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--- ... ---

EDITORIAL

It is appropriate that for Glevensis 20 we have some excellent articles on the Romans in Gloucester, which of course is where we as a group started. It is pleasing too to get contributions from further afield in the Shire so that we do not become too parochial! We can note with pride that Glevensis is highly regarded nationally, and the quality of these reports should maintain our reputation in that respect.

Academic standing is not everything, though. Glevensis is, or should be, a Group affair, and while nearly all contributors to the present review are indeed Group members, it would be very pleasing to see a greater spread of members putting pen to paper (or finger to keyboard), perhaps to produce articles of a lighter or even humorous character. This is acceptable if it is recognised as such and not a perversion of the factual evidence; indeed there is more danger of this occurring in a seriously presented article. I shall now wait expectantly for lively and witty archaeological reports!

The most surprising find last year was that of an inscribed stone of the Twentieth Legion (Legio XX) built into the Cathedral fabric and unrecognized until the keen perception of one of our own members, Barbara Bagge, who must be congratulated wholeheartedly; for, by her discovery, she has initiated a whole series of discussions on the significance of this inscription.

We are indeed pleased to have the reporting of this and other matters important for the history of Gloucester to add to the more usual but very welcome items from around the County. Glevensis relies not only on members' subscriptions but also on sales at archaeological meetings and elsewhere, and these obviously depend on the general interest of the contents. I appeal to members not only to provide the articles but to advertise Glevensis far and wide!

Bernard Rawes
EXCAVATIONS IN GLOUCESTER 1985 – AN INTERIM REPORT

Malcolm Atkin

Introduction

This is the first of what is hoped to be a series of annual reports of the work of the Gloucester Excavations Unit. The next few years seem likely to see an acceleration of building development in the city, and consequently a need to be able to provide a considered and effective archaeological response. This fact, coupled with a renewed awareness of the potential of archaeology as a tourist attraction, led the City Council in 1985 to appoint the author to direct rescue excavations in the city. These excavations on threatened sites will be carried out as part of a research strategy for archaeology in the city – based on questions posed by the results of earlier excavations and by the database of information provided by Patrick Garrod’s work in monitoring building development. It will be a clear priority to try to preserve potentially important archaeological deposits wherever possible, and developers will be encouraged to minimise below-ground disturbance. Where this is not possible then we shall seek funds to carry out appropriate excavation. But archaeology is not simply about digging. We hope to expand the documentary research that accompanies excavation, and to relate a study of the standing buildings of Gloucester to the remains of excavated buildings (which may represent a different class or period).

It is unlikely that central government (through the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission) will again provide the bulk of excavation finance in the country. Most recent excavation in Gloucester, as elsewhere, has been financed through Manpower Services Commission schemes. The structure of these schemes means however that they cannot be a substitute for a professional and permanent archaeological service. Indeed, the proper maintenance of the latter is necessary to allow the MSC schemes to attain their full potential. For the foreseeable future excavation in Gloucester is likely to be funded by a combination of the City Council, MSC (through the Crickley Hill Archaeological Trust), HBMC, site developers and local firms. We also hope to involve local volunteers as far as possible.

The main excavation of 1985 concentrated on Kingsholm, while survey work and more limited excavation was carried out in the Abbeydale III redevelopment. The work was carried out through the kind permission of the site owners, Brickworth Homes Ltd, and the Abbeydale Consortium. It was financed by Gloucester City Council, and grants from HBMC and the Abbeydale Consortium. Brickworth Homes also provided help in kind, as did J. Romans and Co. and Hales Containers Ltd. Particular thanks are due to Stephanie Howard of Bruton Knowles for facilitating work at Abbeydale and to Messrs Baldwin, Veal and Holder for their kind cooperation on Sandhurst Road. Grateful thanks are owed to the field team Kevin Carroll, Ken Collier, Sean Cook, Andrew Jones and particularly to Mike Sims (MSC team leader) and to the other local volunteers, especially Bernard and Barbara Rawes and Chris McNab. Patrick Garrod, Don Mackreth and Graham Webster kindly discussed aspects of the Roman defences and gave much useful advice and encouragement. Final thanks must go to the Archaeology Director, Malcolm Watkins, and to Marjorie Imlah (manager of CHAT) for nursing me through my first year at Gloucester with cheerful patience!
KINGSHOLM

Sandhurst Road (SO 83411971) Site 24/85 (Figs 1 and 2)

Summary

Excavation on Sandhurst Road in Kingsholm provided the first clear evidence of the defences of the 1st century Roman fortress. Evidence for later use of the area included 2nd century boundary ditches and possible occupation associated with the Saxon royal palace.

A four-month excavation was carried out by Gloucester City Excavations Unit during the winter of 1985 in advance of development on the plot next to 27 Sandhurst Road (Fig. 1), under the direction of Malcolm Atkin, assisted by Mike Sims. An area c. 20m x 5m was excavated along the Deans Way frontage at the junction with St. Oswalds Road, to try to find evidence for the line of the defences of the 1st century fort or fortress of Kingsholm, and to establish the later pattern of occupation. This was the first opportunity to excavate on the suspected line of the Roman defences as deduced by Patrick Garrod from the negative evidence derived from many years of observing building sites in the vicinity.

Period 1 (Mid 1st century) (Fig 2)

Immediately overlying the natural sand was a compact layer of dark sandy loam (layer 287/314). No turf line was apparent, nor was there evidence of cut features or ploughing. Some late Iron Age or Romano-British 'Native ware' and early Roman pottery, and a copper alloy stud, were found, possibly indicating a transitory phase of activity immediately before the turf was stripped to provide a bedding for the defences.

The first of a sequence of defensive features was then built on the cleared surface (layer 287). This consisted of a rampart faced with turf and clay, c. 5m wide, separated by a narrow berm from an eroded V-shaped ditch, 3.7m wide and 1.4m deep. A 7.3m length of the rampart (surviving to a height of 0.5m) was exposed, showing two distinct methods of construction. The front (layer 340) and rear (layer 339) revetment walls on the west side were built with a chequered pattern of alternating sods of estuarine clay and turf, while those on the east (layer 262) were built wholly of sandy turf. The rampart had been built up in lifts of c. 0.25m, producing the characteristic interleaving of revetment and the core of sand and earth behind. The only evidence for a timber corduroy at the rampart base was a series of patchy linear spreads of gravel, reflecting the lines of rotted-away timbers. There was some evidence for possible strapping at the height of the second lift (0.5m). This consisted of a row of close-set shallow slots (cf. Kings School Field Rampart; O'Neill 1965, Fig. 2) running behind the front revetment and at right angles to it. Their line was preserved only where they had been sealed by part of the clay dump from the Period 2 rampart (layer 288), which had slumped into the hollows left when the timbers had presumably rotted (organic material on the site was poorly preserved). It is therefore not clear how far back the slots stretched to the rear. However, their spacing would argue against their being part of any box-type construction. They may have been set over the top of the levelled core as part of the foundation for the Period 2 rampart, but it seems more likely that this strapping was an original feature (cf. strapping on the Eastgate rampart; Hurst 1972, 28).
Fig 1  Location of site in Sandhurst Road in relation to early Roman finds in the Kingsholm area
Fig 2 Abstracts of sections, showing stratigraphy of Roman defences
A possible beam slot, robbed out in Period 2, was found within the rear revetment and parallel to it. In the absence of firmer evidence for a timber box-construction for the rampart, this has been interpreted as the rear wall of a rampart building, associated with a sequence of three small ovens.

Just outside the ditch was an irregular slot containing angled stake-holes. Together they are interpreted as the remains of a thorn bush and stake emplacement.

Period 2 (1st century) (Fig. 2)

The ditch soon began to silt up with sand from the ditch sides and the face of the rampart. The defences were subsequently almost completely rebuilt on a much larger scale, the first rampart being levelled into the ditch. The fill was then sealed by a thick dump of clayey soil. This second rampart was notable for the much greater use of clay in its construction. A cheek built of coursed clay slabs (layer 70) fronted by a battered wedge of clay (layer 343) was cut into the front of the collapsed early rampart. Behind it was a thick levelling dump of clay (layer 288), sealing the above-mentioned slots for timber strapping. The height of this phase was a mere 0.40m below existing ground surface.

A new defence ditch was dug 2.5m to the north of its predecessors. Only its inner lip fell within the excavation, but its very sharp profile suggests it was not exposed for long. Its fill was also much cleaner – a contrast with the essentially rampart material thrown into the earlier ditch.

The greater quantity of Roman finds (including fragments of painted wall-plaster and possible armour fittings) found in the clay make-up to the Period 2 defences reflects the presence of the earlier establishment, and confirms it as a distinct phase of building. Two Claudian copy coins were found in the upper fills of the Period 1 ditch (layers 214 and 217).

Period 3 (late 1st century)

The backfill of the defence ditch and at least partial levelling of the rampart mark the end of the military phase of Kingsholm. Continued activity on or around the site, however, is marked by the digging of a large rubbish pit. The fill of this on the east side was overlain by a sequence of hard-packed gravel layers probably representing the eroded cores of surfaces. The latter may have been associated with the beam slot of a timber building just outside the line of the rampart. This slot follows the earlier alignment of the military buildings but the explanation is probably that this building respected the alignment of the defences which remained as a recognisable topographic feature. The gravel layers did not reappear to the west of the later ditch 155, suggesting that the ditch may have respected an earlier boundary line dating to this period. The quantities of apparent cess staining at this level suggest that animals were penned here.

Period 4 (2nd century)

A wide shallow ditch (155) was then cut on a new north-to-south alignment across the site. Its backfill closely respected the variations of layers through which the ditch had originally been cut (and therefore contained large amounts of 1st century material including an Aucissa-type brooch.
and a bone scabbard mount). This suggests that the ditch was originally associated with a bank (probably on the east side, as no evidence remained of such a feature within the excavation). If so, this seems likely to have been a boundary bank, possibly formalising a pre-existing boundary line reflected in a division of features noted in Period 3.

The backfill of ditch 155 also contained large quantities of domestic refuse and a concentration of iron slags. The latter was almost entirely confined to this phase and consisted largely of tap slag and smelting bottoms from furnaces, with some debris also from smelting hearths. The quantities were not enough to indicate intensive use as a rubbish dump, but suggest rather the casual tipping of a load from an iron-working site nearby. The backfill was then cut by a narrow gully (52) on the same alignment. The latter had then been loosely filled with domestic refuse and more lumps of tap slag.

**Period 5 (3rd/4th century)**

Evidence for later Roman activity on the site is more difficult to interpret and date, due to the masking effect of large quantities of residual early Roman material. A number of rubbish pits, possible post-holes and post-pads found on the north part of the site did, however, point to continued use of the area.

**Period 6 (Late Roman/Saxon)**

Overlying the latest definite Roman levels on the east side of the excavation were two cobbled surfaces. Only small sherds of abraded Roman pottery were found in the thin occupation surface. This was overlaid by a mixed topsoil level containing some of the few occurrences of early medieval pottery. These surfaces may be Saxon and therefore associated with the palace complex to the south. The hollow marking the front line of the rampart that still remained along the north part of the site may also have been filled in at this stage (but with the fills containing a considerable amount of early Roman pottery.

**Period 7 (Post-medieval)**

Evidence of later activity was sparse, and despite the disturbance of later cultivation, there was no suggestion of medieval occupation on the site. A series of gullies running north-to-south and parallel to Deans Way may have been the base of plough furrows dating to the 17th/18th century, and there were other features of possible post-medieval market gardening.

**Period 8 (Modern)**

The site was uniformly capped with a very mixed topsoil, cut by substantial modern pits and quarries. Over 90% of the finds from the quarry backfill were of Roman date, with modern assemblages being apparent only in the lowest fills.
Discussion

The pinpointing of the defences of Kingsholm has been an important pre-requisite for the proper assessment of the scale and nature of this Roman base (see Hurst 1985 for a general discussion of the strategic background to Roman Kingsholm). The constructional details of the defences are interesting in themselves, although further evidence is needed to resolve a number of problems in their interpretation. The sections excavated through the later 1st century defences of Glevum all show slight variation, but basically describe an earth rampart with turf and clay revetments (O'Neill 1962, 18-19) and built on a corduroy of rough close-set timbers (O'Neill 1965, 20; Heighway 1983, 21). Evidence of internal timber strapping survived on Eastgate Street and Berkeley Street (Hurst 1972, 28, 35-6). The front face of the rampart had generally been destroyed by the insertion of a later stone wall, but none showed any evidence of a timber-clad front.

The Claudio-Neronian defences at Kingsholm would appear to have been of this same general type, although any evidence of a corduroy or timber strapping was less well defined. The Kingsholm base has often been associated with the movements of the XX Legion and particular attention was therefore paid to possible similarities between this and the defences at Colchester and Wroxeter where the presence of a weather-boarded front has provided a distinctive design feature. (I am particularly grateful to Graham Webster and Don Mackreth for discussion on this matter). Such a feature seems unlikely on the excavated section, though because of the often flimsy survival of the evidence, there is still room for doubt.

Two styles of construction were noted in the revetments of the Period 1 rampart. The greater use of clay slabs or sods to the west may just reflect differing sources of material but may also denote an attempt to strengthen the rampart at a weak point. If the line of the north-south Roman road recorded off Kingsholm Road (Garrod and Heighway 1984, Fig 52) is projected northwards then it crosses the suggested line of the defences immediately west of site 24/85 (on Deans Way). This raises the possibility that the difference in construction marks the east side of a gatehouse.

The two phases to the defences may be correlated to the two phases of military building in the area as postulated by Henry Hurst (Hurst 1985, 113). Such a radical rebuilding of the rampart and replacement of the ditch suggests that this was most likely to have been occasioned by a change of unit or status. Figure 1 presents a provisional interpretation of the present evidence. The north and south bounds of the initial fort are suggested by the lines of the defences on Sandhurst Road (site 24/85), and by a possible rampart and associated military ovens recorded at 24 Kingsholm Square by Patrick Garrod (watching briefs: sites 23/83 and 9/86). If the remains at site 24/85 do represent the east side of a centrally-placed gateway, they can be taken to bisect the north defences; evidence for the eastern extent comes from the watching brief on Coppice Corner (site 9/83). The resulting enclosure is c. 9.5 hectares (23½ acres) in size, commensurate with an early vexillation fortress.

The rebuilding of the site 24/85 defences may then be associated with an expansion of the base to the south and west. Sill-beam buildings on the 'Kingsholm alignment' have been found to a distance of 280m south of the site 23/83 rampart and extending across to the Recreation Ground
Pl. I General view of Sandhurst Rd excavation looking south towards Gloucester. Deans Way to west.

Pl. II The Roman defences showing two phases of rampart with ditch in foreground.

Photos: City Excavation Unit
on the east (Hurst 1985, 115-7). This expanded plan would enclose an area of c. 17 hectares (42 acres), suitable for a legionary fortress (and of a similar size to the later Glevum fortress).

Following the abandonment of the military base c. AD65 and the backfilling of the defensive ditch, the site was used as a temporary rubbish dump with some evidence of Flavian occupation (although the bulk of the evidence for this is confined to the area south of St. Mark's Street: Hurst 1985, 113). The sequence of boundary ditches crossing the site from north to south indicates a new system of land division on a different alignment. However, the survival of the line of the rampart to the west of this boundary line as a topographical feature until at least the end of the Roman period suggests that the defensive line still retained a significance. Indeed, the northern defences survived as a topographical or legal boundary for a considerable period. The general line of the northern defences was retained as the north boundary of Kingsholm Close and probably that of the Saxon palace before it. Burials, predominantly inhumations, have been found on all sides of the site and further work is needed to show whether the absence of any sign of human burials from the excavation has a wider significance. It may be that the distribution of burials can be used to suggest the survival of a limited area of occupation from the Flavian into the late Roman period - and possibly beyond. Further evidence is needed to show if such a continuity of occupation reflects the survival of a late Roman estate unit which then formed the basis of the Saxon royal palace, but this remains an obvious possibility.

Further discussion on these and other points of interpretation is reserved until a detailed analysis of the finds and the final publication. It is hoped the latter will form part of a monograph which will also include an account of Patrick Garrod's work on Coppice Corner and other sites in Kingsholm.

ABBAYDALE

Summary

Initial work on the Abbeydale III development to the south-east of the city has suggested that the land was primarily farmland from Roman times, with surrounding occupation concentrated around the farmsteads of Upton, Barmwood and Saintbridge.

The proposed redevelopment of c. 400 acres of farmland just within the Gloucester district boundary led to an implications survey by the Unit in March-April 1985, funded by HBMC and the Abbeydale Consortium and carried out with the help of an MSC team from the Crickley Hill Archaeological Trust. The main project was directed by Nigel Pollard, assisted by Ian Stewart, with later work by the writer and Alister Barlett of the Ancient Monuments Laboratory.

The area is fringed by several known archaeological sites, including those of probable Roman villas at Upton St. Leonards and on Ashwood Way/Trevor Road, and three medieval mills along the Twyver. It contains large areas of medieval ridge-and-furrow, still visible particularly in aerial photographs. Field-walking and excavation of small trial slots produced little
evidence of settlement within the area. This was true even near the sites of a corn drier and other Roman finds found earlier near the M5 at Upton St. Leonards. Here the excavation of a 25m² area near where Romano-British pits and a hearth were discovered in 1969 (Fowler and Walthew 1971, 44-45) revealed a Roman field boundary ditch. The results suggested that settlement was confined to the edges of the threatened area (as with the possible Roman villas at Saintbridge, Hucclecote and Upton St. Leonards). Heavily abraded pottery from the Roman period onwards was probably introduced during manuring. A resistivity survey in the field yielding the densest scatter of finds produced no evidence of archaeological features.

It is hoped to carry out further sampling in 1986/7 and record any finds made during development; this may provide a better idea of early land apportionment. The area is bounded to the west by the Twyver and development will encompass the probable sites of two of the medieval mills. These will almost certainly have been obliterated by their post-medieval successors, which have also been surveyed, as have their associated engineering works.
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As a footnote, contrast the opinion of Thomas Fosbrooke, writing in 1819;

"...Kingsholm is incontrovertibly antient, and yet from position and subjection to inundation, could not possibly be of Roman origin. In situation and character it is decidedly British and agricultural, as Gloucester is Roman and military; one being the town, the other the garrison."

History of Gloucester, p.3.
BUILDING INSCRIPTION OF THE TWENTIETH LEGION (Site 19/1985)

Patrick Garrod

A Roman inscription was recently observed in the triforium of Gloucester Cathedral. The chance discovery was made by Mrs Barbara Bagge who was with a party being shown round the triforium by the Clerk of Works, Mr T Dorrington. The inscription was identified as a centurial building stone, included upside-down in a pre-1422 wall blocking an upper arch of the Norman nave. The inscription is cut into an ansate panel 12 x 24 cm long of oolitic limestone, the face showing some old abrasions and surface weathering. The panel is cracked through at one end and broken off at the other, with the loss of part of the two-line inscription which is as follows:

LEG(ionis) . XX . V(aleriae) V(ictricis) C(o)HO(ritis)
C(enturia) CORNELI(i) CRESC(entis)

Of the Twentieth Legion Valeria Victrix and of the -- Cohort, the Century of Cornelius Crescens (built this)

As reused building material, the inscription is unprovenanced, but it is assumed that the stone originally came from a Roman masonry structure in Gloucester. The evidence of the inscription dates the stone loosely between the 1st and 3rd centuries. The title Valeria Victrix was reputedly awarded to Legio XX after the Boudiccan revolt. (The ligatured I above the L of Cornelius is a common device in inscriptions of the 3rd century, but does not exclude an earlier date - information from Mr Mark Hassell.)
The legion which built the mid-60s timber and clay fortress beneath Gloucester's city centre has not been identified, but the centurial stone provides a positive link between Legio XX and Roman Gloucester. The stone may originally have been inserted into a military bath block. In a reappraisal of his earlier interpretation that primary fortress structures were subsequently re-used or altered for early colonia occupation, Mr Henry Hurst now argues in favour of a second fortress built in stone. The wide dating of the inscription precludes it from being used in this particular argument but he acknowledges the possibility that Legio XX built the second fortress, after its withdrawal from campaigns in the north, AD87-8. However the stone could equally be assigned to the Colonia Nervia Glevesium. This particular aspect of the dating raises yet another interesting question: was the colonia built by and for Legio XX? For further discussion see H. Hurst, 'Fortress to City'; also 'Gloucester - the Roman and later Defences' (1986).

Note on the Building Stone

Graham Webster

Legio XX is known to have been established in Gloucester from a tombstone from the military cemetery at Wotton, found in 1824 (RIB, 122), but now lost. As the fortress under the city has been dated to c. AD65, the probability is that the fortress from c. AD48 to c. AD65 was at Kingsholm, where military equipment has been found, and recently military defences have also been located. Legio XX was awarded the title Valeria Victrix (Valorous and Victorious) after AD60, but it remained at Gloucester until it was transferred to Wroxeter (Viroconium) c. AD65, and replaced by Legio II Aug from Exeter. The only building from which the cathedral stone could have derived would have been the bath-house, which could have been built c. AD60-65. Thereafter the legion was at Viroconium and Inchtuthil until AD86 (Inchtuthil 1985, p. 280), when it took over the vacant fortress at Chester, and dismantled the Wroxeter fortress, and thus was fully occupied with these tasks until at least c. AD90.

The suggestion that the legion returned to Gloucester at this time creates an illogical legionary concentration in a pacified area, while the vulnerable northern frontier would have been seriously undermanned.
NEW THOUGHTS ON GLOUCESTER'S DEFENCES

Henry Hurst

In the Defences volume just published*, apart from giving a detailed account of the excavations at 41–51 Eastgate Street, I have tried to make sense of all the archaeological evidence obtained so far on Gloucester's defences. There is a surprising amount of information. Starting with the first archaeological dig ever done in Gloucester, by John Bellows in 1873, there are published excavations from some twenty points around the Roman circuit and much to say about the post-Roman defences. Naturally I hope that everyone will buy a copy of the book to read for themselves, but it may be helpful (and perhaps even an encouragement to purchase!) to highlight some of the novelties which have now emerged.

With the Roman there is first of all a change to the sequence, producing only four (instead of the previous five) main periods of defence-building:

1) legionary, c. AD65;
2) first wall, c. AD90(?);
3) second rampart and stone towers, c. AD160–70;
4) late Roman wall, in two builds (here called 'second' and 'third' walls), both perhaps c. 270s–290s – previously the two builds were thought to be of different dates.

Most of the interest surrounds the exact character of the defences at each stage, which we can now reconstruct to a considerable extent, and have done so – with the help of four superb drawings by Phil Moss. As an example, the first two stages are shown here (Figs 1, 2), with some comments about them and about the late Roman wall.

The legionary rampart is noteworthy because it is both of a very common type – probably the standard turf-faced military rampart of early Roman Britain – and yet an exceptional amount of it survives. This is because it was partly preserved in the later defences, unlike most early military ramparts which were slighted at the end of their use. At Gloucester the turf faces of the rampart were much thinner than is usually believed (the inner face is only 2ft wide instead of 4 or 5ft or more, as generally assumed); also there were horizontal courses of timber strapping every 2ft or so throughout its height, which we have reconstructed (guessing) at 12ft. Also it is clear that the whole rampart – turf faces, core of upcast clay and sand from ditch and timber strapping – was constructed together, stage by stage.

In all these respects more detailed information is at our disposal than was the case twenty years ago when the reconstruction of The Lunt was carried out. As was recorded at the time, there were problems with building The Lunt rampart; hence the idea of building a stretch of rampart to the 'Gloucester prescription' to see if we now understand better how they were built.

* H.R. Hurst, Gloucester, the Roman and later Defences (Gloucester Archaeological Reports, no. 2, 1986). Obtainable from Gloucester City Museum and from Oxbow Books Ltd, 10 St. Cross Road, Oxford.
Fig 1  Legionary rampart

Fig 2  Stone facing to rampart ('first city wall')

Drawings by P.A. Moss
Although barely a stone survives in position of the first city wall, having all been replaced by the two builds of late Roman city wall, we can go some way towards reconstructing it. The key point here is that the large blocks of stone reused in the late wall must originally have come from it. They are undoubtedly reused and there are simply too many of them to have come from anywhere else; the blocks on the east side of the circuit alone would be enough to face the podia of four or five Temples of Claudius at Camulodunum! The foundations and a small fragment of wall were found in the excavations at 38-44 Eastgate Street, showing that the large blocks served as the facing to rubble packing added to the front of the original legionary rampart. Like the Roman east and north gates, which had similar large blocks and were probably contemporary, the wall was dry-built, in contrast with the late Roman wall. Also, though this is less certain, the stones may originally have had a 'rusticated' appearance, with their edges cut neatly to provide the drafting lines for the masons to set them in place and their centres left as roughly dressed protrusions. There are signs that these protrusions were hacked off when the stones were reused in the late Roman wall (masons' toolmarks are an element in the study of the city wall where more work could usefully be done).

The wall thus produced is an unusual one - we are more used to concrete or mortar-rubble walls faced with small stones - but it has a parallel in the fortress wall of the XXth legion at Chester, the main difference being the use there of the local sandstone instead of oolitic limestone at Gloucester (and the surviving wall at Chester is of later date, mid-2nd century or later). This parallel might not be a coincidence: the book expands a bit on this thought, picking up the suggestion from other evidence that the XXth might have rebuilt Gloucester as a stone fortress a few years before it became a colony.

The revised interpretation of the two builds of late Roman city wall - the 'second' and 'third' walls - comes about because it seems to be the best way to explain the site at 1-5 King's Square, excavated by Alan Hunter in the 1960s. Here 'second' and 'third' walls were present, as at 41-51 Eastgate Street, but unlike the latter site, where they were simply two lengths of wall joined to each other (they can, incidentally, be seen in the viewing chamber below King's Walk), there was a stretch where a 'second' wall plinth had 'third' wall construction above it. So either the second wall had been built and demolished to plinth level, which does not make sense, since it was a massive concrete wall, or the second build had only got to plinth level when a change of design occurred, producing the third build. The third wall is associated with external towers or 'bastions' and thus there is a parallel with certain of the Saxon Shore forts - Burgh Castle, Richborough, Dover - where towers may have been added after a change of design during building. This would date the wall with these Saxon Shore forts (and a number of Gallic town walls, which the third wall resembles) to the last decades of the third century. Does this mean that Gloucester had a more 'military' type of late Roman defences than most other major towns? There are one or two other hints that this might have been so.

With the post-Roman periods, the defences of the late Saxon burh have recently been in question. A major part of the problem is that we still have no direct archaeological evidence for them. We assume that Gloucester was fortified because the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle tells us that the men of Glou- cester and Hereford and other burhs resisted the Danish army in AD914.
The natural assumption would be that the Roman wall was reused, as in every other former Roman defended site which became a *burh*. This also seemed to be borne out by the medieval street pattern within the Roman walled area, which resembles that of other *burhs* where the laying out of streets and urban properties went with the provision of defence. The suggestion has recently been made that there might have been a Roman riverside wall and that the west side of the Roman wall was removed in the late Saxon period, and thus that the *burh* extended from the east side of the Roman circuit to the river. However, neither idea holds up: there is evidence for a retaining wall on the Roman river bank, but none for a defensive wall; there are positive indications that the line of the western Roman defences existed until the Norman conquest. Whether the full Roman circuit served for the *burh* defences or there was some less substantial outer earthwork for part of their length has not yet been resolved beyond doubt; all one can say is that the greatest density of building at the time of the Norman conquest was within the Roman defended area.

From the early 12th century onwards, the city did have defences extending to the river: in Leland's words (16th century), "Glocestre where yt is not sufficiently defended by Severn ys walled". The medieval defences, which included a double line on the north (wall and earthworks on outer line), were used in the siege of 1643 and removed in the late 17th century. An interesting point to emerge is that even where the Roman wall line was preserved, a great deal of medieval building was carried out, right down to ground level. This indicates that when interest was revived in the city's defences in the late 11th or early 12th centuries, the Roman wall had been dismantled and robbed to a large extent: as is also shown at Hereford, the earlier *burh* had been a short-lived episode followed by a century and a half when communal defence was not of great concern.

Apart from any novelties in the reconstruction of the defences in successive periods, we also now look at city defences - whether of the Roman or post-Roman periods - in a slightly different way from a few years ago. We are less at the mercy of 'history' - trying to fit defence-building into historically-recorded episodes like Clodius Albinus' attempt to become emperor in AD197, which was supposed to have led to the earthwork defences of Romano-British towns (they probably date from 20-30 years earlier!); also perhaps we have a stronger sense of the non-military aspects, such as civic pride or boundary definition, which were mixed into the construction of defences. While I hope that gains in knowledge have been made and consolidated in the present volume, of course study of the defences will go on and we can look forward both to new finds at Gloucester and to revising our ideas about what we know.
ANNUAL REVIEW OF MINOR DEVELOPMENT SITES IN GLOUCESTER

Patrick Garrod

Senior Excavations Officer, City Museum Excavation Unit

Lower Quay St. Flats Development  SO 82721878 Site 11/1983 continued

Observation made in a 12m dia hole machined to a depth of 3m in the site's lower parking area, 5m from the Quay Street frontage. 
Medieval: A compacted layer of organic occupation refuse with leather offcuts and 14th century pottery was recorded at 1.0m. The layer included small pieces of wattle walling but no structural remains were found in situ. A grey silt level contained 12th to 13th century pottery at 2.2m, and overlay estuarine river silting deposits above and within the Roman harbour area.

Parliament Street  SO 830183 Site 8/1984 continued

Trench Ia: Observations in a new cable trench 1.4m deep, extending south along the Southgate Street pavement from the existing British Telecom shaft, Trench I, at the junction with Parliament Street, reported in 1984. The main Roman road approaching the colonia from the south. An undated primary metalling of small oolitic stones and Bunter pebbles above a mottled silt/loam level on natural was recorded at a depth of 1.2m. The primary surface was both overlaid and cut away to the north by a compact metalling of Bunter pebbles on a red sand loam. Spreads of charcoal overlay this surface. A secondary metalled area of rammed small oolitic stones, Bunter pebbles and some fragments of tegulae, bedded in crushed limestone above a make-up of oolitic rubble and sand/loam, bounded and sealed the Bunter pebble surface. Both surfaces sloped to the north, in the direction of the colonia defences, from the point where the primary metalling was cut, approximately 5.2m south of the Parliament Street junction. It seems likely that both the Bunter pebble and upper limestone metallings are associated with an early 2nd century remetalling at the junction of the Roman main south road with the newly-constructed wide colonia ditch. Remains of two later Roman surfaces above contained similar metalling including red sandstone fragments and 2nd to 4th century pottery. The top level was 60cm below the modern pavement.

Trench II: Observations made in a vertical shaft excavated below the south side pavement at the junction with Southgate Street to a depth of 4.6m.
Geological: A truncated top level of natural lias clay was recorded 2.6m below pavement level. 
Roman/medieval Defences: Part of a truncated ditch or gulley, northside shoulder, cut the surviving lias clay to a depth of 1m. This feature is parallel with the outer side of the southern city defences ditch, and appeared to be terminating in the Southgate Street side of the trench. A black organic and clay silt fill contained only occasional bone and stones but included a sherd of late 1st/early 2nd century pottery. 
Post-medieval: A brick cellar floor level with stone-lined well 3.64m deep, bounding a timber-piled wall footing, was recorded at a depth of 2.2m below the pavement. This cellar had removed all stratigraphy. The remains are part of the early 19th century gaol.
Trench III: Observations made in a British Telecom trench extending the length of Parliament Street and across Brunswick Road. Average depth 2m. Parliament Street alias Green Dragon Lane overiles the southern length of the city ditch, extending from the South Gate around the south-east angle of the wall. Metalled surfaces consisting of stone and brick fragments with ash lenses were recorded beneath the modern street to an average depth of 85cm. The post-medieval fill of the ditch was a darkish grey to greenish gritty loam. At 1.8m this overlay a buff sand silt layer of unknown depth. In the junction with Brunswick Road the ditch fill was 2.4m deep and overlay natural red sand with Bunter pebbles. Here a deep limestone walled and slab constructed culvert 75 x 85cm wide overall cut into the level of natural. The culvert is assumed to be of Georgian date. Beneath the east side of the Brunswick Road carriageway, the level of natural was also cut by a large organic-filled feature (previously recorded 4/1982) 3.9m deep. Its relationship with the post-medieval fill of the city ditch was obscured by service trenches and shoring.

New Sewer Shaft, Upper Quay Street  SO 82891868  Site 16/1984

Observations made in a new sewer manhole shaft in Upper Quay Street (alias Castle Lane), at the junction with Quay Street to a depth of 2.5m. 

Suspected Medieval Street Level: An undated fine graded metalled surface overlaid by a thick deposit of organic saturated silt was recorded across the trench area at a depth of 2.45m. The oolitic and liassic limestone cobbled metallings with numerous Bunter pebbles and reused Roman material is typical of the excellent 11th century street surfaces found in Gloucester. 

Medieval Building: Part of a robbed stone wall footing, aligned east-west, bounded by two contemporary stony street metallings was recorded 12.5m deep. It is here assumed that this building had encroached into the west side of the earlier Castle Lane alignment. The location of a junction into a contemporary Quay Street alignment to the west was not discerned.

Later Medieval Street Levels: The demolished building and its contemporary street levels were sealed between two metalled surfaces of iron-working slags and associated workshop debris. It was not determined whether these metallings were intended to cover the original medieval width of Castle Lane, or were associated with the construction of a Quay Street alignment to the west. All stratigraphy above 1.7m was destroyed by modern service trenching.

Manhole Shaft, Longsmith Street  SO 82951861  Site 17/1984

Observations were made in a manhole shaft rebuild immediately west of the Berkeley Street junction to a depth of 3m. 

Roman colonia Defences: A compacted stony level recorded at 3m deep is here identified with the open metallic perimeter extending around the west side defences ditch. This was overlaid by dark loam levels, late Roman to medieval, 80 cm thick.

The Longsmith Street Alignment: Successive medieval to post-medieval hollow streets with suspected walkways along the upper shoulders were recorded to a depth of 2.2m. The primary street level extending the line of Longsmith Street through the west side city defences towards the river was not dated.

33 Oxford Street  SO 837189  Site 18/1984

Observations made during the underpinning of foundations beneath a subsiding building and in trenches for the new kitchen extension to the rear.
Roman: A light clayey loam containing pottery, fragments of tegulae and kitchen refuse, sealed natural lias clay at a depth of 1.5m. This was overlaid and cut by the following feature.

Suspected Post-medieval: A large undefined silted water course or pond filled with black plastic clay silt and water snails was recorded under the south side and rear foundations. This extended for an unknown distance beneath the rear garden 2m deep. Elsewhere the building was founded in a black clayey loam saturated with separated ooliths from limestone. Dating evidence is 2nd to 4th century with Roman pottery assumed to be residual.

Note: On Causton's 1843 map this house is numbered No. 20; on the Gloucester City Board of Health map of 1851 it is No. 22.

111 Westgate St. (Jelf and Langston) SO 83051868 Site 19/1984

Observations made within the existing late 18th century brick cellar.
A small area of lias stone flooring bounding remains of an internal east-west stone wall footing was reported within the brick-constructed front cellar area. No definite architectural features were found in the stonework, indicating it was part of an earlier medieval undercroft.

St. Michael's Tower, The Cross SO 83161854 Site 20/1984

Observations in a new drain trench extending from within the tower into the Eastgate Street pavement alignment to a depth of 1m.
Part of a large lias and oolite stone wall footing aligned north-south was recorded between the inner archway on the east side of the tower.
A small area containing six medieval church floor surfaces above a stony make-up was recorded to a depth of 1m. Occupation deposits consisting of fine laminated grey silts were found on each successive surface. Except for its tower, the medieval church of St. Michael was demolished and rebuilt in 1658. A lime mortar floor and the north wall of the later church respectively overlaid and cut the medieval floor levels. Numerous 18th/19th century brick vaults and burials inside the church had destroyed all other medieval floor levels within the trench area. The 1653 nave with side aisles was demolished in 1958.

Inner Ring Rd Junction with Lower Northgate St. SO 83481874 Site 21/1984

Observations made in a new sewer shaft in the Inner Ring Road at the former junction of Lower Northgate Street and Black Dog Yard.

Roman: Street metallings of the Flavian spur connecting the North Gate with Ermin Street at Wotton were recorded to a depth of 1.3m. The primary metalling consisted of Bunter pebbles embedded on a make-up of large oolitic stones in fine gravel and sand above natural lias clay. Three successive colonia street metallings above were overlaid by stony loam levels of late- or Post-Roman date. It is now apparent from previous observation that this Roman alignment is as wide as modern Lower Northgate Street.

Medieval to Post-medieval: The original open course of the River Twyver equated here with a defences ditch in front of the Outer North Gate was recorded to a depth of 2.6m. This was found backfilled, and cut by the 19th century brick-culverted course of the Twyver.

St. Catherine Street SO 83341901 Site 22/1984

Observations in a new sewer shaft cut into the north side carriageway of St. Catherine Street, opposite Park Street junction to a depth of 2.3m.
Geological: A river terrace deposit of red sand and Bunter pebbles extended throughout the trench area.

Roman: An east-west slot feature cut into natural, containing fine waterborne laminations of sand silts, is here identified with a wooden box-constructed drain or gutter. This was subsequently recut as a stone-lined drain containing 2nd century pottery and tegula tile fragments. The slot was bounded to the north by an undefined U-profile feature largely obscured by the trench shoring.

Medieval - Post-medieval: A suspected sunken alignment for St. Catherine Street filled with lenses of stony dark gritty loam truncated the Roman levels at a depth of 1.5m.

Mechanaid Site, Skinner Street SO 83411908 Site 23/1984

Observations made in a service trench extending from a new factory site into Skinner Street to a depth of 70 cm.

Medieval - Post-medieval: The original wide open course of the River Twyver, filled with organic charged dark grey silt, was exposed along the length of the Skinner Street frontage. The depth of this fill to lias clay natural is approximately 2.5m. The course of the 19th century brick-culvert Twyver cut the silted river bed. Substantial successive 18th/19th century metallised surfaces were recorded beneath the Skinner Street carriageway. Materials used included very large beach pebbles, copper slag, and 5cm bricks. A retaining wall along the side of the Twyver would seem necessary to support earlier raised street levels extending out of the medieval Alvin Gate at the end of Skinner Street. Modern disturbances at the side of this street obscured this relationship.

The Rectory, 17 Brunswick Road SO 83201824 Site 24/1984

Observations made during machining of concrete beam foundation holes within the southside front lawn area to a depth of 3m.

Geological: Natural lias clay sloped west-east from an average depth of 1.5m. Numerous large permafrost fissures in the clay surface over 1.3m deep were filled with River Terrace red sand and Bunter pebbles. This was overlaid by a sticky lightish buff silt deposit indicating the outer perimeter of the oolitic gravel spread.

Roman: A scatter of stone rubble was noted above the original humus level, adjacent to the street frontage, 1.2m deep.

The Hayfield, nr Green Lane, Mucclecote SO 870161 Site 1/1985

Observations made of a field of former ridge and furrow ploughland known to have been pasture for the last hundred years, the proposed site of a nature conservation order but subsequently ploughed up before housing development. Five scattered flint flakes/fragments found in the heavy clay plough soil. Occasional finds included two Roman coarseware sherds, part of a broken quern-stone of conglomerate red sandstone, and one fragment each of a tegula and a red sandstone tile. A 15th/16th century purse frame had previously been found on this field.

30 Brunswick Road SO 83131818 Site 2/1985

Observations made in foundation trenches for office extension above rear of existing building, 1.0m deep.
Geological: A river terrace deposit of pink sand and Bunter pebbles overlaid by buff clayey loam containing larger pebbles, 35cm thick.

Roman: A shallow pit or ditch feature containing some lias stone rubble and an occasional tegula, cut natural 50cm deep.

Medieval: Accumulated dark loam, possibly ploughsoil, 1m thick, cut the Roman feature and removed the humus level above natural.

Llanthony Road  SO 82321808  Site 3/1985

Observations made in a service trench extending from the east carriageway into a new factory area adjacent to the north-west corner of the Llanthony Priory grounds, 2.6m deep. Successive buried stone-and-cinder metallised surfaces above estuarine clay were recorded to a depth of 1.6m below modern pavement level. The metallings extended into the site area for an unknown distance, exceeding 2m. (The Western Archaeological Trust M.S.C. scheme undertook excavations within the new factory area, January 1984.)

Nos. 29, 31, 33 and 35 St. Catherine Street  SO 83261908  Site 4/1985

Observations made in foundation trenches during rebuilding of exterior rear kitchens, 1m deep.

Roman: Remains of a Roman surface of unknown area were recorded throughout the trench sections, depth 79cm. Small lias and oolitic stones, fragments of tegulae, Bunter pebbles and gravel were embedded in spreads of redeposited mortar and wall plaster. Painted plaster included plain red and splash marble-effect surfaces. Some 2nd century pottery was also recorded. The metallised horizon in the trenches of No. 35 were truncated by 19th century make-up levels. A 2nd century linear or pit feature extending across the excavated area aligns with the colonia.

Site of flats at 7-12 Brunswest Ct, Parliament St.  SO 83041823  Site 5/1985

Observations during machining of trenched area, which removed brick footings and cellars of recently demolished houses. 11 x 14 x 1.4m deep.

Roman: Remains of a suspected metallised surface above natural humus were recorded 1.4m below dark loam. This is here assumed to be part of an open metallised perimeter extending in front of the colonia southern defences circuit.

City Library, Brunswick Road  SO 83231830  Site 6/1985

Observations in builder's sounding trench within City Library basement, which is on the site of the eastern defences ditch alignment. 1.4m deep. A layer of clayey silt with numerous Bunter pebbles and small stone fragments sealed a substantial bed of redeposited Roman building stone, mainly oolitic with some lias stone. Bonding mortar was found adhering to some stones. This overlaid a silt loam level of undefined depth. From builder's information, a similar sounding 11m to the south struck natural gravel at a depth of 1.8m. The stone rubble layer was not encountered.

Selwyn School, Matson Lane, Matson  SO 851158  Site 7/1985

Observations made in foundation trenches for dormitory block extension to Taylor House, 1.2m deep.

Geological: Lias clay natural slopes gently to the north and south.
Roman: A large undefined pit feature, containing mid-to-late 1st century Roman pottery and food bone fragments was located in the west end of the site. Similar mid-1st century groups of pottery have been recovered in this area of the Gloucester district.

Medieval: Parts of two narrow slots associated with a parallel U-profile ditch alignment bounded by various larger pits or linear features were recorded in the east end of the site. The clay silt fill within these features, some saturated with charcoal, contained 11th to late-12th century sherds, food bones and residual Roman pottery. A spread of local iron sandstone, possibly hard standing or destruction level, sealed some of the above features. About 35m east of the Matson medieval moated site 184/53.

White Hart Inn, St. Johnswood Alley, Kingsholm  SO 83581930  Site 8/1985

Observations in contractor's trenches for four houses built in the rear garden of the above; access from Swan Road, 2m deep.

Geological: Red sand/loam of the Kingsholm River Terrace was recorded at 1.0m deep.

Roman: A possible eroded 1st century surface/make-up of redeposited estuarine clay extended across the eastern two-thirds of the site. With the exception of one small lias clay-filled feature, no hard evidence of structural remains was observed. A number of pit features cut from a subsequent loam level was recorded. Evidence for timber sill slots was supposedly found in the adjoining playing field to the rear (Green, Roman Studies, 1943). The late colonia burial ground in Kingsholm did not extend into this site. Unstratified objects included several 3rd to early 4th century coins, one Trumpet brooch and a small rectangular belt-plate.

Mount Street School, Mount Street  SO 829191  Site 10/1985

Observations made in a foundation trench on the site of the demolished 19th century school to the depth of 2.85m revealed the former course of Dockham Ditch (alias Old Severn) at a depth of 2.55m.

59-61 Park Road  SO 83401801  Site 15/1985

Observations made in the 1m deep foundation trenches during redevelopment of the site of demolished houses at the junction with Belgrave Road.

Geological: Light brown stiff loam above a Jurassic sand and gravel terrace.

Roman: A short length of a U-profile slot or ditch feature 40cm wide was recorded along the east side of the site. Sherds of a 1st-early 2nd century ring-necked flagon were recovered from the fill.

Moody's Garage, 67-71 Parkend Road  SO 83301750  Site 16/1985

Geological: Stiff light brown loam sealing a thin secondary layer of oolitic gravel, above a 1.3m bed of fine sand. A primary deposit of oolitic pea-size gravel beneath seals natural lias clay.

Archaeological: Other than a brick-built well and 19th century brick wall footings no features were observed cut into natural below a dark loam overburden 50cm thick.
SOME GLOUCESTER EXCAVATIONS 1931 – 1985: A SELECTED LIST

Colin Wallace

This list provides an up-to-date and structured bibliography of the main archaeological work carried out in Gloucester over the last half-century. Newcomers to the city will find it particularly helpful, and old hands too should find it a useful check-list, both for the standard references and for the less obvious material.

Background Reading

Heighway C.M. 1976 Ancient Gloucester
Heighway C.M. 1985 Gloucester: a History and Guide
Hurst H.R. 1985 Kingsholm: Excavations at Kingsholm Close and Other Sites
Saville A. (ed) 1984 Archaeology in Gloucestershire

Quick Reference


The Gloucester Roman Research Committee

This body was formed in 1931 by the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society at the instigation of the then President W.H. Knowles:

"(1) to study the antiquities of Gloucester associated with the Romano-British period and to secure their preservation;
(2) to prepare a complete survey of the Roman site and, as opportunity may permit, to investigate its remains by excavation or other means;
(3) to obtain on loan for exhibition in the Museum, Roman objects found in the city and now in private custody". (TBGAS 52, 302.)

Excavations organised by the Committee are reported on in the Society's Transactions:

Crypt School Grounds 1931-32 (TBGAS 53 and 55)
Commercial Road, 'Barbican' Site 1934 (TBGAS 56)
Bon Marche 1934 (TBGAS 56)
CWS Upper Quay Street 1937-39 (TBGAS 59 and 60)
Knowles died in 1943 and the Committee only reappears in the late 1950's, sponsoring the following excavations in conjunction with the City Museum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 King's Square</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>(H.E. O'Neill, TBGAS 77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friar's Orchard</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>(H.E. O'Neill, TBGAS 81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's School Gardens</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>(H.E. O'Neill, TBGAS 84,90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee was reconstituted as the Gloucester and District Archaeological Research Group in 1967.

**Gloucester City Museum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsholm and Early Gloucece</td>
<td>1930's</td>
<td>(C. Green, JRS 32 and 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Square</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>(C. Green, Antiq J 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cross and Bon Marche</td>
<td>1955/6</td>
<td>(M. Cra'ster, TBGAS 80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Marche</td>
<td>1958/9</td>
<td>(A.G. Hunter, TBGAS 82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estcourt Road</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>(C. Green, TBGAS 67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Westgate Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>(A.G. Hunter, TBGAS 87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cross</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>(A.G. Hunter, TBGAS 99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Square</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>(A.G. Hunter, TBGAS 86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quay Street/South Street</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>(A.G. Hunter, TBGAS 103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-66 Kingsholm Road</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>(R. Abbott, TBGAS 86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Art site</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>(B. Rawes, TBGAS 91, 96; J. Rhodes, TBGAS 98)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Museum organised the 1966/7 work on the new Market Hall and Longsmith Street sites (TBGAS 93 and unpublished), the start of government-funded rescue archaeology in Gloucester. Rescue observations by Gloucester Museum staff up to the early 1970's are largely unpublished, but details often appear in later publications (e.g. Heighway 1983, 15). The Museum catalogue ('A' and 'N' volumes) often provides useful detail to expand the summary publication of sites noted above under 3 and 4. Museum accession numbers (e.g. 2/84) have now come to be used widely as site codes.

**The City Excavation Unit**

In August 1968 the post of Gloucester Field Archaeologist was created and attached to the establishment of the City Museum. The first incumbent was Henry Hurst, succeeded in 1974 by Carolyn Heighway. The City Excavation Unit came into being in 1973, with a permanent establishment of a Unit Head, a Field Officer, a Finds Research Assistant and an Administrative Assistant. The Unit returned to direct City Museum control in 1981, the post of Unit Head falling vacant in that year. 1985 saw the appointment of Malcolm Atkin as Assistant Archaeology Director and Unit Head. While the Unit establishment had always been expanded with many fixed-contract staff in order to carry out its work, the lack of funding consequent on the lack of a Unit Head in the early 1980's led to an MSC-funded excavation and post-exavcation project in Gloucester being organised by the Western Archaeological Trust (succeeded by the Crickley Hill Archaeological Trust) in the years 1983-86. The MSC and HBC are expected to contribute to the Excavation Unit's programme of work from 1986 onwards. In 1974 the Unit produced Archaeology in Gloucester: A Policy for City and District compiled by Carolyn Heighway, which summarised current knowledge and future work. Henry Hurst's work is summarised in three interim reports (Antiq J 52, 54 and 55) and is now being published in the series "Gloucester Archaeological Reports". The first of these (Hurst 1985) concerned itself
with the 1972 excavations at Kingsholm Close. The second, recently published (Hurst H.R. 1986, Gloucester, the Roman and Later Defences) includes a detailed reassessment of the defensive sequence (see above, pp. 14-17. Ed.) and several changes to interpretations published in Heighway 1983 and Garrod and Heighway 1984. Future reports will cover work done on urban sites (including 11-17 Southgate Street, 13-17 Berkeley Street, and 10 Eastgate Street). Mosaics from the new Market Hall site, Longsmith Street, Berkeley Street and Eastgate Street are described and illustrated by David Neal (1981, catalogue Nos. 52 to 59 and colour fiche 2).

The rescue observations made by the Field Officer (Patrick Garrod) are reported in the following works (and others forthcoming):

Heighway 1983; Garrod and Heighway 1984; Hurst 1985; TegAS 1978 to 1986; Glevensie No. 15 onwards.

The following excavation and interim reports have been published:

| North Gate (45-49 Northgate St.) | 1974 | Heighway 1983 |
| East Gate (35-44 Eastgate St.)   | 1974 etc | Heighway 1983 |
| l Westgate Street                | 1975 | Brit. 11, Med. Arch. 23 |
| St. Oswald's Priory              | 1975-78 | (Antiq J 58,60), Brit. 23 |
| Tanner's Hall                    | 1978-80 | TEGAS 101 |
| St. Oswald's Priory              | 1983 | (Glevensis 18) |

Note also Richard Bryant's work 1978-79 at the church (and Roman extramural site) of St. Mary de Lode (Glevensis 14).

The Type Fabric Series

The Gloucester Type Fabric Series provides detailed fabric descriptions of Roman to post-medieval pottery from Gloucester excavations since 1968 (i.e. those in Section 5 above), offering the chance to reduce the bulk of any pottery report by simple mentions of a Type Fabric (TF) number instead of long descriptions. The core of the system comprises a sherd reference collection and files of fabric descriptions housed in the City Excavation Unit. Full published descriptions can be found in Med. Arch. 28, Heighway 1983 (Appendices B1 and B2) and Hurst 1985 for most TFs, supplemented by Vince 1984. To the original collection, created by Alan Vince, new TFs are continually being added and existing ones revised - new TFs will be published in the pottery reports in which they first occur. The study of vessel forms is not yet as organised as that of fabrics.

Bibliography

Hurst H.R. 1985 Kingsholm. Excavations at Kingsholm Close and other sites. (Gloucester Archaeological Report 1)
Neal D.S. 1981 Roman Mosaics in Britain (Britannia Monograph 1)
Observations were made in trenching and piling operations during the Home Office redevelopment scheme for HM Prison, Gloucester.

Provisional Interpretation

**Geological:** Natural Lias clay at the upper shoulder of the east channel of the Severn was recorded at 6.5m deep. It was overlaid by estuarine river silt deposits 40cm thick. See also the rationalisation of test bore holes record, 11/1985.

**Roman River Front:** A line extending across the *colonia* quay or river frontage retaining wall was plotted across the site. Remains of a substantial wall foundation trench packed with oolitic limestone rubble founded on timber piles was recorded at a depth of 5m. Made-ground loam levels were found at the rear of the wall alignment. A surface and make-up of Bunter pebbles 80cm thick was traced along the front of the wall trench, extending 15m towards the east channel of the river. Pottery dating from the early 2nd to 4th century was recovered. Post-Roman river silting was deposited across this area of the site.

**Saxon-Norman River Front:** A dark gritty silt level with organic content sealed the post-Roman deposits from an average depth of 2.4m. It seems likely that the Roman retaining wall remained *in situ* in this period. The wall may also have been used as a boundary to the garden of the monks of St Peter's Abbey, on which the tower or keep was built, to the rear of the wall alignment.

**The Gloucester Castle (built c. 1110-1120):** A primary bailey metalling of stone and Bunter pebbles embedded on a make-up of estuarine clay was recorded throughout the development area at 2m deep. Four successive and silted metalled surfaces collectively 80 cm thick were also discerned.

**The Outer (Curtain) Wall (12th century):** Part of the west or riverside outer wall circuit 75m in length was planned, showing four differing angled alignments within the development area. The wall was 2.6m thick, constructed with a Lias stone rubble core, bonded with redsand and faced with oolitic limestone ashlar blocks. An offset course of facing blocks indicated some reduced thickness of the wall to its maximum height of 12m. The foundations, packed in estuarine clay, were machined out to a depth of 5m.

Evidence for two external bridges was found; one, possibly part of the drawbridge to the Kingsbridge across the river, was a secondary build to the wall.

**The Bailey Wall (Late 13th to 14th century):** A bailey wall 2.2m thick built largely of Middle Lias stone bonded in brown sand was recorded between the outer wall and the castle tower or keep. A contemporary rectangular tower was located in the angle of the bailey and outer wall alignment.
A truncated pit containing 13th century pottery was found beneath the foundation of the bailey wall.

**Inner Bailey Buildings (13th century):** Three separate groups of buildings were recorded within the middle bailey area. Most are here assigned to the 13th century or later date.

**The King's Residential Area:** Various lengths of wall footings with associated floor levels were recorded within an area designated as the King's chambers, tower and garderobe. This is located in the angle between the outer wall and bailey wall alignments.

**The Queen's Residential Area:** To a lesser extent a similar record was made of walls and floor levels of buildings near the outer wall on the opposite side of this bailey area. Destruction levels above the King and Queen's quarters contain 16th century pottery and medieval stamped tile. The tile is identified as late 13th - early 14th century Nash Hill kiln product.

**The King's Chapel:** Remains of a masonry building were located close to the bailey wall, adjacent to the castle tower. Documentation indicates the King's Chapel stood in a similar position to the tower.

**Buildings in the Middle Bailey area:** Masonry remains of a building were found in the middle bailey adjacent to the above possible chapel.

**The Castle "County Gaol" (16th to 18th century):** A dark loam level in thick was identified with the gaol levels sealing those of the medieval castle. Three burials were recorded in the former inner bailey area, presumably prisoners who died in gaol. Walls of the 18th century gaol yard and crown land boundaries were also recorded.

**The County Gaol (Model prison, late 18th century):** Brick walls and foundations of the women's cell block and airing yards in the north-west quarter of the model prison overlaid the 16th-late 18th century castle gaol levels. The prison warders' houses, 1-8 The Quay, were built on this area of the prison and later demolished.

---


---

The castle and surrounding area in Speed's map, 1610
HENRY III - GLOUCESTER'S KING

Arthur Dodd

From the time of the Norman Conquest all but one of England's kings have been crowned at Westminster Abbey. The one exception is Henry III whose coronation took place in St. Peter's Abbey, Gloucester (now the Cathedral) on 28 October 1216. At the time, Henry was a nine-year-old boy whose father, King John, had died at Newark just ten days before 'of a surfeit of peaches and new cider', leaving the country in the grip of a vicious civil war and an invasion by the French.

The events leading up to this situation were both complex and a little bizarre. While outwardly compliant, John had never really accepted the terms of Magna Carta which had been forced upon him by his barons at Runnymede on 15 June the year before. He had used all his considerable wiles in an attempt to regain control. Firstly, he had declared England to be a fief of Rome and had convinced the Pope that Magna Carta was not in the best interests of the Church because the barons were using it to prevent him from ruling as the direct representative of the Vatican. He then recruited mercenaries from the continent to fight against his own disaffected barons. In the meantime Stephen Langton, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was a great believer in freedom, had gone to Rome to protest at the imposition of papal authority and was being held a virtual prisoner of the Vatican by the Pope, who not only would not see him but refused to let him leave the Eternal City.

The barons in desperation had sent to Paris and offered the crown of England to Louis, the Dauphin of France, on the somewhat flimsy grounds that he had married Blanche of Castile, a grand-daughter of Henry II and therefore had a legitimate claim to the throne. Louis, gathering a large army, had landed on the south coast but was being held up by the stubborn resistance of Hubert de Burgh, Constable of Dover Castle.

Inland, the castles of John's mercenary captains created a formidable barrier which confined the French forces to London and the south-east and effectively prevented them from linking up with the dissident barons of the north who were the King's most implacable foes. John himself had hastily moved his army northward in a bid to establish control and, while attempting to take a short cut across the treacherous sands of the Wash, had seen his baggage train containing most of the Crown jewels engulfed by the rising tide.

To complicate matters still further, the Pope had sent a legate to England to ensure that the Church would become the real power behind the throne of this new fief of Rome. The legate, Gualo Bianchieri, had already given warning of his spiritual power by excommunicating Louis and all his supporters thus letting it be known that he did not approve of attempts to dethrone John, who was not only an appointed king but was an avowed vassal of the Church.

Such was the situation in England when the 78-year-old William Marshal, Earl of Pembroke and Lord of Striguel, rode to Devizes Castle to meet nine-year-old Henry, son of the discredited John and hereditary heir to the throne.
The Earl Marshal was probably the greatest knight in medieval Europe; he was the hero of over 500 single-combat tournaments, a veteran of the crusades, and, most important, he was intensely loyal to the Crown of England. He realised at once that the situation demanded political expediency and that the first step on the way to peace was the early crowning of John's heir. This at least might evoke a wave of loyalty throughout the land and call a halt to this internecine strife; but the coronation must be done in due form by a churchman of the highest rank, and the boy must be properly appointed before a representative of the Pope or there was the ever-present danger that he would fail to be recognised as the true king.

Westminster Abbey, where the coronation should have taken place, was in the hands of insurgents, and Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, who should have officiated, was in Rome. However, it was obvious to the Earl that some sort of preliminary crowning had to be done - and this as quickly as possible. The nearest 'King's City' was Gloucester, and it was not too far away from Devizes. After all, there had been a tradition in Gloucester since the days of Edward the Confessor that the king had a 'crown-wearing' in the city at Christmas-time so this made it an obvious place for a coronation.

So to Gloucester they came; but first the boy had to be knighted and this was done by the Earl himself as premier nobleman of the land. The coronation which followed in Gloucester's abbey church was spartan in comparison with the normal lavish ceremonial. The actual appointing and crowning was done by Peter des Roches, the Bishop of Winchester, and the act was witnessed by the Bishops of Exeter and Bath, while Gualo Bianchieri, the Papal legate, accepted the young King's oath of fealty to the Pope. Since the crown had been lost with John's baggage-train in the disastrous attempt to cross the Wash, a simple circlet of gold was hastily borrowed from the Queen Mother to complete the ceremony. And the good people of Gloucester took the little king to their hearts. For a month after the coronation every citizen wore a head-fillet in honour of the golden-haired Plantagenet.

Peter des Roches, who was born a Poitevin, seems to have been rewarded with a grant of land in Westgate Street on which was built a house and tavern, for the Gloucester Rental of 1455 records "Also of the tenement .... where there is an Inn which Peter Poitevin (held) with booths and cellars and rendered 16d in the time of King Henry III".

William, the Earl Marshal, became Regent during the first part of Henry's minority and ruled well and wisely as 'Governor of the King and Kingdom'. He set about consolidating royalist position and gradually won the confidence of the barons, regaining their loyalty by pointing out that John's death had greatly changed matters and, with a new young king committed to observe the freedoms of Magna Carta, their duty was to serve him and fight in his support against the invading French. While Louis fought on, dissipating his strength against well-fortified castles, the old Marshal was skilfully detaching man after man from his cause. Finally Louis agreed to withdraw from England and give up his claim to the crown.

Following the Earl's death in 1219, the young king was greatly influenced by Peter des Roches and showed a partiality for foreigners whom he appointed
to the highest offices of the Church and State. In 1220 there was a second coronation — this time at Westminster Abbey — with Stephen Langton officiating and with all the proper robes and pomp which had been lacking at the first crowning in Gloucester.

Henry was always a deeply religious man and retained a fondness for the city of his first coronation throughout his long life. It was he who gave monetary grants and mature oaks from the Royal Forest of Dean to form the roof timbers when the religious houses of Blackfriars, Greyfriars and Whitefriars were founded in Gloucester during the decade following 1230. Some of these huge oak beams can be seen in the roof of the Dominican Friary of Blackfriars, part of which still stands.

It is perhaps ironical that the city of his first coronation should also have been his prison for a time when civil war again divided his unhappy kingdom in the 1260's. For sadly the latter part of Henry's 56-year reign was noted for misrule, culminating in the so-called Barons' War led by Simon de Montfort who set up the first true House of Commons.

Henry III was not without good qualities but he was more a monk than a king; he was weak and ineffectual as a ruler and regrettably when he exercised his royal authority it was usually to extort money from his subjects.

In his last years he achieved his life's ambition to provide a new setting for the remains of Edward the Confessor whom he venerated. Over a long period he employed the greatest artists and craftsmen of the age in rebuilding the abbey church of Westminster. In October 1269 the bones of the Saxon king were finally transferred to a golden shrine in the centre of a superb new apsidal chancel beyond the high altar.

Henry was generally unpopular during his lifetime and died, regretted by few, on 16 November 1272. He was buried at his own request in Westminster Abbey in the grave formerly occupied by Edward the Confessor.

Perhaps the only tears at his passing came from the people of the city of his boyhood coronation, who still looked upon him as Gloucester's own king.
REVIEW OF ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE FOREST OF DEAN, 1985-86

Ian Standing

Over the last year or so there has been an upsurge in archaeological research in the region, mostly carried out by the Forest of Dean Local History Society. Many significant new sites have been found. In addition, both the Dean Heritage Museum and the University of Manchester have undertaken excavations, while various bodies have been actively concerned with site conservation. All the work mentioned in this review — a general summary of work reported in detail in the Society's journal, The New Regard, 1985 — has been carried out by members of the Forest of Dean Local History Society, except where otherwise attributed.

Prehistoric

Numerous sites have been discovered by field-walking. High praise is due to Bryan Walters for his lead and successes in this discipline. More new sites have come to light in the period under review than in the last 30 years. The oldest site is a flint implement yielding area at Nedge Cop near St. Briavels (for report see following article); this is the first substantial site of the period in west Gloucestershire and looks set to become important in a county Mesolithic context. Numerous flints and some other artifacts of Neolithic and Bronze Age dates have been found near Newland, at Eastbatch, Bearse Farm, Ruardean, English Bicknor and Coleford. Various artifacts known to have been found in recent years and in private hands have also been examined and reported on. These included a Mesolithic flint core tool from Littledean, a Bronze Age palstave from Cinderford and an early Bronze Age flint knife from Hudnalls. At Sallow Vallets Enclosure (SO 59951354) a small earthwork probably of prehistoric date was surveyed and written up.

Romano-British

Five new sites have been detected. On a field near Bearse Farm field-walking recovered 80 pottery sherds, mainly abraded Severn Valley wares. At The Mount, Lower Lydbrook (SO 59351645), a Romano-British occupation site has been identified. There appear to be two rectangular stone-filled banks and several round hollows. Pottery so far recovered ranges from 2nd to 4th centuries. Investigations, at The Park, Great Howle Farm, near Ruardean, centred upon a rectangular earthwork which was noted and destroyed in the 19th century. A surface concentration of pottery contained rim forms of 3rd and 4th century date, mainly Severn Valley ware (see p. 36).

At Coleford, a watching brief at the new industrial estate retrieved Romano-British pottery, iron ore and tumbled iron slag (SO 578102). Rescue excavation began in August 1985, and well-stratified Romano-British layers have yielded large amounts of 2nd to 4th century pottery. Iron objects, three coins, iron ore and some slag and refractory material have also been found. Occupation must have taken place here, but opinion is divided about the extent of a building, if any, so far revealed.

Near Clearwell (SO 57320860) investigations were made of a cropmark noted in 1980 on aerial photography taken in the drought of 1976. Two buildings were apparent, one 21m x 12.5m and the other 10m x 8m. Initial excavation produced Roman pottery of 3rd-4th century date. During the autumn of 1985
a 5m x 5m square was excavated outside the buildings, over a major resistance anomaly, which proved to be an undulation in the weathered surface of the Carboniferous Limestone and its overlying clay. Between this and the turf, numerous pottery and slag finds were recovered. The provisional dating is 2nd to 4th century.

In 1984 the owner of Littledean Hall, D. Macer-Wright, discovered the foundations of a large building 30m x 22m, apparently containing side corridors and a well-made drain, with a series of post-holes in the centre. Professor Barri Jones of the University of Manchester visited and considered the structure to be that of a Roman springhead temple. Aerial photography showed extensive building foundations to the south-east. In August 1985 the University of Manchester launched a full-scale excavation on the site. Finds were sparse; the nearby foundations yielded medieval items. Nevertheless, Prof. Jones feels that the large building can be nothing other than a springhead temple (Jones and Maude, 1985).

The last site with possible Roman affinities examined was the ancient paved and kerbed Dean Road, running from Lydney to Mitcheldean and long accredited to the Roman period. A small excavation near Soudley discerned details of the construction and showed that no earlier road surface lay beneath. A layer of charcoal was found below the paved surface. In February 1986 the Society gained a Lloyds Bank Dating Award for radio-carbon processing and the results are awaited.

Medieval

Field-walking produced medieval pottery from several sites. In addition a non-intrusive research project was undertaken on the moated site of Breckness Court (SO 568058) near Coleford. Such sites are rare in upland Dean. The combination of documentary research and field archaeological techniques built up much information: it was an unusual manor created c. 1225-31 in assorted lands. There were associated fishponds. Deseretion of the moated site probably took place in the 17th century but manorial interest was still extant in 1831. The findings have been published as a monograph, Preliminary Report on Breckness Court.

Industrial

Major accumulations of bloomery slag was recorded at three sites in Coleford which probably date from the medieval period, and it was possible to equate these with documentary evidence. Two 17th century charcoal blast furnace sites received attention: that at Flaxley dating from 1680 to 1807-12 continues to be excavated by members of OSIA with local help. At the Lydney furnace, 1604-1810, an investigation has been started by teachers and pupils of Whitecross School. Trench excavations have revealed a bewildering variety of foundations. Work is to proceed with MSC-funded archaeological teams. Dean Heritage Museum continues to excavate its site at Camp Mill, Soudley. Excavations in 1983, as yet unpublished, are claimed to have found evidence for the 17th century Soudley Forge but excavation over 1984-85 does not support this. Most of the recent work has uncovered the remains of the 19th century forge and foundry operated by Samuel Hewlett. On the scheduled site of Whitecliff Furnace, Dean Heritage Museum Trust began exploratory excavations in February 1986 using a MSC-funded workforce. The archaeology is overseen by a group representing Whitecliff Furnace.
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Trust, Crickley Hill Archaeological Trust, and Dean Heritage Museum Trust.

Conservation

It is heartening to be able to record some progress in this field. At Whitecliff Furnace the Whitecliff Furnace Trust of the Historical Metallurgy Society effected a further and costly stage repair to the fabric of the furnace stack. Stage 4 repairs are planned for 1986. At the 19th century ironworks complex of Darkhill the unrestored 1976-78 excavation by MSC teams continued to cause concern. During late 1985 the Forestry Commission backfilled most of the site and consolidated some of the above-ground structure. The site finds were donated by the Commission to the Historical Metallurgy Society. It is hoped that this will add impetus to the production of a rescue report on the site as none was published by the original excavators.

At the Boughspring Roman Villa near Tidenham an unfinished private excavation was cleaned and recorded by MSC-funded teams from the Crickley Hill Archaeological Trust and backfilled (published in this review, pp. 37-40). Nearby at Lancaut the disintegrating remains of the church continue to alarm local residents. Much groundwork by the planning department of Dean District Council led to a public meeting which appointed the Lancaut Church Preservation Group to investigate the possibilities of preservation. The church lies within the scheduled Deserted Medieval Village site and poses many problems, including the age of the surviving fabric.

The contribution by Dean Local History Society members to most of these projects has been considerable. In addition they undertook one project themselves at Lydney Park, where the only iron-ore mine of proven Roman date in Britain was collapsing in its entrance section. This was dealt with and the mine is now safe and sound for the future. One last project requires mention, not so much from a conservation viewpoint but from a rescue one. During the late 1950s the Society's President Dr. Scott-Garrett dug his last site at Park Farm near Lydney. This was a settlement of Roman date, but with the death of its excavator was never published. A report is now in preparation based on Scott-Garrett's field notes and photographs. At the same time, some of the finds have been located and are being processed. Publication is expected during 1986.
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FOREST OF DEAN: SITE REPORTS

Bryan Walters

Romano-British Site at Great Howle Farm  SO 61281871

This site extends over some 50 acres, chiefly in Herefordshire on the north side of Lodge Green Brook. Only a cursory examination was possible in the autumn of 1985 because of replanting. However, surface pottery finds make it necessary to reassess what was previously reported (New Regard p. 29). Although rim forms had formerly been noted that were popular throughout most of the Roman occupation period, none of the pottery recovered in the autumn could be dated later than the late 2nd/early 3rd centuries. A limestone-tempered large storage jar of local native ware could be late 1st century. The total absence of black burnished ware among the surface finds is noteworthy.

Some 150 kg of bloomery slag, including furnace tap-hole-trapped slag, was recovered from the surface in the immediate area of the pottery finds. A considerable quantity was also noted north-east of the site towards a spring. Baked clay was also recovered.

Nedge Cop, Bearse Farm, St. Briavels.  SO 5675805832

Nearly 1,000 flints in two concentrations dating from the Mesolithic to the Early Bronze Age have now been retrieved from the site. More than twenty Mesolithic microliths and blade cores confirm the site as the most important yet discovered in Gloucestershire west of the Severn. Romano-British pottery rims from the same field suggest a nearby Romano-British site. They include a 2nd-century flanged bowl and beaker, and a late 3rd-century black burnished cooking pot.

Barnfield, Eastleach Court  SO 59421508

Further confirmation (see New Regard p. 22) of a Romano-British presence in the vicinity is the recent find of a centenionalis of Constantius II minted at Trier in AD353 with, on the reverse, the large chi-rho Christogram and SALUS AUG NOSTRI. The condition of the reverse is about Good Fine and might suggest a deposition date of c. AD365-375.

A short summary of sites discovered in 1985 in the Forest of Dean with those from the county as a whole will appear in the Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society Vol. 104 under Archaeological Review No. 10. - Editor.
BOUGHSPRING

A Moderately Sophisticated Romanised Farmhouse

Briony F. Walker

Site Location

The Boughspring Roman Villa (ST 57560974), a scheduled ancient monument (County Monument No. 437), is some 6½ miles from Lydney, Glos, and 4 miles from Chepstow, Gwent. It is on a small plateau between the 100m and 125m contour lines, overlooking the Severn.

History of Archaeological Research

There have been three phases of work on the site. The first excavations, by a Mr. Price, who appears to have discovered the site in or possibly before 1969, revealed the walls of a building 20m x 14m. (a short account of this work, written by Mr. N. P. Bridgewater, appeared in Glevensis 7, p. 7). Work recommenced in 1976/7 under Mr T.E. Wilcox aided by apprentices from the army college at Chepstow, and continued intermittently until early 1985.

In the third phase, the Mobile Field Team – a team of six under the auspices of the Crickley Hill Archaeological Trust M.S.C. Agency – spent four months from August to November 1985 on site. After vegetation clearance and general tidying, a survey was carried out, followed by partial backfilling to preserve the more vulnerable features from frost damage. The site is to be fully backfilled shortly. The villa building has received most of the attention and very little work has been carried out in the surrounding field where ancillary buildings might be expected to lie.

The Villa Building

The building was found to be well preserved with walls remaining to heights of over 1m in places: at the rear, a bank has helped preserve one wall to a height of 1.4m. The walls were of sandstone blocks (possibly quarried from the site itself) 25 x 20 x 15cm on average, built to a uniform width of 0.6m above foundation level, and slightly wider below. Sandstone was also used to pave part of the front corridor. From the roofing tile debris around the site it is apparent that both stone and ceramic tiles were used, but it is not possible to say which rooms were covered with which.

The villa covers an area 29.5m x 13m, divided into six or seven rooms; the exact number is uncertain because of the shortage of evidence as to the nature of the range at the rear of the building, which may have been a lean-to arrangement or another corridor linking other rooms as yet undiscovered.

The plan shows a main living/working area consisting of two rooms, one with a mosaic floor, and a corridor (probably a verandah-like arrangement with half stone walls and an open or wooden upper part), divided into three areas – an entrance hall and two working areas. To this were later added four wing rooms and a range to the rear. Three of the wing rooms had underfloor heating, and two of them (the adjoining areas to the left of the main doorway) may have been a simple bath-house; the *opus signinum*
floors were robbed out in antiquity revealing the floor supporting stacks and the hypocaust channels. The fourth wing room appears to have been in the kitchen area as there are the remains of an oven-like feature in the eastern corner.

A notable feature of the villa is the main doorway – an attractive arrangement 4.8m high (or wide?) overall and consisting of two large sandstone blocks (each 1.5m x 0.5m) as the main door and doorframe supports, flanked by two incised corner stones 0.5m square and 0.3m thick. Inside, either side of the entrance are three courses of rectangular ceramic tiles (each some 4cm thick) capping three or four courses of the usual stone walling.

Only one mosaic was uncovered. It has been ascribed to the late 2nd century (David Neal, personal communication) on the basis of its geometric design which goes through 16 rotations of pattern. (Full account by David Neal forthcoming in Britannia).

**Find**

Ceramics and painted wall plaster made up the bulk of the finds; there were also several coins. Few personal artifacts were recovered. Both the ceramic and numismatic evidence are from the later occupations of the villa – the late 3rd and early-to-mid centuries. The pottery is a late Roman assemblage from a villa obtaining its specialist kitchen and tablewares from Dorset (Black burnished ware BBI all forms) and Oxfordshire (red and brown colour coated wares), and its coarsewares locally.

**Conclusion and Summary**

The Roman Villa at Boughspring - a relatively simple construction - was no more than a moderately sophisticated farmhouse. It prospered and developed from a simple 2nd century two-roomed structure with a front verandah/corridor (the mosaic provides this foundation date) into the present arrangement by the late 4th or early 5th centuries when it was abandoned. The owner's increasing wealth is indicated by the addition of a bath-house and other wing rooms and by such 'typical' Roman features as underfloor heating and painted wall plaster.

A full archive report, with all the site documentation and finds, has been deposited with Gloucester Museum.
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- Walls above foundation level.
- Opus signinum floors.
EXCAVATION AT WORTLEY NEAR WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE

FIRST INTERIM REPORT - 1985

David Wilson

Introduction

The site of a probable Roman villa (fig 1) was accidentally discovered in 1981 by the land owner, Mr Paul Cory, when digging a post hole. Local enthusiasts subsequently opened a trench c. 7m x 4m x 1m, exposing the badly-damaged pilae of the hypocaust system of parts of two rooms. The trench also produced considerable quantities of painted wall-plaster, tesserae and tegulae, as well as pottery, some small finds and bone.

In 1983 and 1984 archaeologists from the University of Keele drew plans and sections of the earlier work, carried out contour and resistivity surveys, and, as far as possible, collected together the finds which had become dispersed. In addition, in 1984 the topsoil was removed from an area abutting the original trench in order to determine the limits of the structures. Following this, it was agreed that the University would adopt the site for long-term excavation and training, and that the finds and archive would eventually be housed at Stroud Museum, within whose "parish" the site falls.

The first four-week training excavation season took place in mid-1985.

Excavation (Fig 2)

Some 184m² has now been opened, including the 1981 trench, and although this is only a small area a number of structures and features can be identified. Parts of two rooms, I and II, have been exposed; all the upper structural features have gone, and all that remains in the excavated areas are the badly reduced pilae, the damaged opus signinum on which they stand, and part of an external wall abutting the opus signinum to the west. The two rooms are separated from each other by a remnant of an internal dividing wall and a slight drop in floor level. There is a marked contrast in the construction of the hypocaust pilae between the two rooms, those in I being of conventional tile, but those in II being made of possibly re-used tegulae, filled with mortar and placed on top of each other. The latter construction is reminiscent of room XXIX at the Rockbourne (Hants) villa, where imbrices were used in a similar way. Room II is probably later than I, but the lack of records from the 1981 excavation makes impossible any dating distinction from finds between the two rooms.

A medieval robber trench (F51) had been dug on the eastern side of rooms I and II, removing the external walls and most of the internal cross-wall, damaging or removing the pilae and destroying large parts of the opus signinum sub-floor. The latest pottery on this robber trench can be dated to the 11th - 13th centuries. Apparently associated with the robbing is a shallow linear feature (F19), perhaps a barrow-run. Abutting the eastern edge of F51 is a line of tegulae in their fallen position.

Further, as yet unexcavated, robbing took place along the southern end of Room II (F21). Also at this southern end the destruction debris includes
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quantities of sandstone roofing slabs rather than tegulae, indicating another building.

Along the eastern edge of the excavation is a linear feature (F16) c. 2m wide and c. 7m long as so far excavated, and c. 20cm deep. This feature had been levelled up with destruction material including pieces of tegulae, stone, mortar and some fragments of painted wall-plaster. None of the pottery from this feature so far is later than the 4th century.

At the southern end of the site is a so-far unexcavated feature (F57). Cleaning out of a large animal hole in this (F36) suggests F57 is of some depth and contains Roman destruction debris.

Post-Roman features of the site, other than the robbing, include F44, F45, and F60, all associated with a modern land drain; post-holes F30 and F39; and the stakehole F32 within F30.

**Finds**

A copper alloy strap-end with the incised decoration of a peacock was found. This was possibly one of a pair and is most likely of Roman date. It is very closely paralleled by the design of two peacocks separated by the Tree of Life on a bronze buckle in the British Museum, from Stanwick, Yorkshire, dated to the early 5th century.

The pottery from the Wortley excavations falls into two main groups, Roman and medieval, and within these groups a further division has been made into Type Fabrics, using as an example the Gloucester Excavation Unit Type Fabric Series. Apart from a few sherds of samian ware, all the Roman pot found so far appears to belong to the later Roman period, c. AD240-400, and includes colour-coated sherds from the Nene Valley as well as from the Oxford area. Imports can be recognised in the amphora from Spain, and the two examples of Rhenish wares, as well as in the samian ware which has come from central Gaul. The coarser Roman fabrics are represented by Dorset black-burnished ware (BB1) but there is a much larger quantity of micaceous sandy grey ware, evidently produced in similar forms to BB1, which may have its source somewhere in North Somerset. At present no sherds have been recognised which could post-date the Roman period and pre-date the 11th century. The medieval pot can be distinguished by its oolitic content, and this has been divided into fabric types which now need to be checked microscopically. We are indeed indebted to Dr Jane Timby for the great help given in fabric recognition.
PITTVILLE, CHELTENHAM (SO 95352335)

Bernard and Barbara Rawes

Evidence for Romano-British occupation was found while planting three fruit trees in the back garden of 104 Evesham Road. The finds were at a depth of c. 60cm at the junction of brown sand disturbed in the last century and the surface of the undisturbed natural yellow sandy clay, and consisted of potsherds from at least 10 vessels, including two of samian ware. Also present was much iron slag and a small bent bronze pin (possibly Roman).

The site appears to spread into neighbouring gardens and under the large Victorian houses. It would have been near Wymans Brook, now dammed to form Pittville Lakes, on a gentle sandy slope. Apart from a possible site at Benhall (Glevensis 14, p.61), this is the first evidence for Roman settlement in Cheltenham.

DORMY HOUSE HOTEL, WILFERSEY (SP 119381)

Peter Ellis

During construction work at the Dormy House Hotel in 1978 workmen uncovered and reported two skeletons and a visit was therefore made by the author, a field officer with CRAAGS. The Hotel, formerly a farmhouse, is constructed across the rampart of Willersey Hill fort on its south-eastern side (RCHM 1976, p.128). Extensive work had been carried out on the site including the refurbishing of farmhouse buildings for residential accommodation and the construction of a below-ground conference centre. To the west of the farmhouse a 3m deep excavation had taken place and evidence of trenches cut across the line of the hill-fort defences was also noted.

The skeletons of an adult and a male child c. 8 years old had been unearthed in a service trench on the exterior of the hillfort (identification by Dr. R.F. Everton). On the west side of the main excavation a pit was recorded in section, at least 1.2m deep and filled with dark brown clay and stone. No dating evidence was recovered for the feature. A slight inner bank 0.6m high and 14m wide was recorded in the field to the west of the hotel and this was obliquely cut by the development. The bank was composed of earth and stone with three large stones visible at its base. Flint flakes were recovered from the ground disturbed by the building works and a broken flint blade. The hillfort bank was cut to allow access to the building site south of the hotel but the section had been graded and returfed.

Figure: Trevor Pearson
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In 1980 the manager of Stockwell Farm, Mr T.M. Berington, kindly allowed CRAAGS to record earthworks to the south-west of the farm before the field was levelled. The farm itself occupies the site of the shrunken medieval settlement at Stockwell. The previously noted but unrecorded earthworks represented by banks and closes were recorded in a hachure plan with the assistance of Bruce Levitan. The remains comprised parallel banks, some with inturned terminals, up to 1m in height but generally between 0.25 and 0.5m high, which formed slight terraces following the natural west to east slope. Some possible house platforms were recorded. Whether the banks represent, in part at least, plots to the rear of house sites to the north was impossible to determine since quarrying had taken place along the north side of the field. The quarry in the centre of the field appeared to cut the bank systems which continued to the south apparently terminating in an east-west running bank to the south of the field. A visit was made following levelling of the part of the field north of the central quarry but no further information was recorded.

Figure: Trevor Pearson
ROYAL GEORGE HOTEL, BIRDLIP

Christopher J. Guy

Small-scale excavations were carried out behind the Royal George Hotel in September and October 1985 prior to the building of an extension. The work was funded by Whitbreads plc and HBMC. A hoard of over 200 Roman coins had been found c. 1890 (Butler & Butler 1958), and in 1917-18 the remains of Roman walls, painted wall plaster, tile and pottery were found beneath a mound next to the lawn (Baddesley 1923). The site is close to the line of Ermin Street at the top of the Cotswold Scarp (SO 925144).

Two trenches – one 2m square, the other 2m by 1m – were excavated by hand and the stratigraphy recorded. Beneath 5 layers possibly representing building operations to the rear of the hotel was a loam deposit, 6, c. 15cm thick, which contained charcoal flecks and fragments of limestone. Aligned north-south in the centre of the trench below this was a linear feature, 7, c. 300mm wide and 50-80mm deep. The sides of the feature were straight but the base was irregular. The fill was similar to layer 6. Feature 7 cut a layer of light brown soil, 8, with fragments of limestone and occasional flecks of charcoal. This layer was up to c. 150mm thick. It overlay a layer of dark brown sand and clay with pebbles, 9, c. 180mm thick. Underlying layer 9 was a layer of clayey loam, 10, c. 170mm thick, with occasional fragments of limestone and tile. Below 10 there was a deposit of limestone rubble and tile in a matrix of mid-brown loam, 11, up to 300mm thick. This deposit sealed a layer of yellow-brown silty clay, 12, up to c. 60mm thick. Below there was a layer of pea-grit above a cobble surface, 13. The limestone cobbles were c. 60mm in diameter, set in a matrix of brown/yellow silt and pea-grit. The surface sloped slightly from east and west towards the centre of the trench and immediately overlay natural.

The other trench, II, some 10m to the east, produced in its upper layers similar evidence of recent activity, including a water-pipe trench. Under this, sealed by layer 3 was a layer of brown loam, 4, c. 300mm thick, with a concentration of limestone rubble and tile at the bottom. Layer 5 consisted of pea-grit and brown loam, 70mm thick, with a lens of compact yellow mortar on the north side. Layer 5 sealed a surface of small pebbles and limestone fragments, 6, the east edge of which over-lapped the west edge of a cobble surface, 7, at the east end of the trench. Immediately below was the natural limestone.

Although these two trenches provided no evidence of walls or floors, the presence of the cobble surfaces and of limestone rubble and tile suggests that there was a Roman building in the vicinity. The relative levels of the cobble surfaces in the two trenches suggest that the land was terraced in the Roman period. The height of natural in a machine-dug test pit 2m south of the first trench, at 450mm below ground surface, supports this theory.

The pottery from the site was examined by Dr. Jane Timby. Only the lowest layer in the first trench contained exclusively Roman pottery, probably 2nd-3rd century in date. Layer 11 contained in addition to Roman pottery six medieval sherds. In layer 10 the proportion of 11th-13th century pottery was about 50%. The proportion of medieval wares in layer 9 was higher, at c. 65%, and the Roman pottery was more 4th century in date. Post-medieval pottery was present above this.
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Generally the pottery within each layer was mixed, and there was no continuity within the pottery sequence. The majority of the Roman pottery was Severn Valley, black-burnished, south-west slip or grey wares. Only layer 4 in the second trench contained pottery and this was a mixture of Roman, medieval and post-medieval sherds. The small finds were:

1. Edward I period jeton (from trench I, layer 6). (Forthcoming in TEGAS Vol 103)
2. Coin. ?Constantinopolis, 330-341 (from trench I, layer 9)
3. Coin. ?4th century (from trench II, layer 4)
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PORTWAY ROMAN SETTLEMENT: A SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE

Bernard Rawes

Interim reports on this site appeared in Glevensis 11 and 12 and a full report was published in the Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society Vol 102 (1984). Although the main conclusions remain unchanged, greater emphasis can now be given to certain aspects of the varied finds. This is best done with some photographs (opposite) not previously published. For a closer study of the features see the TBCAS report.

1. This aerial view taken c. 1973 shows the straight line of the Portway with the embankment of the M5 in the foreground. The circled area indicates the extent of the Romano-British occupation. The excavation produced evidence that the Roman layout was based on lines parallel to the Portway, suggesting continuity of field boundaries back to the Roman period (possibly late 1st century). This does not of course imply continuity of occupation. The distant circle is the Wheatridge Romano-British site on another parallel field boundary. The significance of these boundaries is discussed in TBCAS 102. All this area is now covered by housing.

2. This telephoto picture was taken from Robinswood Hill in 1977 when the building development was approaching the excavation (centre). The white line in the background is the road over the M5. The area of the spring and pond lay beyond the dead elm in the Portway hedge, where another hedge goes up the slope at right angles.

3. On this photo the head of the deity is angled to show the defacement and how it has been broken off from a larger sculpture or monument. The significance of these points was discussed in the main report.

4. The gullies of the polygonal building were interpreted as slots for timber panels, which are more suitable for creating flat surfaces than stakes and wattle-and-daub, as used on circular houses. This is supported by the lack of daub found in the immediate area, and the clearly differentiated deposits in the gullies between dark soil and yellow clay, showing where the panels had been; as opposed to any sign of stake holes. The feature which was probably the setting for a central pole for the structure can be seen.

5. This shows the cobbled courtyard or assembly area*. The stones are worn and much compressed, possibly by animals. One track goes west across a ditch to the entrance of the polygonal building. Another could be postulated going north to meet the Portway 'Roman' cobbled tracks near the pond area, thereby connecting the shrine to what may have been a sacred area by the spring.

6 & 7. These photographs* show the cobbled trackways with cartwheel ruts which lay on either side of the Portway hedge. Horseshoes were found embedded in the clay and among the cobbles which had been thrown down to prevent the wheels from sticking in the mud. The evidence strongly suggests horses losing their shoes while struggling to pull heavy loads out of this swampy area. Clean sand from the gravel area on the Wheatridge covered these

* The scale on the ranging rod is in 20cm divisions.
tracks, probably deposited in the early Middle Ages, so that one can postulate a late Roman 'Portway'. Photograph 7 shows Roman levels under the cobbles and over the water course.

Many varied activities took place on the site over the years. Originally the site may have had official sponsorship, hence the presence of RPG tiles and some regularity in the layout. Possibly pottery and other more perishable objects were made there. Much iron slag was found at the eastern end of the site. One or two horseshoes appeared to be roughouts or unfinished. Was there a farrier's site here? The religious nature of the site should not cause surprise: most settlements paid respect to a deity or were involved with a cult. Usually these matters are difficult to identify from the archaeological evidence, but at Portway we were lucky enough to find the defaced head and the polygonal shrine. From this evidence, various objects such as the decorated spoon, the decorated boss, the lead roll, and even the unusual pot with a lead spout, may have had ritual significance. And always we should remember those many objects in wood etc which must have perished.

All these facets build up a picture of a farmstead within the territorium of Glevum set up at a spot which may already have had some ritual associations, and which developed into a settlement serving as a wayside shrine for travellers and traders between Gloucester and the Cotswolds.

ooo0000000


Where better to start than the back cover? "This book" as the blurb says, "is the first fully illustrated survey of life in the town from its beginnings as a Roman fort to the present. It concentrates on the daily life of ordinary people and their surroundings, set against the great events of national importance that have taken place in the city", and very well it does it, too. The range of illustrations is broad indeed; the County Library's Gloucestershire Collection has been raided to very good effect, some familiar archaeological drawings reappear, there is judicious use of imaginative reconstructions, and contemporary photographs capture aspects of Gloucester's current appearance - sadly, all in black-and-white, though the delightful 1806 watercolour of Westgate Bridge on the front cover goes some way towards making up this deficiency.

All these pictures don't leave much room for the words, and the text does not claim to be more than a survey. That said, the author makes every sentence count. Interesting facts abound: even though Glevensis readers probably already know what a scaramasax is, they probably don't know that the Gloucester murder rate in 1221 was 50 times today's. Each chapter has a handy list of 'what-to-see' suggestions related to the period in question. As an introduction to Gloucester, it is ideal: I wish it had been available 15 years ago when I first arrived in the county, but it could not have been written then: a glance at the principal sources shows how much of the material is new (or newly interpreted): over three-quarters of the main titles are post-1970, and are a telling tribute to the cumulative wealth of information that recent archaeology has brought to the history of Gloucester.

JH
BRONZE AGE ARROWHEAD FROM KILKENNY, DOWDESWELL

Alan Saville

In May 1986 Mrs S. Rogers and her daughters Lucy and Sara discovered a flint arrowhead lying on the surface of disturbed ground at the higher, southern, end of the Kilkenny viewpoint area (SP 00321838) in the parish of Dowdeswell on the Cotswolds just to the south-east of Cheltenham. The find was reported to Cheltenham Museum, where it is now on loan, and in view of its intrinsic interest it is described here.

The arrowhead is nearly complete except for a modern break at the tip. The surface is discoloured to the grey-white colour characteristic of cotswold flint artefacts, except at the break where the fresh grey flint is exposed. The arrowhead is very carefully worked and may originally have had serrated lateral edges to judge from the present appearance of the left-hand side. Present length: 41mm; original length: ?44mm; max. width: 31mm; max. thickness: 5.5mm; weight: 5.2g.

Although an isolated find without context it is nevertheless of particular interest because of its type. The convex base profile formed by the regularly curving shape of the tang and both barbs permits classification as a so-called 'Conygar Hill' type of barbed-and-tanged arrowhead (Green 1980, 51 and fig. 46), a type of 'fancy' arrowhead relatively rare on the Cotswolds (Green 1980, 240-241), and examples as large and finely-finished as the Kilkenny find are extremely rare. 'Conygar Hill' type arrowheads are dated to approximately 1800-1200 BC in radiocarbon years (early/middle bronze age) and can be shown in parts of England to occur in association with food vessel pottery but not with beakers (Green 1984).

One might expect an arrowhead such as the Kilkenny example to have served as a grave-good accompanying a burial deposit within a round barrow. The findspot is just over the field boundary north of the field in which lies the St. Paul's Epistle round barrow (SP 00231818) but there is no present evidence, and apparently no previous record, of another barrow in the immediate vicinity of the findspot, and it must be admitted that the location of this find remains somewhat enigmatic.
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EARLY MEDIEVAL POTTERY FROM UP HATHERLEY

Colin Wallace

Dr Alan Vince has identified a rim sherd from the CHAT Mobile Field Team's exploratory excavations at Manor Farm, Up Hatherley (Glevensis 19) as being in Oxford Fabric AC. This early medieval ware is a limestone-tempered ware of the 10th to late 12th (or later) centuries (described in Haldon 1978, 115). The sherd from Up Hatherley was from a bulbous cooking pot (Haldon 1978, fig. 18.20).

The context for this pottery was greenish clay (14) surrounding a stretch of limestone walling (F3) in trench 4, interpreted as a retaining wall for a drainage ditch around the site (McAndrew and Walker 1985, 39). Medieval and more recent pottery also came from this context. It has already been remarked that there were more imports of pottery into Gloucestershire in the 10th century than in the 11th (Vince 1984,254), but Oxford Fabric AC has not so far been noted this side of the Cotswolds (other limestone-tempered fabrics are listed in Vince 1984, 282-64).

A site where it may occur, in the light of the Up Hatherley piece, is Winchcombe, but here "no detailed thin-section comparisons have been made between the Winchcombe ware and other limestone-tempered wares on the Cotswolds (except those described here) ((TF41/Cirencester-type/Minety/ Luveden Ware/TF561))" (Vince 1984, 263).

The pottery report on the 1977 rescue work at Winchcombe does however show that while the most common 10th/11th century ware was a new fabric not recognised elsewhere (74% of the early medieval pottery), Winchcombe also received pottery from the Gloucester and Hereford areas, Stamford, Hampshire, Wiltshire and the East Midlands in this period (Vince 1986, 113ff). Vince (ibid, 122) notes the pottery links between the towns of Gloucester, Hereford, Worcester and Winchcombe, adding that "it would be interesting to know whether 11th century rural sites also received pottery from some distance..."
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Looking back over the past year one is struck by the number of changes there have been - we have lost old friends and gained new ones.

Four members have left the Committee, all having left the district. First we lost Alison Allden, Gloucestershire's County Archaeologist, who has taken up a post at the British Museum. Alison joined GADARG when she came to Gloucester and became a valued member of the Committee. We are pleased that Alison's successor, Jan Wills, has also joined GADARG and will be coming onto the Committee.

Another loss was Christopher Henshaw, editor of Glevensis for three years. In spite of moving to Reading, Christopher managed to bring out Glevensis 19, before handing over to Bernard Rawes who has been 'holding the fort' until this AGM.

In the autumn Michael Bennett, for many years our vice-chairman, announced that he was moving to Newark-on-Trent. Michael was also our projectionist and had loaned his equipment to GADARG most generously. We are very grateful to Michael for his years of support and faultless projection at lectures, not only for GADARG but also for other archaeological meetings in the county.

GADARG now had the problem of raising money to buy lecture equipment. Members rallied round and, thanks to individual donations, sale of fruit and plants and donation of lecture fees, about £50 was raised. We also applied to the Gloucester Lotteries Fund and were awarded £200 which has enabled us to buy a Zeiss Ikon projector, long-throw lens and control lead. More equipment is still needed, so fund-raising efforts will have to continue.

Nigel Spry took over as vice-chairman from Michael, only to receive an overseas posting for which he and Jo left in February. I am sure all members will join in sending Alison, Christopher, Michael and Nigel our good wishes for their future and sincere thanks for all they have contributed to the Group.

Some go, some come, and it is good to report the arrival in Gloucester of Malcolm Atkin, appointed by the City as assistant director of archaeology. Malcolm joined the group and was co-opted onto the Committee soon after his arrival. His first excavation, carried out under far from ideal circumstances, on the defences of the Kingsholm fort, was very successful. It has added greatly to knowledge of the early Roman phases at Kingsholm. GADARG will look forward to supporting Malcolm in any way it can in his future work.

A matter of considerable concern to GADARG has been the tragedy of the destruction on the site of Gloucester Castle by the building of a new reception area at the Prison. Letters of complaint were sent to many bodies not only by GADARG but also by other organisations concerned with archaeology. Fortunately the stir created has resulted in a new awareness of the problems in cases where government departments are involved. I quote "British Archaeological News" issued by the Council for British Archaeology: 'Andrew Saunders (Chief Inspector of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings) commented that HBMPC is taking two lines of action
- "The first is specific to Gloucester and involves the enhanced scheduling of the city's deposits ... secondly we are pursuing with the Home Office the possibility of ensuring that we know of all their proposed developments!"

GADARG is represented on the Gloucester Community Forum and wrote to the City Planning Officer pointing out that there was no mention of archaeology in the 1985 Gloucester Plan Review. As a result the Review was amended and now contains the following: "where development proposals affect a site of archaeological importance, access for excavation will be required for a reasonable period prior to commencement ... to avoid any more delay in development, contributions towards the cost...will be sought from developers within the sites defined on the plan and on other sites of archaeological interest elsewhere as the occasion arises." We hope these policies will result in better protection for archaeology in Gloucester. In planning matters GADARG has objected strongly to proposed development within the Condicote Henge scheduled monument (twice) and has commented on other proposals in Gloucester and elsewhere.

The Secretary was delighted when James Rachael agreed to become Meetings Secretary. He has arranged the varied and interesting series of winter lectures, ranging widely in subject from 'The Bristol Mummy' by Phillippa Jones, through 'The Origins of Roman Towns' by John Bestwick and 'Whittington Stone Quarries' by Arthur Price to 'The Story of Masonry in Gloucester Cathedral' by Tom Dorington, the Cathedral Mason. All these meetings were well attended.

Two seminars, followed by a field visit to Frocester, on the subject of fieldwork, were not so well supported. The weather was against us on the day of the field visit, but those who braved the fog learned a great deal about the Frocester landscape from Eddie Price who shared his intimate knowledge of the area with us. The excavation by Eddie on the Frocester Roman site has continued for another season and has again been supported by diggers from the Group.

James Rachael also arranged visits to Littledean Hall, the Crickley Hill excavation, and to Silchester. This coach outing on a Sunday was very popular. We had a fine day and were shown round the excavation of the basilica by Dr Michael Fulford. A visit was also made to the amphitheatre. On the return journey we called at the Ditches, Woodmancote, where Dr Stephen Trow showed us his excavation revealing the unexpected find of a Roman cellar attached to the early villa within the hillfort.

Thanks are due to James for arranging all these meetings and excursions, also to other members of the Committee for their support. In particular I would like to thank our Treasurer, Gerry Watson, who not only deals with our finances so ably (as you will hear), but also organises the distribution of newsletters and addresses all the envelopes. This is quite a task as Group membership remains steady at about 200.

The Committee is always seeking new ideas and initiatives and welcomes any suggestions from the membership. Please approach the Secretary or any other Committee member if you have anything you would like to see arranged or changed. It is your Group.

Barbara Rawes
GLOUCESTER AND DISTRICT ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH GROUP

Income and Expenditure Account for the Year ended 28 February 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531.45</td>
<td>Members' subscriptions; donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>Contributions at meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.34</td>
<td>Tax repayment on covenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.72</td>
<td>Stationery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.79</td>
<td>Duplicating: printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.05</td>
<td>Postage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>Lecture Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.40</td>
<td>Room hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>Subscriptions, application fees to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510.96</td>
<td>Glevensis: costs/sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales &quot;Glevensis Alehouses&quot;; lottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projector: equipment/donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest on bank deposit account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess exp.</td>
<td>Over income:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£55.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excess income over expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£1538.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at 28 Feb 1985</td>
<td>£498.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess income over</td>
<td>Cash in bank current account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expenditure</td>
<td>Cash in bank deposit account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£160.98</td>
<td>Cash in hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£659.91</td>
<td>£659.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(signed) G.H. Watson Honorary Treasurer 28 Feb 1986

Examined and found correct (signed) G.L. Bishop 6 March 1986