche [lych?] bell, ij challees [chalices] with theyr patterns of sylver, ij grete brass candlesticks, ij candulstiks of bras that war apon the high aulteer, ij copes*, i of broune tawny velvet* the other of bridges [Bruges?] satten*, vj pere of vestements, j of silke culler * popengey* j of red silke, j of grene silke, j of branchyd silke, j of crane* culler silke & j of whyte fustyan*. We had a brasse crosse with a staffe of brasse brased [half of brass], & j olde holly watter pote of bras[s], which crosse, according as we wer[e] comanded, did deface and brake the same, & so lefte ther in the church, which watter pott & broken peces of the crosse hath ben sens imbeseled furthe of the church by whom we know not.9 Wm Moole Curate'.10

The four great bells were presumably hung in the tower, the upper stage of which with its small spire, are both of 14th century date.11 A brass cross had been apparently broken up and the mention of an associated staff or long shaft implies that it was a processional cross. In 1931 the parish was transferred from Worcestershire to Gloucestershire.12

3. Cutsdean

'The inventorye taken of all the jewelles plate belles & ornamentes of the Sherche of Codiston presented by Raff Dyngley Curate Roberte Perte [?] sherche warden & Thomas Moore parisshenner the viij day of Auguste É Oon [one] Chalyse of Syluer parcel* gylt* with a patente, oon Coope* of lynnen [linen] , oon peere of westymentes of green sylke, oon pix [pyxe*] of brasse, yn [in] the steepull iij belles, a Sawnce* bell & a sacryng* bell'.

The three bells were presumably hung in the west tower, which is all that remains of this medieval chapel (it was a chapelry of Bredon), the rest of the chapel was rebuilt in 1863-4.13 Cutsdean was a detached portion of Worcestershire until 1931.14

4. Daylesford

'Viij th of AugusteÉ The Inventory takyn of the church gudes of all the plate and ornamentys Ryc’ Ireland parson there Wyllm Bryan and John Hokynts churche wardens. One chalys [chalice] of syluer gylte*, and A Paten, one cope* of crule*, iij pere of vestementes, one of blewwe sayten* an other of clothe of tyssue* and another of wyte [white] fustyan*, ij belles, one saycaryng* bell, one pyxe* of brasse, one sensure* [censer] of brasse, one corpox* case and one corporax, ij alter clothes'.

Daylesford, like Cutsdean, was a detached portion of Worcestershire until 1931.15 Its medieval church was reconstructed during 1816-18, and then completely rebuilt during 1859-63.16 The two bells mentioned in the inventory were presumably hung in a tower or steeple. Richard Ireland was Rector from 1543 until 1568.17

5. Evenlode

An Inventorye Indented taken of all juelles plate & ornamentes bylonging to the Churche of Evynlode presented by John Walker Clerk parson there Edward Walforde and John Rock paryssheners é viij Auguste. One Chalice of syluer with a patent, floure paire of vestementes whereof two be of red saten* of brydges [Bruges] & thother two of Blewe saten of brydgis, one Cope of the same, one Crosse of Copper, a pixe of Brasse, two belles in the Stepil, one Lyttell [little] bell & a Saunce* bell. In the Churche boxe xxx Shillings which same dyd accrew & come by sale of a bell Aboute iij on yreres past'.

Interestingly, this parish had money from the sale of one of its surplus liturgical objects in c.1548. The two bells were presumably hung in the west tower, which was added to the church in c.1400.18 Evenlode was a detached portion of Worcestershire until 1931.19

6. Icomb

'Aug. 8 - a chales [chalice] with a patent sylver, ij vestments, j redd chamblet* with a blew crosse, the other blew damaske* with a rede crosse, a coope* of blew [blue] satten* of bruges with grene borders, iij belles in the steple, j saunce* bell. Will Wye, parson'.20

The present west tower dates from c.1600, so it must presumably have replaced an earlier structure.21 Part of the parish was a detached portion of Worcestershire until 1844, when it was transferred to Gloucestershire.22

7. Little Washbourne

'Knyghtes Washbourne in the parish of ouerbyrryÉ Inventory é viij august é of all the belles plate juelles & ornamentes belonging or apperteynyng to the sayd chapell presented by Thomas Hytches Curratt there, John Hawkyns & Thomas Hyde churche wardens. One chalyce of syluer & gylt with
A patten of the same, a Sute of bleue vestimentes olde, ij belles in the steple, ij sacrying belles, one lytle [little] crosse of latten§.

Both before and after the Reformation Little Washbourne was known as Knight's Washbourne to distinguish it from its neighbour King's Washbourne (now Great Washbourne). Little Washbourne, like Alstone, was part of Worcestershire until 1844, when it transferred to Gloucestershire, but it still remains part of the Diocese of Worcester. Little Washbourne chapel was formerly part of Overbury parish, but it is now in the care of the Churches Conservation Trust. It possesses a bellcote, not a steeple.

8. Mitton
The Inventory taken of all the juelles plate & ornamentos belongyng to the parrische churche of bredon presentyd by John Aston Curate & Willm Rede gent church wardené viij Augusté A chalice of Silver with a patten & ij belles, a vestement of olde Redde veluett*, a vestemenof olde Redde Satten* a brigges [Bruges?], ij pere of olde vestementes wherof on' was stolen, a cope of smale valuye of redd satten. Per me Johannem Aston curatorem Willm Rede gent churchwarden Richard Daiys parischoner.' Mitton was formerly a chapel within Bredon parish; see previous article for details. The two bells mentioned in the inventory presumably were hung in the west tower of this vanished chapel.

9. Redmarley d'Abitot
'Vij Augusté Rydmareley dabytot é Inventory of all the goodes remaynyng now within oure parissche church'. ffurst we haue a chalysshe [chalice] and a pyxe of syluer, two crosse of brasse, two sensers* of brasse, two copes ye oon red sylke [silk] & ye other red velvet, three payre of vestementes, the oon of Red velvet, the second of blacke velvet, the thryd of turkye satten*, a vesture for a deacon, a vesture for a subdeacon, iij belles in the steple. Other juelles [jewels] plate ornamentals or goodes we haue noon but old bokes, v olde aulter clothes* & table clothes beynge of smale value. And ys to be done é [unreadable]é we wylle justyfye byffore your worshipes. The churchwardens at the present tyme Mawrys Dogmore Edward Wode parishoners Thomas Sherle ['?] John Malten'.

The medieval west tower of the church was rebuilt in 1738. This parish transferred to Gloucestershire in 1931.

10. Teddington
'The Inventory of all the plate juelles ornamentes and belles belongynge to the Chapell of Tedyngton. Annexed to the churche of Ouerbury presented viij th Augusté by Sir John Browne clerk vicar there, John Heynes and Robert Robertes church wardens. A crosse with ij Images of syluer and gylt, ij Chalices of siluer parcel* gylt, a cope of blew [blue] velvet, a peyre [pair] of vestementes of Red velvet, on met clothe [probably a meat cloth?] & iij Towelles, iij belles in the Steple, a pyx of tinne'.

The present west tower was built in 1567 and its two bells are dated 1605 and 1609, so there must have been an earlier tower or bell turret as it possessed a 'steeple' with three bells. Teddington like Alstone is still a chapelry of Overbury; Sir John was vicar of Overbury until 1554, when he was deprived of the living, presumably due to his Protestant views. This church is still part of the Diocese of Worcester.

Discussion
These Gloucestershire inventories provide a unique snapshot of the liturgical contents of their parish churches and chapels during a period of dramatic religious change, shortly before most of this material was removed. Obviously Mass was held in every place of public worship, so in addition to an altar plus coverings, there was a universal requirement for certain essential clerical vestments, plus towels or cloths and some basic liturgical vessels to celebrate Mass (see below). These were mainly, a chalice and paten, a hand or santus* bell, a pyx and a pair of cruets*, or some substitutes. Some idea of how these objects were used before the Reformation in a major church Mass is illustrated by a German panel painting of c. 1490-95, depicting the Mass of St. Gregory (see fig. back cover). Of these ten churches and chapels, all possessed at least one chalice, normally with a paten, and nine of them had copes. Chaceley and Redmarley churches possessed a larger array of vestments than the other examples. At Redmarley there were vestments for both a deacon and sub-deacon to assist at Mass and other services, plus two censors. Until 1547 Redmarley church possessed a chantry chapel, with its own priest, dedicated to 'Our Lady' (the Virgin Mary), which may explain its additional vestments and liturgical vessels. Chaceley also possessed a chantry endowment, although smaller (see below). At Icomb the vestments were decorated with red and blue crosses. One rare local survival of fragments of embroidered clerical vestments depicting various saints and the crucifixion dating from circa 1380-90, is now displayed in St Peter's Church, Winchcombe. These fragments survived by being incorporated into an altar frontal during the 16th century. Six churches or chapels owned a pyx; perhaps the other parishes possessed some low value item like a small wooden box that fulfilled the function of a pyx, as all churches and chapels where Mass was celebrated would have
needed one to hold any surplus consecrated material. As none of these churches possessed cruets, alternative types of vessels, perhaps ceramic serving jugs, must have fulfilled this function, because without them Mass could not have been celebrated. While almost all of the items listed in the inventory can be identified with a high degree of certainty, the identification of the two types of small or hand bells (sanctus and sawnce) appears to have been confused during compilation. Five churches and chapels possessed these bells, while Cutsdean possessed one of each implying that they might have served different functions. Possibly in some parishes one hand bell served several liturgical functions including that of a lych bell*, as only Evenlode possessed one of these.

Processional crosses were owned by Chaceley and Teddington, the latter decorated with images of the crucified Christ on both the front and back. The other crosses listed appear to have been altar crosses. As only six inventories listed crosses it might imply that the others possessed none, which would have been very surprising. However, these other parishes may have possessed simple wooden crosses of little value, which would not have been listed. Service books and altar cloths are probably also under-represented in the entries as such items usually had little value and books are mentioned only at Redmarley, which was clearly the best equipped of these churches.

Chaceley was the only church possessing any metal candle sticks, two of which had formerly stood on the high altar. Presumably the other parishes had some alternative form of lighting, such as ceramic hanging lamps or stone lamps. Perhaps some parishes had already disposed of their candle sticks. From the 13th century onward numerous images of saints were installed in parish churches, in front of which 'lights' were lit on a daily basis as signs of devotion and reverence. For instance, until 1547, a small chantry provided Chaceley with an annual rental from land and property for the maintenance of 'lights and lamps'. Many 15th-century wills included bequests for 'lights' as their provision was one way that parishioners could be remembered and believed they would participate in services after they had passed away.

Every church or chapel surveyed apparently possessed at least two bells; four in the case of Chaceley and Redmarley, another possible indication of their relative wealth. These bells were normally hung in a west tower (frequently described as a steeple) or bellcotes, as at both Alstone and Little Washbourne. However, no church possessed a modern full set of seven or more bells. These bells would have been the responsibility of the parish clerk, who would have checked the clappers and the ropes.

The clerk and his assistants would have rung the bells to summon the faithful to services. In addition they may have rung the tolling bell for the elevation of the Host during Mass and possibly, in larger communities, also rung an evening curfew (normally at 9pm).

It appears that rich urban parishes possessed more liturgical objects than their rural counterparts, as shown in the length and complexity of the 1552 entries compiled by the eleven parish churches of the City of Worcester. These included various ceremonial or decorative items such as banners, censors, corprax cases, pyx cases or coverings, cushions, silk curtains and numerous sets of silk or silk damask vestments. Exactly what liturgical goods a contemporary London parish was expected to possess in order to carry out Roman Catholic services was spelt out by Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London, in the autumn of 1553, at the start of Queen Mary's attempt to reinstate the Roman Catholic Church. These included: various service books, a chalice, two cruets, vestments for the priest, deacon and sub-deacon, frontals for the high altar, three towels, three surplices*, a processional cross, 'a cross for the dead', a censer, a little sanctus bell, a pyx, a valence* or veil for Lent, a holy water pot, a bier for the dead, a candlestick for the paschal (Easter) taper and a font. It is probable that Bonner's list represented the ideal range of liturgical equipment that might have been available in a wealthy urban parish (such as the City of Worcester churches) and that relatively poor rural parishes would have possessed much fewer items judging by the entries discussed here. For instance, none of the Gloucestershire churches and chapels listed above possessed cruets and only two possessed censers. Fonts were not included in the 1552 inventory as they were not being removed from churches.

John Hooper, a clergyman of extreme Protestant views, was appointed Bishop of Gloucester in 1550. Then in 1552, when he also became Bishop of Worcester, he issued instructions for the removal of altars, images and other components of traditional worship from all the churches within his diocese. So it is possible that Hooper's policy had already caused the removal of some liturgical goods like candlesticks before this particular inventory was compiled. There are a number of documented instances where parishes sold material shortly before it could be confiscated, but the theft of material from churches appears to have been on the increase after 1547. At Chaceley it was claimed that a holy water pot and a processional cross had been broken up and then 'lost'. It is tempting to think that these two 'lost' items had been sold and that the garbled version of events that was presented to the commissioners was simply an attempt to explain the discrepancies...
between the contents of the present inventory and an earlier one, presumably compiled during 1547 or 1549. In a number of parochial inventories the recent loss of various items was attributed to theft, which implies that a rural crime wave was taking place, but it is debatable if all these reported thefts were actually criminal acts.\textsuperscript{42} For instance, the curate of Mitton Chapel claimed that a missing set of vestments had been stolen. At Cotfon Hackett the loss of an altar cloth, two candlesticks of maslin\textsuperscript{*} and a towel, since the compilation of the previous inventory, was also blamed on theft.\textsuperscript{43} Furthermore it is documented that some donors were retrieving gifts (and additional items), while some parishes were disposing of material before it was confiscated. Of the ten Gloucestershire parishes only Evenlode admitted that they had money from the sale of liturgical equipment. At Doverdale it was reported that the parishioners about a year earlier had sold two small candlesticks and a little brass cross, and they also claimed that two of their altar cloths had ‘worn out’ since the compilation of the last inventory.\textsuperscript{44} The parishioners of St Swithin’s church in the City of Worcester provided a detailed list of their recently sold liturgical items and recorded that a ‘copper’ pix was still ‘in the custody’ of their former parish priest.\textsuperscript{45}

Some parishes were concealing forbidden liturgical items as one way of retaining them.\textsuperscript{46} There is some archaeological evidence for this practice of concealment within Gloucestershire. At Mickleton church a Romanesque crosshead was hidden in the cemetery, only to be rediscovered in the mid-19th century during grave digging. Secondly, at South Cerney church in 1915 two fragments of a wooden Romanesque figure of Christ on the cross were found concealed inside a cavity in the wall of the nave. Both these examples appear to represent the deliberate concealment of complete liturgical items. However, it appears that fragments of religious statuary which had presumably already been smashed by iconoclasts, was also concealed locally by devout individuals. For instance in 1875, a collection of smashed medieval statuary was recovered from under the sanctuary floor of Tewkesbury Abbey.\textsuperscript{47} Exactly when these objects were hidden is uncertain, but during 1547-52 or after 1558 seem the two most likely periods for concealment. Material could have been concealed after 1558 in the hope that the Catholic Church might be re-established a second time. In 1567 at Ripon Minster in Yorkshire, five vicars were accused of concealing a large number of alabaster altarpieces, statues or images and liturgical books. It appears that this Catholic material had been hidden away en masse during the reign of Edward VI, brought out again during Mary’s reign, then concealed again after the accession of Elizabeth.\textsuperscript{48} The almost complete loss of medieval liturgical items due to the impact of the Reformation is emphasised by the rarity of surviving examples of basic items such as Welsh chalices and patens. One medieval silver gilt chalice and paten was discovered in 1890, hidden on a hillside above Dolgellau in north Wales.\textsuperscript{59} While the Dolgellau chalice and paten might have been stolen property hidden by a thief, it is quite likely to be another example of the concealment of a treasured liturgical item.

These inventory entries not only provide a vivid impression of the vanished contents of the parish churches in the Diocese of Worcester during 1552, they also afford us a glimpse of the reaction of people at a parochial level to the impact of the English Reformation. It should be remembered that these communities had recently witnessed the destruction and looting of local monasteries by avaricious government agents, then the subsequent abolition of the chANtries, so they had good reason to be wary of the motives behind the compilation of this inventory. The impression is that many people resented the confiscation or theft of material, which they or their ancestors may have donated to their parish churches, hence the recurring accounts of objects that had been either ‘lost’ or disposed of before they could be confiscated. While much of this liturgical material may not have possessed great monetary value, many of these banned objects doubtless possessed great spiritual and sentimental value to devout parishioners as ‘liturgy lay at the heart of medieval religion and the Mass lay at the heart of the liturgy’.\textsuperscript{50}

\textbf{Note on back cover illustration:} The \textit{Mass of St. Gregory} was a popular theme in 15th and 16th century religious art. It depicts the moment during Mass when Christ appeared and showed his wounds to St. Gregory the Great, a Pope who died in AD 604. The panel painting [original size 109.1 by 54.2 cm] is on the rear side of the left hand wing of the German altarpiece by the Master of Aachen c. 1490-95 [reproduced by courtesy of the National Museums Liverpool: Walker Art Gallery, WAG 1225].

\textbf{Glossary}

The definitions cited are taken from a number of sources.\textsuperscript{51}

\textit{Altar cloths}: a medieval altar was formally covered or ‘dressed’ with three linen cloths. The lower two were the same size as the top of the altar, while the top one hung down to reach the ground on each side. These cloths were intended to symbolize Christ’s shroud. In addition there was often an antependium or decorative cloth frontal and sometimes a second one was suspended behind the altar like a reredos.

\textit{Cape}: see cope.
Censer: or sensor, vessel in which incense is burnt.
Chamblet: a type of costly cloth from the Middle East.
Cope or coope: a long mantle or cloak worn by a priest over his surplice.
Corprax: a variant of corphyr or corporals, these were altar cloths on which the Eucharistic elements were placed during consecration. These cloths were stored in special cases.
Copper: copper.
Crane: cranium or skull cap.
Crule or crewel: a knitted woollen fabric perhaps used to cover items of furniture or a floor mat.
Cruets: small paired vessels, one to hold water and the other wine, were used during the celebration of Mass for mixing water with the wine.
Culler: or culm an item listed in an account.
Damask or damaske: silk damask was a figured textile like satin; it was generally imported from Italy, but apparently originated from Damascus as its name implies.
Fustian: a mixed fabric generally of linen and cotton (occasionally wool) woven in England or imported.
Gilt: gilt.
Holy water pots: vessels for holding water to be sprinkled with an aspergillum when an object is to be blessed.
Laten: an alloy similar to brass.
Lych bell: a tolling bell for use at funerals. It could have been either a hand bell, which was rung at the front of the funerary procession taking the deceased to church or a larger bell hung in the belfry.
Masculen: a tolling bell for use at funerals. It could have been either a hand bell, which was rung at the front of the funerary procession taking the deceased to church or a larger bell hung in the belfry.
Masctelyn: a tolling bell for use at funerals. It could have been either a hand bell, which was rung at the front of the funerary procession taking the deceased to church or a larger bell hung in the belfry.
Meat cloth: a (secular) table cloth, perhaps used by a parish fraternity or guild when having meals or other events inside the church.
Parcel: partly.
Popengey or Popelot: a type of luscious silk based fabric.
Pyxe: small cylindrical vessel for holding the Host or consecrated bread of the sacrament.
Sanctus bells: these bells were normally hung in an external roof turret situated at the junction of the nave and chancel and rung during the Sanctus (the conclusion to the Eucharistic preface), but they could also have been used to summon people to services (see Sawnce bells). It is possible that some of those examples listed were hand-bells.
Satten or sayten: satin was a smooth luscious silky fabric, which could be pure silk or a cheaper mixed fabric, imported from Cyprus and Bruges etc.
Sawnce or saunce bells: 'Saunce' is a corruption of the Latin 'Sanctus' and refers to small bells (sometimes handbells) which had similar functions to the Sanctus bell (see above), including perhaps summoning people to services.
Scryng or sacrying bells: (Sacrament). Small hand-bells rung at various times during Mass, specifically at the Elevation of the Host by the server. Etymologically related to 'consecration'.
Sensure or senser: A censer or vessel in which incense is burnt.
Stoller: liturgical stoles (a narrow strip of cloth) worn by priests during services.
Surplices: liturgical vestments with long wide sleeves. These would have been worn by servers at Mass or priests.
Tynne: tin.
Tyssue, tinsel or tisshue: (spelling variable) was a luscious fabric similar to satin, normally made of silk with gold and silver threads.
Vayle: valence or cloth used to cover the altar when it was not in use. In the Roman Catholic Church it is still the custom to cover all crucifixes and sculptures inside churches during Holy Week (the week before Easter Sunday) and the week preceding it.
Velvet: velvet a closely woven rich fabric, probably silk and cotton mixed with other fabrics.
Vesture: a piece of clothing or a vestment.
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33 Presumably these vestments each had a large Latin cross sewn on their front and back.

34 Donaldson, D. St Peter's Church Winchcombe, Gloucestershire (revised edition of guide 1988). There is a colour picture of the frontal on p14.


36 Marks, R. Image and Devotion in Late Medieval England (Stroud, 2004), 61, 162-63.

37 Walters, 'Inventories, Worcestershire, part 3, lists 9 of these church inventories.

38 Queen Mary (1553-58) was a devout Catholic so she had been deeply opposed to the English Reformation and immediately sought to return
In her preface written in 1937 Mary Rudd states "In publishing some of the results of several years of research in the history of the parish of Bisley, my object has been to create a book of reference for those who wish to pursue the subjects treated further than the scope of my work admits" Miss Mary Amelia Rudd spent years copying documents from the Public Record Office (now The National Archives), the Gloucester Probate office and Gloucester Library as well as many documents in the private possession of local families, all relating to the modern parish of Bisley. From these sources, as well as the early histories of the county, she traced the history of Bisley from the prehistoric through the Roman and Norman periods. She looked at the various tithings of the parish and the main houses and families, together with a large section on the ecclesiastical history. But the part dealing with the manors in Bisley provides some problems, as very little is known of the early history and hence the various independent manors. The late Huw Jones in his book Roman and Saxon Bisley discusses the bibliography of the history of Bisley and whilst praising Mary Rudd's industry in attempting to write the first history of the parish, points out the many shortcomings, particularly serious errors of transcription. The reprint by Alan Sutton in 1977 contained a corrigenda provided by the local historian Frederick Hammond, which went some way to correct some of the more serious errors. This latest facsimile edition is welcome, as the original publication of 1937 was limited to 250 copies, whilst that of 1977 was limited to 350 copies, hence both editions are difficult to obtain. Whilst the accuracy of the book has been questioned it is still worth purchasing as it contains reference to many important sources of information about an area of which little has been written.

It was many years before others took up Mary Rudd's challenge to "pursue the subjects treated" until the important and more reliable history of Bisley contained in volume XI of A History of the County of Gloucester in the Victoria History of the Counties of England was published in 1976, edited by Dr Nicholas Herbert. Also the late Huw Jones published in 2008, in his series of Bisley Histories, The History of the Manor of Througham which covers this manor in the parish of Bisley in great detail. It is unfortunate that Huw Jones passed away before he could complete his series of histories of Bisley and perhaps someday a new historian will tackle the complex task of tracing the history of the various independent manors of Bisley.
BIRDLIP HILL GIBBET

Nigel Spry

Fig. 1 : 1704 map of Northgate Turnpike road on Birdlip Hill
A map of 1704, showing the Northgate Turnpike road in Great Witcombe parish as it rises up Birdlip Hill (fig. 1) includes a depiction of a gibbet on a mound named as Rowland Badgers Knapp (fig. 2). The present writer has previously commented on this in an earlier issue of Glevensis, but no illustrations were offered then.

Suspended the body, usually covered in pitch to preserve it but sometimes only the head, of an executed criminal in an iron body-shaped cage, although more humane than an earlier practise of gibbetting alive, was seen as a further deterrent to others contemplating a similar capital crime. The legal term for this additional punishment was 'hanged in chains'. Between 1732 and 1784 at least eleven executed local murderers suffered this indignity. From a compilation of reports from the Gloucester Journal and other local newspapers between 1722 and 1828, we learn, for example, that on 9th August 1727 Roger Bryant was sentenced to death for the murder of Ann Williams and afterwards was to be 'hanged in chains'. As late as March 1777 Joseph Armstrong, who was due to be executed for the murder of Mrs A'Court, killed himself in his cell, but was afterwards hanged in chains near Cheltenham. Surprisingly hanging in chains was not abolished in England until 1834, but the last person to be so gibbetted was James Cook on 10th August 1832 at Leicester.

All these punishments are later than the 1704 date of the Birdlip Hill map. A 1826 guidebook by Samuel Young Griffith, mentions this gibbet and his observations in a footnote are worth repeating "Near a cottage, on the hill, to the right of Birdlip [viewed from the east], there was formerly a gibbet, upon which a culprit, who had been convicted of the murder of a woman, was gibbetted alive, in the reign of Queen Anne - the only record of such punishment on record. Not far from the cottage stands a yew tree, which, it is said, could be seen from a distance of thirty miles, before its branches, which were once of immense size, were reduced by fire".

Since Queen Anne reigned 1702-14 and the map is of 1704, it is unlikely that Griffith was correct in his dating, but the event he records, probably excluding gibbetting alive, was surely a local folk memory. As I proposed before, the culprit may have been named Roland Badger.

The second observation Griffith made, about the immense yew tree, may also be true and perhaps it is this tree that is shown on the map east of the knapp and cottage, annotated later with the word 'mark'; it does appear to be on the Great Witcombe parish boundary.

References

1 Gloucestershire Archives (GA) D1866, The topographical description of the manor of Whitcombe, 1.
5 Griffith, S. Y. Griffith's New Historical Description of Cheltenham and its Vicinity, (Self published,1826), 86.
PORTABLE ANTIQUITIES ROUND UP FOR GLOUCESTERSHIRE IN 2013

Kurt Adams

Introduction

This report looks at the artefacts recorded by the Portable Antiquities Scheme for Gloucestershire from the end of 2012, as well as 2013. During this period there were 920 records made consisting of 993 individual artefacts of which 88% were recovered by metal detector users. Statistically, the most common period recorded was the Roman period achieving 51% of the total finds that were added to the database in 2013. This was followed by the Post Medieval period at 20%, then the Medieval period at 19% and the Neolithic at 4%, with the Mesolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age, Early Medieval, Modern periods and Unknown each averaging about 1% of the respective total. Below is a list of some of the particularly interesting finds that were recorded.

Prehistoric

Flint scraper (Fig 1)
Find Spot: Miserden
Database reference: GLO-003622
End scraper with semi-abrupt, direct retouch on the forward edge. Very large hard hammer bulb of percussion on the ventral. Light grey flint with darker patches. Date Early Neolithic.

Iron Age

Colchester style brooch (Fig 2)
Find Spot: Donnington
Database reference: GLO-D5B383
Copper alloy one piece Colchester brooch that has a spring cast integrally with the bow. Half of the spring remains consisting of four curls, the pin is missing. There is a rearwards facing hook on the top of the head which holds the external cord of the spring. Small rectangular wings flank the head and cover the spring. The bow is plain, the catch plate on the reverse is missing. This artefact dates to AD25-60.

Roman

Strap end (Fig 3)
Find Spot: Miserden
Database reference: GLO-198227
A copper-alloy/nail-cleaner strap-end, which would probably have performed both roles. The main body is made from a lozenge shaped plate with an elongated lower point that has a V-shape notched terminal; this has been decorated with a ring and dot in the centre. On the top edge are two opposing crescents with an inverted triangular plate above, both of which have a ring and dot in the centre. The top edge has a long thin rectangular tab that has been bent back on itself to form a loop, with the end of the tab secured by a lead solder to the rear of the strap end. Small V-shaped notches have been removed from around the top edge to form a decorative border. These artefacts date to AD350-400, for similar examples see ESS-9A2812, HAMP-BBD006, HAMP-5F68B3 and BH-9BA52.

Roman Republican coin (Fig 4)
Find Spot: Blaisdon
Database reference: GLO-5F9A66
Silver Denarius of the Roman republic struck by the family Cossutia dated to 74 BC (Reece 1), Head of Medusa left, winged & entwined with serpents CARVLA/ Bellerophon riding Pegasus right, hurling spear.
Note; the obverse has been counterstruck with a large C at the base of the bust.

Iron Pilum Head (Fig 5)
Find Spot: Chedworth
Database reference: GLO-3955E5
Roman iron pilum with a long thin shaft, 120 mm long 19mm diameter; this may have had a circular or rough hexagonal cross section. The head appears to have expanded into a flat leaf shaped blade with a lozenge cross-section. However, most of the blade has been truncated with only its base remaining. At the opposite end of the base the shaft widens outwards to form a rounded socket; this has been truncated resulting in only the tip of the socket remaining.

The pila are divided into two distinctive groups, the heavy group which had a round weight added at the junction of the wood and iron, and a light group, such as this example. A similar artefact has been found at Caerleon and was dated to the 3rd century.

Early Medieval

Silver penny of Aethelstan (Fig 6)
Find Spot: Sudeley
Database reference: GLO-E0BE78
Circumscription cross (924-39),
Length 18mm, width 16mm, weight 0.54g
Obverse: short cross
Obverse inscription: [TIRBTOT+][ERNAT][SIDEA]
Reverse: short cross
Reverse inscription: [+EREMONET][ALVND][IVITET]
Mint: (probably) London

Note: there is considerable damage to the sides resulting in the loss of most of the inscription and about 30% of the coin. The inscription on the obverse is reversed.

David Symons writes:
It is one of a well-known group of 'irregular' pennies issued in the name of Aethelstan (AD924-39), which were discussed by Christopher Blunt. The moneyer's name is written variously as Efe, Ere or Eie, and they all carry what purports to be a London mint signature. The coin appears to have the same legend as another example in the British Museum (BMC Aethelstan 59), which has a retrograde legend on the obverse side.

It is possible that this coin was struck from the same pair of dies as BMC 59, but unfortunately that is not illustrated in BMC.

Stirrup Strap Mount (Fig 7)
Find Spot: Alkington
Database reference: GLO-BA06F5
Early Medieval stirrup-strap mount length 50mm, width 28mm, thickness 11mm, weight 21.83g. The mount is sub-triangular in shape with slightly concave sides and a suspension loop at the top. The face is decorated with an elaborate interlaced knotwork pattern that forms the body of an animal, the head of the beast is at the apex of the triangle, below the loop. There are two rivet holes at the bottom of the mount and a rearward facing projection at the base. This is an example of Williams class A type 10A and dates to the 11th century.

Medieval

Strap End (Fig 8)
Find Spot: Minsterworth
Database reference: GLO-DFDA05
Copper alloy buckle with integral box chape length 57mm, width 30mm, thickness 6mm, weight 20.69g. The box chape is rectangular in plan with two rivet holes at the rear. The aperture of the chape is 20mm long, 3.5mm high. The topside is inscribed with the letter M within a square border. A projection on the forward part of the chape has deep concave sides with a hole in the centre of the pin; this is heavily worn. The frame of the buckle is a long trapezoid that emanates from the front of the chape, the sides are slightly concave with four protruding roundels on the side of the frame. The front of the buckle frame has an inside pointed lip and a semicircular projection on the forward edge that contains four roundels.

Similar examples are recorded in the London Museum Medieval Catalogue. This example is a strapend with Saint Christopher in the centre of the trapezoid section. Ward-Perkins dated this example to 1390-1410 basing this date on those found on contemporary brasses. The M on the box chape is also present on these examples, so it is possible that this has some religious connotations and may be referring to The Virgin Mary.

Nested Weights Box (Fig 9)
Find Spot: Highnam
Database reference: GLO-4BD596
A complete copper alloy weight-box of medieval date. The lid of the box is slightly domed, and is decorated with two sets of double concentric lines. In the middle and contained within the first circular band are five ring and dots forming a cross. At the end of each arm are four more ring and dots arranged in a diamond pattern. A final band of ring and dots run around the outer edge of the lid.

The box is circular in plan and gently narrows to the base. There are four sets of evenly spaced double vertical ribs that have a triangular cross section. The top edge of the rim is decorated with a line of ring and dots. The inside of the box is plain. On the top edge is a double set of pierced lugs that form the hinge for the lid. On the opposing side is a pierced rectangular lug that is encrusted with iron corrosion that would form part of a mechanism to lock the lid in place. This would have contained a nested set of cup weights of differing sizes, but these are now missing.

The record IOW-D1CE76 goes on to say 'It has been suggested that these cup weights date from 12th-14th century and seem to be based on a standard close to the old Roman system. These types of weights were used for weighing gold and silver in the form of coin, small objects or as scrap metal or other precious materials.'

Post Medieval

Dagger pommel (Fig 10)
Find Spot: Minsterworth
Database reference: GLO-F53486
Copper alloy sword or dagger pommel. This is a long rectangular pommel that has an oval cross section (23mm by 18mm) with a hollow interior and a rounded top. The aperture at the base is round with an internal diameter of 15mm. At the top is a round hole (7mm in diameter) which is encrusted in iron corrosion; this is where the tag passed through the top
of the pommel. The outside is decorated with three curving, diagonal recessed lines that run the length of both of the wider sides. Towards the top of the pommel on the right side is a beaked projection that has a concave underside and a convex upper side. This is mirrored by a smaller example on the opposite side, these are to prevent the hand from slipping off the back of the pommel.

This pommel would be from a thin bladed weapon that dated to the late 15th-mid 16th century.

**Nuremberg jetton (Fig 11)**
Find Spot: Highnam
Database reference: GLO-1C0395
Nuremberg jetton of Hans Krauwincke II depicting the coronation of Louis XIII at Rheims in 1610. Obverse: crowned and armoured bust facing right Obverse inscription: LVDO XIII D G FR ET NA REX CHRISTIAN (HK on the left shoulder) Reverse: City view of Rheims with hand from clouds lowering ampulla Reverse inscription: FRANC DATA MVNERA COELI X VI OCT in ex RHEMIS /1610
Note: there is a hole pierced to the rear of the kings bust where it may have been suspended as a pendant.
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HON TREASURER'S REPORT FOR THE YEAR ENDING 28 FEBRUARY 2013

Receipts and Payments for year ending 28 February 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members' Subscription</td>
<td>£1,630.00</td>
<td>£1,428.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions at Meetings</td>
<td>£307.00</td>
<td>£247.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glevensis</td>
<td>£108.09</td>
<td>£157.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potery Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Outing</td>
<td>£516.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>£28.00</td>
<td>£94.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Interest: High Interest Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax Refund</td>
<td>£280.46</td>
<td>£255.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>£286.80</td>
<td>£47.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>£3,156.71</td>
<td>£2,290.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Publication Fund**

| Donation from Mr E Price                    | £7,928.85 |
| Bank Interest: CAF Account                  | £35.84    | £24.77    |
| **Subtotal**                                | £7,964.69 |

| **Total Income**                            | **£11,121.40** | **£2,315.29** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer's Expenses, Fees, Donations &amp; Gifts</td>
<td>£110.00</td>
<td>£140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>£420.00</td>
<td>£467.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation Fees</td>
<td>£69.00</td>
<td>£49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>£387.20</td>
<td>£387.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>£195.87</td>
<td>£210.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Outing</td>
<td>£491.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing: Glevensis</td>
<td>£621.90</td>
<td>£529.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>£115.08</td>
<td>£53.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying &amp; Stationery</td>
<td>£4.50</td>
<td>£54.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Site Host Rental</td>
<td>£20.28</td>
<td>£20.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation to Gloucestershire Archives</td>
<td>£50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>£10.00</td>
<td>£79.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2,494.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2,001.62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Publication Fund**

| Bank charge                                 | £0.50     |           |
| **Sub-total**                               | **£610.50** | **£0.00**  |

| **Total Expenditure**                       | **£3,105.33** | **£2,001.62** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surplus of Income</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>£661.88</td>
<td>£288.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Fund</td>
<td>£7,354.19</td>
<td>£24.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£8,016.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>£313.67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement of Assets and Liabilities as at 28 February 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Assets</th>
<th>2012-13 £</th>
<th>2011-12 £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank Accounts: Treasurer's Account</td>
<td>5,080.51</td>
<td>4,381.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Interest</td>
<td>1,786.12</td>
<td>1,785.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFCash</td>
<td>19,785.41</td>
<td>12,404.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in hand</td>
<td>37.86</td>
<td>37.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,625.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,608.97</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accumulated Fund

| Brought Forward from last year | 6,204.75   | 5,917.51   |
| Less Loss on LiDAR             | -1.76      |            |
| Plus surplus                   | 661.88     | 288.90     |
| **Sub-total**                  | **6,866.63** | **6,204.75** |

Publication Fund

| Brought Forward from last year | 12,404.22  | 12,379.45  |
| Plus surplus                   | 7,354.19   | 24.77      |
| **Sub-total**                  | **19,758.41** | **12,404.22** |

**Overall**

|                      | 26,625.04 | 18,608.97 |

**Notes**

1. The subscription includes 2 (5) subscriptions £25 (£64) 2013-14 (2012-13).
2. The donation to the Gloucestershire Archives was a donation towards the purchase of a document relating to the Civil War siege of Gloucester.
3. The Publication Fund is the money transferred from the Frocester Publication Fund in 2001 and has a restricted usage.
GLOUCESTERSHIRE ARCHAEOLOGY
NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS TO GLEVENSIS AND EDITORIAL CONVENTIONS
FOR REFERENCES

Format

Authors are requested to submit a typed hard copy of their manuscript and an identical copy preferably on CD-ROM. The format of the text body should be either word or rich text with Times New Roman 10 point font. Text should be double spaced, justified to left hand side, with numbered pages and wide margins on one side of A4 paper. It would be helpful if only the final version of the article, clearly labelled, were present on the disc. If for any reason a disc cannot be supplied it is important that the manuscript should be of good quality i.e. on at least 80g/m2 white paper so that the text can be scanned into a computer.

Illustrations should be kept separate from the text. All illustrations, line drawings and photos, should be 'figs' (figures), and not plates and figures. Captions should be supplied and be sufficiently descriptive to give a reasonable explanation of the figure without reference to the text. Illustrations should be of good quality, with photos supplied as prints and line drawings in black ink, on white paper, no greater than A4 in size, if possible. (Limited modification of line drawings using computer graphics may be applied during editing to improve drawings of 'freehand' quality). If supplied electronically on CD-ROM these should be saved in jpg, (not eps format) and as black and white or greyscale images only (i.e. not coloured).

Referencing

The reader should be able to check and follow up the evidence for statements made by the author, by means of a referencing system. This also protects the author against charges of plagiarism.

1. Glevensis uses the 'running note' method of citation, where each cited reference has a separate sequential number, superscripted in the text in 7 point Times New Roman font after the punctuation mark. Notes and references will be printed at the end of the text and should be supplied typed in sequence.

2. Some items in the references, may be explanatory notes, but the majority will refer to the source and published sources should be presented as follows:

   a) For books: Author, editor (with initials) or organisation name. Title of book (in italics), edition if not first. Place and name of publisher, year of publication (in brackets) page numbers referred to.

   Example

   b) For journals: Author's name. 'Title of article' (in quotes), Title of Journal (in italics) volume number (in bold), date (in brackets), page number(s).

   Example

   c) In the case of chapters from edited books or papers from an edited collection, the name of the chapter's or paper's author is followed by the 'title' of the article, (in quotes), followed by 'in', the name or names of the editor(s) and the title of the book, (in italics), then the publisher, date and page no as in a) or b) above.

   Examples:
   Herbert, N. M. 'Trade and industry', in Herbert, N. M. (ed.), VCH Gloucestershire, 4 (1988), 23-24. (This is the standard way of citing the Victoria County History)

d) Where a reference is to an already referenced book or article, it is sufficient to give the author's name, a shortened title, and relevant page numbers. But where another reference to the same source immediately follows it, 'ibid' may be used, plus the relevant page numbers.

Example(s):
- Hoskins, Fieldwork in Local History, 41-46.
- Herbert, 'Trade and industry', 23-24
- Moore, 'Charter evidence', 97-98

e) Maps used should also be referenced. Creator, editor or organisation. Title of map. Sheet number, edition or series title. Place and name of publisher (if given).

Examples
- Map references: Ordnance Survey. 1972. OS map. Plan SO7622-7722 Scale 1:2500 (25")
- Ordnance Survey 1885 1st edition OS map. Sheet no 24/8. Scale 25"


Example

4. Unpublished documentary sources should be referenced by the location of the document, its local reference number and the folio number(s). The document’s description and date is also desirable.

Examples (explain any abbreviations used in text):
- NA. National Archives, STAC/7/16/5 ff.1-10 (1601 depositions).

5. Information provided by individuals should be referenced by: Name of source: Personal communication. Date information given.

Deadline for submissions will be October 31st. The Editor will subsequently notify you whether your paper has been accepted and discuss any changes needed. Following revisions you will be sent proofs to check for any errors and give final approval, prior to publication.
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Amended and updated by Diane Charlesworth & Les Comtesse, September 2009 from guidance by Nigel Spry and Don Mayes (n.d.) and Martin Ecclestone 2004
The ‘Mass of St Gregory’ (reproduced by courtesy of the National Museums Liverpool: Walker Art Gallery, WAG 1225). Notice the chalice and paten, missal or service book, candle stick, two cruets and a towel on the altar. Behind the altar is a retable or decorative back panel (obscured by the figure of Christ), while the top surface of the altar is covered by a white cloth and its front is apparently covered by a black cloth with a horizontal decorative band or braiding. The pope and his two assistants are all wearing matching, elaborately embroidered copes; one assistant is holding a hand-bell and the other a censer. The right-hand figure in the background is holding a processional cross and the left-hand one a papal crown. The area in front of the altar is carpeted. In the foreground a child is holding a tall processional candle.