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Gwladys Davies recently passed to me a letter she had received from a friend in Australia. Part of this letter is reproduced below for it illustrates, in a much more entertaining way than I could, points I intended to include in this Editorial; how wide, sometimes unexpectedly so, is the compass of our hobby- or employment - and how rewarding (albeit not financially) is active participation in it.

Archaeology is what one makes of it

"When the invitation came to take part in an archaeological excavation, I was delighted, and sent off an acceptance and the necessary $48.00. Details supplied were as follows. The excavation would be over the period 7th to 19th January 1980, 8.30 am to 4.30 pm. Latecomers would wash finds all day. Morning and afternoon tea and lunch would be provided. The Dig was organised by the Council of Adult Education under the auspices of the Archaeological and Anthropological Society of Victoria.

Support lectures were held prior to the Dig. Subjects included Historical Background to the Site, Open Plan Excavation Techniques, Recording Systems, and Analysis of Cultural Material. Our Lecturer and Excavation Leader was an English archaeologist who, prior to coming to Australia, worked with the University of Birmingham.

The Site itself was of enormous interest. Approximately 15 miles east of Melbourne, it has been chosen for the building of an eight-roomed residence for Rev. James Clow in 1838, within two years of colonization. James Clow was born near Stirling, Scotland, in 1790. He became a Presbyterian minister. In 1837 he arrived in Victoria with his wife, two sons and eight daughters, and conducted the first Presbyterian service ever held in Melbourne. He had reason to expect appointment as Resident Minister there, and was disappointed when Rev. James Forbes arrived from Sydney with the appointment. But Clow accepted this, and Forbes married one of Clow's daughters. In August 1838 Clow took up 36 square miles of glorious country reaching into the foothills of the Dandenong Ranges, and built a house he called 'Tirhatuan' - the Flying Possum.

By the time of our arrival, all that showed above ground of that first homestead were a few scattered hand-made bricks and an old pear tree. This is where we worked for a fortnight in very happy fellowship. Personnel included a hard core of Archaeology graduates and students; youngsters of school leaving age trying to choose a profession, and a mixed group of people who, like myself, had studied archaeology for many years, but had never before had the chance to get down into it.

Facilities consisted of tap water and toilets. In addition there were two caravans. An area outlined in bales of pressed hay and covered by two lengths of flapping hessian on poles served as mess hut and finds- washing room, with trestle tables up the middle. Fortunately, this has been the coolest summer in memory.

The method used was Open Excavation over a site approximately 130 ft by 35 ft, with as few baulks as possible, and 50 people working at a time. The site was sprayed twice daily and hand sprays were at the ready, to help distinguish disturbed ground from natural clay. We learned to tell whether a long-rotted post had been a rough sapling or dressed timber;
that a row of buried glass splinters represented windows in a collapsed outer wall; and that a long, indented darker streak in the earth could be the legacy of raindrops falling for years off the edge of a verandah roof. So many TV and other camera crews turned up that we ceased to look at them.

Finds included tiny abo. flints and weapons, handmade bricks with thumb prints, thousands of handmade nails; hundreds of ancient bottles and jars, some dated, scores of broken clay tobacco pipes, some with pictures embossed on the bowls; a few pieces of simple jewellery, some coins, slates and slate pencils, a school or chapel bell; and about a drayload of broken Staffordshire pottery. My own special find was a "token" coin. In the early days we had no Australian coinage, but used "tokens", undated replicas of English money minted for that purpose in England.

One became so utterly absorbed in that world of 150 years ago that the present almost ceased to exist. Never before have I found it so difficult to return to the 'here and now'."

AWARD

Bill Chouls, first Glevensis editor and a past Chairman, has presented a Challenge Shield to the Group. This is to be awarded annually to the Junior Member who, in the opinion of the Committee, has shown most dedication and who has contributed most to local archaeology by way of fieldwork, excavation or research during the year. A Junior receiving the shield as a result of a report based upon such work is certain to see his or her work published in the Group's review.

This year the shield went to Miss Rowena Lawrence, particularly for her work at Richard Bryant's recent excavation in St Mary de Lode Church. Rowena, who joined the Group three years ago, is now reading Archaeology with History at Nottingham University. Congratulations, Rowena.

AND REWARD

Your Editor would like to put forward his own list for another prestigious award - the O.T.B., in recognition of the hard work done by the people who help him in the production of Glevensis. First on the list, and not merely for reasons of chivalry, is our most expert typist, then a back room wallah (who usually seems to be working in the dark), a select band of collators and couriers and lastly our worthy cover designer, Phil Moss. Thank you all.

NPS

Lose one, Gain one

Mr Brian Smith, the County Archivist since 1968, has now been appointed Assistant Secretary to the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts in London. His post at the Gloucestershire Records Office has been taken over by Mr David Smith to whom we extend a warm welcome.

It is to Brian Smith, who first came to Gloucester in 1961 as Senior Assistant Archivist, that much of the credit must go for the close relationship which exists between the staff of the Records Office and local amateur researchers, many of whom first acquired an insight into the use of historical records through attending one of his courses of evening classes.
Introduction and Summary

St Mary de Lode has long been considered to be a Saxon foundation. Its name is Old English and refers to a crossing of the nearby River Severn. It has a 12th century tower and, until it was demolished in 1824, the nave had many Norman elements. The church's parish was exceptionally large - usually a sign of great antiquity - and it has recently been suggested that St Mary's may have been founded before the 10th century to serve the extra-mural parish of the Abbey of St Peter.¹

The excavations of 1978-79 uncovered part of a substantial Roman building of the 2nd-4th centuries, consisting of a large room surrounded by ranges of smaller rooms. There were mosaics on the floors of the surrounding ranges, and all the rooms were richly decorated. The alignment of this building was exactly the same as the later church, suggesting that some of the building survived to affect the subsequent development of the site. Two of the walls in the excavation area were left standing, above the destruction debris of the rest of the building.

The destruction rubble of the Roman building was deliberately levelled over in the 5th-6th centuries, or later, and a timber building was constructed. Its west wall was directly above and on the same alignment as one of the Roman walls. This building contained east-west grave slots and an east-west headless burial, sealed below a rough mortar floor. The shoulders of the burial were to the west, in the Christian manner; the building may, therefore, have been either a Christian mausoleum or a church.

Above this building lay the floors of the 9th or 10th century Saxon nave. The foundations of the south wall remained, and the position of the robbed west wall was traced across the full width of the nave. There are indications that this church was built largely of timber.

Just outside the west end of this church was a cemetery which was in use for at least 250 years before a stone built western annex was added to the nave. The annex was built in the mid-11th century or earlier. It had substantial foundations, probably to support a large western gallery rather than a tower.

In the late 11th or early 12th century the Saxon nave was demolished, but the walls of the western annex were incorporated into the first, aisless Norman nave. The Norman church also had a central tower and a short chancel. A decorated doorway was set into the west wall of the retained annex.

In the mid-12th century, north and south aisles were added, and the walls of the nave were pierced for an arcade. Towards the end of the century the tower fell, destroying the chancel. Both tower and chancel were rebuilt in a style markedly different from that of the first Norman building.

In the 13th century the chancel was extended to the east and the aisles to the west, whilst the north and south walls of the old western annex were cut back to allow another bay to be added to the nave arcade.

In the post-medieval centuries St Mary's seems to have suffered periodic decay.² However, during this period the large Saxon font was replaced by a smaller one nearer the west end, and the south aisle was remodelled and widened.
We are fortunate in having several etchings of the east end and south side of the church in the late 18th century, and a medal struck in 1797 which shows the west end. Structural elements from the 12th century to the post-medieval period are evident in these illustrations, and 19th century articles and a letter add descriptions of the interior. The excavations have further shown that, although pierced by later doors, windows and arcades, parts of the mid-11th century western annex were still standing at the beginning of the 19th century. Architectural elements from the 12th century onwards are still visible in the tower and chancel, but the nave was demolished in 1824-26 and replaced in the early Gothic Revival style. This nave almost certainly respects the ground plan of the medieval nave and aisles, and provides a large space for worship and parish activities, but it can hardly be said to be beautiful.

The 1978-79 excavations took place, by kind permission of the Vicar and congregation of St Mary's, in advance of the work of relaying the floor of the nave, and alterations to the west end of the nave, where a parish hall was to be created.

In 1978 excavation in the southern half of the nave lasted three weeks and was carried out, at short notice, by an entirely voluntary team. My particular thanks are extended to Diane Fenicle. Members of the excavation team from St Oswald's Priory also gave valuable assistance.

In 1979 nearly £2,000 was made available by the Gloucester City Lottery for the excavation of the north side of the nave, and a further £2,000 was granted by the Lottery for post-exavcation work. This allowed two months work to be done, and a much larger area was investigated. My thanks to Christopher Guy and David Kear, who acted as supervisors, Ivette Staelens who processed the finds, Elizabeth Baxter, Lynn Copland, Angela Haden, Rowena Lawrence, Sheila Newton, Peggy Youngs, Ian Barclay, Simon Bennett, Renford Key, Ralph Paish and Paul Roberts and others who gave their help on the excavation.

Members of the Youth Opportunity Programme took part in the early stages of the excavation and, to my relief, undertook the tedious task of back-filling after the excavation had finished.

I am grateful to Dr Richard Gem for his comments on the standing structure and to Stuart Davies for providing the information on the 18th century medals.

Harold Wingham gave much help and advice with site photography; Jonathan Jones helped me with the analysis of the Roman wall plaster.

Much of the dating evidence in this report comes from the study of the excavated material by Cherry Goudge, Caroline Ireland, Allan Peacey, Alan Vince and Malcolm Watkins.

My wife, Carolyn Heighway, not only leapt in with a trowel at the slightest provocation during the excavation, but has acted as a harsh editor and critic during the writing of this report. I acknowledge a great debt to her.

Last, but by no means least, I must thank the Vicar of St Mary's, the Rev. Sidney Riggs, and his wife Jean, and the congregation of the church, who were willing not only to have their work of restoration interrupted by the excavations, but also to act as guides and to provide refreshments during the excavation. Their support and enthusiasm for the project helped to make it one of the happiest and most memorable excavations that I have worked on. I believe that we have shown there to have been continuity of worship at St Mary's for more than 1000 years and I hope that this, together with the information that we managed to retrieve about the
early structural development of the church, may add in some way to the feeling of Christian fellowship that is present in St Mary's today.

The Excavation

Period 1

This period was represented solely by wall plaster found in the make-up for the floor of Room A (Period 2). The wall plaster is of fine quality and quantitative analysis suggests that it is from a scheme of large black panels surrounded by red borders, above a dado of flecked, blue/white 'false marble'. The black panels are decorated with turquoise and white plants with three-lobed leaves and yellow-ochre flowers and highlights. This scheme was overpainted later with broad white bands outlined with fine red lines. Several of the white bands and red outlines are curved and these may have formed part of a scheme of arcading against the original black. Pottery indicates a 2nd century date.

Period 2.1

The second Roman building was a large, at least partially-roofed area (Room A) surrounded by ranges of rooms. The excavation only reached Roman levels in three areas (see figure). In Trench IV, east of Wall F.135, lay a very hard, coarse mortar surface, on which was a deposit of fine green silt, approximately 10 mm deep. Immediately on top of this silt was a black organic layer with some burned timber. Five metres east of these deposits and, continuing out of the excavation area, exactly the same sequence of layers occurred; and on the south side of the nave (Trench II) the same sequence also occurred, east of Wall F.17. The similarity of these three sequences suggests that they all come from one large area, bounded to the west by walls F.135 and F.17.

To the west of Room A was Room B, containing a 'negative' style mosaic with white diagonal trellis decoration against a black background. The tesserae were large (20 mm approximately) and made of oolitic limestone (white) and lias limestone (blue-black). This mosaic was the floor of a corridor which, to judge by the border on the mosaic, ended under the present central aisle. A doorway in Wall F.135 led from this corridor into Room A.

Several other mosaics were discovered in 1825. During construction work for the north wall of the new nave....

"Workmen came to part of a beautiful tesselated pavement..... extending from east to west 16 ft 6 ins, and from north to south 7 ft 6 ins. This pavement was divided into compartments, enriched with a variety of scrolls, frets, and other ornaments, having a wreathed border inclosing figures of fish and surrounded by a guilloche. The colours of the tesserae were red, white and bluish grey; the sizes varying from one-half to three-quarters of an inch".6

Since this pavement did not appear in the excavations of 1978-79, there must be an east-west wall under the present north aisle, between Room A and the mosaic (Room E). Confirmation of a wall in this position was provided by the Period 2.3 destruction debris. This was deeper against excavated Roman walls and was also thicker towards the north edge of the excavation.

Two other mosaics were found in 1825. One, which lay near to the Room E mosaic, was of large blue and white tesserae and was probably the same as the mosaic in Room B, continuing the corridor to the north. The other
mosaic was discovered under the south side of the new nave and this had a
'fire place and underneath a flue composed of brick tiles'.

The use of this Roman building spans the 2nd to 4th centuries. It stood
almost on the bank of the then river. It must have been either a large
private house or a public building such as a bath-house; it was certainly
not a temple as suggested by 19th century historians.

Period 2.2

A rectangular pier was added to the north face of the right-angled return
on wall F.17. Earlier wall plaster runs behind the addition. This added
pier was plastered on all three exposed faces and burned. This must be
part of the remodelling of an entrance arch between Rooms A and C.

Period 2: wall plaster

In Room A it was possible to define at least three phases of painted wall
plaster and the second of these seemed to be contemporary with the single
phase of wall plaster recovered from Rooms B and C. It was not possible
to relate any of the wall plaster to specific building phases, but there
were markedly different schemes in each room.

The first phase of wall plaster in Room A was of very good quality; it
consisted of panels of red and cream, with small areas of plain white and
salmon pink bordered by fine red lines and white.

In the second phase the colour scheme changed. Above what was probably a
dado of speckled lilac outlined in dark purple, were panels of light and
dark terracotta. Some of the earlier white was retained and partly over-
painted with dark terracotta. Dark yellow entered the scheme, overpainted
with fine white lines; and lighter red with broad white borders. The dark
purple seemed to be used not only above the dado, but also in borders
immediately below the ceiling and in panels or broad borders overpainted
with white lines. Light and dark lilac were used elsewhere in conjunction
with pale green and yellow.

At the same time in Rooms B and C there was a bold scheme of diamonds,
triangles and slashed borders in a range of earth colours, and red, white,
dark grey, and dribbled and speckled green over khaki. It is suggested
that this scheme was contemporary with the second scheme in Room A because
the red in Room C was an exact match for one of the reds in Room A, and
the surface of the plaster was treated in a similar way. The reds were
otherwise all very different. The plaster of one of the triangle panels
from Room B was actually moulded into receding planes, accentuated by the
decoration.

The third phase consisted of overpainting of dark red-maroon decoration
on white (curving lines and circles with radiating lines), and white and
grey borders. There was also an almost fluorescent pink-orange. The
quality was very poor and the paint had cracked and peeled, chiefly
because it had not been painted onto wet plaster, but applied directly to
the dry face of the previous phase.

Period 2.3

The building was partially destroyed by fire. There was a considerable
quantity of burned material over all the excavated area of Room A, but
none in Room B. Room C was not fully investigated. This material was
then overlaid by a thick layer of destruction debris; stones and mortar,
with quantities of both fired clay and sandstone roof tiles. These
deposits lay also across Rooms B and C. Walls F.135 and F.17 were not,
however, covered by this destruction, and must have stood, although
reduced in height, for some time after the demolition of the Roman
building, to affect Period 3.

Period 3: The sub-Roman mausoleum or church

Period 3.1
To the east of wall F.135, the site was levelled up with compacted,
fairly stone-free loam. The top 150 mm of this levelling spread across
wall F.135. To the west of wall F.135, the levelling consisted of
limestone and tile rubble. A similar stony rubble layer was found near
the west end of Trench III.

The marked difference in the levelling materials east and west of wall
F.135 might indicate that different uses were intended for each area
(see Period 3.2 below).

In the surface of the levelling east of wall F.135, a group of 4th to
5th century pottery was found, together with sub-Roman grass tempered
ware.

Period 3.2
Immediately above the west face of Roman wall F.135, a drystone wall of
colite slabs (F.226) was built in a shallow foundation trench cut into
the levelling layer. The outline of a beam which had once rested on this
wall, and which had been burnt in situ, was visible as a fire-reddened
strip 250 mm wide on the surface of the limestone slabs. Two east-west
groove slots, and an east-west headless burial (B.16) with its shoulders
to the west, were cut through the levelling layers, and were sealed by a
rough mortar-loam floor which only occurred east of wall F.226. To the
west of F.226, the Period 3.1 rubble was roughly levelled with flat stones
in loam. This may have been the foundation of a paved forecourt. The
burnt timber building, with the burials sealed beneath its floors, must
have been a mausoleum, a church or an oratory. Its date is given by the
pottery from Period 3.1 which indicates that this structure was built in
or after the 5th to 6th centuries. A Carbon 14 determination from B.16
should provide a more precise date.

Period 4
Two east-west burials were recovered from the west end of Trench IV.
B.15 was cut in half by the Period 5 foundation, and B.14 lay in the same
layer as B.15. Both burials had their heads towards the west. It is
possible that these two burials belong to Period 3, but later disturbance
has removed the necessary evidence. Again, Carbon 14 may provide a date.

Period 5
Below the foundations (F.197) of the western annex of Period 7, was a
mortared stone east-west linear foundation (F.222). Although very similar
in construction to F.197, F.222 was 270 mm narrower, and was sealed by
part of a Period 6 layer of redeposited human bones (108).

Under the southern Period 6 wall foundation F.33/35 was a robber trench
F.41. Both this and F.222 have been placed in Period 5 because of their
position in the excavation sequence. If they were contemporary, they
would form part of a structure as wide as the Period 6 nave.

Period 6: The Saxon nave
Above the Period 3 floor surface was a series of layers which contained
limestone tempered and shell tempered pottery. The layers were very
distinctive and included a red, burned clay makeup, and several white
mortar surfaces. This stratigraphy was traced both in Trench III and IV, bounded by a shallow north-south robber trench F.193 on the west, and cut by the Norman wall foundations to north and south. Under the south Norman wall was an east-west wall foundation (F.33/35) which must have been contemporary with the floor sequence just described. F.33/35 was at least 0.85 m wide and varied in depth from 400 mm to 700 mm. The west robber trench F.193 was 0.85 to 1.1 m wide but only 220 mm deep at its maximum. The southern foundation, although of variable depth, was substantial enough to carry stone walls, but the shallow west robber trench indicates that the west wall was probably a timber-framed construction resting on a sleeper beam. The north and south walls could also have been timber-framed, above stone dwarf-walls. Dwarf-walls of stone would have helped to counteract the lateral pressures of a roof 11 m wide. There was no evidence of internal support for the roof.

During Period 6 a north-south trench (F.202) was dug across the nave about 5 m from the west wall. F.202 was 350 mm deep and 650 mm wide and did not reach the north wall. Its south end was observed in Trench III, where later floors had subsided into it. Presumably F.202 was for a substantial wall, possibly the support for a western gallery or a screen. It was too near the west end to be a rood screen.

At some time after the removal of the wall in F.202, during the latter part of Period 6 or perhaps in Period 7, a circular structure was set centrally in the nave about 4 m from the west wall. This structure (F.140) was bedded onto mortar, and appears to have consisted of a circular wall (250 mm wide and at least 230 mm high) surrounding a space of 1.3 m in diameter, in the bottom of which was rubble packing. This feature existed until the 16th century, when it was demolished and the hole filled in. Although so large, this can only have been a font. It would have had a stone or plaster floor above the rubble packing of the soakaway, and this floor must have been smashed up when the structure was robbed in the 16th century. The font was then replaced by a much smaller font further to the west (see Period 13).

Outside the west wall of the Saxon church, two sequences of burials were recovered. B.2 and B.5 to B.10 represented at least five 'generations' of burials closely respecting the line of the west wall; B.11 to B.13 pre-dated Period 7 and could be correlated with B.2, B.9 and B.10. Thus five generations of burials were contemporary with the Period 6 church and pre-dated Period 7. At the west end of St Oswald's Priory in Gloucester, a burial generation for the Saxon and Norman period could have been as many as 66 years (Heighway 1978); at the east end a generation was 30 years (Heighway 1980). If an average of fifty years is used for each burial generation at St Mary's, then burial had been taking place just outside the west wall of the church for 250 years before the Period 7 addition. The Period 7 structure was certainly pre-12th century (see below), so the Period 6 have could have been built in the 9th century, or at latest in the early 10th.

Period 7: The western annex

Cutting the west wall of the Saxon nave was a foundation (F.197) of coursed stones in rammed loam and mortar, 1.6 m wide and 0.8 m deep. F.197 continued out of the excavation to the west. It was massive enough to carry a considerable masonry structure, perhaps a tower. But the pre-existing west wall of the nave was not strengthened in any way, and so would not have been strong enough to carry the fourth side of a tower. The western structure was probably an annex of the same height as the nave, with substantial walls to carry a first floor gallery or chapel.
A series of mortar floors within the ground floor area of the western annex sealed the Period 6 burial sequence.

**Period 8: The Norman church - late 11th to early 12th century**

In the present day structure of the tower and chancel there is evidence of at least two Norman periods. The crossing arch has chevron decorated voussoirs and scalloped respond capitals (much altered at a later date). Originally, the outer order was carried on angle shafts. The north and west walls of the tower are built of coursed, well-cut, large ashlars up to first floor level. There is what appears to be a cut-back string course in the north wall (1 m from the present ground level) and the east jamb and two voussoirs of a Norman window. The east and south walls of the tower, together with the chancel arch, are described below (Period 10).

In the excavation, the north wall of the Norman nave was represented by a broad foundation (F.133). A foundation of similar width, extensively robbed, (F.32/F.40) was found on the south side. F.133 sealed the robbed Saxon west wall and was butt-jointed against the Period 7 western annex. F.133 was 1.5 m wide, built of coursed stones in sandy mortar, and it became deeper (nearly 1 m deep) towards the east. The southern wall foundation was shallower than F.133, but it too became deeper towards the east. The south wall of the Norman church was shallower because it rested on the remains of the Saxon south wall, which provided a ready-made foundation, although it is uncertain why this should not have been the case on the north.

Continuous foundations of such depth and breadth must have been originally intended to carry solid walls, which were later pierced by arcades (Period 9). The greater depth of the east section of the foundations could be explained as buttressing for the central tower.

From all this information a fairly detailed picture can be obtained of the first Norman church. The nave had no aisles and it continued, apparently without internal division, into the retained Saxon west annex. Either in this period, or in Period 9, a west door, "decorated with zig-zag and filleted mouldings", was set into the west face of the annex. A central tower rose above the junction of the nave and chancel. Nothing remains above ground of the first chancel, but it would almost certainly have been a simple, single-bay structure, the same size as the Period 10 rebuild.

**Period 9: The Norman church - mid-12th century**

Descriptions written before 1826 show that the nave was, in part, flanked by a Norman arcade both on the north and south sides. There is even a sketch showing what seems to be a two-ordered arch set on a scalloped capital on a circular pier. The voussoirs of the arch are chevron ornamented, and the hood moulding is decorated with billet carving.

When excavations were in progress, chevron voussoirs and sections of hood moulding were recovered from the 1826 pew cavity walls, together with segments of circular piers; these details corroborate the 19th century descriptions.

Large disturbed areas around the present pier bases indicate the position of the Norman piers. The latter with about 0.8 m in diameter, and the spacing seems to vary from 4.3 m to just under 4 m (centre to centre). An arch reconstructed from the recovered voussoirs would fit these dimensions, while the voussoirs themselves show clearly that they come from two-ordered arches with hood moulding.
Period 10: Late Norman

The east and south walls of the present tower are markedly different from the ashlar construction of the north and west walls (Period 8). They are much more irregular both in coursing and in the type of stone used; and they appear to be contemporary with the chancel arch. This arch is decorated with a single, heavy roll moulding and, in the opinion of Richard Gem, the capitals of the respond shafts are typical of late Norman work of the last quarter of the 12th century. The most reasonable explanation for this is that the tower fell and was rebuilt with the north and west walls of the old tower incorporated into the new structure up to first floor level. It is likely that the first chancel would have been, in large part, destroyed by the falling tower. Any Norman work, therefore, that remains in the heavily restored chancel must also belong to Period 10.

Period 11: 13th Century

On both the north and south sides of the nave, immediately to the west of the ends of the Norman foundations, were large square foundations of coursed stones in mortar and rammed earth (F.36 on the south and F.134). The mortar of both was deep orange. It was not possible to excavate below F.36 because one of the present piers (F.1) stands upon it; but F.134 was set on top of the foundation for the retained west annex, showing that at least part of the annex was demolished. Re-used in the foundation of the modern pier F.1 was a complete, circular capital for a pier of 0.8 m diameter. This capital was decorated with a simple 13th century moulding. 19th century accounts of the pre-1826 church, although conflicting, all agree in describing pointed arches in the nave arcade, "as well as semi-circular ones." It seems likely, therefore, that the two foundations, F.36 and F.134, were the pier bases of a single western bay added to the arcade in the 13th century, when the north and south aisles were extended to the west. The walls of the old west annex would have been cut back to accommodate the new arches.

At the same time the chancel was enlarged by the addition of another bay with quadripartite vault ribs supported by foliate capitals on clustered wall shafts. Two corbels support the vaulting ribs where they meet the east wall, but these are obviously re-used from another context and may even date to the extensive restorations of the 19th and early 20th centuries. There is pictorial evidence for three different east window arrangements, the present one being almost certainly early 20th century.

Period 12 & 13: Late Medieval and Post Medieval Floors

The nave area yielded many late-medieval and post-medieval finds from a sequence of thin deposits of fine grey-black silt, interleaved with mortar spreads. Since this area of the town was subject to serious flooding until comparatively recently, these silts may represent flood deposits. Part at least of this sequence seals the robbing of those sections of the Norman foundations which lay between the south arcade piers.

In the 14th to 16th centuries part of the floor was tiled, while in the early 18th century a floor of lias flagstones was laid throughout the nave.

Period 13: Post Medieval

Just to the north of the central axis of the nave, about 4 m from the west door, was a drystone font soakaway. This, and three of the brick cists discovered in Trench IV, belonged to the post-medieval period.
In 1797 a series of medals were struck depicting major Gloucester buildings and monuments. St Mary's is shown in west elevation with the Norman west door, buttresses on the line of the north and south arcades, late glazing in what were presumably early English or Perpendicular windows, a single pitch roof covering the aisles and nave, and a flat roofed extension to the south. The flat roof of this extension indicates that it was a post-medieval addition, and the robbing of the portions of the Norman foundation between the piers may belong to a general relaying of the floor and remodelling of the interior contemporary with this southward extension.

Period 14: The Georgian Church

In 1824, having collected a large sum of money to repair the nave, it was decided that a new nave should be built. The old structure was in bad repair. By 1826 the present Early Gothic Revival nave was completed. The centre of this nave is 0.7 m to the south of the centre of the chancel arch (the modern ridge is about 0.6 m to the south of the old ridge on the west face of the tower). This can be explained if one supposes that the present nave utilises the line of the foundations of the pre-1826 aisles. On the north side these foundations would have been Norman, while on the south they would have been those of the Period 13 extension. The result would have been a shift of the axis of the new structure to the south.

The present spindly octagonal piers appear to respect almost exactly the positions of the medieval piers so that, with a good deal of imagination, one can visualise the internal dimensions of the medieval church.

Notes and References


2. For the 17th century - Historic Manuscript Commission. 12th Report Appendix, Part IX.
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12. See Fosbrook 1819; or an undated, but almost certainly later, version signed by J Bonner.

13. See Note 4 above.
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St OSWALD'S CEMETERY, GLOUCESTER, AFTER THE DISSOLUTION

by Stuart Davies

When St Oswald's Priory was founded in A.D. 909, it was built on the site of a ninth century cemetery which was in turn on the site of a Roman cemetery. It has been suggested that this may have been a royal cemetery associated with the supposed late Saxon palace of Kingsholm. It certainly became the graveyard of the parish of St Catherine alias St Oswald, the parish church of which was the Priory. Even after the Dissolution the priory church continued its parish function, probably until the mid-17th century. The recent series of excavations at St Oswald's have revealed a large number of post-Dissolution burials and the purpose of this note is to examine the documentary sources for evaluating the use of St Oswald's graveyard during this period.

The church was apparently heavily damaged during the Siege of Gloucester in 1643. The parish did not get a replacement until 1866 when Medland designed a new brick church next to the ruins of St Oswald's. By an ordinance of Parliament in 1648, the parish was united with St John's. The church buildings, such as remained, were given to the corporation of the city and in 1655 the roof and some other parts of it were used in building the Barley Market house in Eastgate Street. This ordinance became null at the Restoration and the parish once again became separate.

Between the mid-17th and mid-19th centuries the parish was served by a curate who held services in St Mary de Lode. From the 17th century the revenues were appropriated to the Chapter of Holy Trinity, Bristol, who appointed a vicar to baptize children in their homes. These were probably one and the same person, attached to St Mary de Lode but with special responsibilities for the parish of St Catherine. However, separate registers were kept, although after the rebuilding of St Mary's in 1826 baptisms were generally included in that parish's registers. Burials were kept apart throughout though, for the churchyard continued to be used as the place of burial for the parishioners. Marriages were recorded in the registers although they were conducted in a number of different churches. If only one parishioner was involved the location would normally be the spouse's church. But where both were parishioners then, presumably, the venue would depend on a variety of factors - personal, administrative and even fashion. Of the 51 known marriages involving St Catherine couples between 1695 and 1737, the venue of 14 is unknown. Four were held at Norton, three at Hartpury and one each at St Nicholas and St Mary de Lode. Of the rest, 13 were held at St Michael's (although none after 1732) and 15 at St Mary de Crypt (all of them 1729 or later). The parish of St Catherine and, indeed its neighbour St Mary de Lode, is an historical demographer's nightmare, being not only very large but containing urban, suburban and rural elements. Furthermore, the registers do not reflect precisely the total baptisms and burials for the parish. There has been a certain intermingling of register entries between St Catherine's and two of its neighbours. When assessing the historical demography behind the use of St Oswald's graveyard it has therefore been necessary to consult the registers of St Catherine's, St Mary de Lode's and St John the Baptist's. This essay is concerned with mortality in the parish rather than the whole historical demography of the parish. However, to come to some basic conclusions about the usage of the graveyard since the mid-17th century, some consideration of the size of the parish population during this period must be taken into account.
In 1563 there were 102 households, in 1712 100 inhabited houses, and, in 1743, 119 houses housing 406 people. This suggests that throughout two centuries the population of the parish did not exceed 500 and may, indeed, have shrunk to not many more than 400 by the mid-18th century. There was not the substantial growth in population that was experienced in other Gloucester parishes and indeed throughout England in the late 16th and early 17th centuries. There was, however, a considerable rise in the late 18th century for, by 1801, there were 781 inhabitants. This upward trend continued in the early 19th century, just over 1,900 inhabitants being recorded by the middle of that century.

To summarise then, between the mid-16th and mid-18th century the population of the parish was stable at between 400 and 500 persons. Between about 1750 and 1850, however, it roughly quadrupled, nearing the 2,000 mark. The baptismal registers reflect the late 18th and early 19th century increases although, of course, they do not take into account either non-Anglicans or migration into the parish.

The registers reveal that approximately 1,500 people appear to have been buried in St Catherine's churchyard between 1720 and 1850, forty per cent of them in the final thirty years of that period. This is not surprising since, as the population of the parish increased, so did the number of deaths and burials in the parish. The mortality rate also seems to have increased during this same period, from about 13 per 1,000 to 20 per 1,000. By contrast the mortality rate at St Mary de Lode was fairly consistent at 24 per 1,000.

Some useful comments can be made on the sex and age ratios of those buried at St Catherine's in the period 1813 to 1850. The information available is tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 89</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, the sex ratio of those buried is very even. Of the age distribution only one face is remarkable, that 44 per cent of those buried were aged less than five. However, infant mortality of these dimensions was not unusual; between 1813 and 1850, 2902 people were buried at St Mary de Lode, of which 1,248 were aged less than five - 43 per cent of the total.

A number of problems arise when trying to apply these figures to the entire post-Dissolution period and, indeed, if one were to suggest that they might have an application in Roman and Medieval studies. However, infant mortality rates appear to have been generally on the decline during
the 18th century and are unlikely to have been any lower in the 16th and 17th centuries than in the early 19th century. There is therefore every reason to assume that throughout the post-Dissolution period at least one half of all the burials would have been of infants aged less than five years.

This has obvious archaeological implications. At the time of writing the skeletons so far excavated at St Oswald's are almost entirely of adults and therefore do not accurately represent the true demographic characteristics of the parish. It may be, therefore, that infants are buried together in a part of the churchyard not yet excavated or that the remains are too ephemeral to be archaeologically recognisable. Only further excavation and excavation techniques carried out in the light of this postulation will provide a solution to this problem.
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Hollow way on the medieval Gloucester to Northleach road east of
Colesbourne looking west at SP 017129.
The ancient map of Great Britain in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, is dated 1325-1350. A facsimile version of this "Bodleian" or "Gough" map is available from the Ordnance Survey. It is important in that it is the first map of England's road network that we have. This makes it worthy of study by anyone interested in the history of communications. Here is an expression of the preferred routes of the 14th Century, used by travellers of Chaucer's England, but not always maintained by people of later times.

In local terms, the map shows a road running directly from Gloucester to Northleach, crossing the River Churn well below Seven Springs but above Gloucester. In spite of distortions and simplifications within this early map, these towns, the river and the source of the Thames, are all clearly marked. Today, a traveller leaving Gloucester for Northleach would either take the A-40 through Cheltenham or go by way of Crickley Hill, Seven Springs and the Frog Mill. Did another route, aligned more directly, ever exist and, if so, what was its function and why was it regarded as a trunk road?

Roads are by no means permanent features of our landscape. If trade declines, or commercial patterns change, roads may be abandoned entirely or parts of them downgraded to minor status. A once complete network can disintegrate into tattered remnants - a course of events which happened to the Roman roads, and which has happened to our railway system in recent decades. The virtual disappearance of a once important highway, thronged by travellers such as those described in the Canterbury Tales, is nothing to be surprised about. Apart from commercial considerations, the fortunes of roads have also been influenced by the modes of transport employed on them. Wheeled vehicles call for gentle gradients, the motorist liking ones even gentler than those established for stage and post coaches. Foot travellers, riders, pack and drove animals can all cope with quite steep slopes, taking a direct ascent before resting at the top. Such forms of traffic would have been the commonest on 14th century roads. None would have objected to short, sharp climbs and descents. All would have preferred directness to easy gradients. Wheeled vehicles would have been few and their journeys generally short. The rich rode and the poor walked. Topography on the direct Gloucester to Northleach line is cut up by the headstream of the Thames and Frome systems. However, this ridge and valley relief is unlikely to have deterred 14th century travellers and their animals.

A direct road to Northleach has survived and can be followed for its whole length on foot or horseback and for much of its distance by car. The traveller left Gloucester by the East Gate and went by way of Saintbridge ('Bridge at the Sandy Place') and the Portway to Upton St Leonards. The name 'Portway' takes on more significance if it is appreciated that 'ports', or market towns, lay at both ends and not just to the west. A bridge crossing the Sud Brook at Saintbridge implies a road of some importance. Gloucester's East Gate would not have had much significance if the road leading out of it served only a local function.

That Northleach should have been the destination of the Port Way needs explanation. It was the Abbot of Gloucester who obtained a market grant for Northleach in 1227. From that date a Wednesday market and a June Fair (28-30 June) were held. Thus, Northleach and Gloucester had common commercial interests. Religion and scholarship created a movement of travellers between Oxford and Gloucester. For these, and for people heading for London, the road via Northleach and Oxford would have had many attractions.
From Upton St Leonards to Northleach the road takes a direct line. East of Upton it climbs steeply up the scarp, in places as a hollow way, south of Prinknash and then tumbles down into Cranham. From there a steep ascent takes one up to a cross roads on the modern Birdlip to Stroud road. To the east the land drops down to Climperwell. Perhaps the existence of this road makes the tradition that William the Conqueror hunted in the woods around Prinknash and Climperwell easier to understand. William’s visits to the Abbey at Gloucester would have brought him this way! From Climperwell the lane takes a steep way up a little side valley, leading towards Brimpsfield. This side valley shows traces of abandoned routes up both its flanks and provides a perfect example of the way in which travellers used to vary the detailed line of their journeys before roads became fixed and metalled ribbons. At the top of the rise the road crosses what used to be the open field of Brimpsfield.

The passage through Brimpsfield may well have taken different routes at different dates. It almost certainly split there. The direct line is the one that is still a right of way down through Brimpsfield Park. This avoids the village itself, but another way would have gone through the settlement past its church and castle to Briary Hill, across Ermin Street to Elkstone by way of Highgate. The route through the Park seems the more likely of the two as a route to Northleach. It is direct and easy to traverse on foot. It joins Ermin Street between Highgate and Smith’s Cross. From there it is a short way to Elkstone across its South Field. Smith’s Cross was located where a deep and recently made cutting now exists on Ermin Street. From what is now an extensive lay-by, the Old Bath Lane takes one by way of Winston, Sapperton, Cherrington and Tetbury. The name Smith’s Cross implies rather more than the branching of the road to Bath from Ermin Street. A crossing by another important road, such as the Northleach one, would explain the name rather well. Older maps of Elkstone show several roads that no longer exist crossing the fields to meet at Smith’s Cross.

Our road reaches Elkstone, runs through the Manor Farm yard, past the Priest’s House, above the site of the original water mill and along the village street. From this it bears off across the old North Field to Sparrowthorn. From there the road ran directly down the fields to Penhill Farm at the start of Colesbourne's village street. Today, this length of the route is no more and one has to follow two sides of a triangle in order to reach the farm by public road. The old road has been overlain by the A-435, built in 1825, as it passes the Colesbourne Inn. Many adjustments in road alignment have occurred in the area of Colesbourne, but the old London road probably ran past the church and across what is now Colesbourne Park. Today, we have to follow the main road and take a left turn onto the Withington lane which crosses the Churn. The old alignment can be picked up again at SP 007132 where a track runs up into the woods heading eastwards. After crossing the crest it drops down through a very deeply incised hollow way to the little dry valley that runs up behind Marsden Manor. This valley it crosses on a raised causeway. A further length of hollow way takes one up towards Woodlands Farm past which our road heads for Chedworth Laines, only to be lost as a result of the building of the war-time runways. Older Ordnance Maps give us the original pattern of roads.

The way into Chedworth is past the significantly named Newport Farm and the site of the now non-existent St John’s Church. By going down the steep road leading close by the parish church of Chedworth, the alignment takes us the length of Queen Street and across the valley. The somewhat confusing village morphology of Chedworth takes on a little more meaning
if this linear section is thought of as being the oldest section, with side growths extending on to other roads. A steep ascent exists at the exit in the Yanworth direction, but a look back down the field when the top of the rise is reached reveals another length of hollow way which may have constituted the way east. In any case, alternative ways up steep inclines often existed and have left traces in modern landscapes. Having traversed the down, the road to Northleach crosses the Coln near Yanworth Mill. It appears to have been diverted round the north-west corner of Stowell Park. Traces of tracks can be seen running up through the Park behind a lodge house, on a direct alignment. These may have been alternative ascents.

The 14th century road appears to cross the Fosse Way at an acute angle and head straight for the Mill End of Northleach. Passing close to the church, it enters that part of the Market Place which is detached from the present town centre by a group of buildings that includes the Sherbourne Arms. Similar buildings, of course, once existed within the market place of Cirencester and other towns. Northward, the road seems to head straight through Northleach and on to Farmington where it splits into ways to Stow and to Burford by way of Sherbourne, Windrush, Little Barrington and Upton. Entry to Burford by this route is made at the point where the old Cirencester road entered the main street opposite the church and a little above the Windrush crossing. We cannot be sure, therefore, that Northleach was the road's terminus, the town possibly being but one settlement on a longer line of communication.

The relationship between the road of the Bodleian Map and settlement shape is interesting, and its alignment fits well with all the places through which it goes. Indeed, the road can be said to explain the shape of many of the settlements including Northleach and Burford at a period before that of their greatest economic growth. Northleach itself consists of two distinct parts. An old huddled one lies around the church and the eastern market place. A newer, better ordered western part is composed of burgage plots set at right angles to the main street. These patterns show up well on air photographs. The ordered plots may relate to growth that followed the market grant of 1227. Any expansion following that event would have resulted in a blurring of the original layout and alignment. Burford, too, has a morphological relationship with the old road. An original nucleus at a cross roads close to the Windrush crossing would have given early Burford direct contact with Northleach and Witney, as well as with places to north and south.

Roads serve places and the system adjusts to the economic needs of particular periods. Improvements in transport led to an enlargement of the spheres of influence of some places at the expense of others. The granting of market privileges tended to polarise this trend. Halting places on a route used by pedestrians and riders had to be closer together than those on routes used by coach travellers. In the case of the road under discussion, settlements are located at about three mile intervals, each one being aligned on the route. This is in direct contrast to the Fossway, Ermin Street and the A-40 in this area, all of which bypass most villages. The era of the turnpike trusts and stage coaches bypassed many small villages, placing emphasis on more direct routes between market towns. When the Gloucester-Crickle Hill road was turnpiked in 1698, an increased emphasis on wheeled transport was already apparent. By 1751, when the rest of the Oxford road, by way of Seven Springs, the Frog Mill and Northleach, was turnpiked, a new age had come. The older, up-hill and down-dale road would have lost its significance quickly, being used only for local movement. Thus a trunk road became a tenuous thread across the county, broken in parts and its significance forgotten.
TRACKWAYS

Across the bare bleak Cotswolds, adown the Severn Vale,
And deep amid Dean Forest glades, the haunts of nightingale,
The old grass tracks still wander, the old green roads still lead
Past barrow, camp, and horestone gray, by hill, and dale, and mead.

O'er Cotswolds stretch the Calf Way, the Salt Way,
Buggilde Street;
'Twixt Puesdown Hill and Salperton the White and Saltways meet.
There's Silver Street and Sprakeway; there's Sarn,
and Sleight, and Stey;
A portway climbs to Buckholt Wood, there's Wick Street Painswick Way.

Green lanes amid the meadows, green ways across the downs,
They linked together ages past the earth-walled British towns;
They lead past camp and barrow, o'er wold, o'er hill, and stream,
Where you may walk the livelong day and of Old England dream.

L E W O Fullbrook-Leggatt
AN ANCIENT ROAD THROUGH CHELTENHAM

by Nigel Cox

One aspect of historical research into the Fairview area of Cheltenham has been the investigation of ancient land divisions. The most significant of these is that which now divides Glenfall Street from York Street. This boundary may be traced across the whole of the Cheltenham Inclosure map of 1806, where for most of its length, except through Fairview, it appears as a road. It seems likely that it represents the course of an ancient highway which bypassed the medieval town but which fell into disuse, by about 1800, as Cheltenham expanded. The road runs from the Cross Hands on the Tewkesbury Road west of Cheltenham across the north side of the town towards Hewletts farm. It apparently formed part of a drift way from Gloucester and the Severn to the Cotswolds and London. John Milner has suggested that it be seen as one of a series of east/west routes across the vale from the Cotswolds to the Severn.

By 1756 turnpike roads had been created from Gloucester using the High Street as a route to London and to Stow-on-the-Wold, and Cheltenham had become a place people travelled to and stayed at. Gradually the 'old road' became stopped up, parts being incorporated into new roads linking Cheltenham with surrounding farms and villages. The tradition of a right of way seems to have survived well in the 1840s when parts of the route were built over.

The course of the road through Cheltenham follows the high ground between the River Chelt and Wyman's Brook, ignoring the High Street altogether. Through Fairview the road divided the freehold land of Whaddon Field from the copyhold land of Coneygree Old Inclosure. Coneygree can be traced back at least to 1690 in the Court Rolls and is represented today by the area between Winchcombe Street, Fairview Street and Fairview Road. Various Court Roll entries refer to land on the north of Coneygree as 'late a road or way formerly called the sandshards' (1804), 'the old sandy lane' (1815), 'public watercourse formerly the old sandy lane' (1819) and 'ancient watercourse' (1824). An extract from the schedule to the inclosure award copied out for William Gyde, a major land owner in Coneygree, tells of the construction of a drain 'one ditch drain or watercourse No. 36 beginning on the south side of the Old London Road (leading towards Uletts (sic) and Whittington) and extending westward of the breadth of 8 ft along the south side of the sandy lane to the northeast corner of an allotment to John Cook'. This drain followed the line of the road from its junction with Hewletts Road to approximately Brunswick Street.

The Route (lettered sections refer to map)

Cross Hands to Maud's Elm (formerly Maul's Elm) : a - b

At Cross Hands the Old Gloucester Turnpike of 1756 joined the Tewkesbury turnpike of 1726. East of the Cross Hands is the Princess Elizabeth Way roundabout which, in 1800, was a cross roads where the road from Swindon Village crossed the 'old road' to join the High Street. The present Tewkesbury Road has been straightened to align with High Street. When the Midland Railway was built in 1840 no provision was made to bridge the 'old road' although the route west of the railway can still be traced as field boundaries on 20th century maps.

Swindon Turnpike : b-c

The turnpike road from Swindon Village is pre-1799 and uses a section of the 'old road' from Maud's Elm to the junction of St Paul's Road. The turnpike must have been created to link the centre of Cheltenham to...
Swindon Village. Maud's Elm, destroyed in 1907, would have been a prominent landmark on the road for several hundred years.

**St Paul's Road to Pittville Gates : c - d**

St Paul's Road, formerly Maidenhorn Lane, is an extant section of the road. Clarence Square and Clarence Road are also, more or less, on the line although here it has been straightened by Joseph Pitt who owned land on both sides.

**Fairview : d - e**

From Pittville Gates to All Saints Road, the line of the ancient highway can be traced as property boundaries. York Street and Portland Square were developed from 1824 onwards, provision being made to preserve access from Winchcombe Street along the south of Portland Square. A holloway exists along the back gardens between York Street and Glenfall Street. It seems probable that this represents the 8 ft drain, mentioned earlier, either on the site of the road or with the road running just to the north on the line of Glenfall Street. Glenfall Street was built in the 1840s and may well have been named after Glenfall House close to which the 'old road' passes on its way up Agg's Hill.

**All Saints Church to Hewletts Road : e - f**

The road line today is marked by the backs of properties in Pittville Circus Road. A slight holloway exists north of All Saints Church. On the estate map of the Earl of Essex of c. 1799⁶ this section north of the church is shown as a road between hedges.

**Hewletts Road : f - g - h**

At (f) the road merges with the Hewletts turnpike. Evidence from maps of c. 1799 and 1806 suggests that this turnpike was created c. 1800, possibly by James Agg who bought Hewletts Farm in 1797. Agg may have wanted a good road into Cheltenham where his brewery was situated. The turnpike preserves the line of the ancient road up Harp Hill and Agg's Hill; one turnpike house still exists at the reservoir. On Mitchell's map of 1806⁷ this section is described as 'formerly the road to London one mile stone still remains on the upper part of the hill beyond Hewletts'. This milestone may still be seen halfway up Agg's Hill. Alfred Landseer writing in 1829, refers to Hewletts Road as 'formerly known as the only road to Stow-on-the-Wold and thence to London'.⁸
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6. British Museum ADD. MSS. 43463
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Until the middle of the 18th century, Gloucester still retained many features whose sites we can now only point to. Holy Trinity, the Butchery and Scriven's Conduit all still occupied their time honoured, but obstructive, positions in the main streets. The High Cross stood where it had done for more than 500 years.

Much of the domestic character of a medieval town survived; for along Gloucester's streets, timber framed houses had not yet succumbed to the pressures of fashion and finance. Some new houses had been built; one of these, the elegant house in Longsmith Street constructed for Henry Wagstaff at the turn of the century, was now occupied by the Raikes family - yes, Ladybellgate House.

Part of the medieval castle survived as the County Goal, and would do so for another half century, surrounded by the magnificent gardens of the Hyett family's town house. Although slighted after the restoration of Charles II, much of the City's defensive wall still stood and, together
with its ditch, it presented an imposing spectacle, particularly when viewed from the south and the east.

It is the thriving riverside port and city, at just this point in time, that Philip Moss has chosen to capture in the accompanying view. Cleveonis cannot do justice to the almost photographic quality of his original large scale drawing. However, Phil has arranged for the production of 30" x 12" finely printed copies on a quality cartridge paper and, as a special offer to GADARG members, these can be obtained unmounted from him at £1.25 each. His address is 21, Havelock Road, Hucclecote, Gloucester.

Let us hope that his panoramic view will be but the first of a complete series transporting us back to other periods in the City's past. What about this for the sequence - 1500 AD, 1250 AD, 1000 AD, 750 AD, 500 AD, 300 AD, 150 AD and, finally, 70 AD? Shall I book a similar space for No. 2 for this time next year, Philip?
SITE REPORTS

BOURTON-ON-THE-WATER Settlement Area near Bourton Bridge (SP 159208) Further to my reports in Glevensis 11 p. 42, and Glevensis 12 p. 28, I now produce a plan of the area I own, part of field OS 159, indicating structures so far revealed. Most of these structures are shown on large scale drawings in the earlier reports. The site was occupied from about 50 to 400 with a period from about 200 to 250 when it is believed to have been vacated due to flooding.

A new area in the north east corner of the field has been excavated in 1979 in anticipation of finding a road between two ditches clearly shown on aerial photographs of field OS 160 to the east. On my field, being 'Ridge and Furrow', there are no signs of these features in the photographs. Excavation successfully located a road 5 m wide between ditches whose centres are 11 m apart. These ditches were approximately 1 m wide at the top and 1 m deep. While excavating, some stonework was revealed which turned out to be a heavy pitched foundation of a circular building with internal radius of 3.5 m. No upper walling stones remained. Within the circle is a stoned area, near the south side of the building, constructed of flat stones 10 to 15 cm in size. Beneath this stone work was found a circular enamelled brooch of c.200 (illustrated). Outside the circle sherds of a large grey pot suggest a date of c.150. Sherds of a Samian dish of unusual shape have yet to be identified. A key in good condition is also illustrated.

A spear and a drop-handle have been found near the previous excavations (at 12E, 4N); these are also illustrated. Provenance suggests a date of around 100. An early vessel, recovered from below an area of deposited stonework at 21E, 29N, (see Glevensis 12) is reported on below.

It is expected that more features have yet to be excavated and help on the site would be most welcome.

C Renfrew
Bourton Bridge, Bourton-on-the-Water

ROMAN SETTLEMENT
CIRCULAR ENAMELLED BROOCH

IRON KEY

IRON DROP HANDLE

SHEEDED SPEAR (1/2 Scale)
REPORT ON AN IRON AGE VESSEL FROM BOURTON-ON-THE-WATER

This prehistoric vessel found at the Bourton Bridge Settlement, is a hand made jar of situlate shape. The form was common in the Hallstatt phase of the Iron Age, having been copied from metal vessels. Although our vessel has the high shoulder, its wall is more curved and the rim more outspayed than the standard early type. Also it has a more tubby appearance, which brings it nearer to later more cylindrical pot shapes. At Maiden Castle Wheeler (1) placed the situla jars in an Iron Age A category. However, Harding (2) prefers an early Iron Age B date with the suggestion that evolved forms continue right up to the Roman period when, as we now know, 'native ware' continued to be made in the old hand made tradition. Indeed, the 'tubby cooking pot' description could apply to this vessel.

The fabric is heavily impregnated with fossil shell, possibly oyster; in which case it may be Gryphaea sublobata from the Gryphite Grit of the Middle Inferior Oolite of the Jurassic. This bed outcrops at places along the Cotswold escarpment. Crushed shell is used as filler in pottery from the camp on Woolstone Hill (3) and the Beeches site, Cleeve Hill (4), where some of the rims may be from a similar form. Comparisons can also be made with pots from Hanborough, Oxon (5), where thumb impressions under the rim, as on our pot, occur. The rim can be compared with one from Heath Farm, Milton Common, Oxon (6). So we have an Iron Age A/B pot which, in a local context, may have been made at any time from the 3rd century B.C. up to, or even in, the Roman period. Because it was found on a Roman site with sufficient sherds to produce a profile, it is more likely to be of the mid-1st century A.D. However, because of its more 'prehistoric' character than the usual native ware of this period, there is just the possibility of it coming from a disturbed pre-Roman occupation, especially in view of its proximity to such a major prehistoric site as Salmesbury Camp.

Bernard Rawes

(2) Harding, D - The Iron Age in Lowland Britain (1974), 90.
(5) Case, H et al - 'Excavations at City Farm, Hanborough, Oxon', Oxoniensia 29-30 (1964-5), Figs. 32 and 33.
(6) Rowley, T - Oxoniensia 38 (1973) Figs. 7 and 12.

FROCESTER
Frocester Court Roman Villa

Excavations continued in the area immediately outside the courtyard southwest boundary wall and showed that a strip approximately 9m wide extending northwards from its wicket gate had been cultivated in the 4th century, effectively destroying all shallow earlier features and leaving an irregular pattern of scoops and hollows. Work on the west boundary ditches confirmed the suspected line of both the re-used inner 1st century and the later outer features. It also disclosed two phases of a shallow earlier Iron Age boundary just inside and partly dug away by the deeper 1st century ditch. A westward extension of the late R.B. palisade trench ran to the silted up centre of the latter and apparently turned south along its line. The probable late Bronze Age ditch first located in 1968 produced further dating evidence of its primary and secondary phases.
The 1st-2nd century gravel foundation spread found in 1978 did not extend further north but gave way to a back yard area containing badly plough-damaged features. This yard was subdivided by the turning north of a shallow frost eroded ditch first located in 1976 and a multi-phase fence and/or planted hedge with a 0.9 m wide gateway near its north end.

The contents of the twelve circular pits found suggested a period of use spanning the 1st centuries BC-AD, but, in general, gave little indication of their purpose, but it is suggested that the two large 1 m deep outliers, one of them probably lined with staves or wickerwork, may have been shallow wells. A rectangular pit containing a pair of bronze tweezers is probably later. None of the pits appear to have been open for any great length of time.

The stone packed postholes of a four-post feature dated to the early 1st century indicate a timber structure using 18-20 cm diameter posts, at least one of which was renewed. It could have been a raised storehouse, possibly to hold unthreshed ears of corn. A nearby similar feature of which three posts were located in 1978, and a fourth this season containing last 1st century samian, must postdate it, as does the circular feature located further to the west. This latter appears to have consisted of eight posts supporting a possible roofed area with a slight timber framed wall or windbreak outlining at least the northwest segment of the circumference. Inside a kidney shaped hollow 3 m across was surrounded by a rudimentary cobbled floor of re-used potboilers. Its function is not clear, the depression could have been caused by threshing with a stick or flail and subsequently shovelling up the grain, but a similar effect could well have been produced by penned livestock, e.g., a pig or poultry.

Five infant and two adult male burials were recorded. The first adult a 1st century crouched burial, the second a 2nd to 3rd century extended skeleton in a wooden coffin. Its skull had been placed between its knees and a ritual forequarter of lamb was laid by its right side.

E G Price

GLOUCESTER
The Prince Albert Site Development
Station Road
(SO 8550 1842)  Observations made during wall trenching and a 200 square metre basement area, excavated to natural sand and gravel levels. This site is situated 160 m beyond the east colonia defences, adjacent to the northeast angle of the wall.

Roman: Part of an oolite stone block constructed foundation approximately 64 cm wide, of undetermined use and length, was traced 14 m across the site in an easterly direction. The footing was bounded either side by an open metallic area of crushed oolite rubble. Successive metallings above contained 3rd-4th century pot sherds. Traces of metalling beneath medieval plough soil level, were observed throughout the site.

Medieval: Two undated boundary ditches 1 m wide running parallel 20 m apart, extended across the basement area in a north-south alignment. A number of pits and small linear features, some associated with gravel extraction, were recorded throughout the site.

Post-Medieval: The 17th-18th century open course of the River Twyver was recorded beneath its 19th century brick culvert alignment. The culvert ran parallel with Station Road, alias Mill Lane.
A service trench cut along the north side of the main building. Part of the open metalled area, east of the Roman defences ditch was observed below the existing terraced area adjacent to the street frontage. Remains of two, possibly three, inhumation burials and a scatter of 2nd/4th century pot sherds, were noted on the spoil heap, from a length of backfilled trench near the northwest corner of the building.

Observations continued on this site during the construction of the building. Dark loam tip lines, presumed to be the back of the 4th century rampart, were observed in a trench beneath the medieval metallings of Queen Street.

A trial trench was machined across the above site, to bisect an alignment projected for the Roman colonia Quay Wall

Roman: The line of the quay side retaining wall was found robbed out. This was bounded to the east by made-up ground of the 2nd to 3rd century Roman waterfront. A secondary build to the wall was indicated by a construction trench which cut the made-ground. It was not possible, in this particular exercise, to examine the deeper stone block platform level of the quay

Medieval: Post-Roman deposits of estuarine silts within the lower harbour area, west of the wall alignment, was overlain by reclaimed and consolidated land levels of 11th century date. The wall was finally robbed out in the first quarter of the 12th century. Medieval and post-medieval houses fronting Lower Quay Street alias Walker's Lane, were subsequently recorded on the site.


Observations made in a gas main trench, 1.8 m deep. Successive 16th-17th century metalled surfaces, of the Gloucester Quay, were recorded beneath the east carriageway of the modern Quay. A polyangular wall foundation, within Barbican Way, is identified with the original Clerk of Works office for the 19th century County Gaol.

Observations made in two service repair trenches. The robbed out alignment of the west side circuit of the colonia defences wall was recorded in Trench I at a depth of 3.5 m. A 4th century berm horizon, in front of the wall alignment, was discerned at a depth of 3 m in the second trench. The Roman levels were sealed beneath successive
medieval and post-medieval street metallings. The lowest street levels are associated with late 10th to mid 11th century pottery, also a late Saxon decorated leather scramasax sheath.

GLOUCESTER
Gloucester Cathedral
(SO 8315 1878)
Observations made in a series of viewing trenches cut around standing column shafts, within the Crypt. A primary medieval sand mortar floor with a lias stone rubble make-up, over lay natural lias clay, shot with perma frost fissures. The fissures were filled with red sand loam and bunter pebbles. The medieval floor level was overlain by a raised mortar floor with a sand make-up, totalling 40 cm thick. This make-up contained fragments of 18th century roofing tiles. It was noted that the columns had subsided 30 cm below the medieval floor level.

GLOUCESTER
Dulverton House, Pitt Street
(SO 8318 1883)
A service trench 70 cm deep exposed the 19th century brick culvert course of the Fulbrook, extending along the south side garden boundary with the Cathedral grounds.

GLOUCESTER
14-27 Pitt Street
(SO 1830 1894)
Observations made in a boundary wall trench, 90 cm deep, for new lock-up garages on the above plots. Re-deposited natural red loam, recorded from a depth of 48 cm overlay deposits of dark green charcoal flecked loam containing 2nd century pot sherds and bones. Similar deposits were previously recorded beneath the floor of No. 28 Pitt Street. It is assumed the above levels were all redeposited, and may have been originally part of a raised bank along the outer edge of the suspect ditch before the abbey precinct wall. The redeposited levels were post dated and cut by a linear feature, extending along the trench at a slight angle into the street frontage. 17th to 18th century pottery was recovered in its backfill.

GLOUCESTER
British Rail Bridge
Hare Lane
(SO 8334 1598)
Observations made during consolidation of the bridge piers. A robbed stone wall footing bounded by a floor of puddled lias clay, was recorded at a depth of 1 m. A destruction level above the floor was sealed by a rough stony surface containing re-used Roman debris.

GLOUCESTER
British Rail bridge land, adjacent to the St Catherine St and Dean's Way junction
(SO 8316 1905)
Observations made in a service trench below the east side pavement and carriageway of St Catherine Street, alias Watrynstr. Successive stone wall footings, 13th century to post-medieval, were recorded fronting onto a sunken street alignment. The street metallings exceed an exposed depth of 2 m.

GLOUCESTER
St Catherine Street, near the junction of Skinner Street
(SO 1839 1901)
The silted-up course of the River Twyver was recorded in a service trench beneath the north side carriageway at a depth of 1.6 m. The river bed was overlain by a 19th century brick culvert alignment and successive street metallings.
Observations made in three trial holes on site of proposed new factory area. Four successive fine metalled surfaces overlying natural were recorded at a depth of 1.1 m, adjacent to St Catherine Street. To the north a large post pit containing a post hole, 30 x 34 cm, was observed cut into natural. Further north one side of a large silted up ditch feature, containing late 1st and 2nd century pottery, exceeded a recorded depth of 3 m.

Observations were made in a service trench cut into the south carriage-way, 90 cm deep. A gravel metalled 20 cm thick was noted above the natural loam layer. The metalled loam layer, sealed by the modern street levels.

A small trench area in the rear garden, dug to natural loam level, 1 m deep. Finds included a small group of mid 1st century pottery brooch. The majority of Roman pottery and four coins recovered are attributed to either the 2nd or 4th century. Medieval pottery sherds include late 11th and 13th century fabrics. No structural features were discerned.

Observations made in a builder's excavation, 1.2 m deep. A shallow inhumation burial laid in a prone position with the head to the west.

Observations were made following mechanical levelling of the field 3313. A small intrusive plot of land, part of field 4300 which flanks Whaddon Green, was also included. Stripping of the plough soil in the intrusive plot, exposed an area of charcoal flecked loam, cut by a pit feature containing 14th century pottery and food bones. A concentration of 13th to 14th century pottery occurred throughout the above loam level. One sherd of Roman pottery was also found in the same area.

GLOUCESTER - KINGSHOLM
Edwy Parade, junction with Kingsholm Road
(SO 8348 1940)

was overlain by a dark accumulative street levels.

GLOUCESTER - KINGSHOLM
34 Kingsholm Road
(SO 8345 1920)

sherds and a Colchester IV M-L type pottery and four coins recovered are attributed to either the 2nd or 4th century. Medieval pottery sherds include late 11th and 13th century fabrics. No structural features were discerned.

GLOUCESTER
Builder's yard
46-48 Denmark Road
(SO 8355 1935)

WHADDON
(SO 8336 1407)

part of field 4300 which flanks Whaddon Green, was also included.

Striping of the plough soil in the intrusive plot, exposed an area of charcoal flecked loam, cut by a pit feature containing 14th century pottery and food bones. A concentration of 13th to 14th century pottery occurred throughout the above loam level. One sherd of Roman pottery was also found in the same area.

Anthony P Garrod

Excavations were carried out for the Department of the Environment at Blackfriars, Gloucester, in April and May 1979. In April the only unexcavated area remaining within the church - the east end of the nave and the north transept - was dug. In May the north aisle, now outside the standing building, was excavated. (Work undertaken in 1978 was reported in Geovenis 13 page 23).

Although the east end of the nave and the north transept had never been excavated, very little survived from the Friary period. In the post-Friary period this area formed a basement, the floor of which was slightly below the level of the Friary period floors. However, there was evidence of several graves, especially within the north transept. These were not excavated. In the centre of the nave a pit 1.50 m square was observed. Two fragments of an inscribed grave slab were recovered from its upper levels.
Excavation of the North Aisle

To the north of the church the presence of an aisle was conclusively proved. The original 13th century aisle, which was about 3.5 m wide, was rebuilt and widened by 30 cm in the 14th century. When the church was converted into a house in the 16th century, the aisle was blocked off and demolished. An inscribed grave slab has been built into the west wall of the north transept and worked stone was re-used in the bay window in the north wall of the nave.

Two distinct floor levels, and traces of a third, were found. The most recent, of 15th or 16th century date, had a few plain tiles remaining in situ immediately south of the north wall of the aisle. These tiles were 12.5 cm square with a black glaze. There was also an extensive area of tile-impressed mortar. This floor was 15 cm above an earlier, 14th century floor of which thirty-two tiles, or fragments of tiles, were found in situ. Some of the tiles were decorated (four with heraldic designs) and they were set in alternate lines of patterned and plain tiles. They were 16 cm square and most were set diagonally to the axis of the church. 50 cm south of the north wall of the aisle this floor had subsided and there were traces of an intermediate floor level. Part of a tile, probably from the original 13th century aisle floor was found in a disturbed layer above the latest floor.

G J Guy

HAREFIELD
THE MOUNT
(SO 80981047)

Over a small area immediately south-west of the outer rim of the ditch around "The Mount" moated site limestone building rubble, larger worked stones and a portion of Roman flue tile were observed. In addition, a medieval rim sherd was obtained.

HAREFIELD
MOUNT FARM
(SO 8099 1063)

During the laying of an agricultural water pipe due west of Mount Farm, a trench was cut across a rectangular building platform. Subsequently, a group of 12-13th century cooking pot sherds was recovered, together with stone and occupation material. The site is within an area which apparently has not been subject to medieval or later ploughing. There is some evidence for other features nearby.

N P Spry and E G Price

KINGS STANLEY
STANLEY HOUSE
(SO 8095 0415)

Rescue excavation at this site during 1979 has enabled us to distinguish between various phases of construction, but later disturbance has been extensive and approximate dating is possible in only a few places so far.

Referring to the plan, a long range of walls has been excavated, roughly parallel to the southern boundary of the site (F46; 91; 100; 116). The western end of this has not been established beyond the point at which it passes underneath a late partition wall (F4). A culverted drain (F.47) runs north-west from this southern wall, passing underneath a later wall (F.6) which is on a different orientation. Further eastwards the walls F6/F25 and F116 converge, the southern wall having been robbed to half its width, possibly to allow working space to construct the later one.

The earlier wall appears to have been built in a number of phases. For instance, the eastern end (F91 and F100), 102 cm wide, is linked to a
narrower (92 cm wide) section, including a possible doorway (F86), by abutment. So far, only one wall has been discovered leading off to the south (F151, 76 cm wide) near the churchyard gate. This, too, is abutted to F116, which is 107 cm wide where not robbed.

The pitched stone foundations and core of an eastern exterior wall (F69) have also been excavated. The way in which this wall runs up to and over a short stretch of masonry (F101), parallel and apparently contemporary with F100, indicates that it is of a later period.

A further system of ditches has appeared in the eastern part of the site. At the bottom of one of these, some late Iron Age pottery has been found (F147), while in a shallow circular pit (F143) the headless skeleton of a slender young female occurred. (Examined by Dr C Oyler). Another ditch (F72/83) passes underneath wall F69.

It appears that the earliest features are the recently discovered ditches filled with large quantities of slag and with soil containing Roman material. The next phases are represented by the southerly range of wailing, while the previously reported walls (Glevisens 11, 12 and 13), and the eastern exterior wall appear to date from some time during the medieval period.

P K Griffin

LONGFORD
QUEEN’S DYKE
(SO 83002050)

extensive Romano British occupation evidence including building remains was revealed at a depth of around 0.7 m, below flood deposited clay.

The site extends southwards for 50 m, from a point 60 m south of where the Queen's Dyke is crossed by Sandhurst Lane. Pottery finds suggest a 2nd to 4th century date range. Two coins found by the contractors following machining operations are reported on below.

Referring to the drawn section, there is evidence for a wall (now robbed) crossing the line of the cutting at 67 m; in the west undrawn section stone debris and sandstone tiles with nails were also observed here. North of this point a practically complete Flaxurnished ware vessel intruded into the natural orange sand. Between 74 and 82 m the Roman deposits were disrupted by a now silted up water course.

At 105 m, a 0.8 m wide wall of horizontally laid lias stones crossed the ditch on a line shown in the accompanying plan. Above it was lias rubble and then mortar and small stones.

In the opposite west side at 100 m a second stone feature was observed. This feature, which continued back into the section, took the form of two vertical structures of squared lime stone with blue clay and dark silt between and enclosed by them. This could represent lower courses or the foundations of the corner of a large building.

One AE Gloria Exercitus, one standard, probably DELMATIUS A.D. 335-337.

Pottery Report - Bernard Rawes

The nearest shape to this cooking pot of B.B.1 type fabric is Gillam form no. 148, dated AD 290-370 in 'Types of Roman Coarse Pottery Vessels in Northern Britain', Arch. Aeliana, Ser 4, XXXV (1970 revision). In the south it may be slightly earlier. Indeed, J P Gillam in a reassessment in the Glasgow Arch. Journal, Vol. 4 (1976), form 11 or 12, dates this type to the early 4th century.
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Postscript: The depth of the overall deposit of pink clay may help to explain the apparent lack of evidence of structures at the adjoining WALHAM site at S08304 2018 (see Glevensia 13, page 29).

TIDENHAM BOUGHSpring (SO )

The site measures approximately 45 m by 20 m and lies between 107 m and 122 m contours a little over 1 km from the settlements at Strato. It was probably quarried and levelled in antiquity, out of the hillside which rises immediately behind. The building here is covered with mounds of stones and overgrown. See Glevensia 7, p.7 (Site A) for an earlier note on this site. Clearance of the undergrowth exposed long, low, narrow, grass covered mounds which roughly delineated the shape of a building. Limited excavation at strategic places produced foundation walls in good condition and indicated that the building outlined was a winged villa, with a front corridor. Its size is 30 m x 16 m overall.

Recently, more detailed excavation at the west corner of the 13 m x 7.5 m (external) south-west wing has revealed hypocaust pillars constructed from local stone carrying the remains of bridging flags which in turn carried a floor 70 mm thick constructed of opus signinum. Almost all the floor has been destroyed and the flags carried away. Only two parts of the floor remain. The room to which the floor belongs is 5.5 m square. The junction of floor and wall carries a 1/4 round skirting and at intervals around the walls, are situated warm air flues. The walls have been plundered to floor level and below. No trace has been found of a mosaic but a few white and brown tesserae were found in other locations. Specimens of wall plaster in green, white, brown and yellow were recovered from the lines of the walls. The building is littered with stone roofing tiles, some with iron nails in situ.

Limited excavation has also revealed that a 5 m wide front corridor is flagged with stone and that it was approached by a pillared entrance. From the cement floor of what may be a rear corridor fragments of Black Burnished ware, thick grey ware and of buff-orange coloured barbotine decorated ware point to the site being of a 2nd/3rd to 4th century villa in a commanding position overlooking the River Severn.

T E Wilcox
TAYNTON
CASTLE HILL EARTHWORK
(SO 715211)

It has long been known that an earthwork of indeterminate date existed in Castle Hill Wood, Taynton. The site was recorded by Barbara Rawes as a castle mound (Glevensis 11, 1977), when she remarked on its similarity to Little Dean Camp. It is also mentioned in Trans. B.G.A.S. Vol. LXXVII p.59. To date, there has been no documentation.

A superficial survey recently carried out by Group members showed that the earthwork was a roughly circular enclosure about 30 m in diameter with a slightly flattened north-west side. The enclosure is surrounded by a bank and external ditch. A mound, which encroaches into the central area, being built into the north-east wall. What purports to be an entrance immediately south-east of the mound is not thought to be contemporary with the vallum. The whole earthwork is covered with trees and is badly degraded, especially on the south-west side.

The mound, which is still about 2.5 m high, is composed of a sticky, yellow clay and slopes sharply down to the ditch on the north-east. The bank surrounding the enclosure has a stony-clay make-up which shows some evidence of burning. The central floor of the enclosure, which slopes gently downhill towards the south-west, contains small packed stones.

It seems similar to both Little Dean camp (SO 676135) and Howle Hill camp (SO 612202) and what has been seen, so far, points to it being a Norman 'Ringwork and Watchtower' fortification rather than a conventional 'Motte and Bailey'. If so, it is likely to date from the late 11th century or early 12th century rather than from the anarchical period of Stephen which saw the setting up of so many adulterine M & B castles.

A F Dodd

---
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The aims of the third season of excavations, undertaken in the late summer of 1979, were to complete investigation of an area lying immediately northwest of the 4th century A.D. stone built temple and to re-excavate a portion of the 1st century A.D. enclosure which had been partially excavated in 1977. (See Glevensis 12, p 33 and Glevensis 13 p 32).

Final Pre-Roman Iron Age

The northwestern corner of the ditched and palisaded large religious enclosure was excavated and traces of an external bank relating to the main oval ditch were recovered for the first time. The southern half of the deeper ditch segment on the eastern side of the enclosure was totally excavated and secondary post pits and deposits of 1st century A.D. native pottery matched those discovered in the northern half of the ditch, excavated in 1978.

Early Roman: Late 1st century - 2nd century

By the early 2nd century the posts of the main palisade had been removed and, in the area northwest of the later temple, traces of a timber stake-hole structure were found to overlie the secondary fill of the palisade trench. By this period the deep ditch segment to the east had almost silted up and palisade trenches and post-holes cut into the upper fill layers can now be interpreted as having supported a small, but substantial timber building associated with the re-cutting of the main votive pit excavated in 1978.

Mid Roman: Late 2nd century - 3rd century

Part of the stone building, first recorded as a crop mark in 1977, was planned but not excavated. Several building phases were apparent and the floor levels relating to the wing extending southwards beneath the road were partially excavated. Taking into account the evidence from the area of demolition rubble relating to this building excavated in 1978, it is now possible to date the crop mark building to the later 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D. It appears to have been demolished prior to the construction of the stone temple in the early 4th century and thus was probably contemporary with the southeastern range of stone buildings excavated in 1977. No religious structure associated with these ranges of buildings can be identified within the excavated area but other stone buildings certainly exist elsewhere within the field.

Late Roman: 4th century

Northwest of the stone temple a major building possessing stone footings was excavated. This structure, which was aligned north-northeast to south-southwest, was a large, single aisled hall subdivided into two main functional areas. The southern third possessed a plain tessellated pavement and, possibly, an elaborate verandah or porch while the northern part of the building housed a complex of hearths, ovens and a possible furnace surrounded by cobbled floor levels. The building contained large quantities of domestic 4th century pottery and was probably contemporary with the 4th century stone temple immediately to the southeast. Running between the aisled hall and the temple a further stretch of the cobbled holloway identified in 1978 was investigated.

Further deposits of votive material derived from the temple were recovered above the remains of this structure and within the holloway. These included jewellery, lead defixiones, a bronze caduceus, other votive objects of bronze, fragments of a small stone statue and a bronze figurine - possibly an infact Bacchus; (identified by Dr Martin Henig).
Final Roman and sub-Roman: post-temple structures

A large area of the demolished remains of the 4th century aisled hall had been cut away to form a level terrace on which a rectangular timber building had been constructed. The porch post-holes relating to this building had been excavated in 1978. For the first time on the site, floor levels relating to a post-temple structure were well-preserved and these were associated with a square central hearth. This timber building appears to have fulfilled a domestic function. A further portion of the timber-revetted turf bank dividing the post-Roman domestic structures from the religious structures overlying the demolished remains of the temple was also excavated. Overlying the final Pre-Roman Iron Age ditch, the southern portion of the first post-temple ritual dry-stone building was totally excavated. In 1978, fragments of a major cult statue of Mercury had been recovered from the foundations of this building and the outstanding find of the 1979 season was the head of this limestone cult statue. The head had been deliberately removed from the statue and carefully deposited in a small pit immediately to the northeast of the foundations of the dry-stone structure and below the earliest phase of the exterior cobbled platforms surrounding it. The ritual deposition of the statue fragments in relation to the structure further confirms its religious interpretation and indicates the full significance of the desecration and demolition of the temple of Mercury prior to continued religious activity on the site possible in a Christian context.

Head of cult statue of Mercury (The following description has been extracted from notes supplied by Dr Martin Henig).

The head of the cult statue is carved in a highly accomplished manner. In terms of Romano-British sculpture, this is a masterpiece at least the equal of and probably superior to the head of Mercury from Cirencester. Unlike the Cirencester Mercury and others like it, there is no petasos and the head is covered in a mass of tight curls with a looser tress hanging down in front of each ear. Although Roman statues of Mercury display a medley of influences from the time of Polykleitos onwards, the gentle humanity of the Uley head is Praxitelean and brings the great Olympia Hermes to mind. The general configuration of the statue-type is, however, closer to the Hermes of Andros, a Roman copy of another Hermes by Praxiteles.

The Uley cult image was probably made in mid-Antonine times and in a highly romanised milieu. It is therefore important to note that the statue is modelled in local Cotswold limestone.
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During the summer of 1979 members of CADARG undertook archaeological observation of a water pipeline under construction from Haresfield to South Gloucestershire. No fieldwork was done beyond the River Cam at Coaley. Sites are identified below by their Gloucester Excavation unit site number. See accompanying figure.

HARESFIELD
(SO 8088 1057)
4/79/1

Near "The Mount" within a limited area west of a house called "Roystons" and immediately below the gravel spur
within the 100 ft contour, 2nd and 3rd century Roman sherds, sandstone tile fragments and a piece of daub were recorded. This site appears to be associated with the one at SO 8098 1047 (see above).

HARESFIELD
(SO 8054 1016)
41/79/2

STANDISH
(SO 7961 0920)
41/79/3

STANDISH
MANOR FARM
(SO 7888 0845)
41/79/4

narrow ridge types are represented on a number of different alignments (see plate). These fields belong to the "Green Farm" settlement centred on SO 7872 0862 - trans. BGAS Vol. XC (1971), p. 54.

WHITMINSTER
(SO 7852 0807)
41/79/5

EASTINGTON
(SO 7822 0761)
41/79/6

EASTINGTON
(SO 7733 0635)
41/79/7

EASTINGTON
PUDDLEWORTH
(SO 7681 0560)
41/79/8

Small group of Severn Valley and Grey Ware fragments.

A few Roman sherds and sandstone tile fragments.

East of Manor Farm the pipeline passed through an extensive and well defined system of ridge and furrow ploughing and cut a depression interpreted as an earlier field road. Both wide and narrow ridge types are represented on a number of different alignments (see plate). These fields belong to the "Green Farm" settlement centred on SO 7872 0862 - trans. BGAS Vol. XC (1971), p. 54.

Sandstone fragment, crude but probably Roman sherd and tile fragment. Not clearly defined site.

Single Severn Valley rim sherd.

A few Roman sherds including one small piece of Samian ware.

At this previously identified early settlement site, a spread of medieval (12th century onwards) and early post medieval sherds was observed together with sandstone, limestone and early brick structural debris.
Manor Farm Field System
Photo: J Lees

Hazleton North long barrow from the west, December 1979, at the close of the 1979 excavation season. Scales in 0.5 m divisions.
Photo: A Saville
HAZLETON EXCAVATION PROJECT, 1979

Introduction

Ever since the formation of CRAAGS in 1973, the problems associated with the nationally important archaeological resource represented by the region's Cotswold-Severn chambered tombs have been under consideration. The implications of Drinkwater's review (1972) of the poor condition of these monuments, particularly as a result of plough damage, led to further assessments following DoE commissioned surveys (Drinkwater and Saville 1976; Saville 1980). These assessments led in turn to a research design which selected excavation priorities from within the total threatened resource. At the top of the priority list were the two Hazleton long barrows (GLO 33 & 54), located only 70 metres apart in an arable field known as Barrow Ground, and both severely threatened by plough-damage despite being scheduled ancient monuments. This barrow pair offered the greatest research potential within a rescue archaeology framework for exploring the current gaps in our understanding of this class of monument and also for investigating other aspects of the early agricultural settlement of the Cotswolds. A long term project involving the total excavation of both the Hazleton barrows was accordingly adopted by CRAAGS and the DoE in 1979, and this summary provides an account of the first season's work, which began to investigate Hazleton North Barrow (SP073189).

Summary of the 1979 season

Work at Barrow Ground commenced after harvest in September and continued through until the end of December, with actual excavation confined to the months of October and November. A detailed contour survey was made of the Hazleton North barrow, followed by a resistivity and magnetometer survey by the Ancient Monuments Laboratory (DoE). A full field survey of Barrow Ground was undertaken commercially. Before excavation Hazelton North was visible as an unploughed rectangular grass covered mound, approximately 33 x 18.5 metres, with obvious ploughed extensions into the surrounding field. It was known that this barrow had been completely ploughed over in the past, but there was no record of any previous excavation, disturbance, or finds, and the surviving mound retained an apparently intact profile. The barrow type was unknown, and the primary aim of the initial season was to establish the nature and extent of the monument. Excavation proceeded by the removal of topsoil/ploughsoil within a rectangular grid placed around the extant mound, subdivided into quadrants. Altogether some 1,262 sq metres were stripped, entirely by hand, leaving the whole of the cairn exposed, except for a small area on the north east side. An exploratory sampling programme of sieving was employed to quantify the ploughsoil artefact content. The stonework of the cairn was cleaned off at its uppermost surviving level, to permit planning and assessment, but no attempt was made in the initial season to enter the cairn.

Hazleton North can now be shown to be a blind entrance type of Cotswold-Severn tomb with (at least) a pair of opposed lateral chambers, set back some 23 metres from the broad end of the cairn. The entrance to the chamber on the south side of the cairn is defined by two portal orthostats on line with the inner peripheral wall. Two further orthostats immediately to the north of these continue the line of the entrance passage into the cairn. To the south the entrance passage continues to the outer peripheral wall, which is continuous across the entrance, presumably from subsequent blocking. The total length of the south passage is approximately 3 metres, and its infilled blocking seems completely intact. The south chamber is imprecisely defined at present by two further orthostats, one on the south
and one on the east, and by large flat slabs on the east which may be the remains of incipient corbelling. The picture is confused at this uppermost level of the stonework, however, by the combined action of ploughing and frost-shattering, which has reduced what were originally large slabs to scattered fragments. The present surface of the central chamber fill contains numerous burnt stones and humic intrusions, and may indicate disturbance.

The north chamber has yet to be clearly defined, but the two portal orthostats at the passage entrance, and a further orthostat on the east side of the chamber are visible. It should be emphasised that although the present evidence suggests two separate chambers, the eventual plan could prove more complex.

The blind entrance appears to be non-orthostatic and is marked by a shallow concavity in the terminal dry-stone walling. Unusually for a Cotswold-Severn tomb, the broader and higher end of the cairn, which is oriented approximately west-east, is situated at the west end. This clarifies the confusion raised by Witty's description (Witty 1883, 80; cf. O'Neil and Grinsell 1960, 81), which is now best seen as simply in error in making the east end the higher.

The cairn, roughly trapezoidal in shape, tapering from west to east, survives to a length of 51 metres (167 feet), and has a maximum width of approximately 19 metres (59 feet) at the west end. The cairn is composed of oolitic limestone, ranging from slabs over 1 metre long, to small rubble. Structural elements which can already be defined include an inner and outer dry-stone peripheral wall, a ridged zone of large opposed-pitched stones behind the blind entrance aligned on the long axis of the cairn, and offset dry-stone walls at right angles to the long axis. In some cases there is obvious pitched infilling against the offset walls. Plough damage at the east end has effectively removed the tail of the cairn, and it is unlikely that the original length can be archaeologically proven.

Beyond the cairn 'extra-revetment' material was present to some degree around the entire periphery, although most marked at the west end and between the west end and the lateral chambers. To the south of the cairn, beginning close to the entrance to the south chamber, initial evidence for a substantial subterranean feature was located. This feature is provisionally interpreted as a contemporary stone quarry.

Fieldwalking of Barrow Ground, plus three adjacent fields, has produced a large quantity of lithic debris, including leaf arrowheads and a polished stone axe fragment. None of this appears to be pre-Neolithic, but its nature and generalised distribution is not yet indicative of settlement or knapping foci. The excavation has also produced lithic debris, none of it securely stratified, and a Roman coin from the barrow surface.

Further work
A second season of similar duration is planned for 1980. The main objectives of the 1980 season will be (a) investigation of the 'extra-revetment', (b) elucidation of the forecourt and blind entrance, (c) investigation of the south chamber and (d) excavation of the suspected quarry.

References in the summary


GLOUCESTERSHIRE SOCIETY FOR INDUSTRIAL ARCHAEOLOGY JOURNAL, 1979

GADARG's interests overlap those of the GSIA at many points (indeed, the two groups have a number of members in common), and it is therefore pleasing to find so much to praise in the latest GSIA Journal. Its 60 pages contain five main articles, besides the customary notes and reviews. David Bick, who has been throwing his energies into the archaeology of transport and industry for over thirty years, contributes a general review of 150 years of attempts to develop coal mining in the Newent area, welding disparate documentary sources together with the essential fieldwork.

Diana Court and Ian Standing have produced a good self-contained account of one of the few remaining ventilation furnaces in the Forest of Dean; the function of the structure and its successful restoration (evidently just in the nick of time) are described and it is clear that those involved derived a good deal of satisfaction from seeing the project through. Still in the Forest, Ian Standing and Stan Coates have provided a basic listing of important industrial sites on Forestry Commission land. Site lists are often not the most exciting reading, but they are a vital form of record; without them it is impossible to begin to form sound policies for future action, be the policy makers amateur groups, professionals or official bodies.

There must be few who are not curious to some degree to know why particular roads came to be where they are. Christopher Cox gives an illuminating account of the creation and early years of the Nailsworth Turnpike Trust, its aims and how it solved the practical problems that it faced.

The last main article, by Frank Richmond, on the water mill at Stoke Orchards, will be of particular interest to GADARG's building buffs, with its full description of the present 200 year old structure (records of earlier mills go back to 1314 and beyond), its contents and their workings. It is interesting to see calculated the production capacity of the equipment. The illustrations are meticulous and, as an article of record, this contribution must be as complete as could be desired. The credit goes to the author, naturally, although we note that here again the guiding hand of Brian Smith has been at work, the practical introduction to records that Mr Smith offered through his evening classes will be of lasting benefit to all forms of local studies.

One grumble to pass on to the Journal's Editor: some of the illustrations are below the standard set by the text. Amateurs may feel they do not have to be perfect, but a pack of rub-down lettering can work wonders at very little cost. J.H.

N.P.S. does not dare to agree or disagree with J.H.!
THE HOUSE ON THE MOUND
26 Barton Street, Gloucester

Viewed from the street the frontage of No. 26 shows three storeys and the driveway rises up a slope onto a mound so that the house is much higher than the adjoining buildings in the street. The driveway along the west side of the house then runs down a slope to the Cromwell Street car park which was originally the garden of the house. Viewed from here the house is a four-storeyed one, the mound having been cut away to show the basement windows.

It is significant that the boundary of King's Barton runs over the mound, which leads to the thought that it is an artificial one, made as a moot hill - "a hill of meeting on which our Saxon ancestors held their great courts". If this is a moot hill, it would have been the meeting place for the Hundred Court of King's Barton later united with the Hundred of Dudstone. To the west of it is a strip of land which was outside the City Wall (Brunswick Road), as shown on Causton's map of 1843. This land would perhaps be classified as a suburb under the rule of the City Corporation. East of the boundary was under the rule of the Hundred Court, which consisted of 100 sureties who were responsible for keeping the peace, and which had its own constable and bailiff.

The Hall & Pinnell map of Gloucester (1780) shows Barton Street with houses on both sides, but it does not show the house on the mound with its distinctive bow windows. However, its ground plan is shown accurately on Causton's map of 1843.

A family named Helps, fellmongers, came to Gloucester from Wiltshire in the early 18th century. (A Fell is a skin or hide - usually with the hair or wool still on it). In Raikes' New Guide to Gloucester (1802) two Helps are listed as wool-staplers in Barton Street. In 1820 Ann Helps of the parish of Barton St Michael (i.e., outside the City Wall) was buried. The parish of Barton St Michael extended only as far as the track of the Midland Railway. The whole area of King's Barton was owned by the Corporation from the time Richard III gave this Royal Estate to the town.

The last of the Helps family to live in the house was James Helps who died in 1850. The house was then purchased by the Corporation. By this time the original Crypt School in Southgate Street had become too small for the number of scholars and so the house in Barton Street was used for the Crypt School until 1889 when a new school in Greyfriars was built.

The staff and scholars of Sir Thomas Rich's (Blue Coat) School next moved to the Barton Street House when their old school building was demolished and the present Guildhall built on its site in Eastgate Street. Sir Thomas Rich's school moved to new buildings at Elmore in 1964.

This house is now vacant and awaiting demolition. It is to be hoped that the opportunity to investigate the surely ancient mound on which it stands will be taken when this happens.

Gwladys Davies
OSRIC'S ABBESS (Reflections on a 7th century mystery) by Arthur Dodd

It is generally acknowledged that Gloucester Cathedral owes its origin to the 7th century 'King' Osric, who first set up an abbey on the site around the year 681 AD. Associated with this period are events which, taken singly, do not appear to have a great deal to do with Osric's abbey; but when they are looked at in relation to some 130 years of Anglo Saxon history, they take on a deeper significance and add up to as intriguing a story as anything from the pen of a writer of 'who-dun-its'.

We know that Osric was the Chieftain of a tribe called the Hwicce. We also know that he was able to build his abbey because he purchased the land to do it from his overlord, King Ethelred of Mercia. But who were the Hwicce and why should they owe allegiance to the Mercians? To put this into perspective, we should really go back to the latter half of the 6th century.

The Saxons

At this time, Gloucester was still a British city with, possibly, some remnants of sub-Roman culture. The invading Saxons and Angles were relentlessly pushing their way north and west and it was only a matter of time before there was a confrontation which could only end in open warfare.

"In this year Cuthwine and Ceawlin fought against the Britons and slew three kings, Coinmail, Conidian and Farinmail, at the place which is called Dyrrhah; and they captured three cities, Gloucester, Cirencester and Bath."

So runs the bald entry in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for the year 577 A.D. The Saxon victory at Dyrrhah saw the virtual end of British resistance in the West, and left the valley of the lower Severn firmly in the grip of the kingdom of Wessex and Ceawlin its king.

Fifty years later, this Saxon supremacy was unexpectedly contested by the emergent Anglian kingdom of Mercia. After a sharp battle at Cirencester, in 628, the warlike Saxons seem to have been fought to a standstill. For the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle tells us that Cynegils (Ceawlin's grandson) - "came to an agreement" with the Mercian King Penda which, we can assume, left Mercia in control of the Severn valley.

The Hwicce

It is around this period that we first hear of the Hwicce, who settled in an area roughly analogous to modern Worcestershire and Gloucestershire. Certainly, Gloucester seems to have come under the control of Hwiccan Princes from about this time. This gives rise to a question: were these lands given as a reward by the grateful Mercians in recognition of help in battle? In other words, did Penda of Mercia create the Principality of the Hwicce? This is something that we shall probably never know.

For a relatively small and obscure kingdom centred in the valley of the Trent - which Mercia was at this time - to have had the nerve and the strength to take on battle experienced Wessex suggests some sort of alliance. This could well have been with the powerful kingdom of Northumbria or, at least, with a Northumbrian war-band. If there was such an alliance, the two kingdoms must have been uneasy bedfellows. There was no love lost between the Northumbrians and the Mercians. Northumbria under King Oswald was devotedly Christian, while Penda of Mercia was a dedicated pagan. It was almost inevitable that conflict should break out between them at some time.
The Chronicle entry for the year 641 tells us: "In this year Oswald, king of Northumbria was slain by Penda the Mercian at Maserfeld (probably Oswestry) on 5 August."

After the battle, the king's martyred body was exposed on a wooden framework as a salutary lesson to the local Christian populace. Oswald was later to be avenged by his brother Oswiu at the battle of Winwidfeld (the River Winwood) where Penda finally perished in 654.

Following the death of Penda, Christianity spread rapidly in Mercia. Indeed, Penda's son, Peada, had already been converted; for Bede records that "He accepted the true Faith and its sacraments" and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle also mentions the fact in the entry for the year 653 - "In this year the Middle Angles under Peada the Ealdorman received the true faith".

Osric

In 675, Penda's third son, Ethelred - also a converted Christian - succeeded his two elder brothers, Peada and Wulfhere, as King of a fully Christianised Mercia. Ethelred was such a devout man that he eventually abdicated to become a monk but, during his reign, he made several grants of land for the building of churches in his kingdom. As we know, one piece of land was sold to 'King' Osric of the Hwicce to enable him to build an abbey in Gloucester dedicated to St Peter.

Attempts have been made to link the Hwicccian Osric with the Osric who became King of Northumbria in 718 and reigned for a further eleven years but, here, there seem to be obvious chronological objections.

Whether Osric was actually a king is open to conjecture, but he was, without doubt, the ruler in Gloucester and the surrounding area. The Hwicccan lands had become a very important part of Mercia forming, as they did, a southern buffer zone between that kingdom and ambitious Wessex which, incidentally, does not seem to have attempted to recover the territory lost at Cirencester in 628. It is logical, then to assume that Osric, if not a king would, at least, have ruled in Gloucester as a Mercian Viceroy.

Admittedly, there seems to have been little distinction between Kings and Viceroy's in the 7th and 8th centuries and, no doubt, some of these tribal lords had pretensions of grandeur and probably liked to call themselves by resounding titles. Whether Osric styled himself 'King' is not known, but the Venerable Bede, writing towards the end of the 7th century, mentions him as "King of the Hwicce" and he was described by Ethelred of Mercia as being "of noble race". He would seem, then, to have been a Viceroy or Sub-King.

Osric's brother and successor, Oshere, was also referred to as 'King' although he appears to have been the last Hwicccan ruler to have been so called. Three of Oshere's four sons were named as 'Subreguli' or Viceroy's in charters of the late 7th century.

The First Abbess

The abbey founded in Gloucester by Osric was a community of monks and nuns, living separately, but worshipping together under the rule of an Abbess. We are told that the first Abbess of St Peter's, Gloucester, was named Cynemburgh; but who was this lady and where did she come from?

It has been said that she was Osric's sister; and we know that the two were buried side by side "in the church of St Peter before the altar of St Petronilla on the north side of the monastery." But was she really a
relative? Osric, like his patron and overlord, Ethelred, was very devout. Was the careful positioning of the two tombs to emphasise her importance as Gloucester's first Abbess and, equally, her importance to Osric himself? Was it to tell the world that Osric looked upon her as his 'sister' in God and the Holy Christian Faith? Or was it for some other reason? It may well have been the latter, for there are several significant coincidences that need explanation.

The Northumbrian Connection

Firstly, the fact that Osric and other Hwicce nobles have names that are not uncommon among the Northumbrian aristocracy of the time. Certainly, their names are not Mercian in origin. Does this mean that the rulers of the Hwicce had a link with Northumbria? If so, were they originally a war band recruited by Penda to help him expand his small Anglian kingdom? Of course, it could be coincidence.

Secondly, Saint Oswald, the martyred King of Northumbria, left a widow bearing the same name as Osric's first Abbess - Cyneburh. This, also, could be coincidence.

Thirdly, Ethelred, who sold Osric the land to build his abbey, was the son of the heathen Penda who was directly responsible for the martyrdom of Saint Oswald.

Another coincidence? Or, perhaps, an attack of conscience and an attempt to atone for his father's pagan beliefs.

Finally, it should be realised that Ethelred's queen, Osthryth, was not only Northumbrian by birth but she was also Saint Oswald's niece. Osthryth - who was King Oswiu's daughter - is also said to have persuaded her aunt to take the veil many years after Oswald's death. It was also Osthryth who was responsible for the transfer of Saint Oswald's bones to the monastery of Bardney in Mercian Lincolnshire. And it was at Bardney that her husband, Ethelred, finished his life as the monastery's Abbot after his abdication in 704. The Chronicle tells us "In this year Ethelred, son of Penda, King of Mercia, became a monk."

Are we not starting to stretch the long arm of coincidence a little too far?

Princess Cyneburh

There is more than a reasonable chance that Abbess Cyneburh was, in fact, St Oswald's widow. The time factor certainly puts her within the limits of life expectancy.

According to Bede, King Oswald of Northumbria stood as Godfather to Cynegils, King of Wessex, on his conversion to Christianity in 635 - "taking him as his Godson and his daughter as wife". Unfortunately, Bede does not name the lady, but Reginald of Durham writing in the 12th century, says her name was Cyneburh.

If we assume that she married Oswald when she was twenty - a not unreasonable assumption - she would have been about 66 years of age at the time of the abbey foundation in Gloucester.

There is also the unexplained and significant item of a gift of 120 hides of land in South Wessex which is contained in the lists of endowments of Gloucester abbey. This points to some sort of early close association with the southern kingdom. A magnificent gift like this could well have come from a Princess of Wessex.
Oswald himself was revered as a very holy saint in the Anglo-Saxon Church. In the words of Bede, he was the "most Christian King" and although he was a Northumbrian, this would not have detracted from his saintliness in the eyes of the Mercians. The very fact that his bones were contained in one of their own monasteries, surely, have added greatly to the prestige of the kingdom.

But, despite the reflected glory of the relics the Mercians feared and distrusted their Northumbrian neighbours. They had never really forgotten or forgiven their defeat by Oswiu's army in 654; following which, their country was ruled by Northumbrian deputies for three years until the Mercians threw them out and put one of Penda's sons on the throne.

This distrust may have been the reason behind one mysterious disappearance and one undoubted murder. The first was that of the Hwiccian Oshere - Osric's brother and successor in Gloucester - who could well have been a Northumbrian noble and whose last recorded appearance seems to have been in 693. It is odd that there is no mention of his death. The second was that of Queen Osthryth, Ethelred's consort, whom we know to have been a member of the Northumbrian royal family. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for the year 697 tells us "In this year the Mercians slew Osthryth, Ethelred's queen, sister of Ecgrith".

What actually happened here? Did the Mercian chieftains fear some sort of takeover by Northumbrian royalty? Significantly, Ethelred, who was still on the Mercian throne at the time, seems to have done nothing to find and punish the murderers.

Epilogue

Some 200 years later, in the early 10th century, Æthelflaed, the 'Lady of the Mercians', daughter of Alfred the Great and a Princess of Wessex who had married into the Mercian royal family, removed St Oswald's bones from Bardney and brought them to Gloucester where she had built a Minster church.

Why Gloucester? Was she trying to reunite Cynburg and Oswald in death? Pure fantasy, perhaps - but stranger things have happened.

This poses the question as to why Oswald's bones were allowed to remain at Bardney for over 200 years. The answer could well lie in the ever present threat of Wessex which was finally resolved by Æthelflaed's marriage to Ethelred, Lord of Mercia, and the virtual 'take-over' by the southern kingdom which followed his death in 910.

Æthelflaed died at Tamworth, the Mercian capital, on 12 June 918 but, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle tells us, "she was buried at Gloucester in the east chapel of St Peter's Church". Again, why Gloucester?

The whole story adds up to an intriguing mystery that will probably never be satisfactorily resolved.
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GADARG SITES AND MONUMENTS RECORD

Eight years have passed since the GADARG Sites and Monuments Record was started and this seems an appropriate time to review progress. It is still the only comprehensive list of sites held in Gloucestershire which covers the whole county. As we have no County Archaeologist or County Museum, no official county-wide record of sites has been set up and it has always been the Group's hope that its card index could be of use until the County authority plays the part it should in the archaeological field.

The aim of the record is to provide a checklist of sites, find spots, crop marks, notable buildings, etc., within each of the parishes of the new Gloucestershire. It can be used to alert fieldworkers to the potential of areas under development. For example, a survey of the route of the Gloucester Northern Bypass was prepared before observation on the ground began. It is also a tool to guide researchers to local resources and is a depository for information on chance finds and discoveries which may not have been published. The record takes the form of a card index filed alphabetically under parishes and at present amounts to 20 boxes containing approximately 7,000 separate entries. The cards are standard 8" x 5" and record brief details of the type of site, location, national grid reference, sources of information, field observations, date (if known) and any other relevant information. Each entry is numbered within the parish; and 'continuation' cards, amplifying the information, continue in sequence, e.g., Sapperton 5, 5.1, 5.2, etc. Small maps and sketch plans are included when available.

Local and national journals, archaeological reports, building records, parish histories and local documents of all kinds have been worked on, aerial photographs have been examined (when available) and the field names of some 25% of the parishes in the county have been recorded. The index is kept up to date by the entry of new sites and discoveries which come to the notice of GADARG or the Committee for Archaeology in Gloucestershire (see site reports in this and earlier copies of Cleveonis) by reports from members working in particular parishes (these have been disappointingly few) and by information from the local museums and excavation units.

Parishes which have a good local history written by a historian with an eye for topography and an awareness of archaeological remains are represented in the index in considerable detail. For example, there are 128 entries for Bisley-with-Lypiatt thanks to the "Historical Records of Bisley" by Mary A Rudd, published in 1937 - a fascinating and detailed study of the parish which records not only Miss Rudd's researches into local and national archives but also her acute observation of the topography and architecture of the neighbourhood. Certain parishes, especially those on the periphery of the county, where there seem to be no one interested in archaeology, or at any rate, aware of the existence of GADARG or CAG, have very few entries. Hamfallow has three entries and Evenlode only seven for example, although there is no reason to suppose that they do not have as much "archaeology" as anywhere else.

An arrangement for exchange of information exists with Gloucester Museum. GADARG's index is being copied by voluntary helpers for the Museum to add to their own index which has already been copied by GADARG. The Excavation Unit also co-operates by sending brief accounts of the discoveries in Gloucester itself as well as other information. We are very pleased to have such a good working relationship with these two bodies.
The record is available for use at any time by prior arrangement by group members, or bona fide students and increasing use is being made of it especially by people working on local history research. Unfortunately, it is a sign of the times that the location and map reference of certain sites must be kept confidential due to the possibility of interference by the metal detecting fraternity. Such sites are not added to the copy of the index kept in the Local Studies room at Cheltenham Public Library.

Various members and friends of GADARG have contributed to the record, by personal researches, copying cards, reporting of fieldwork, etc. Particularly to be thanked are Mrs E Gander (Syde and Brimpsfield area), E G Price (Procester), Ann Kellock (Wotton-under-Edge), Peter Lindsell, James Hodsdon, Beryl Martin and Nigel Spry.

Some of the entries that I find most interesting are the contemporary accounts of finds made in the past, written about but more or less forgotten until a researcher comes across it in an old newspaper or document. I append a selection of these, for which I thank the contributors. May I appeal for any similar "discoveries", or modern field observations to be forwarded to the writer for inclusion in the Sites and Monuments Record.

BARBARA RAWES (Chairman, GADARG Records Sub-Committee)
11 Trowsecoed Avenue, Cheltenham, Glos.

Cheltenham Manor Court Book April 1697 (GRO D 855/M12)

"We doo present Francis Battorn and John Hardnutt and coy having in their custody a pott of copper coyne which by them was found in Naunton Field within this Manor". (Julian Rawes)

Gloucester Journal 13 December 1823

"A small coin of the reign of the Emperor Gratian was lately dug up in Jessop's Somerset House Nursery Garden, Cheltenham. On one side is a head of the Emperor and on the edge are characters now scarcely discernible; on the obverse side is a Roman galley, surmounted by the word Virtus". (Dr Stephen Blake)

(The location referred to is in the St James' area of Cheltenham.)

Gloucester Journal 24 February 1827

"A few days since, a tesselated pavement was discovered in an arable field in the parish of Leigh, the property of Mrs Hill, near the turnpike road leading from this city to Tewkesbury. This curiosity is about two feet below the surface of the ground and is about 60 feet long and 8 feet wide. It is now exposed to the weather, and it is to be feared it will sustain considerable damage owing to the extreme severity of the frost". (Amina Chatwin)

(This may well be the Staplins site; see Glevensis 6 (1972) p.7, and adds materially to our knowledge of the site.)

Cheltenham Chronicle 13 December 1814

"As some workmen were lately digging a road from Burford to Barrington, in this county, they discovered, near the surface of the earth a stone coffin of immense size, and extremely irregular, weighing nearly 3 tons, which on examination, was found to contain the perfect skeleton of a man, of middle stature, having his teeth entire, also a great number of short nails, completely oxidated and matted together in pieces of hide, of which material it is probable a shield was formed.... This relic is deposited in Burford church for the inspection of the curious". (B.R.)

(It is not clear if this burial was in Gloucestershire, or just over the county boundary, nearer to Burford than Barrington).
ARCHAEOLOGICAL OBSERVATION DURING OIL PIPELINE RENEWAL -
TWYNING, AND TEWKESBURY/LEIGH

During the summer of 1979, a section of the oil pipeline in Twynig Parish 
was replaced. Simultaneously, a section from Tewkesbury to Leigh was
renewed. Corresponding pipeline work was undertaken from the Worcestershire boundary, through Ryall towards Worcester. It was not possible to
observe this section.

Twynig section

1. To the west of Puckrup farm the trench cut a large bottle pit.
   Several complete 19th century bottles and a Langley Mill 1 pint 
   stoneware bottle were collected. To the southeast of Puckrup farm
   the trench revealed alternate, nearly vertical, bands of sand and 
   pebbles. Some curved crop marks have been observed in this field,
   but the configuration in this case suggested natural formation.

2. Behind Martineau's Nursery, on the brow of the hill the trench
   revealed two concrete strips at 0.9 m depth. The angle of cut
   suggested that the two were parallel, 1.5 m in width, 10 to 15 cm
   deep and 9 m apart. The topsoil patterns of ridge and furrow 
   cultivation were present above the concrete. The red marl subsoil
   had settled over the concrete giving the appearance of being un-
   disturbed. No explanation has been found. A sample was retained. 
   The rapid progress of pipelaying prevented a section being drawn.

3. The pipeline cut the Roman road immediately behind the Mythe Water
   Tower. The angle of cut, and a slight mound in the field, confirm
   that the road follows the boundary hedge north to Shutonger Common
   where a dig had previously excavated a cross section. The road
   comprises two limestone drainage walls with a raised clay fill
   which contained a thin scatter of lime and limestone particles.

4. Topsoil behind Mythe Grange, at the south end of the trench con-
   tained cut nails and 17th, 18th and 19th Century sherds.

Tewkesbury to Leigh section

5. Some substantial lengths of human limbs had been excavated at the
   north end of this section. It was not possible to locate the
   original site. Small sherds of coarse, soft earthenware were also
   found in this area.

6. Near the pipeline, just inside the field gateway at the rear of
   Gubshill, a section of wheel rim was found. The wheel rim indicated
   a 1.35 m diameter wheel with six rim segments, each section being 
   spiked to the wheel by four 6 cm wedge-shaped nails at each end.

7. A heavy horseshoe 14 cm long x 12 cm wide was found southeast of 
   Gubshill and was retained for identification.

8. The area from 7. to the Southwick Park drive contained an abundant
   scatter of pottery debris. It included a part of a Malvernware 
   base with thumb decoration; a yellow and brown slipware rim with a 
   scalloped inside edge. Animal bones and broken clay pipes were
   present. Most pipe bowls dated from 1600 to 1700. Two later pipe
   bowls are impressed H1 and O1.

9. Scatter contained iridescent amber glass full of small bubbles. 
   The iridescence is probably due to acid clay soil - a neck from 
   a hand made bottle shows similar less extreme effect.
10. At Staplings Farm a boar's tooth was found under ridge and furrow.

11. The field to the north of Brick House Farm contained heavily grogged earthenware land drains with a fluted pattern on the outside. The area by the road at the farm suggested lengthy occupation of the site and that the ash deposit was of greater depth than the flooded 1.8 m pits which had been dug prior to boring under the road. Between here and the school, where pipe-laying ceased, a general scatter of late domestic pottery was observed, contrasting with the very few examples present in fields south of the Southwick farm drive and north of Brick House Farm.

M G Hare, Twynning Historical & Archaeological Research Group

BOOK REVIEWS

Clay Tobacco Pipes in Gloucestershire by Allan Peacey
Available from CRAAGS, The Archaeological Centre, Mark Lane, Bristol. Price £1.80 + 20p postage and packing. This recently published work gives detailed information about clay pipes in the county with particular attention being given to Gloucester. Fully illustrated, it is an invaluable handbook to those who wish to identify their own local collections.

Illustrated Dictionary of Archaeology - published by Triune Books
My initial reaction on seeing the word 'dictionary' was to look up the four words most commonly thrown about on a GADARG dig, namely 'feature', 'section', 'post hole' and 'robber trench'. Disaster!! Not a mention of any of them!

Rather dismayed, I then tried 'Samian ware' (Yes!), 'stratigraphy' (Yes!!) and 'Opus Signinum' (Yes!!!), thus confounding my first impression that this book was not about archaeology at all.

Further perusal left the following impression - here we have a wide-embracing, well illustrated and informative publication, ideal for dipping into at odd moments (rather like the Guinness Book of Records), or for looking up some archaeological site or technique for a brief resume. For more detail, of course, one needs to refer to other publications, but the interest of this book is that it reveals to the average GADARG member sites, cultures, wares and techniques of which he/she may be blissfully unaware. (Well, I was, anyway!).

One could be fussy and criticise certain entries for lack of completeness. For instance, we are left with the definite impression that Jerusalem is still occupied by the Turks and that Stonehenge was not laid out with much precision; both contrary to what I have read elsewhere.

Most entries, however, I found very informative, although naturally highly condensed because of the space available. The cross-reference system is good, as is the system of relating the illustrations to the text.

This is a good book to buy as a personal reference volume to enable one to name-drop (or site-drop) at the next GADARG meeting, or as a present for an archaeologically minded friend who wants to read all about the exciting things in archaeology, but not about the post holes or the robber trenches! The cost is but a mere £5.95 - you might find it cheaper.

John Lees
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The Hereford & Gloucester Canal by David E Bick

No major navigation has become so lost in obscurity as the Hereford and Gloucester Canal.

Promoted in the 1790s and encouraged by visions of an important coalfield at Newent, the 34 miles of inland waterway was hopelessly under-capitalized and ironically not completed until 1845, the year of the Railway Mania. The Hereford & Gloucester Canal has an absorbing story, but apart from a brief account here and there, it has never previously been told.

In this book full details are also given of the industrial archaeology of the route which demanded three tunnels and twenty-three locks, and a chapter is devoted to Stephen Ballard, a local man who could number among his friends and acquaintances George and Robert Stephenson, and I K Brunel. Ballard engineered the construction from Ledbury to Hereford, and his diaries have provided a wonderful insight into days before the railways came.

No story of the canal would be complete without reference to the Gloucester & Ledbury railway, which after 1855 partially assumed its route and role, and a chapter on this era contributed by John Norris has been included.

'The Hereford & Gloucester Canal' is copiously illustrated with maps, plans and photographs, and includes appendices relating to the locks and to industrial archaeology. There are also notes on sources and a comprehensive index.

This 80 page book is available as a hardback, with an attractive dust jacket, at £3.95 (plus postage and packing 40p) from the publishers, The Pound House, Newent, Glos.

PROGRESSION

Our congratulations go to Tim Darvill (whose paper on local Roman stamped tiles appears in this issue), on his recent success in obtaining a degree in Archaeology at the University of Southampton.

In doing this, Tim has become the first former Junior Member to do so. Let us hope that other Juniors will follow his example and take up archaeology as a career in the future.

Although Tim is still pursuing research at Southampton, he is actively involved with work on a number of archaeological projects in this area and he has been persuaded to become Honorary Secretary to the Committee for Archaeology in Gloucestershire. This important and onerous post has just been relinquished by Bernard Rawes who, in turn, has been appointed CAG Chairman.
SOME SMALL GROUPS OF STAMPED ROMAN CERAMIC TILES FROM THE COTSWOLDS

by Tim Darvill

Many of the fragments of ceramic brick or tile recovered by archaeologists during fieldwork, salvage operations or full scale excavations can be classified as being Roman in date because of the distinctive flanges, facets, curves and scoring which are so easy to recognise. In the first instance the collection of this material allows an assessment to be made of the extent of the site involved and the intensity of settlement. Later, after an examination of the brick and tile, indications are provided about the structural nature of the building it came from; such features as the nature of the roof, the lining of the walls, the presence of a hypocaust, or the line of the conduits. Unfortunately though, in many cases this is all.

Ceramic building units often represent the largest single class of artifact found on Roman sites and, as Peacock points out, were in economic terms much more important than pottery (1979: 9). Today, however, they hold less attraction because of their superficial homogeneity. Happily, things are now changing. Tiles can not only be seen as a key to an understanding of the building industry, but also for insights into the size of villa estates, the use of road networks, the status and location of part of the ceramic industry and a guide to at least one 'heavy industry' in Roman Britain (cf. McWhirr 1979). To get at this sort of information, tiles must be treated in a more detailed and scientific way (cf. Young 1979) and the present study can only point the direction to the answers of some questions. In the future, when excavators treat tile and brick with more respect and attention, much more detail will be able to be embroidered onto this framework.

Within the Cotswold region some of the producers of brick and tile stamped their products with groups of letters (Clifford 1955 and McWhirr and Viner 1978). The fact that these stamps cannot be interpreted as military insignia allows the assumption to be made that they were civilian brickworks, although the original idea might be military in origin. A detailed examination of these stamped tiles by David Viner, Alan McWhirr and the present author indicated that the tile industry was considerably more complex than had previously been thought, and several 'levels' of the industry were envisaged.

In order to elaborate on the findings of this general survey (McWhirr and Viner 1978), a programme of scientific analysis was begun on the tiles by the present author. Only stamped bricks were used, firstly because they were all that was saved from many past excavations and, secondly, because the results are more valuable when it is possible to link tiles by makers' marks and clay type. The use of these two variables allowed movements of both tiles and brickcasters to be looked for.

Analysis of the tiles was carried out by preparing 'thin sections' of all the samples available. This technique simply involves cutting off a slice of the tile and then grinding it down until the minerals in the clay are thin enough to let light pass through them - so allowing identification of the minerals present. In fact, the slice of tile has to be about 0.03 mm thick (Tite 1972; 215). Thus prepared, the samples were examined under a petrological microscope and visually compared with other tiles or raw clay samples from likely production sites. In the event of a more detailed comparison of samples being needed, quartz grains within the clay matrix can be measured and size distributions compared, as is done on Figure 4. The use of this textural analysis is only valid, however, on samples where the minerals present are the same - since clay is most objectively grouped
by different mineral suites. A more detailed discussions of the techniques used and the problems of interpretation can be found elsewhere. (Darvill 1979: 312-315).

The largest group of stamped tiles known, those marked TPF and variants TPPA, TPFB, TPPC and TPPP, along with those stamped LHS, have already been published (Darvill 1979). The source of these tiles was traced to Minety in Wiltshire where the high quality of clay, availability of water, wood for fuel and the accessibility of arterial routeways, allowed a large industry to thrive. Indeed, the quality (and price?) of the bricks made there possibly accounts for them ending up as far afield as Hucclecote and even Kenchester to the north west, Kingscote to the west, Cirencester to the north east and, possibly, Old Sarum and Silchester to the south.

The purpose of this paper is to illustrate other facets of the brick and tile industry which can be seen in smaller groups of tile. These products bear the stamps TCM, LLH, LLQ, VLA and ()ISF(). (See Figure 1 and Appendix). In total, tiles bearing these stamps make up 14% of the known 240 or so stamped tiles from the Cotswold region (excluding tiles stamped RPG, some of which seem to come from Gloucester).

1. VLA tiles

Five examples of this stamp are known (Appendix 1) and all seem to have been stamped with the same die (see Figure 1). Although few examples are known, they were found at three different sites; Clear Cupboard Villa (Gascoign 1969: 58), Sale's Lot, Withington (O'Neill 1966: 25) and Compton Grove Villa, Compton Abdale (RCHM 1976: 37-8). At Sale's Lot the tile was found within the covering layers of a long barrow, but most likely derived from a Roman structure somewhere in the neighbourhood. The only evidence of the date of these tiles comes from the fact that at Clear Cupboard the tiles were in the bath suite, thought to have been added in the 4th century A.D. Re-use might be thought of, but a 4th century date would be supported by what little is known from the Compton Grove site (RCHM 1976: 38, with earlier references).

Perhaps the most striking thing about the VLA finds is that they all come from within an area only 10 kilometres across (see Figure 3). This small discrete distribution alone is suggestive of a small scale production unit and, coupled with the fact that all the tiles seem to derive from rural farmstead type settlements, points to an 'estate' type of production unit (Peacock 1979: 7). In such a mode of production bricks are normally made for use on the estate itself and are only sold to outsiders when internal demand is low. Whether or not the sites in this example should be seen as related by ownership is not clear, but either this or the sharing of a kiln by neighbouring estates may be thought of from the tile evidence. Although none of the stamps from the Cotswolds can be read with certainty, Professor Wiseman notes that the letters VLA may be an abbreviated tria nomina, if the archaic praenomen Vibius is used (1979: 225). Alternatively, Professor Rivet suggests that it may be an abbreviated Celtic name (McWhirr and Viner 1978: 367).

The evidence from the tiles themselves shows that not only are the stamps identical, but so also is the clay used, further promoting the idea of 'estate' production. Although it was only possible to thin section two samples (see Appendix), a macroscopic analysis with a hand lens of the other specimens showed that they were all the same. Under the microscope the fabric was dominated by flecks of colourless mica up to 0.25 mm long and semi-rounded quartz grains up to 0.07 mm across (although most measured around 0.05 mm across). In addition there were a few flecks of iron ore and a little grog (crushed up tile or pot added to the clay to give it
Figure 1

Stamp die types discussed in the text.
Figure 2

The location of sites mentioned in the text.

Figure 3

The findspots of VLA tiles (dots) other villa sites (triangles) and Upper Lias clay outcrops (solid shading). See Figure 2 for location of this map.
strength). The fabric was soft, being easily scratched with a fingernail, and orange/red in colour. The nature and size of the quartz and mica in the clay precludes an origin in the small pockets of decayed limestone clay that can be found on the Cotswolds, as this has much more quartz in it. At present the best and most likely origin for the tiles is clay from the Upper Lias beds. This type of clay can be found in the sides of the steep cut river valleys in the vicinity of all three sites (see Figure 3). At present the exact location of the kiln is unknown, but it is along these bands of clay that it might be expected.

2. (IPS) tiles

At present very little can be said about this stamp group. The only known example is from Wotton-under-Edge and, unfortunately, even that is incomplete so that the full reading is unclear. The die is shown on Figure 1 but the findspot is not included on Figure 2 because the tile was not brought to my attention until after the map had been drawn. The stamp itself is interesting as it has a frame which is pressed into the clay leaving the letters standing in relief within the slot. The only other examples of this type of stamp from the Cotswolds are the TPLF and VLA dies.

The tile submitted to the author for examination was moderately soft and pale red in colour. In thin section the clay contained a heavy scatter of colourless mica flecks up to 0.1 mm long (although most were in the region of 0.05 mm long), along with semi-angular quartz grains up to 0.17 mm across. Iron staining was also present, as were very occasional small grains of plagioclase felspar. Although no samples of clay from near Wotton-under-Edge are available for comparison the general appearance suggests that it is Lower Lias clay, such as could be obtained from the floor of the Severn Valley.

3. LLH tiles

Three examples of this stamp are known, all come from Gloucester and all show the same stamp die (Figure 1). One example came from Greyfriars (JRS 59, 1969, 242, No. 39), while the other two came from separate excavations on the Bon Marche site (Cra'ster 1961: 58 and Hunter 1963: 58). The stratigraphic positions of these finds sheds little light on their dating, although the fact that the fragment recovered in 1955 from the Bon Marche site came from below a wall, in a building generally regarded as not being built later than the 2nd century A.D. (Cra'ster 1961: 57) suggests that they might be quite early in the Roman period, and of a similar date to the TPF and LHS series (Darvill 1979: 312). At present, examples of pilae and imbrex tiles are known stamped LLH.

Only one fabric group can be recognised at present. Under the microscope the field of view is dominated by fine mica flecks up to 0.09 mm long, although most are in the region of 0.05 mm long. There are also quartz grains ranging from less than 0.01 mm up to 0.1 mm across and a few iron ore fragments. Superficially the fabric resembles that of the (IPS) tiles mentioned above but, when compared in more detail, the finer mica in the LLH tiles suggests a different source, although quite probably on the Lower or Middle Lias clays. An origin in the area of Gloucester itself would be very possible. Comparison with a sample of tile from the pottery below St Oswald's Priory where RPG tiles seem to have been made (Heighway 1978: 106) showed that it is very unlikely that the LLH tiles could also come from the clay used at St Oswald's. This implies more than one group of tile kilns providing bricks for Glevum.
4. TCM tiles

This is the most numerous group reviewed in this paper. The 19 examples known at present break down into three die groups (see Figure 1). Die type A has large rather crude letters and exhibit a little variability in exact form. In particular, the top of the T has a more or less pronounced V knotch in the centre of the cross bar, and the gap between the top of the C and the M also varies a little. On the whole, however, the die is easily recognisable and is found at Hucclecote Villa (Clifford: 352 and TBGAS 1911: 13). Baginton near Coventry (JRS 48, 1958, 154), Cherry Orchard Kenilworth and Glasshouse Wood Kenilworth.

The second stamp type (B) has smaller and more closely set letters with a dot in the middle of the C. Examples of this die come from the Ebrington Villa (O'Neil 1972), and Dyer Street, Cirencester (Arch. Journal vol. VI; 133). A variation of this stamp is defined as die type C. This die has much thinner letters than B and is represented by only one example, from the Ebrington Villa.

So little material was found at Ebrington that the dating of the building, and hence the tiles, was not possible. At Hucclecote, however, the tiles were in direct association with examples of tiles stamped TPF, TPPA, TPPF and RPG. The whole group was sealed in the destruction of the first villa, thought to have taken place about 150 A.D. (Clifford 1933: 353).

The fabrics of the TCM tiles show an interesting diversity as seen on Figure 4. Two important fabric groups stand out. The first (Fabric Group 1) contains the examples from Hucclecote, while the second group (Fabric Group 2) contains all but one of the tiles from Ebrington. The tile from Hucclecote, not included, is the one now in the Corinium Museum in Cirencester (B1387), and can be shown to be of Lower Lias clay (Fabric Group 3). The clay used to make Fabric Groups 1 and 2 cannot, at present, be traced to its source, although the Hucclecote tiles in Fabric Group 1 may well be made from Lower Lias clay with the addition of sand tempering.

The tile from Cirencester with a die group B stamp on it has a very sandy fabric and can be seen on its own on the left hand side of Figure 4; it is defined as Fabric Group 4. The same singularity applies to the Baginton tile which, although less sandy than the Cirencester tile, cannot be fitted into the other groups because of the lower mica content; it is defined as Fabric Group 5. Finally, Fabric Group 6 contains the tiles from Cherry Orchard and Glasshouse Wood, Kenilworth. Although these are combined in one group at present they may require splitting if more samples become available to clarify slight differences which are hinted at in the samples available to date. (These indications include the presence of very small fragments of sandstone in the Cherry Orchard samples which, although not present in the Glasshouse Wood sample available, may be noted if a larger sample was available). What is clear, however, is that these products are not matched by the products of the tile kiln at Chase Wood, Kenilworth, a sample from which was kindly supplied by Coventry Museum for analysis.

The position at present is, therefore, of at least six different fabric groups being produced by one group of tilers (two or three if you count the die differences as representing group variability rather than chronological variability). The fact that only at Hucclecote is there more than one fabric represented (and these might well be the same clay; one with sand, one without) would suggest that this group of tilers was itinerant, and set up their kiln on clays locally available for the job in hand.

Evidence of this mode of production has already been cited for the TPF brick makers, where workers from the major brickworks at Minety seem to have gone to Hucclecote to make bricks, interestingly enough out of the same Lower Lias clay used by TCM workers, which can be found very near the site (Darvill 1979: 319).
Figure 4

Ternary diagram showing the results of quartz grain size analysis on TCM tiles. The graph compares the percentages of large and small quartz grains with matrix counts. (This compares not only the makeup of the quartz distribution, but also the density of quartz in the matrix). Fabric groups are indicated, but it should be remembered that points in close proximity may be distinguished by criteria other than the parameters used on this graph.
The reason for an itinerant element in brick production is, of course, that bricks were heavy and therefore expensive to transport. High quality bricks which would be required for special purposes could bear the cost of transport, but rougher bricks for more prosaic uses could be more cheaply made on the building site. This was facilitated by the portable nature of brick making equipment (e.g., spades, moulds, trimming knives, etc.) and the widespread availability of suitable clays. It was an itinerant mode of production that seems to have been used on many housing estates in Victorian Britain (Peacock 1979: 7; White 1971 and Woodforde 1976).

5. LLQ tiles

Unfortunately, very little can be said about this group of tiles since, at present, none of the examples are available for study. The four tiles known all seem to have been stamped with the same die (Figure 1). Three examples are known from Lydney Park (Wheeler and Wheeler 1932, 102, 7 Fig 28.7) and one from the excavations on the Northern defences at Cirencester (JRS 1967: 206, 33). No comments can at present be made about the mode of production which lies behind this group of tiles.

Conclusion

The findings of the above analysis illustrate modes of production within the ceramic tile industry during Roman Britain which can be identified by comparative ethnoarchaeological investigations (Peacock 1979) or suspected from a consideration of the spatial distribution of finds spots. Combined with the results of previous work on the TPF and LHS stamps, the diversity involved within the industry, which until recently had little attention paid to it, can be seen. It is clear that the road network was used to meet demands for high quality bricks by direct movements, while itinerant brickcasters also went to sites to produce the lower quality bricks. Evidence which would suggest an estate mode of production also seems to be present in at least one group of tiles thus illustrating a response to a different type of demand.

The fact that bricks from many different sources were used in one building project is illustrated by the finds sealed within the first villa at Hucclecote. This feature of the building industry was common until recent years and is illustrated by Sandgate Castle in Kent where bricks from at least 13 different brickworks were used between 1539 and 1540 (Rutton 1893: 236).

At present, it is unclear what percentage of a brickcaster's output was stamped. That it was not all of them seems fairly certain, as does the fact that not all brickworks stamped bricks.

For the time being, emphasis must be placed on understanding the tile industry by the analysis of material with good control variables, i.e., stamped tiles. Many more must remain to be found, and it is important that field workers become familiar with recognising stamps, which are not always as well preserved as might be thought. Furthermore, it is crucial that before tile is thrown away an assessment is made of the quantity involved (weight, fragment count), and also of the number of fabrics and types of tile represented. It is hoped that this paper shows the value of recording this sort of data, and the results it can given when compared against expected patterns.
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APPENDIX 1: Gazetteer of stamped tiles reviewed in this paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Museum Number</th>
<th>Slide No.</th>
<th>Fabric Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VLA - Stamp Group A</strong> (Large crude letters without frame)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington Villa</td>
<td>GCM a</td>
<td>R. 672</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington Villa</td>
<td>GCM b</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington Villa</td>
<td>GCM c</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale's Lot</td>
<td>GCM L 174</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton Abdale</td>
<td>Chelt. Mus.</td>
<td>R. 673</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>()ISF() - Stamp Group A</strong> (Small extrusive letters in hollow frame)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wotton-under-Edge</td>
<td>Private possession</td>
<td>R. 549</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LLH - Stamp Type A</strong> (Well formed small letters within a frame)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>GCM A3465</td>
<td>NAFS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>GCM A4946</td>
<td>R. 670</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>GCM 80/1967</td>
<td>R. 671</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCM - Stamp Group A</strong> (Large crude letters without frame)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hucclecote Villa</td>
<td>GCM A 1854</td>
<td>R. 303</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hucclecote Villa</td>
<td>GCM A 1851</td>
<td>R. 304</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hucclecote Villa</td>
<td>GCM A 1859</td>
<td>R. 305</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hucclecote Villa</td>
<td>Chelt. Mus. 1970: 82:11</td>
<td>R. 300</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hucclecote Villa</td>
<td>Cor. Mus. B 1387</td>
<td>R. 667</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasshouse Wood (Kenilworth)</td>
<td>Private possession</td>
<td>R. 680</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Orchard (Kenilworth)</td>
<td>Private possession</td>
<td>R. 678</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Orchard (Kenilworth)</td>
<td>Private possession</td>
<td>R. 679</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCM - Stamp Group B</strong> (Small close set letters with dot in the middle of C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebrington Villa</td>
<td>GCM A 6262</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebrington Villa</td>
<td>GCM A 6261</td>
<td>R. 287</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebrington Villa</td>
<td>GCM A 6260</td>
<td>R. 286</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebrington Villa</td>
<td>GCM A 6263</td>
<td>R. 288</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>Cor. Mus. B 1412</td>
<td>R. 668</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCM - Stamp Group B</strong> (Thin letters with a dot in the C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebrington Villa</td>
<td>GCM A 6259</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LLG - Stamp Group A</strong> (Even letters with stamps between the letters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydney Park</td>
<td>Private possession</td>
<td>NAFS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydney Park</td>
<td>Private possession</td>
<td>NAFS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydney Park</td>
<td>Private possession</td>
<td>NAFS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>CIR 1964/5</td>
<td>NAFS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes on Appendix

This catalogue of stamps and petrological groupings was compiled from data available up until January 1980. This Appendix should be used in conjunction with Figure 1 in the text which illustrates a representative example of each group. It must be remembered that in some cases stamps are not complete, making classification difficult. Within each die group there will be variation between examples. It is rare to find stamps evenly impressed and, in most cases, some letters are deeper than others which affects letter width. A further cause of variation is the shrinkage of the clay after the stamp has been impressed. The most efficient way of comparing stamps is to make rubbings on thin paper, and then compare them over a light table.

The following abbreviations are used in the Appendix:

- Chelt. Mus. - Cheltenham Museum
- CIR - Cirencester Excavation Committee site code
- Cor. Mus. - Corinium Museum, Cirencester
- GCM - Gloucester City Museum
- Cov. Mus. - Coventry Museum
- M - Macroscopic examination only of this tile
- NAFS - Tile not available for study

Slide numbers (R.000) is the University of Southampton, Department of Archaeology, thin section library number. Fabric group relates to the fabrics defined in the text and should therefore read as: VLA fabric group 1 (for example).

***********
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41–43 High Street Cheltenham
SO 952222

These two houses, on the north side of the High Street at the junction with St James' Street, are due to be demolished as part of a road widening scheme. Behind the 19th century stucco facade and recent shop fronts (41 is now a pet shop, 43 a store for a DIY shop to the rear) are two unpretentious properties, in all likelihood of late 18th century date. Both are brick built, of two stories and an attic, with slated roofs. No structural timberwork is evident, other than in floors and roof. Both are in poor condition. No. 43 has a small cellar to the rear, largely of irregular stonework, extended to the west in brick, and with an arched recess of uncertain function in the east wall.

No. 43, now a corner property, has a passage on the west side running from the High Street frontage to the rear; this is explained by the fact that there was formerly an adjacent property, No. 45. This was demolished 15 or 20 years ago.

Information based upon title deeds, kindly made available by Dr Steven Blake of Cheltenham Art Gallery and Museum, suggests that the three properties 41–43–45, which were formerly numbered 63–63–64, had probably assumed much of their present form by 1839, when they were sold to a local surveyor and developer. Conceivably it was he who added the present facade. At this time, the properties included gardens, a bakehouse, coalyard and shed to the rear. A chimney stack at the rear of 41–43 (together with the cellar recess mentioned above) may be related to this bakehouse.

The three properties of 1839 were in turn a development, through 'diverse alterations and improvements', of a house (possibly two houses) of unknown description dating from at least 1776. On approaching Cheltenham from London, these would thus have been among the first buildings on the more or less continuously built-up northern side of the High Street.

James Hodsdon
THE CIRENCESTER WORD-SQUARE

by David Viner

Puzzles today are a form of entertainment, largely confined to newspapers, quiz books and party games. To be successful, all puzzles from riddles and anagrams to crosswords and word-searches must embody the twin elements of disguise and discovery - a clever form of concealment which challenges the ingenuity of the participant. The assumption throughout is that both constructor and solver derive pleasure from the pastime.

In the past, puzzles have sometimes been used for more serious purposes and examples may occasionally be discovered in the classical literature and - perhaps surprisingly - in our museum collections. In the Corinium Museum at Cirencester is displayed a fine example of the hidden meaning. A word-square or palindrome was found in Cirencester in 1868 during the excavations for new houses. It was scratched upon a section of wall plaster, a very typical example of the type well-known to have been used to decorate Romano-British houses in the town. Beyond this, the rather limited archaeological evidence at the time of discovery could produce no closer dating for the fragment.

The inscription consists of five words:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ROTAS} \\
\text{OPERA} \\
\text{TENET} \\
\text{AREPO} \\
\text{SATOR}
\end{align*}
\]

which read the same both across and also down and back to front - a true palindrome. The scratch marks are fairly faint and not by any means a confident and bold assertion drawn upon the wall for all to see. Rather, the impression is of a quickly produced (if careful) inscription executed rather furtively as if intended only for those 'in the know'.

Also worth noting is the fact that the inscription is drawn just above a change in the colour scheme of the wall plaster, from ochre red to blue grey, which might perhaps give a clue to its position in relation to the height of the wall - at waist height, perhaps?

What does the puzzle mean? The fascination of this piece is that we will probably never know! However, this is not to say that much time and effort has not been spent in attempting an answer. A leaflet recently published by the museum summarises all the arguments so far expressed. The favourite idea is that the inscription conceals a hidden code meaningful to the secret Christian community in Corinium before the adoption of Christianity in the Roman Empire in 313 A.D. This shows itself in no less than three ways. Firstly, although the literal translation of the piece 'the sower Arepo holds the wheels with force' seems to be meaningless, if this word-square is turned upside-down and inside-out it reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SATOR} \\
\text{AREPO} \\
\text{TENET} \\
\text{OPERA} \\
\text{ROTAS}
\end{align*}
\]

which might then be translated as 'the great sower (i.e., God) holds in his hands all works; all works the great sower holds in his hands'. To a believer, the otherwise meaningless code would thus assume a clear message.

The second clue can be drawn from either form of the palindrome. The word tenet can be read across and down the centre of the word-square in the
form of a cross, the traditional Christian symbol; this might also give a clue to dating, as this symbol was not in common use before the mid 2nd century A.D. The third clue is, perhaps, the most tantalising of all and only relatively recently identified by scholars.

The 25 letters of the palindrome can be seen as an anagram of Paternoster repeated twice - thus:

\[
\text{A} \text{P} \text{A} \text{T} \text{E} \text{R} \text{N} \text{O} \text{S} \text{T} \text{E} \text{R} \text{O}
\]

There are, in fact, two clues here. The word Paternoster, being the first two words of the Lord’s Prayer, and the A and O, the alpha and omega, referring to Christ as the beginning and the end. A third clue is the reassembly of the letters in the form of a Cross.

The Cirencester word-square is probably the best known example from Britain, although similar examples have been recorded from Pompeii and from Dura-Europos in North Africa. All belong to the 'Rotas ....' format and a further discovery of this type was made recently during archaeological excavations at Manchester. Although not a complete fragment, the greatest contribution of this new piece is perhaps its suggested date bracket in the 2nd century, a base upon which the earlier discoveries might now be considered.

Was there a body of Christians in Corinium in the 2nd century or earlier, secretly worshipping in each others' homes? Have the various discoveries, each with its tantalizing lack of supporting evidence, given us the only clue so far to such activities? Puzzle enthusiasts continue to enjoy the challenge, Christian activists argue the case, whilst archaeologists look hopefully for the discovery of better documented examples in the future of such intriguing and mysterious word-squares.

R Ellis 'The Cirencester Word-Square' is published by the Corinium Museum, Park Street, Cirencester in 1980 and is available from the museum at 20p including postage.

Brockworth Mill

Through the agency of the Reverend John Thornton of Great Witcombe, who saw Phil Moss's report in Glevensis 12, a photograph of Brockworth Mill as it appeared 25 years ago has been kindly supplied by Mrs H Bowers of Brockworth. It is especially pleasant to be able to publish something which stems from a previous contribution in the Group's review.

This has also afforded the opportunity to reproduce the portion of the Brockworth tithe map which shows the mill. We are grateful to the Gloucestershire Record Office for permission to do so.
Brockworth Mill as it appeared about 1955.

Brockworth Tithe Map (part only) Courtesy of Gloucestershire Records Office
A ROMAN SITE AT BENHALL

by Cherry Goudge & Alan Saville

In October 1979, while excavating a trench along the side entrance to his house in Coberley Road, Benhall, Cheltenham (SO 918 218), Mr Martin Spires uncovered some Romano-British pottery. The find was reported to Cheltenham Museum and the pottery sent to the Gloucester City Excavation Unit for examination.

The pottery can be sorted into the following types, with reference to the Gloucester Unit type fabric (TF) series.

Samian ware

Flange fragment from bowl. Drag. form 38. Central or East Gaulish? Late 2nd to 3rd century.

A micaceous grey ware (Gloucester TF5)

Three body sherds from wheel-thrown jars. All are lightly burnished on external surface. The largest sherd has unburnished zone and may be a copy of black-burnished ware cooking pot form, very common in this ware, which seems to have a wide distribution in the Severn Valley and West Cotswolds. Its source is not known at present. 3rd to early 5th century.

Malvernian handmade ware (Gloucester TF18)

(The fabric is tempered with angular fragments of Malvernian igneous and metamorphic rocks and is micaceous) - fragment of lid, buff-grey colour, burnt in use? Probably 2nd century.

Dorset black-burnished ware (BB1, Gloucester TF4)

14 sherds. All the sherds come from large, handmade cooking pots, including three 'flaring' rims, (cf. Gillam 1968, No. 145) and body sherds with obtuse angled lattice. These features date the vessels to the 3rd century.

White-slipped, sand tempered flagon ware (Gloucester TF15B)

Rim, neck and upper part of body of small, wheelmade, flanged neck flagon. The handle is missing. The white slip has fired to a pinkish colour and is now rather thin. The fabric contains numerous burnt out organic inclusions, as well as quartz grains. The form of this vessel is 3rd to 4th century in date. Red-slipped flagons of the same form, and in similar fabrics, are known from Gloucester (TF15C). This ware has a wide distribution in the south west, dating from the 2nd century, when the ring-necked type of flagon was the common form.

'Severn Valley Ware' (Gloucester TF11B)

Usually wheelthrown vessels, in orange/buff, micaceous fabrics, without added tempering. The forms represented here include large, narrow mouthed jars which have a long life in this ware, and wide mouthed jars typical of the later Roman period in this area. These vessels, together with a possible bowl rim, probably date to the 3rd century or later.

The 'Severn Valley Ware' sherds can be catalogued as follows:-

1. Rim, part of body and base, of large, narrow mouthed jar, with cordon at base of neck, groove on shoulder, and rim with down-turned flange. Flat base.

2. Part of narrow mouthed jar with cordon at base of neck and zone of burnished lattice decoration on shoulder.
3. Sherd from neck of narrow mouthed jar with slight cordon.
4. 11 miscellaneous body sherds, including one coarse sherd, possibly Malverian 'Severn Valley ware'. (Gloucester TF19).
5. Flat rim from bowl?
6. Three jar bases (two flat, one with small foot-ring).
7. Two ribbed handles, (one very fine fabric, well-burnished - a few similar sherds known from Gloucester).
8. Two wide mouthed jar rims.

This collection of pottery, which is in very good condition, seems to be contemporary, comprising wares typical of the region and suggests 3rd century A.D. occupation in Benhall.

The findspot itself is curious. The subsoil through which the trench was excavated was uniformly blue lias clay and this appears to be the matrix in which the pottery lay. There was no obvious evidence of disturbance or previous foundations. However, the findspot within the trench did centre around a modern drain (contemporary with the house), which crossed the present trench at an angle. There must remain a slight possibility that the pottery was associated with the back-fill of the drain trench and was therefore a modern deposition. But this seems extremely unlikely, unless as a hoax, and the good condition of the pottery is better explained by the finds being in situ, and originating from a Romano-British feature intrusive into the clay, backfilled with clay, and unrecognized when the trench was dug.

Romano-British occupation within Cheltenham District has previously been regarded as minimal (Rawes 1974; Saville 1975). This new find, away from the expected focus of settlement is, therefore, of considerable interest.
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Harold Wingham wishes it made known that he - contrary to the now popularly held belief - does not use, as part of his photographic developing technique, a special additive derived from that most overrated of vegetables "Daucus Carota". Furthermore, he believes that this mistaken view is entirely the Editor's fault for allowing the figures 2220 to creep onto the page below his aerial photograph of Cassey Compton Earthworks opposite page 31 in Glevensis 13, thereby usurping the rightful place of the figures 220.
Looking back over the last 12 months, I have found it difficult to settle on any one word or phrase to characterise the Group’s activities over the year - no single event stands out as dominant but, nevertheless, one can record a pretty respectable list of topics where the Committee and members have been able to make useful contributions both to archaeology itself and the protection of archaeological interests.

In the area of primary archaeology, that is to say discovering and recording the past, the association of GADARG with the Frocester excavations, now under the direction of Eddie Price, has been a main feature of the year, and has proved both enjoyable and instructive to all those who have participated. The kind of conclusions about villa farming that Mr Price was able to illustrate in his talk to the Group in November show how fruitful an extensive long-term project such as Frocester can be. Fieldwork has also continued with perhaps the best 'bag' being achieved by Nigel Spry and other Group members who notched up several new Roman and other sites in their walking of the new water pipeline in South Gloucestershire.

Urban archaeology has been less prominent this year. However, within Gloucester, some members helped with Richard Bryant's work at St Mary de Lode.

One of the Committee's main jobs is that of speaking up for archaeological interests, and I would place under this heading the case prepared by the Group against the proposed demolition by the Gloucester City Council of 91 Westgate Street. Our objection, along with those of several other interested parties, was heard by the recent Public Enquiry.

The historical, archaeological and environmental arguments for saving this building were strong, but regrettably it is in a very poor state of repair at present, and the financial arguments against restoration by the Council seem like winning the day. More successful, from our point of view, was a GADARG representation against a planned development of the Kingsholm Palace site; this important area now seems safe, for the present at least.

The Llanthony Priory saga rumbles on. The City is pressing on with the legal steps necessary to clear the site of incompatible uses, but experience leads us not to expect a sudden resolution of the problem.

We are represented, as one of a number of amenity groups, in the deliberations on the Gloucester Interim District Plan; in Cheltenham, potentially useful links have been forged with the Borough Council's Planning Office and the Museum, notably over access to the Plough Hotel site (once development begins) and in the recording of threatened buildings.

Wearing its educational hat, the Group can look back to a very successful joint WEA/GADARG half-day symposium in October on recent work in Gloucestershire, held in Cheltenham, where the turnout exceeded all expectations. We were also represented at the Local History Conference in Gloucester. The customary summer excursions were arranged, some better supported than others. The winter talks programme has again proved the activity best supported by members, who this year can thank John Lees for the considerable and extended effort that underpins a successful programme such as we have enjoyed.

Glevensis marches on, Issue No. 13 containing a record 58 pages. Once more, Nigel Spry has been the moving spirit here, and to him goes the
credit for this successful production.

After something of a hiatus, the scheme to award a Junior Challenge Shield, in recognition of, and as a stimulus to, the efforts of younger members of the Group, has at last got off the ground. Bill Chouls takes the credit for this idea, and it was he who kindly donated the shield itself.

Another name which should not go unrecorded this year is that of Henry Hurst, who was elected an honorary member of the Group - only the third there has ever been - in November last. His enthusiasm for the projects he engaged himself in, and his support of the Group during his years in Gloucester will be long remembered, and indeed we have continued to benefit from his advice on Gloucester matters even since his departure to a post at Lancaster University.

Those who have been reading the papers recently will be aware that the arguments over metal detecting are becoming fiercer, and battle lines have now been drawn by the CBA, who have launched what looks like a blanket attack on metal detector users/treasure hunters and all their works. GADARG, partly because of a charitable conviction that some sinners may yet be saved, and partly because Gloucestershire does not seem to have been nearly as badly affected as some other counties, has continued to hold out an olive branch in the form of its free leaflet, encouraging metal detector users to be aware of the archaeological impact of their hobby. We can only wait and see how this gathering storm will affect us.
GLOUCESTER AND DISTRICT ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH GROUP

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE - YEAR ENDED 29 FEBRUARY, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(£ 42.80) Duplicating &amp; Printing</td>
<td>(£238.75) Members' Subscriptions £386.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 19.64) Stationery</td>
<td>Tax repayment on covenants 72.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 54.66) Postage and Telephone</td>
<td>Profits from raffles 11.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 24.00) Lecture fees</td>
<td>( 41.70) Field meetings 79.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 36.00) Room hire</td>
<td>( 97.85) Glevensis sales 128.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 13.50) Subscriptions &amp;</td>
<td>Sales of books 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation fees</td>
<td>( 12.37) Interest on bank deposit account 23.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 26.00) Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  6.00) Advertising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 40.00) Field meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(207.46) Glevensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimonial to Mr B Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess income over Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£701.95</td>
<td>£701.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at 28 February 1979 £295.82</td>
<td>Cash at bank credit account £116.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheques paid but not passed</td>
<td>Cash at bank deposit account 318.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through bank</td>
<td>Excess income over expenditure 110.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cash in hand 2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess income over expenditure 110.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£437.63</td>
<td>£437.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have examined these accounts of Income and Expenditure and found them correct.

John Punshon
14 March 1980.