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EDITORIAL

This issue of Glevensis marks the end of my spell as editor. I would like to thank the people who have helped with this and previous issues, in particular; Phil Moss for the cover designs; Harold Wingham for the preparation of illustrations and John Punshon and Pat Bott for the typing.

I wish the next editor success, whoever they may be. It would be nice to see a group member who has not served in an official capacity before prepared to take on the job. That would ease the load on the group members who seem always to have to shoulder the burden of group administration. In addition there would be an injection of fresh ideas. Any interested group member should not hesitate to put themselves forward.

HON. SECRETARIES' REPORT FOR 1984-1985

Since the last A.G.M., we are able to record another busy year in which many members took part in a variety of activities.

In the early summer, six evening meetings were held in a room at the Gloucestershire Record Office on basic archaeology. The meetings were organised by Kate Haslem and John Punshon and all the talks were given by members. The winter lectures, of which the highlight was Martin Carver's talk on Sutton Hoo, have been very well attended. Unfortunately, a fire at the Old Bakery in Cheltenham led to the cancellation of one meeting, but another was transferred to the Old Crypt Schoolroom in Gloucester.

Our summer meetings consisted of our usual visit to the Crickley Hill excavations, where we were conducted round the site by the Director, Dr Philip Dixon. An evening walk round the centre of Gloucester was led by those experienced City Guides Arthur Dodd and Philip Moss. This meeting was so popular that we had to split into two large groups for the entertaining and instructive tour.

During the year there have been five committee meetings. Subjects of concern have included commenting on the route of the Brockworth Bypass, where the southern option was thought to be the least damaging archaeologically. Various local plans such as the Tewkesbury Borough Cheltenham Environs Local Plan, have been commented on. It is pleasing to record that local plans now recognise the importance of the historical and archaeological dimension. The draft of the revision of the Gloucester Local Plan included the proposed establishment of an archaeological and interpretive centre at Llanthony Priory site and the appointment of an excavations director to work for the City Museum.
We have also been concerned that the Abbeydale III development should receive full archaeological attention and have been pleased to hear that an archaeologist has been appointed for this task.

Excavations in Gloucester have continued throughout the year with M.S.C. schemes. Tim Darvill's work on the Castle site produced some evidence for what was happening in 'Dark Age' Gloucester. Patrick Garrod, aided by John Smith, has continued his invaluable work of watching development in Gloucester. Due to the demise of the Western Archaeological Trust, the Crickley Hill Trust has set up an M.S.C. agency to continue work in Gloucester and elsewhere in the County.

The dig at Frocester Court Roman site, where our Chairman, Eddie Price, is helped by several Group members, has continued to add more pieces to the jigsaw there. This site and Bernard Rawes' excavation at Vineyards Farm were visited by members and material from both sites was on display at the Archaeology in Gloucestershire exhibition at Cheltenham Museum in the autumn; as was publicity material for GADARG. The CAG Symposium, at which talks were given by a number of members, was held in conjunction with this exhibition.

GADARG was represented by the Chairman and/or Secretary at all meetings of the Committee for Archaeology in Gloucestershire, also all Council for British Archaeology Group XIII meetings, one of which was held in Gloucester for the first time in many years.

As members are aware, the Secretaries are moving to a new address. This led to consideration of what to do with the Groups archive of past correspondence, minute books, etc. This has found a permanent home at the Gloucestershire Record Office, which was pleased to accept an example of the records of a society like GADARG.

The level of subscription was discussed by the committee and, following our Treasurer's advice, it was raised to £4.00 for ordinary members, £5.50 for an ordinary and an associate member and £2.00 for juniors, at a General Meeting of the Group on 21 January 1985. These rates are to begin on 1 March 1985.

Sadly, we have to record the death of three members during the past year. Mrs Helen O'Neil died in August at the age of 90. She was a founder of GADARG and an Honorary Member. Her obituary appeared in Glevensis. Mr E Cartnell and Mr W Thomas both died suddenly. The Secretaries have expressed the sympathy of the Committee and members to Mrs Cartnell and Mrs Thomas.

It now remains to thank all those members of the Committee and ordinary members, too many to name here, who have given freely of their time and effort to help run the Group. Without their assistance GADARG could not function.

Thank you everyone.

Barbara Rawes
Bernard Rawes
Joint Honorary Secretaries
William the Conqueror and Domesday

by Arthur Dodd

"He had castles built and poor men hard oppressed.  
A stark man was the King...."

(Anglo Saxon Chronicle)

William of Normandy was born in 1027, the illegitimate son of Duke Robert II by his mistress Hurleva, the daughter of a tanner at Falaise. Robert, known as Robert the Devil, died in 1035 on his way home from a pilgrimage to the Holy Land whence, no doubt, he had gone in expiation of his many sins.

Before his death, Robert had already induced most of his followers to recognise his bastard son as his heir. However, one faction would not agree and, for the first twelve years of the boy's rule, Normandy was a land of bloodshed and anarchy. Eventually, William not only quietened his turbulent followers but led a united country to victory over the formidable opposition of the French king. In so doing, he made his duchy a force to be reckoned with on the continent of Europe and enhanced his own reputation as a wise ruler and an able general.

In 1051, William paid his famous visit to the court of his kinsman, Edward the Confessor, where he is said to have received a promise of the throne from the childless monarch. Not unnaturally, the English nobles, led by Earl Godwine of Wessex, objected violently, pointing out that the disposal of the throne was a matter for the Witan and not the prerogative of the King. As a result, it appears that Edward was forced to revoke his decision.

In 1064, Harold Godwinsson, who had succeeded to the Earldom of Wessex, was wrecked on the French coast and taken prisoner by Guy, Count of Ponthieu, who was a vassal of William. Guy, realising the importance of his prisoner, promptly handed him over to William in Rouen. It was here that Harold apparently compromised himself by taking some sort of oath over holy relics by which he acknowledged William to be the heir to the English throne.

On the death of Edward the Confessor, and confident that he had a right to the crown, William undertook the conquest of England. At the suggestion of his most trusted counsellor, Lanfranc, Abbot of St Stephen's Caen - later to become Archbishop of Canterbury - he secured the Pope's sanction for an invasion and, by this, converted straightforward aggression into a holy war. On the 14 October 1066, he faced King Harold's army at the Battle of Hastings, defeated and killed him. On Christmas Day he was crowned King of England in the new abbey at Westminster.

Although William was victorious at Hastings - albeit by the narrowest of margins - it took him several years to subdue the entire kingdom. The English were still not ready to accept defeat; in the west, the people were reluctant to conform - Edric the Forester and the men of Shropshire attacked and slaughtered the garrison at Shrewsbury; Gloucestershire and Somerset refused to acknowledge the new government; there was open revolt in Dorset and Devonshire at the instigation of Harold's mother, Gytha, and Exeter was only taken after a desperate
siege. In the east, Hereward, Thane of Bourne, resisted the Norman invaders for five years in the Fen District while, in the north, the Earls Edwin and Morcar led an insurrection which was only put down with difficulty. Morcar later joined Hereward in the fens.

One result of William's efforts to contain matters was the erection of many motte and bailey castles at potential trouble spots. Of some thirty royal castles built before 1100, the majority are inside, or alongside of, the walls of important towns. Such were the castles of London, Cambridge, Chester, Colchester, Exeter, GLOUCESTER, Hereford, Lincoln, Old Sarum, Winchester, Worcester and York.

In many cases the King built his castle not inside the town, but against its outer wall. This was a mark of suspicion; he did not want it hemmed in with houses or too easily accessible. In Gloucester sixteen houses were demolished - possibly to improve the field of fire.

Trouble flared again in the north. This time it was instigated by a legitimate English claimant to the throne, Edgar Atheling, the grandson of Edmund Ironside, who had a promise of support from the Scottish king, Malcome Canmore. The insurrection was also helped by a seaborne invasion fleet of some 240 ships sent by King Swyn Estrithson of Denmark under his brother, Osborn, who, landing at the confluence of the Ouse and the Humber, proceeded to invest York.

William acted immediately. He force marched his army into Yorkshire and successfully bought off the Danes; Malcolm Canmore arrived late and was forced into retreat while Edgar Atheling, finding himself unsupported, withdrew with his followers into Scotland.

The Conqueror's triumph in the north was followed up by an unparalleled act of cold blooded vengeance. He decided to put into effect a 'scorched earth' policy and ordered the utter destruction of the whole country from the Ouse to the Tyne with fire and sword. So horribly complete was the work of desolation that no fewer than one hundred thousand people are said to have perished and the whole fertile district remained for years a scathed and barren wilderness. William of Malmesbury, writing some eighty years after the event says, "From York to Durham not an inhabited village remained." The Domesday records of a decade and half later bear the ominous phrase "Here is waste" against many Yorkshire villages, a number of which had not recovered from the effects of the King's punishment thirty years later.

Eventually, the whole country became quiescent under William's iron hand; although the resentment of the English was still apparent, seething, just under the surface.

William would have lost no time in visiting Gloucester once he was firmly established on the throne. The tradition of the Christmas crown wearing in the City had been instituted in the early days of Edward the Confessor's reign and it was too good a piece of propaganda for the wily Norman not to take advantage of it.

The most momentous of his visits to Gloucester was, without doubt, that of Christmas 1085 which resulted in the compilation of the Domesday Book. We have a shrewd idea as to his personal appearance in this eventful year; he is said to have been a fierce visaged, thickset, heavy, corpu-
lent man with iron grey hair markedly thinning at the front.

William held his court at Kingsholm - the King's Home - for five days and this was followed by a three day synod held by the Archbishop and clergy, probably at the Abbey of St Peter.

At some time during this period, the King ordered a nationwide enquiry into the wealth of the country. The manner of the enquiry was by means of the 'Sworn Inquest' and it was carried out speedily, efficiently and in great detail. Answers were given under oath to a fixed list of particular questions. The examination was made twice, using two sets of investigators. "so they could check the findings of the first survey"... according to Robert de Losinga, Bishop of Hereford, who was present when the order was given. The Anglo Saxon Chronicle somewhat sourly says that nothing escaped the eagle eye of the commissioners sent to do the survey. "not even one ox, nor one cow, nor one pig...".

The question arises: why did the refractory English accept this enquiry into their personal possessions without clamour? The answer is simple. It was the law - and the Saxon English had always had a profound respect for the letter of the law. What is more, it was nothing new; THEY HAD SEEN IT ALL BEFORE!

With the country firmly in their hands, the conquering Normans had used every artifice to denigrate all things English. They sneered at their military prowess - despite the near defeat at Hastings. They said that they lacked culture; that their language was the speech of serfs and that their royal halls were nothing but wooden hovels. They considered their churches and cathedrals unsuitable and started to rebuild them in the Norman style. Above all, they expressed contempt for their system of government. Yet the English administrative machine was probably the most efficient in the whole of northern Europe. Its strength lay in the fact that it had trained officials in charge of both central and local government.

The most important of these officials were the Shire Reeves or Sheriffs who controlled the Shires. Each Shire had clearly defined boundaries which were well known to the local populace and it was virtually impossible for any person or holding to evade the control of the Sheriff or his officials.

Every village belonged to a 'Hundred' which held a court every four weeks; every Hundred - under its 'Hundredesman' - belonged to a Shire whose moot, or court, met twice yearly and where every man of importance was expected to attend. The moots not only allowed for discussion and the settlement of lawsuits, but also afforded an opportunity for the passing on of orders received from the central government and the monarch. The whole system gave considerable control to the king and the information it provided enabled him to levy a land tax at regular intervals throughout the country.

The land tax of pre-conquest England was known as Geld. It was levied from the hundreds of hides which subdivided each Shire - the hide being, notionally, 120 acres, although the area could vary in different parts of the country. Geld could be called for various purposes: to form a portion of the royal revenue; for the upkeep of the army or navy; or to buy off an invader (Dane Geld). The central government knew exactly
how many hides made up each Shire and sent the demand for Geld to each Shire moot who divided it amongst its component Hundreds. Each landholder knew exactly what he was required to pay. When, in the tenth century, the Anglo Saxon kings had decreed that all men should be in a Hundred, they not only ensured that they could speedily be brought to justice but also that they could be easily taxed!

The liability of every holding must have been known to all Sheriffs and the officials responsible for the Geld collection and its transpor-tation to the royal treasury. Thus, both the tax and the machinery for its collection were already ancient when the Normans came. There is no doubt that William was well aware of its potential for he imposed four general Gelds BEFORE the Domesday survey. In fact, the Geld system proved to be such a useful tool that the Normans kept it going until 1162! But what was different about Domesday was the very detailed nature of the enquiry. It asked:-

1. What is the name of the manor?
2. Who held it in King Edward's time?
3. Who holds it now?
4. How many hides are there?
5. How many teams, in desmesne and among the men?
6. How many villeins, cottars, slaves, freemen and sokemen?
7. How much wood, meadow and pasture?
   How many mills and fisheries?
8. How much has been added or taken away?
9. How much was the whole worth?
   How much now?
10. How much had or has each freeman or each sokeman?

   All this to be given in triplicate; that is, in the time of King Edward, when King William gave it and at the present time.

11. And whether more can be had than is had?

... Note the sting in the tail!

So King William's edict of 1085 simply used the machinery of the old government to assess the relative values of the land at three different dates. In effect, he called a triple Geld.

The Norman landowners accepted the survey without demur because, under their feudal system, all the land belonged to the King anyway. The native English reluctantly accepted its nit-picking thoroughness and referred to the visit of the King's assessors as DOMES DAEG or Judgement Day because there was no appeal against it. In other words, the inquisition was equally acceptable under both Norman and Saxon law.

"The Domesday survey has been seen as the first great achievement of Norman government in England. It might equally well be considered as the last testimony to the sophistication and efficacy of the late Saxon government." (Michael Wood).

It is interesting to note that the survey showed that William was Gloucester's principal landowner; in fact, the City became known as the 'King's Desmesne' and the 'Royal Burh'. It also showed that 25% of the population of Gloucestershire were slaves - the highest proportion in the entire country!
In 1086, Norman William held his Christmas court at Gloucester for the last time. Records show that both Robert of Normandy and William Rufus were present on that occasion.

On 9 September 1087, William I died in Normandy at the age of 60, following a rupture and inflammation of the intestines caused when his horse reared unexpectedly, after stepping on a red hot ember during the sacking of Mantes and threw him with great force against the iron pommel of his saddle.

William the Conqueror is, perhaps, the most famous of all the kings who have visited Gloucester through the ages. He was a brave and skillful soldier and a wise and vigorous ruler; but his great qualities were sometimes overshadowed by his inordinate ambition and cruelty. He could be completely ruthless to those who stood in his way and his painful and miserable death was regarded by many as a just retribution for the many cruelties he had perpetrated during his lifetime.

His lasting monument is the great survey that he ordered to be carried out when he visited Gloucester during that Christmas 1085; a survey which resulted in what is probably the most valuable recording of antiquity possessed by any nation – The Domesday Book.
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HARDING'S HIGH BROTHERIDGE AND LEGGATT'S LEGENDS

by Harold Wingham

Re-reading Gordon Hardings article "High Brotheridge" in the 1977 (11th) edition of 'Clevesis', it occurred to me that a stronger case for his proposal that here was once the largest hill fort in the British Isles could have been made. The description given is rather difficult to follow on the ground; partly due it must be admitted, to timber-felling, new timber-cart tracks, changes in type and density of undergrowth from year to year, and the sheer size of the site. Greater emphasis could have been placed on guiding walkers around the various features simply and clearly so that at all times they knew exactly where they were in relation to the rest of the earthworks. Side-issues could have been dealt with later.

In his reference to the gateway he discovered at Buckholt he says "... however there is no evidence in the form of piles of rubble to indicate the existence of terminal Guard-houses". I believe there is evidence for guard-houses in the form of two mounds; that on the north side of the entrance has been almost completely destroyed by fire and stands some eight feet above the entrance corridor. The burning was so extensive that practically all the stone has been reduced to a reddish-brown clay; and a great deal of material was obviously raked forward into the large defensive ditch to provide access to Buckholt House. The ditch and counter-scarp can be seen more or less intact some 25 yards further north; a path cut through the counterscarp 20 yards below Buckholt's boundary shows its profile clearly.

The mound on the south side has also been damaged by fire and quarrying especially on its southern flank. Possibly the burning has saved it from more extensive quarrying. Trees and undergrowth obscure the view and make access for measurements difficult, but it appears to be roughly circular, 80 feet across and at least 25 feet high. When standing on the mound one is looking down on the ridge of Buckholt House and the eyes are just about level with the chimney tops. As a gateway it must have been massive, with all that this implies, whatever form it took.

It is also said there is no evidence for a covering earthwork before the entrance. The counterscarp just mentioned starts some 60 yards north of Buckholt’s grounds and gradually increases in size until it is apparently terminated abruptly by the Buckholt boundary, at which point it is about 7 feet above the ditch and is at least 8 yards wide; the full width is difficult to determine because of the steep slope on which it stands, but the highest point is 4 yards from the ditch. At this point it is level with the northern mound, and it is unlikely that it did not continue further into the area of Buckholt’s grounds, thus covering the entrance. There is in fact evidence that it did just that, for the ground continues to rise in the direction that the counterscarp should take, with its maximum height where it should be – directly in front of the entrance corridor between the two mounds. The survival of its line as demonstrated by the Western boundary of Buckholt’s property and by the 25” O.S. map shows that it was curved around the entrance as one might expect. In addition, the gateway does not stand symmetrically across the ridge – which is here a mere 120 yards wide – but it is displaced to the north, not what one would expect unless there was a covering earthwork.
On page 19 of his article Gordon appears to claim to have added some 500 yards only, to the earthworks shown by the Ordnance Survey. Although this increased the known earthworks by 50%, it should be made clear that this referred to the initial work only, and that his later work produced something like another 2000 yards of mainly unrecorded and some re-discovered earthworks.

With reference to the SW corner of the outer earthwork which has been deleted from the present 25" O.S. map and dismissed by the RCHM as a trackway to a quarry, not only does it go to the top of a 140 foot quarry, but it takes a circuitous route of 900 yards downhill and up again to reach a field at a point only 500 yards away and easily reached in level ground. Further, the St Peters Abbey map of the hill (1749) shows no quarry, although it does show two small surface quarries on the hill top, coloured blue to indicate they were water-filled, as they are now. And the 25" O.S. 1884 map also shows no quarry there then, but it does show an extension of the earthwork where the quarry now is, and it shows it to have an inturned end. Part of this in-turn is still to be seen with careful observation, though it is not shown on the 1923 25" O.S. map.

There is one part of the hill where the natural defences are weak - but no more so than parts of most Cotswold hill forts - and that is in the fields on the western side, south of the old trackway from Buckholt and the parish boundary. In this area we have the feature claimed as Celtic fields. They should be viewed from the SW in the morning light when grass is short, to be assessed more clearly. Near here is the point where one of the 'extra-mural linear earthworks' (P20) fades out just before reaching the area where banks and ditches should be. This 'extra-mural double-ditched earthwork', according to the 25" O.S. map (1923) ran half-way down the hill toward Fiddlers Elbow, on the Painswick-Cheltenham road, but it had in fact been cut across by a later timber track and the lower half hidden by undergrowth. Harding showed that it continued on, quite clearly and with similar form and dimensions spreading and fading just before reaching the grounds of Folly House, right in the crook of Fiddlers Elbow. Nothing could be seen on the other side of the road.

Roughly a year after the publication of Glevensis No 11, from the vicinity of Prinknash Abbey I noticed a large bank on the northern boundary of the abbey property. Investigation showed it to be a single bank and ditch which ran up the slope to Fiddlers Elbow, and was clearly the continuation of the earthwork which ran down from High Brotheridge. It had been hidden from view from the main road by a dog-leg kink in a dry-stone wall about 70 yards away, and the earthwork between the road and wall having been levelled and filled in. This may have been done when the road was constructed, or it could have been in the late 1930s when Gloster Aircraft's No 2 Factory was being built, excess soil from this was used to bring up the level of the road in this area, which later caused slumping and other troubles due to the many springs being interfered with.

Later, the earthwork was traced further downhill and it soon became clear that it was in fact a road, in many places a classic example of a hollow way. As one progressed downhill so the size of the road increased, on the lower boundary of Prinknash Parish it runs below a
high bank, giving the impression of a defensive earthwork. On the relatively level and wetter ground between Seat Field and Picked (or Peaked) Acre it divided into a number of alternative routes for a short distance, becoming a hollow-way again. For most of its length the way is deep in undergrowth, so much so that a couple of detours have to be made, and useful photography during the summer is nearly impossible. Field boundaries and strip-fielding systems respect the road all the way, confirming both the route and its antiquity; there could be no doubt that it pre-dates the strip-field system. For the last fifty yards or so indications of the route fade, until it terminates at a lane just outside Upton St Leonards. But it is obvious from the map that the lane and our route coincide as far as Brick Cottage, 100 yards north of Valley Farm.

Attention was then turned to the other end of the road; from the amount of traffic that had obviously been carried it seemed unlikely that it could end in an open field, and the map gave the impression that there was a continuation towards Cranham. Buckholt Wood was combed from Prinknash Corner to Cranham and to the east of Buckholt House, but there was nothing remotely resembling what was expected, certainly nothing that had carried that amount of traffic. So the track, it seems, must have started on the hill—and runs through an area that was heavily quarried in early times, from Prinknash Corner to Well Close House. That they were not recognised and plotted as quarries on the 1st edition of the 25" O.S. map on the St Peters Abbey lands map of 1740 I believe was due to their being already so old that debris falling down the faces had accumulated to the point where the natural angle of rest had been attained. A good example of this can be seen on the N.W. boundary of the field where the track commences. Here the irregular shape of the field boundary was created by quarrying, and two or three feet of quarry face still shows above the debris in places.

It is suggested therefore that the road was in fact for carrying stone in large quantities. That it was used for wheeled traffic is shown by the gradual slope chosen and by the fact that the terraced way had to be cut for it into solid stone. That the traffic was at times continuous and in both directions I believe accounts for the double terrace. A single terrace wide enough to carry two-way traffic would require the removal of at least twice as much material as that removed for two single way terraces; and the vertical face would be twice as high and therefore more unstable.

The Bristol and Gloucestershire Archeological Transactions for 1964 published an article by L Fullbrook-Leggatt, entitled "The River Twyver and the Fullbrook". It is mainly concerned with the fact that at some early period the Twyver had been diverted at Upper Barnwood Mill from its natural junction with the Sudbrook at Saintbridge, and canalized into the city of Gloucester.

The several tributaries of the Twyver rise in an arc of the hills between Pincott and Spoonbed, joining to became two main tributaries which unite as one stream at Upton Mill; but just after it, rather than before the mill as one would have expected.
Part of his report deals with legends that the Romans were originally responsible for the diversion and that its purpose was to carry stone from the Cotswold Quarries for the building of Glevum and to supply water for the moat. Other traditions state that it was done for the building of the Abbey, also that Llanthony Priory was built of Painswick stone, transported by the same method. Water level, it was said, was raised by a series of dams where later mills were built.

The starting point, direction and probable purpose of our road naturally prompted speculation that it may have some connection with these traditions. At Upton Mill it was found that one tradition says the stone started its water-borne journey to Gloucester from here. The mill in its final form had an overshot wheel, which still exists, fed by a wooden trough, but it had obviously been subject to several changes over the years, and the stream itself seemingly just as many.

The most intriguing of the various courses took the form of a large gully, approximately 15 feet deep, 30 feet wide and 400 feet long, about 50 feet east of the present course; the gully joining the stream at both ends. Here, it was said, was the point of embarkation and that stonework had been found on its flank, though none is visible now. It is heavily silted up and covered in undergrowth, but is is almost certainly not natural.

Further study of the 1st edition 25" O.S. map and the tithe map showed that the road did in fact carry on beyond Brick Cottage and the crescent shaped length of muddy land that had been a stumbling block. In the field to the east of the cottage can be seen a slight causeway; the public footpath originally followed this, cutting across the curve of the lane, but has now been changed to run alongside the house and its property. From here to Rooksmoor it is a wide muddy track, known as Valley Lane, which joins Rooksmoor Lane, and again the strip-field system of Rooksmoor Field respects the route as completely as did those of Seat Field and Picked Acre.

At Rooksmoor Cottages one of the two main tributaries of the Twyver crosses our road and enters another large gully similar in size to that at Upton Mill. Private property, trees and undergrowth make a survey very difficult, but it has also been heavily silted and the stream has had to cut new channels in the silt. This gully too is almost certainly man-made.

There is no obviously ancient and direct road from here to the gully at Upton Mill, but that is only 100 yards to the west, and the one can be seen from the other; the junction with the other tributary being only 100 yards down-stream. The Port Way too is only 700 yards from the gully at Upton Mill.

Fullbrook-Leggatt says "Mention has been made of the traditions regarding the diversion and canalization of the Twyver. At present it is impossible to say what substance there may be in them". It would be difficult to claim that the existence of a road of undoubted antiquity, that has carried considerable traffic from an area of many ancient quarries directly to the area of the traditions concerned, does not add some substance to them, however little.
Later he writes "That diversion and canalization were of Roman origin is a practical possibility and proof of it may be forthcoming some day..." Perhaps a little speculation can now be excused. For Saxon and Norman Gloucester a great deal of Roman building stone would still be available, reducing or eliminating the need for newly quarried stone; the building of the cathedral was an undertaking spread over many decades, and the amount of stone required per day must have been relatively small, though of course the monks could have used a system that may have already been in existence. The building of a Roman city would need a great deal of stone for the buildings alone; but the building of a city wall would need a massive amount of stone in the shortest possible time - after all it was required for defence and there is no greater incentive than that - so all methods of transport would be considered.

To return to the High Brotheridge end of the road, why did it extend upward beyond the area of old quarries into the two fields previously described as having the weakest natural defences on the hill? Could it be that since natural defences were weak then the man-made defences would have to be the largest? There would then be an ample supply of stone that did not require quarrying, for purposes such as hard-core, foundations and walls of lesser importance. One final point; on the St Peters Abbey lands map of 1740 these two fields are called 'Bayles Pinket'. How was this pronounced, 'Bayleys' or 'Baylis'? On the tithe map they are called 'Upper Bailey' and 'Lower Bailey'. Was this a mistake, and if so, did someone have good reason for making it?

Thanks must be given to Nigel Spry and to Phill Moss for drawing the diagrams, for checking various points on the hill, helping to trace the route and much else.

Thanks also to Mr J Hemming at Upton Mill for so kindly showing us around his property.
THE LYPIATT CROSS – A DISCUSSION

by Christopher Cox

Location – Description

Standing on the right-hand verge of the road from Stroud to Bisley, close by the wall of Lypiatt Park and about 1½ miles from the village of Bisley, is a battered and headless stone shaft set on a base and penned in by iron railings. 1 Three of the faces bear faint remnants of figures within arched recesses. The fourth side, facing Stroud, has been planed and bears (among other inscriptions) the letters B P. A cast iron plate claims it as an ancient Saxon cross, that it formerly stood at the cross roads at Stancombe Ash nearer Bisley and that it may have been moved to its present site about 1820. It is the purpose of this short paper to support the former proposition, but to show that the date of its suggested move is wrong.

---

18th century milestone =
the Lypiatt Cross +
? Former site of the Cross ? X

The area between Fennell's Farm and Stancombe Field was enclosed in the middle 18th century. Some of the walls then put up have since been removed.

Buildings not shown; nor are other boundary markers, except for the Lypiatt Cross; the 1950s O.S. 6" map gives 5, but only 3 (including the Cross) were located in the 1960s.
Firstly, the date

This stone has for long served as a boundary marker between the parishes of Bisley and Stroud. Well before 1820 it is recorded as such - see the records of Bisley Court baron in 1724: "We present that the stone near Stancombe Ash to be the outbounds of the Manor of Over Lypiatt toward Bisley and doe Order the Lady of the Manor to fix a Mere Stone by it." We may guess that thrift prevailed and, to avoid the expense of cutting, conveying, inscribing and implanting a new 'mere', or boundary, stone, one side was smoothed and the letters B P (for Bisley Parish) cut. It would not have been realised at the time that it might once have been a wayside cross.

There are other references to it in the 18th century. For example, to "Lippeat Upper field near the Lords Stone"3, though "Over Lypiatt Lower Field, newly enclosed is called the Cross Field" does not necessarily refer to this stone, firstly because it is very unlikely that in the 18th century it was recognised as a former cross and, secondly, because (according to Miss Rudd) more than one field was named as "cross"4. But there is record of a deed, though only a copy, of 4 July 1654 which also refers to "the Lord's Stone"5. This would attest the shaft back in the mid-17th century and (presumably) on its present site.
The Lord — which Lord?

Who was this Lord? And where was the original site of the stone? For its present position has meaning only as a boundary marker and, as such, quite distinct from the other boundary markers mentioned in the Bisley Perambulations of 1822 and 1856.6 These consist of trees (sometimes with an initial cut into the bark), initials on stone piers of lock gates below Daneway on the Thames and Severn Canal, ordinary mere or field stones and a few special boundary stones with parish initials. Such stones as these are usually of no great height and are of the round headed 'gravestone' type.7

It was apparently St Clair Baddeley who suggested that the stone had once been a cross:8 he may have taken the date C. 1820 from the 1822 perambulation which refers to "the stone in the lane leading from Bisley to Stroud." This suggestion was strongly opposed by Miss Rudd, who maintained it had always been on its present site, although this may perhaps have been rather a denial of so late a date as 1820 for a move. Elsewhere she does give a useful clue to its possible identification. She writes that in the reign of Henry II, Earl Hugh of Chester, the holder of the manor, assigned land to Humphrey de Bohun. This land she identifies with Lypiatt, Thrupp, Stroud and Paganhill, that is the southern parts of the great manor of Bisley, which later became the parish of Stroud, but at that time the manor of Lypiatt. This territorial subdivision "is marked by the very ancient stone standing beside the highroad near Stancombe Ash .... known for centuries as 'the Lord's Stone'."9

An analogous example stands on the highway at the division of the parishes of Rodborough and Minchinhampton. This is a flat slab, standing nearly 4 feet high but with the top right-hand corner sawn off and inscribed HERE END THE PARISH OF RODBOROUGH 1743 (it might be 1748 as the letters and figures are rather worn).10 The Rev C E Watson writes that some time during the 13th century Rodborough was cut out of the great estate of Minchinhampton, in much the same manner we may note that Lypiatt manor was separated from that of Bisley.11 Estates and manor eventually became parishes and, in both cases, this separation persisted until administrative re-organisation towards the end of the 19th century.

But where was the original site of the Lypiatt Stone?

Where first?

Battered though it now is, the stone is claimed as a type of early English cross of Northumbrian style, closely resembling that at Bewcastle, to take one example.12 But how does a Northumbrian style cross come to be in mid-Gloucestershire? Here we must give briefly the political and ecclesiastical situation on the Cotswolds in the 7th and 8th centuries. Much is conjectural, to say the least.

The West Saxons defeated the British of the lower Severn basin in 577, killing the 'kings' of Gloucester, Cirencester and Bath and taking these cities.13 It is not now thought that this resulted in extermination of the British and their replacement by Saxons and may well have been rather the replacement of landlords and rulers by others, leaving the tillers of the soil on their farms. To judge from various distribution maps of
graves and associated pagan relics, the area of the Cotswold plateau west of Cirencester, that is the later Hundred of Bisley, was settled or occupied by comparatively few people.\textsuperscript{14} Linguistic studies apparently show that while there was West Saxon dialect or word spellings in the southern part of the Severn Vale (now mostly in the county of Avon), the area of the Warwickshire Avon, and adjacent parts of the Cotswolds and basin of the Severn, were mainly Anglian – whatever these somewhat vague terms mean.\textsuperscript{15} There is also strong archaeological evidence of English settlement (possibly combining both Anglian and West Saxon elements) around Fairford, but occupation of the land due west of Cirencester seems to be late in date.\textsuperscript{16}

In 628 Penda of Mercia defeated the West Saxons near Cirencester and the area later to be called the shire of Gloucester became part of the kingdom of the Hwicce.\textsuperscript{17}

**The Enigmatic Hwicce**

This folk group, kingdom or what you will, presents something of a problem. There is not space to go into a discussion of this fascinating puzzle, but Mrs Wilson in an article in the Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society lists six possible theories; the evidence is scanty and open to different interpretations.\textsuperscript{18} But what appears to be proved is a strong connection between the ruling family of the Hwicce and Northumbria. While Penda himself was a strong pagan, he seems to have tolerated Christian royal families in his sub-kingdoms, and certainly after his death in battle in 655 and with the important Council of Hertford in 672 under Theodore, a considerable number of abbeys were established in the land of the Hwicce and these were largely established under the influence of the church in Northumbria, not in Wessex.

St Peter's Worcester was in existence by 676, St Peter's Gloucester by 681, Bath by 676 (although this is very much on the border between Mercian and West Saxon territories), Malmesbury by 675, Withington about 690.\textsuperscript{19} By the prevailing custom, the formula was one kingdom, one bishop. A bishop was appointed for the Hwicce with his seat at Worcester. Indeed if we wish to know the probable extent of the territory of the Kingdom of the Hwicce, we can find it in the area of the see of Worcester as it was before the Tudor Reformation. The first bishop consecrated, Bosul, died early and was replaced by Offfor, one of four outstanding men from Whitby Abbey who became bishops.\textsuperscript{20} As well as this northern ecclesiastical connection, there is also a dynastic link with Northumbria. Professor Finberg offered the intriguing suggestion that the royal family of the Hwicce was a displaced branch of the Bernician dynasty, established in its new kingdom by Penda as a semi-independency; certainly their personal names imply a close connection with the Bernician ruling family.\textsuperscript{21}

Thus, there would seem to be not only the ecclesiastical link with Northumbria, but also the royal connection; and it would therefore not be surprising to have a stone cross set up with close resemblance to those of the northern kingdom.
Why a Cross—and where?

The diocese was established before the end of the 7th century. So were a number of minsters. What we do not have are parishes and parish churches. England was converted by teams of clerics based on a minster, who carried the word (and a cross) about with them in their task of preaching to the heathen.22 We may assume that each team had a more or less specific area in which to proselytise. What we do not know is where the team for the Bisley area was based. The Bishop’s seat was to the north at Worcester; but abbeys existed at Gloucester, Withington and Tetbury, the latter being perhaps rather too close to the West Saxon realm. What should be considered is the route: the team would obviously travel along used tracks and it would also be necessary to rest at night, eat and drink and stay for some time at least at each local centre of conversion.

One thing should be obvious. Such a team did not go out into an unknown and trackless wilderness.23 It did not light on a stopping place by chance. The members may have gone on foot, but some form of transport—a hand cart, mules?—would have been taken. The team needed shelter at night or when stopping in a place for some time. The members (and the putative mules) would need food and water. They would have to get word to the local people to come to listen. They would need the consent of the local governing power—whether local or more distant. Their area for conversion must have been assigned to them already.

Attempts have been made, with varying plausibility, to trace continuity in land areas from at least Roman times into the English period or even into medieval times.24 It is a possibility to be considered that the area of valley and upland known as the Hundred of Bisley already was a unit, even if only a topographical one, even in the 7th century. The original date and purpose of the Hundreds are not known; some historians have given up in despair. 25 However it is of ancient origin. In the Hundred of Bisley, the essential unity seems to have a focus at the cross roads at Stancombe Ash. Here too is a tradition of the Hundred meeting place and the name of Wittentree or Whittentree. This name, of rather late date in written records, has been suggested as meaning a white tree, such as a rowan (in brief flower) or a guelder rose (hardly the most conspicuous of landmarks). But to this writer, these interpretations seem too fanciful; names can linger for a long time in local areas.26

To the south of the Frome, the Hundred of Longtree had its meeting place at a known cross roads. There is still the name Longtree Barn close by. While the later manor courts were held in a place most convenient to the officiating representatives of the land owner, for the early purposes of the Hundred representatives of the Tithings would assemble at a conspicuous place, known locally, convenient for men gathering from more distant parts. Thus, to the north of Longtree was the Hundred of Rapsgate; west of Longtree was the Hundred of Blakelow or Blacklow which has since disappeared.27 It seems possible that the ‘low’, or mound, here was the tumulus on Selsley Common known as The Toots, in earlier times more obvious and complete than it is now. In any case, it forms a clear landmark to men approaching from the Severn Vale; a black mound on the eastern skyline against the early morning light.
Anderson, the expert in Hundred names, writes; Hundreds (first mentioned in the reign of Edmund about 940–946) could be named for a district, a special place, a manor; but also for a clearing in a wood, or even a post or recognisable object: "A reasonable assumption that these were stones erected in memory of some important person .... (where) the men of the Hundred used to gather." He adds that the names of Hundreds might often be changed.28

To name our particular Hundred after the somewhat small settlement of Bisley seems a bit unlikely. It is not beyond the bounds of conjecture that the Hundred was first recognised by the stone cross. Conjecture - but one small shred of evidence. In 1510, there is a reference to the "Hundred of Bisley Cross."29

Conclusion

At all events, what seems fairly certain is that the Lypiatt Cross was a late 7th or early 8th century preaching cross, set up at the focal point of the area later known as the Hundred of Bisley. With changes later in local administration, ecclesiastical arrangement and the division of property, this cross became redundant. This may well have happened fairly soon. When the village of Bisley became the centre of the manor, the lord or his representative would find it more convenient to have his own private chapel built, now Bisley Church. In Domesday Survey, we learn that there were several priests in the Hundred; Bisley itself is given two, although not necessarily just for the one settlement. The cross had become redundant. But it still remained, a familiar landmark, conspicuous, visible to travellers east-west, north-south; durable, although subject to the slow erosion of time and weather.

What better way to mark an important territorial change when in the late 12th century, the manor of Bisley was sub-divided into the manors of Bisley and of Lypiatt? So it would have been moved then from the cross-roads, a significant position, to its new site at the manor boundary on the local highway.

There it remains today, in need of protection from the elements (and perhaps from other contemporary dangers). It might well be returned to what the writer (and others) believe to be its original site. Perhaps it was damaged in the 12th century move? But it has stood, on one site or the other, for some 1,200 years. That's not a bad record!
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INTRODUCTION

The second season of excavation at The Buckles, Frocester (NGR S0 7954-0243), took place during September 1984. The site, a prehistoric land surface sealed beneath up to 1.6 metres of hill-wash, lies on the east side of a small stream which flows through a narrow valley in the lower slopes of the Cotswold escarpment (Figure 1). Full details of the situation and the circumstances surrounding the discovery of this unusual type of site were given in the first interim report (Darvill and Timby 1984).

Having established something of the nature of the preserved land surface during the first season of excavation in 1983, the second season began with three aims. First to examine a larger area of relict surface, second to continue the investigation of a linear feature revealed during the first year, and third to establish the nature of the hill-wash near the present stream. Accordingly, a trench (Area II) totalling 98 square metres in extent was set out immediately south of the 1983 trench (Area I). Because of the considerable depth of hill-wash encountered in some places, the first aim was not fully realised in the time available.

No Roman or medieval features were found cutting into the hill-wash in the area investigated in 1984. Two principal subdivisions of the recorded stratigraphy may be considered.

Hill-wash deposits

Hill-wash was encountered over the entire excavated area. The hill-wash matrix was fine textured yellow/brown clay, with very few larger components except occasional artefacts. The depth increased westwards towards the stream, reaching a maximum of approximately 1.6 metres. The profile replicated that recorded in 1983 (Darvill and Timby 1984, Figure 3), with little visible vertical differentiation, except near the extreme western edge of the excavated area, where changes in the course of the stream had caused truncation and alluviation.

Artefacts within the hill-wash included flint tools (scrapers and arrowheads), pieces of quernstone and abraded pottery. Nothing later in date than the early bronze age was recovered, although this does not preclude the formation of some or all of the deposit after that time.

No animal bone was preserved and an examination of samples from a monolithic core revealed that no mollusca shells were preserved either, despite the fact that the present topsoil is alkaline.

Old ground surface

The old ground surface sealed below the hill-wash was generally recognisable by slight changes in matrix texture and colour. Although charcoal spreads made its recognition easier in some areas, intermixing by worm action made recognition especially difficult in others. The topography
Figure 1: The position of the excavated area within its regional and local setting.

Figure 2: Plan showing the features revealed on the prehistoric ground surface.
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of the sealed ground surface does not follow that of the present surface; the underlying surface has a steeper but shorter stream bank set further east than the present bank and is more level from north to south.

The linear feature, F6, discovered in Area I and tentatively interpreted as a ditch, proved to be a banana shaped pit, approximately 3 metres long, 0,8 metres wide and up to 0,8 metres deep (Figure 2). The profile was U-shaped and the fill, which comprised alternating layers of charcoal rich soil and redeposited natural clay, suggested reuse—probably four times over. Around the southern terminal was a spread of burnt clay (Context 13) which proved to be contiguous with the primary fill of the feature and therefore formed a sort of burnt lining and flange to the pit. A similar deposit probably existed around the north side of F6 too, but this portion of the feature had been truncated by a later cut (F1). To the west of F6, covering the old ground surface over the old stream bank, was a spread of finely comminuted charcoal (Context 12). Careful sectioning revealed that this deposit accumulated as a series of overlapping spreads, but subsequent worm action and down-slope movement effectively intermixed the layers beyond practical dissection. The dense fan of ash reached a maximum thickness of 4 centimetres, but beyond the main spread was a penumbra of less concentrated charcoal.

Immediately south of F6 was a circular hollow, approximately 0,75 metres in diameter and a maximum of 0,1 metre deep. The fill comprised only finely comminuted charcoal.

The only other notable feature on the old ground surface examined was a spread of abraded daub fragments (Context 25), concentrated in a small area (although probably extending beyond the trench) in the southern part of Area II (Figure 2).

The sealed soil profile was up to 10 centimetres thick, although like the charcoal deposits was probably compressed by the weight of the overlying hill-wash. No horizons could be recognised within the soil profile because of worm action. Several artefacts were found within the soil, including a microlith (scalene triangular form), part of a neolithic 'laurel leaf', leaf shaped arrowheads and struck flints.

INTERPRETATION

The interpretation of the excavated evidence is not easy because very few sites of this type have been studied. The excavations at The Buckles have not so much revealed a 'site' in the traditional sense as a portion of preserved landscape. Dating is also problematical and will probably only be resolved by radiocarbon assay.

The nature of the fill of F6, the burnt lining, the charcoal spread and its position on the stream bank all point to an interpretation as a cooking pit or earth oven. Such features are familiar to anthropologists, often associated with hunter-gatherer and mobile societies (see Binford 1983, 166), but are rarely encountered archaeologically. The reason for this is that unless preservation is good, as here at Frocester, such remains disappear through post depositional attrition. The nearest parallels from British archaeology are the 'burnt mound' cooking sites of Wales (RCAHMW 1964) and other areas (e.g., Nixon 1980), although at Frocester there is no sign of a stoney midden. Given this interpretation, it is tempting to imagine hunter-gatherers temporarily camped in this
valley near the escarpment to exploit seasonal animal movements or perhaps as a base for hunting expeditions into the uplands. Exactly how, and when, the recorded features were used, however, remains a problem for future research.

IMPLICATIONS

Excavations at The Buckles have drawn attention to an apparently rare, but important, class of archaeological evidence. No similar sites have so far been excavated in Gloucestershire and it is mostly through palaeoenvironmental research that such sites have been examined elsewhere (e.g., Bell 1983). It is therefore worth underlining two important implications of the Frocester evidence.

Firstly, the deposits under the hill-wash, and the artefacts in those deposits, are well preserved. Details of stratigraphy and form, which would be lost in areas directly exposed to the normal processes of physical and chemical attrition, are intact. Thus types of feature representing classes of activity poorly represented elsewhere in the archaeological record are available for study. Moreover, where large areas of landscape are sealed below hill-wash, the possibility of studying spatial aspects of prehistoric land-use presents itself.

Secondly, such deposits represent an unquantified addition to the known archaeological resource. No surface trace existed to betray the presence of a buried landscape at Frocester and traditional techniques of reconnaissance such as field walking and aerial photograph would not reveal its presence. Characteristics such as the configuration of slope - at Frocester the greatest depth of hill-wash seems to be at the point where the slope changes direction (see Figure 1C) - may eventually prove useful in recognising hill-wash deposits but, until that time, the identification and recording of such deposits must depend upon observation of deep trenches and other sub-surface disturbances. It would be useful to begin compiling a record of hill-wash deposits as a way of assessing the potential of this type of archaeological context in Gloucestershire.

Future work in The Buckles will focus on establishing the extent of the hill-wash and the quality of preservation. On a wider scale, it is hoped to integrate the results from this work with information from fieldwork and excavation elsewhere in Frocester parish in an attempt to document and understand changing prehistoric land-use patterns in the area.
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THE TALBOT HOTEL, TETBURY

by N P Spry and H Wingham

At the request of Mr Roy Speaks the landlord of the Talbot Hotel in Tetbury, a small 2 metre square rough stone built room adjoining the main cellar of the building has been investigated. This room which for many years has been used for the disposal of rubbish is located 5 metres back from the front wall of the hotel and is bounded on the S by the end wall of the hotel's right hand range.

Clearance revealed a collapsed floor of re-used oolite limestone flags, about 6cm thick. These had been used to seal a (presumably) square feature 1.8 metres, or less, across constructed, at least at the top, of narrow laid courses of limestone. The likelihood of this being a well, or cistern, was realised at this stage and it was decided to lift a portion of the floor and to undertake a limited excavation. The measurement between the top of this floor and of the ground floor flags above is 170cm.

At the SE corner the latest fill of the feature consisted of large stone fragments and yellow brown clayey loam. This extended to a point approximately 80cm below the original, pre collapse, surface of the floor. Water was encountered at a depth of 49cm below this floor level. No dating evidence was recovered from the final fill layer.

Below this was a dense, soft organic material reminiscent of that encountered in the context of medieval cess-pits. In the circumstances then existing it was not possible to remove more than 20cm of this deposit. It contained a quantity of pottery, clay pipes and glass together with corks, bones, nuts, leather and preserved timber.

On behalf of the landlord a local ceramic specialist, Mr Peter Wain, received the pottery and pipes. The short interim report below on these items has been kindly provided by Mr Wain. The glass and other finds have been passed to the Corinium Museum and it is expected that reports will be made on these at a later stage.
POTTERY REPORT

1. Lead green glazed jug fragments
   C 1640 - 80 probably Bristol
   150 gms

2. Manganese (treacle) glazed tankard fragments
   C 1680 - 1700 probably Staffs
   320 gms

3. Manganese (treacle) glazed tankard fragments.
   One with AR monogram.
   C 1700 - 1720
   probably Staffs
   890 gms

4. Brown saltglazed tankard sherds
   C 1700 - 1720 probably Staffs
   100 gms

5. Miscellaneous saltglazed fragments
   2 x German tankard late 16C
   1 x German Bellarmine late 16C
   3 x Staffordshire brown rimmed white saltglazed jug C1710
   40 gms

CLAY PIPE REPORT

Clay pipe fragments
C 1690 - 1720 probably Bristol
690 gms

One marked ANDRE...
(possibly Andrews, a known pipe maker from 1739 but this date is not
in agreement with others for this layer)

One marked R TIP
(Robert Tippett from C 1680)

It is understood that the excavation continues as a local initiative and
until further evidence is forthcoming all that may be said at this stage
is that at the latest period of use the structure was being used to
dispose of hotel, and more particularly bar, refuse and that it went out
of use and was sealed (presumably concurrent events) soon after 1720.
HARNHILL ESTATE ROMANO-BRITISH VILLA, DRIFFIELD 1982

by Roger Phillips

The Site

The Driffield Romano-British villa lies for the greater part on the Harnhill Estate owned by Mr Robert Henly, to whom I am greatly indebted for allowing me to visit and examine the site. I will therefore refer to the site as the Harnhill Estate villa, Driffield.

The villa is situated 3 miles east of Cirencester on the west side of Ampney Brook, between the fork made by the Roman Akeman and Ermin Streets, see FIG 1. The underlying geology is a brash of Forest Marble.

Occupational debris has been found in three areas A, B and C on the site map FIG 2. Heavily ploughed out, the villa site itself, at A, is marked by a low mound strewn with tile, tesserae, limestone blocks and pottery sherds (SP 082005). A further building some fifty metres to the south, at B, is indicated by an area of dark soil and a low mound, surface finds from which consist of tile, limestone blocks, a few tesserae and pottery sherds. From this area the RCMH "Iron Age and Romano-British Monuments in the Gloucestershire Cotswolds" records the finding of first century samian sherds. Three hundred metres to the south of A a further occupational area is indicated by a few tile fragments, pottery sherds and iron slag.

Several coins have been found after ploughing and these date to the late third and fourth centuries as do the pottery sherds found on the surface. The tile consists of fragments of imbrex, tegulae, box, sub-floor and pilae. Much of the surface tile appears to be waster fragments suggesting the presence of a kiln on the site. The site has so far yielded sixteen TCM tile stamps and a fragment of tile inscribed with a P. The tesserae are manufactured from red tile, white hard chalk, oolitic limestone, blue lias and brown sandstone and range in size from eight to thirty millimetres square.

Cropmarks, see FIG 2, show that the villa itself lies within an enclosure of approximately 0.4 hectares (1 acre) with an entrance to the east. This enclosure is set within traces of other enclosures and ditches covering more than 5 hectares (12 acres).

THE TCM STAMPS

The TCM stamp occurs in two forms, both of which have been found on the Harnhill Estate villa site, one form has a stop in the C and the other is a plain TCM, see FIG's 6 and 7. The plain TCM stamps contain letters of similar size and shape but are sometimes spaced differently suggesting the use of individual letter stamps. Whereas the stopped C stamps are uniform in spacing indicating the use of a stamp incorporating all the letters. In their paper "The Production and Distribution of Tiles in Roman Britain" Alan McWhirr and David Viner suggest that the tilemakers were itinerant, travelling around the area contracting for work and making the tiles on the building site. This possibility is borne out by the large number of waster tile fragments at the Harnhill Estate.
DISTRIBUTION OF TCM TILE STAMPS (FIG 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>NO. OF STAMPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCM</td>
<td>Baginton, Kenilworth.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherry Orchard Brickpit, Kenilworth.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harnhill Estate, Driffield.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGM</td>
<td>Ebrington.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hucclecote, Gloucester.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cirencester.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harnhill Estate, Driffield.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fourteen stamps including the three plain TCM's came from within the villa enclosure and one from each of the other occupational areas. Of these sixteen stamps, two are in the possession of Michael Stone and the others which were in my possession have been loaned to the Corinium Museum, Cirencester for examination and drawing.

THE TRIAL EXCAVATION 1982

A trial trench was excavated in the northern part of the villa enclosure at the highest point of the mound. Parts of two rooms were uncovered, one with the lower pilae of a hypocaust still in situ the other with a concrete floor, see FIG 4 for the plan of the excavation and FIG 5 for the sections.

Room 1

Ten pilae positions were uncovered in this room, the position of one being marked by a spread of mortar. Two of the hypocaust columns had been constructed by using tegulae with their flanges broken off. Three pilae tiles removed from this room are inscribed with a double fingermark running from one corner to the opposite side. There is a possibility that this room is a later addition as its east wall appears to be butted onto the north wall of room 2, although little more than the slab bases of the walls survive at this point. This east wall stands up to a height of 0,2 metres above the hypocaust base and is 0,6 metres wide, but has been completely robbed out 3 metres from its junction with the wall of room 2. The walls were constructed by filling the foundation trenches with limestone rubble, over which a layer of dark brown soil was laid as a bedding for large limestone slabs that form the base and offset of the walls.

Room 2

The concrete base of this room is a few centimetres higher than the concrete base of room 1 and covers the offset of the north wall. Badly damaged by ploughing, this wall 0,6 metres wide now consists of little more than its base slabs.

No floor level was discernable east of room 1 and it is likely that this was the exterior of the building. The consequent robbing which followed the demolition of these rooms appears to have taken place in the Romano-British period, but the lack of any dating evidence meant that
this could not be confirmed. Occupational activity after the
demolishment is indicated by a mortar layer and a layer of building
debries, dark soil and ash, see layers 4 and 2 on the excavation
sections.

Fragments of painted wallplaster, see FIG 8, recovered from these rooms
show a variety of colour and patterns. Two pieces are of particular
interest one with a lattice decoration the other decorated with
foliage. Fragments of two different sized fillets were recovered from
room 1.

LIST OF LAYERS - sections A-B and C-D

1. Ploughsoil.
2. Building debris, dark soil and ash.
3. Mortar, tile and stone.
4. Mortar.
5. Dark brown soil - bedding for wall base slabs.
7. Concrete hypocaust base.
8. East wall of room 1.
9. Light brown soil.
10. Pilae column superimposed on section.

CONCLUSIONS

The main villa residence is obviously situated within the enclosure at A
(FIG 2) and despite heavy ploughing and robbing the remains appear to be
fairly substantial, at least in the area sampled. The shape of the
mound and extent of building debris suggest this to be an L-shaped
structure with a south and east facing wing and the tesserae, painted
wallplaster and hypocaust indicate an establishment of some quality.
The substantial building to the south could well be a further dwelling
or bath-house, with the occupational debris to the west indicating the
dwellings of farmworkers or a barn.

FUTURE STUDY

I hope to continue with further fieldwork in the area and to determine
the extent and condition of the main villa building by excavating
several more trial trenches within the enclosure. There is a
possibility of my being able to take aerial photographs of the villa
site and surrounding fields, which should be helpful in determining more
of the villa and its field system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Britannia IX, The Production and Distribution of Tiles in Roman Britain
by Alan McWhirr and David Viner.

RCHM Iron Age and Romano British Monuments in the Gloucestershire
Cotswolds.

The Upper Thames Valley in Gloucestershire and Wiltshire by Roger Leech.

Park: Part 1. by Graham Webster.
EXCAVATIONS AT MANOR FARM, UP HATHERLEY, 1985

by Eileen McAndrew and Briony Walker

From May to July 1985, a small scale trial excavation was carried out at Manor Farm, Up Hatherley (N.G.R.S0 917205), by a Mobile Field Team working under the auspices of the Crickley Hill Archaeological Trust. The site, a mound and ditch, is situated in the orchard at Manor Farm. A preliminary survey was made of the field in which the site is located, and four fishponds and a leat were recorded.

The existence of the site was noted by the County Sites and Monuments Record two years ago. The main reason for the excavation was the proposed development of the land at Manor Farm, involving the construction of a road which will cut across the site. It was therefore decided to undertake a small scale investigation to retrieve information prior to the destruction of the site, and also to determine whether there was any substance in local rumours as to the existence of a Saxon church.

The Excavation

The site was surveyed and plotted at scales of 1:500; 1:200; and 1:100. A fixed datum was established, and the site was grided in 5 metre squares. The initial intention was to excavate a single trial trench (one), but trenches two – six were later added as the excavation progressed.

The excavated area totalled 134 square metres.

Trench One

A 15m x 5m trench was laid out which cut across the 'ditch' and into the platform. The location of the trench was determined by the proposed route of the new road.

The removal of 15cm of topsoil (Context 1) exposed a uniform layer of an alluvially deposited gravel (Context 2), which extended over the whole area of the trench and was composed of small stones, mostly worn limestone varying in size from 1cm – 3cm; mineral coal; slate and blue lias. Finds consisted of small fragments of reddish pottery; 19th Century pottery; glass and clay pipes. A number of iron nails were found which were plotted but no pattern emerged from the distribution. Small fragments of charcoal were found throughout the the layer but no concentrations were apparent. F1 and F2 were two patches of greenish compact clay, dimensions 0.95m x 0.35m and 0.80m x 0.25m respectively, which cut into the gravel layer. Both were sectioned but yielded no finds.

A 1m square sondage was dug in the north-west corner of Trench 1, to establish the vertical stratigraphy. This revealed that, underlying the gravel layer, was a layer of compact, waterlogged, greenish clay
(Context 3), which still contained traces of occupational debris, i.e. charcoal and pottery fragments. This was excavated to a depth of 34 cm before the sterile clay subsoil was reached.

The 'ditch', which appeared to be fairly well defined on the ground, was sectioned, but no fill or edges of the 'ditch' could be detected in the section. The gravel layer appeared to continue over the ditch, again overlying a greenish clay which contained traces of occupational debris.

No diagnostic finds or traces of structures were found in Trench 1.

**Trench Two**

A number of stones had been found during tree-planting on the northern edge of the site, so a 2m x 2m trench, later extended to 4m x 3m, was opened to investigate this.

The removal of 9cm of topsoil revealed an area of cobbled (Context 6), fairly compacted, though looser nearer the surface. The cobbled consisted of worn limestone, varying in size from 2cm to 20cm. The cobbled was uneven and appeared to dip on the southern side. A section of the cobbled revealed that it cut into both the gravel (Context 5) and clay (Context 7), and varied in thickness between 20cm (east facing) and 40cm (west facing). The total extent of this cobbled was not defined. Finds included reddish pot sherds, 19th Century pottery, nails, mineral coal, charcoal, slate and clay pipe fragments.

**Trench Three**

A small trench, 2m x 2m was opened on the edge of the site, north of Trench 2. This revealed the same stratigraphic sequence as Trench 1, with an alluvially deposited gravel layer (Context 9), overlying a greenish waterlogged clay (Context 19). No traces of structures or features were uncovered.

**Trench Four**

Preliminary results of a geophysical survey of the site appeared to indicate a slightly higher resistivity in the area between Trench 2 and an oak tree situated approximately 25m north of Trench 2. A trench 2m x 2m, later extended to 6m x 4m, was opened on the northern edge of the ditch adjoining Trench 3, to investigate this.

The removal of 13cm of topsoil exposed an area of cobbled, 3m x 4.5m (Context 13) with apparently well-defined southern, eastern and western edges but continuing into the northern baulk. As in Trench 2, the cobbled was composed of worn and burnt limestone varying in size from 1cm to 7cm, blue lias, and a few pieces of quartz. However, the surface of the cobbled was more compacted and level than in Trench 2. On the western edge were two large limestone blocks, 0.6m apart.

The southern edge of the cobbled appeared to terminate where the line of the 'ditch' was defined on the ground. The area between the southern edge of the cobbled and the north-facing baulk was therefore sectioned (Section 2), and Trench 4 was also extended 1m to the south. This
revealed that after a gap of 0.5m the cobbling continued southwards, and was apparently of the same width as the cobbling north of the gap. However, a section along the south facing baulk of Trench 4 seemed to indicate that the cobbling in fact dipped slightly on the western edge, and this was found to be the case, with the cobbling continuing into the east facing baulk, at a slightly lower level.

The cobbling in Section 2 south of the gap was removed, exposing a line of fairly regularly shaped large limestone blocks, 3.4m long, 0.15m high and orientated east-west, which was interpreted as a possible wall (F3). This 'wall' defined the southern edge of the gap between the north and south areas of the cobbling, but was overlain by the southern cobbling and surrounded by greenish clay (Context 14).

The gap between the north and south areas of cobbling appeared to coincide with the proposed line of the 'ditch', and in the east and west facing sections of Section 2 a layer of sandy clay appeared (Context 15) which may indicate a possible edge of the 'ditch'. This sandy clay seemed to continue under the north cobbling.

**Trench Five**

A trench 5m x 2m was opened, connecting Trenches 2 and 3. The removal of 10cm of topsoil revealed an area of limestone cobbling (Context 19) similar to that exposed in Trenches 2 and 4, and representing a continuation of the cobbling in Trench 2. The cobbling covered the whole extent of Trench 5, continuing into the east and west baulk, but appeared to terminate on the northern edge, and thus did not continue into Trench 3, where no cobbling was found.

A section across the southern edge of the cobbling in Trench 5 revealed that the cobbling was 1.20m thick and again cut into both the gravel (Context 18) and the clay (Context 20).

**Trench Six**

A section, 5m x 2m, was cut across the 'ditch' at a point where it was fairly well-defined, to the west of Trench 2. A small area of limestone cobbling was exposed, in line with that exposed in Trench 2, which terminated on the edge of the mound, on the eastern side of the 'ditch' as defined on the ground. To the west of this cobbling, a single large limestone block was exposed, lying across the 'ditch' section at a depth of 0.3m. No obvious fill or edges of the 'ditch' could be detected in the section, but a layer of sandy clay (Context 23) was uncovered, which underlay the gravel layer (Context 22) and covered the eastern half of the 'ditch' section. This sandy clay was similar to that exposed in the east and west facing sections of Trench 4, Section 2 and may possibly represent ditch fill.

**A note on the Finds**

Finds common to all contexts included reddish/buff pottery, and tile (see below), small fragments of 19th Century pottery, animal bone, glass and clay pipe fragments. A large number (148) of iron nails were recovered, and a few unidentifiable pieces of iron.
Pottery

All the contexts yielded a number of pottery/tile sherds, which range in date from 15th Century to 19th Century. These have been classified into the following broad typology:

A) Orange/buff exterior and interior with traces of green glaze, dark grey core with a sparse concentration of white mineral inclusions. (Pottery, mediaeval)

B) Orange/buff slipped exterior, dark brown fabric, dark grey core, sparse concentration of white mineral inclusions. (Pottery, mediaeval)

C) Orange interior and exterior, very fine well-levigated orange fabric, no inclusions. (Pottery, post-mediaeval)

D) Light buff interior and exterior, dark grey core, coarse fabric with high concentration of white, red and brown grit inclusions. (Tile, mediaeval)

E) Pinkish buff fabric, medium concentration of white and red grit inclusions. (Tile, mediaeval)

F) Red/orange fabric, sparse concentration of dark brown grit inclusions, traces of exterior dark brown glaze. (Tile, mediaeval?)

The pottery mostly consists of worn body sherds as very few diagnostic sherds were recovered. Reliable dateable evidence is almost completely lacking due to the nature of the deposits. The absence of sealed contexts and consequent admixture, due to worm action and weather, of finds ranging in date from mediaeval to modern, makes it difficult to assign a date to the structures uncovered.

Summary and Discussion

The excavation at Manor Farm, Up Hatherley was conducted on a limited scale due to restrictions of time and manpower, and this should be borne in mind when evaluating the evidence. However, very little was recovered in the way of dateable or diagnostic finds to justify further excavaton.

A synthesis of the results is detailed below, together with possible interpretations based on the limited evidence available.

The 'Ditch'

Only tenuous evidence was recovered regarding the existence of a ditch around the site. A possible edge of the ditch was detected in Trench 6, section north facing, and Trench 4, sections east and west facing, where
a layer of sandy clay appeared, overlain by a thicker layer of 
gravel/clay mix, which may represent ditch fill. However, the line 
of this sandy clay did not exactly coincide with the apparent line of the 
'ditch' on the ground. Also, in Trench 4 it appeared to cover only the 
northern half of the gap between the north and south cobb'ing which 
would imply that the 'ditch' was cut by the north cobb'ing and hence may 
be chronologically earlier.

The 'ditch' was fairly well defined on the east and west edges of the 
mound, but only vestigial traces were recorded on the northern edge, and 
it was suggested, (B. Raves, pers. comm.) that the 'ditch' may have 
consisted of two parallel drainage ditches, orientated north-south.

The Cobbling

The cobb'ng was composed of worn and burnt limestone, with a fairly 
compact and even surface, and varying in thickness from 0.20m to 0.40m. 
Limestone outcrops occur naturally in the Cotswold area, so the 
limestone may have been brought down from nearby Crickley Hill or 
Leckhampton, which may explain the presence of a small flint knife found 
in Context 5.

The cobb'ng exposed in Trenches 2, 4, 5 and 6 is probably contemporary, 
though there is a gap between the north and south cobb'ng in Trench 4, 
and between the cobb'ng in Trench 4 and Trench 5. The small area of 
cobb'ng exposed in Trench 6 is in line with the cobb'ng of Trench 2 
and probably represents a continuation of this cobb'ng.

The cobb'ng in Trench 6 appears to terminate on the edge of the mound, 
on the eastern side of the 'ditch' and the north and south cobb'ng of 
Trench 4 both terminate on opposite sides of a gap which seems to 
coincide with the line of the 'ditch' as defined on the ground. This 
would imply that the 'ditch' was either contemporary with, or later 
than, the cobb'ng. However, this gap was sectioned, and no evidence of 
ditch fill was recovered.

In the absence of any definable evidence of a ditch, the precise 
relationship between the 'ditch' and the cobb'ng is difficult to 
determine.

The function of the cobb'ng areas is equally indeterminate. It was 
initially suggested that the cobb'ng in Trench 4, may have been a 
causeway leading onto the mound, with perhaps wooden supports crossing 
the 'ditch' as defined by the gap between the north and south cobb'ng. 
However, further excavation revealed that the original strip of cobb'ng 
in Trench 4 in fact dipped, and continued to the west, as well as to the 
north.

An alternative interpretation postulates that the areas of cobb'ng in 
Trenches 2 and 4 may represent the floors of structures, but no evidence 
as to the function of such structures e.g. hearths or domestic debris, 
was recovered, nor was there any evidence pertaining to a timber 
super-structure, although the total extent of the cobb'ng was not 
exposed, and hence the only edges defined were those in Trench 6 and 
Trench 4 which terminated at the proposed line of the 'ditch'.
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The Wall

A line of large, limestone blocks, orientated east - west were uncovered in Trench 4, overlain by the south cobbling and defining the southern edge of the gap between the north and south cobbling. This was interpreted as a possible wall and corresponded in length to the width of the north and south cobbling. The wall did not seem to continue, but a large limestone block which lay across the ditch section in Trench 6 may be a related feature.

If we accept that the gap between the north and south cobbling corresponds to the line of the ditch, then it is possible that this wall served as a retaining wall for the ditch. Alternatively, if the sandy clay, which continues under the north cobbling, represents the true line of the ditch, then it is possible that the wall may be contemporary with the ditch but earlier than the cobbling.

The lack of reliable dateable evidence makes it difficult to establish the date of the features discussed above. The quantities of mediaeval pottery and tile recovered would tend to suggest a date of 15th Century, but the sherds are worn and not in situ, and as they are associated in all contexts with 19th Century pottery, clay pipes etc this precludes a reliable determination of the absolute and relative chronologies. Stratigraphically, the precise relationship of the features is also indeterminate, but a hypothetical reconstruction based on the limited evidence available, would be as follows:

The cobbling in Trench 4, north and south, represents a causeway leading onto the mound and cut by a contemporary shallow drainage ditch with a retaining wall. The much thicker and less even cobbling in Trench 2 may represent the floor/foundations of a structure, possibly a timber building.

A possible date of the 15th Century is indicated by the pottery, but there is no other evidence to support this.

No evidence pertaining to the existence of a Saxon church on the site was recovered.
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EXCAVATIONS TO THE NORTH OF LLANTHONY PRIORY, GLOUCESTER

by Veronica Yuill and Raph Isserlin

The excavation described in this report was directed by the authors for the Western Archaeological Trust. The work was funded by the MSC through its Community Programme and was carried out during January and February 1984.

Limited time and a small workforce meant that a policy of trial trenching was undertaken to establish the extent of modern disturbance. Work in the three main areas (see fig 1) was severely hampered by flooding as running water was encountered almost immediately below the topsoil, at c. 9.75m OD.

Excavation by hand and machine in trenches II and III, with the assistance of a pump, revealed extensive modern dumping to a depth of at least 2.3m below modern ground level. A steep shelving of the natural from east to west could be detected between the two trenches; the western end of trench III was excavated to a depth of 7.68m OD without encountering natural, which in trench II was at about 8.3m OD. The modern dumping had evidently been carried out to level up the site.

Trench I was excavated to a depth of about 0.8m before flooding and safety considerations rendered further work impracticable. Again, only modern dumps were encountered. Examination of a photograph of the tithe barn taken in the late 19th century showed that the ground level had been raised about 0.6m since then.

Safety problems were so severe that further work in the trenches had to be abandoned. Work on the site was concluded by drawing the elevations of the bottom 2m of the west wall of the tithe barn, and the southern boundary wall of the site. These have been lodged in the site archive.

The Finds

P Isaac

One sherd of local micaceous grey ware and another of sand-and-oolite tempered ware, respectively of late first to second and eleventh to thirteenth century date, are the only items of pre-seventeenth century date. The source for the medieval pot was probably near Gloucester. Ceramic sherds otherwise comprised specimens of earthenware, brown-glazed stoneware, salt-glazed stoneware; plain, painted and transfer-decorated white wares and modern "Powell and Price" stoneware. Types represented were pot, jug, inkbottle, tableware and a ceramic hot water bottle. In date these sherds range from the eighteenth to twentieth centuries.

Three clay pipe stem fragments occurred but no bowls. On the evidence of bore-diameter and analogy two were of late seventeenth or early eighteenth century date. The third was from the short, thick-stemmed 'cutty' pipe of the nineteenth century.

Fragmentary tiles had a date range similar to that of the post-medieval pottery; examples present were of the local iron-rich ceramic tile produced since a seventeenth century original commencement, and modern examples stamped by makers from Bridgewater and Wales. One limestone roof tile was also found.
Slate-working was indicated in the recovery of a large number of dressed strips of cut slate, one rectangular slab and some sheets from which discs had been cut. Decorative work with slate has wide applications in the post-medieval period, nearby Wales being particularly active in such work.

Bottle glass comprised late nineteenth and early twentieth century examples; these included a complete medicine bottle, the stopper from a Worcester sauce-type bottle and the glass 'marble' from a Codd or similar patent-fastening mineral bottle.

Only one coin was found, a farthing of George III, dated 1773.
SITE REPORTS

The following summaries are of minor sites recorded by Anthony P Garrod the Senior Excavations Officer, Gloucester City Museum Excavation Unit.

SO 836-198
Gambier Parry Lodge Development

Site 9/1983
A second year of salvage observations has been maintained during the continued construction of this 11-acre housing estate.

The Roman Period

Roman Building
An excavation on a 1st century building with boundary ditches, reported 1983, is being undertaken by a Western Archaeological Trust M.S.C. Community Programme Scheme, forthcoming.

Roman Burial Ground
A Roman burial ground, extending beyond the above building, has been traced over an area exceeding 325 m long and 35 m wide. Approximately 200 disturbed burials have been plotted from an estimated burial ground content of 2,000 internments.

Cremation urns and grave goods vessels recovered, range from 1st century face urns to 4th century Cavetto B B jars. The latest deposited coins found are of Constantius II AD 337-346.

The remains of two wooden coffins have been salvaged, these were made with single oak plank sides, supported top and bottom by cross spars, nailed into dove tail slots cut into the side planks. There was no evidence of either top or bottom planks, the skeletons in the coffins lay on four staves, laid length wise. Repeated internments cut into one burial position have been observed in a number of places; these may indicate burials within family plots.

With the exception of the tombstone of L VALERIUS AURELIUS VET LEG XX, found in 1983, no evidence of burial markers have been found to date.

Early Military Period Ditch
Part of a linear or ditch feature 2 m wide has been located 25 m to the south and roughly parallel to the burial ground alignment, closest to Kingsholm. The feature contained a group of early 1st century Roman native and Severn Valley variant wares.

Roman Gravel Industry
Individual mid-1st century pitting extends into the site from the Tewkesbury Road frontage. This activity intensifies into shallow intercut gravel workings extending across the remaining two-thirds of the development area and beyond. Provisional dating is mainly 1st century with some early 2nd century works.

The Roman burial ground was subsequently extended across part of this back filled gravel working area.
Suspect Street Alignment

A length of stone and pebble metalled track 2.5 m wide, including rutts of a wheel base approximately 1.20 m wide, was found beneath a recently demolished 19th Century farmhouse, 'The Chestnut', located 70 m to the south and on the burial ground alignment. The track is dated 2nd to 4th century. This, however, is not conclusive as the surface siltings were sealed only by an 18th century plough soil horizon.

Interim Coin Review

This general appraisal includes all Roman coins, 1 stratified or un-stratified, found in the development area of the site to-date.

The Kingsholm Claudius-Neronian Fortress Period

Celtic
Republican
Claudian
Claudian Copies
Nero

Gloucester Flavian Fortress Period

Flavian coins

Colonia Period

2nd century coins

3rd-4th Century

Barbarous Radiates to
Gratian AD 367-83

The current coin and pottery evidence indicates there is little late 4th Century activity on this site.

1 Coins examined by Dr Philip Issacs

SO 8292 1976
St Nicholas House, 100 Westgate Street, Gloucester

Site No. 20/1983

A Department of the Environment minor excavation brief was undertaken around a Roman column base, exposed by builders while reducing the existing undercroft brick floor level by 30 cm.

The house is a Grade 1 Listed 16th Century timber building with five bays surviving to the rear (Building 2), the front part being an early Georgian rebuilding (Building 3).

Building 2 is documented as a town mansion with a gate house approach in Raton Row 1. The house is currently undergoing major renovation.

Provisional Interpretation

Roman

A late Roman stoney ground surface beneath a trodden silt loam layer, was recorded at O.D. 9.800. The rubble make-up overlay loamy made ground of undetermined thickness, exceeding 65 cm. No hard evidence for siting a major public building was obtained.
Early Medieval

Roman was sealed by darkish loam with some organic content, including food bones but no pottery. This layer was cut by a later undated pit feature and truncated by the undercroft levels of Building 1.

Medieval - Building 1

Successive clay floor levels with an internal stone sill/partition, bounded to the north by a robber trench 65 cm wide, with lower off-set stone footing 1m wide. These features are here interpreted as part of an Undercroft/Cellar area for a substantial medieval building, pre-dating Building 2. Provisional pottery dating is 14th to 15th century.

Building 2

All contemporary undercroft floor levels sealing Building 1 were destroyed by the builder's excavations.

Post Medieval - Building 3

A Roman limestone moulded column base 1,01m dia. and lias stone slab footing, had been inserted into the undercroft floor of Building 2. Positioned as a foundation for a support beneath one end of a main ground floor beam, where it buttressed with a cross beam of Building 2.

An earlier observation note drafted in December 1983, siting possible location of major Roman public building, is superseded by the above interpretation.

1 Barbara Drake 1980

SO 863 – 190
Site of new Birds Eye Co Ltd
Plant, west of Walls' Factory
Near Barnwood, Gloucester

Site 24/1983

The site of three large factory units were observed during mechanical stripping of 19th Century plough soil levels.

Geological: Lias clay of the Severn Vale extended throughout the area, with occasional pockets or shallow permafrost hollows containing red silt and thin lenses of oolite gravel.

Pre-historic, Roman, Medieval: Negative evidence.

Post Medieval to Modern: Ditched boundaries of three existing 18th-19th Century fields were recorded. Field system rumble drains consisting of parallel channels filled with oolite stone 25 cm wide spaced, 4,9 m apart. A well 65 cm diameter constructed with 7 cm bricks and site of an open pond were recorded in respective fields.

SO 8313 – 1822
31 Parliament Street, Gloucester

Site 3/1984

Observations made in a sewer connection trench, 3,2 m deep, cutting the south carriage way of Parliament Street, alias Green Dragon Lane.

A Post Medieval backfill within the south side City Medieval ditch alignment was recorded to a depth of 3,3 m.
Six successive metallings associated with the former Green Dragon Lane alignment overlay the ditch infilling. These were recorded to a depth of 1.1 m, below the modern street level.

A similar trench cut opposite No. 21 revealed light sand/silt at a depth of 4.3 m assumed to be natural below the medieval/Roman defences ditch alignment, observed by Ian Stewart.

SO 843 - 189
136 London Road, Gloucester
Site 4/1984

Observations in land drainage trenches 1.3 m deep, extending part length along rear garden.

Geological: Lias clay at the summit of the Wotton hillock, sloped to the north partly overlain by a lense of oolitic sand and gravel.

Roman/Medieval: A cultivation layer of clayey loam, with occasional residual second century sherds, overlay natural, sealed beneath the garden loam and rear driveway.

Negative Evidence: No features were found associated with either the Wotton Roman Cemetery or adjacent medieval St Mary Magdalene Hospital site.

Post Medieval: A green sandstone mere-stone with slightly rounded top tapering down to 27 cm wide and 10 cm thick. Inscribed letters 'H E' on one face and 'J P H' on reverse, was found reused as garden ornament.

SO 8298 - 1840
The Clutch Clinic Workshop
6 Commercial Road, Gloucester
Site 5/1984

Roman

Part of a metalled surface flanking the southern defences alignment, was recorded beneath successive loam deposits, assumed to be the tail of the late Roman rampart.

Medieval

The above site originally lay within the bounds of Blackfriars. A 13th Century loam tip line extended down the tail of the truncated Roman rampart and the area leveled up with redeposited lias clay. Remains of an undated medieval building with pink estuarine clay floor level, bounded either end by robbed wall footings, sealed the lias clay deposited. This building extended 6 m overall from the modern frontage. A white lias stone mould for casting small thimble-like objects with a crude human face and short beard in relief, was recovered in the accumulative loam levels above the building.

SO 836 - 203
New housing development,
Parks Department Nursery Site
Tewkesbury Road, Gloucester
Site 6/1984

Observations made during part development of site area.

Geological: A pink estuarine sand/silt deposit part of the northern end of the Kingsholm River terrace, is partly overlain by occasional thin
patches of oolitic sand and gravel. Subsequent humus soil level is reduced by cultivation.

Pre-historic: One unstratified flint blade found.

Roman: With the exception of one small pit, no features have been recorded to date. An occasional sherd of pottery and two coins of Constantine have been recovered.

Late Medieval: Occasional sherds, a clipped 15th century penny and a bronze belt buckle are the only finds recovered for the medieval period.

Observations are continuing.

SO 830 - 183
Parliament St, Gloucester

Site 8/1984

Observations in a British Telecom shaft and tunnel dug beneath Southgate Street from the Parliament Street junction.

Geological: A River Terrace deposit of buff to red sand/silt with Bunter pebbles, overlies undulating natural lias clay at 2 m.

Roman: A metalled street surface consisting of small graded oolite stone and Bunter pebbles embedded in crushed oolite, above oolite rubble layer was recorded 1,2 m below pavement level. Located immediately beyond the Colonia defences and South Gate.

Observations are continuing.

O.S. SO 819215
Ashleworth


Roman

A small collection of early Roman pottery was recovered from river dredgings deposited near Ashleworth Quay by Mrs S Laville. The sherds are large and relatively unabraded and are thus probably derived from the river bank rather than from the river bed. The material is of particular note because it contains limestone and calcite tempered 'native' ware jars (Gloucester type fabric (TF)33) associated with early Severn Valley ware vessels (T.F. 11B, 17,23) dating to the second half of the 1st Century AD. This material has kindly been donated to Gloucester City Museum.
ARCHEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE COTSWOLD WATER PARK

Dr Richard Hingley

A project was conducted to assess the archaeological potential of the gravels of the Upper Thames Valley in South Gloucestershire and North Wiltshire (between Cirencester and Lechlade). This study involved the examination of all available aerial photographic material and also a detailed project of field work to check archaeological sites on the ground.

Aerial photographic evidence for the area was last surveyed systematically by Roger Leech in 1976. Since the completion of Leech's survey, many new sites have been located through aerial photography and evidence for Iron Age and Roman settlement in this area is now very dense.

Examination of sites on the ground provided evidence for dating of a number of Iron Age, Roman and Medieval sites.

Twenty-two sites of particular importance have been identified in the Cotswold Water Park and it is hoped that these sites will be provided with statutory protection through their scheduling as Ancient Monuments. One particularly well preserved Roman settlement at Cleveland Farm (near Ashton Keynes, Wiltshire) is at present being investigated by the Trust for Wessex Archaeology in advance of its destruction by gravel extraction.

A 'Strategy for the Archaeology of the Upper Thames Gravels in Gloucestershire and Wiltshire' is being promoted and the detailed information gathered as a result of the survey has been integrated into the County Sites and Monuments Record, Planning Department, Shire Hall, Gloucester.

THINK ON THESE THINGS

I quote others only in order the better to express myself.

Montaigne (1533–92)

Nothing was ever achieved without enthusiasm.

Emerson (1803–82)

What is local is often national.

quoted by Bigland
Watch an old building with anxious care, guard it as best you may, and at any cost, from the influence of delapidation. Count its stones as you would jewels of a crown. Set watchers about it, as if at a gate of a besieged city; bind it together with irons when it loosens; stay it with timber when it declines. Do this tenderly and reverently and continually and many a generation will still be born and pass away beneath its shadow.

Ruskin

Fresh and clear .... as if its hues were of the passing years
Comes this time-buried pavement, from the mound
Hoards may have of Trajan, Maximus
Shrunken to coins with all their warlike toil....
The casual treasures from the unfurrowed pit.

Wordsworth

(on a visit to an excavation at Kenchester, Hereford)

The pulse of great events beats in every hour .... These broken fragments are but a part of it. Through them all runs an unbroken thread, a sense of beauty, strength and continuity of English tradition.

Violet Bonham-Carter

To be ignorant of what happened before you were born is to be ever a child.

Cicero (106-43 BC)

The Ruins of Rome

O Golden Rome of pomp and glory,
Where now are your emperors proud;
Where your legions, buildings, statesmen,
Where the gladiatorial crowd?

Rome invincible, Rome victorious
Nero, Claudius, Caesars all!
The irreverent tourist gapes at guide book
And eats his sandwiches on your wall!

Lesley Anne Macdonald

Sing a song of siege-works
In the Wapentake of Rye,
When the Normans brought their arrows
And shot Harold in the eye.

Anon

In 1903 I took the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The meaning of this degree is that the recipient is examined for the last time in his life, and is pronounced completely full. After this, no new ideas can be imparted to him.

Stephen Leacock (1869-1944)
Canadian Humorist
Professor of Economics
McGill University
Montreal, 1908-1936
GLOUCESTER AND DISTRICT ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH GROUP

Income and Expenditure Account for the year ended 28 February 1985

(1983-84)  (1984-85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£475.25 Members' subscriptions; donations</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£531.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.29 Contributions at meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.77 Tax repayment on covenants</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>31.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.96</td>
<td>Duplicating; printing</td>
<td>37.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>107.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Lecture fees</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.20</td>
<td>Room hire</td>
<td>72.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Subscriptions, affiliation fees to other bodies</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459.03</td>
<td>144.65 Glevensis: Costs/Sales</td>
<td>510.96</td>
<td>77.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deposit on Group Tee Shirts</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund raising social</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.99</td>
<td>Interest on bank deposit a/c</td>
<td>41.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess income/expnd.</td>
<td>Excess expenditure over income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.46</td>
<td>£897.67</td>
<td>£897.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance Sheet

Balance at 29 Feb 1984 £554.34
Cheques paid but not passed through Bank 30.72
Cash at bank current account £238.17
Cash at bank deposit account 288.56
Cash in hand 2.92
Excess expenditure over income 55.41

£585.06

Audited and found correct

16 March 1985

52