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Introduction

Tewkesbury, a small town in north Gloucestershire, lies at the junction of the Severn and Avon rivers in attractive English countryside, framed by the Malvern Hills to the north-west and the Cotswolds to the east. The town attracts large numbers of visitors, drawn by the famous abbey church and the remarkable array of historic buildings which line the three main thoroughfares. The fields south of the town were the location in 1471 of conflict between the opposing factions in the Wars of the Roses. The battle, although significant in English history, was incidental to the town’s development. The survival of the historic buildings is partly the result of economic recession in the 19th century when the town’s growth faltered and its population fell, a decline accelerated by the town being bypassed by the Birmingham to Gloucester railway. In the late 20th century Tewkesbury reasserted its administrative and market role, and it has grown with the building of new commercial and housing estates, particularly to the north and north-east. Since 1974 the town has been the centre of a local government district comprising 54 parishes in the north of the county. It has been these initiatives for the town’s revival as an administrative and economic centre which have necessitated recording of the historic environment associated with an earlier era.

Several hundred metres south of Tewkesbury abbey church, an obelisk stands on the edge of a scarp above a playing field. The monument (Fig. 1) carries four brass plates, one of which identifies the location as that of ‘the renowned Holm Castle’, formerly the residence of the earls of Gloucester. In the 1540s John Leland, during one of his tours through England, visited Tewkesbury and to the south-west of the abbey observed the remains of what he believed to be a castle and a residence of the earls of Gloucester. Tewkesbury Borough Council’s plans in 1974 to build new offices on Holm hill led to archaeological rescue excavations in the same year and in the winter of 1975. This report is a description of the results of those excavations and attempts to place the excavated evidence into an historical context.

Norman influence was felt in Tewkesbury soon after the Conquest. Robert FitzHamon, who took part in the extension of the Conqueror’s authority in south Wales, received the manor from William II and founded the abbey, consecrated in 1121. The earldom of Gloucester was formally created by Henry I for his illegitimate son, Robert, who married FitzHamon’s daughter.

*Very shortly after submitting his report Alan Hannan died unexpectedly, on 28 August 1997.
Fig. 1. Tewkesbury: principal historical and topographical features.
and emerged as the main protagonist against King Stephen. Robert was to secure the monarchy for his nephew, the future Henry II. In 1140 Waleran, count of Meulan, attacked Tewkesbury and burnt the ‘magnificent house’ of the earls of Gloucester. Bristol castle had been the caput of the honour of Gloucester but Robert’s son William was forced to surrender the castle to Henry II. This loss remained contentious between king and earl for several generations to come. The Clares, who had gained the honour of Gloucester through marriage, led the baronial opposition to King John, culminating in the Charter. Through the honour of Gloucester, the Clares were elevated to an inner circle of the most powerful barons in the realm. Throughout the 13th century they exercised this influence, often in opposition to the monarch. Pending resolution of their claim to Bristol castle, the Clares adopted Tewkesbury as a caput and its abbey as a family mausoleum. The calamity at Bannockburn in 1314 when Gilbert de Clare, the 9th earl of Gloucester, was killed in a reckless charge and died without a male heir precipitated the break-up of the family estate. Gilbert’s sisters, each inheriting a third of the vast holdings, were the target of aristocratic suitors but on the death of Margaret’s husband, Hugh de Audley, in 1347, the earldom became extinct.

The Report and Archive

A principal objective of this report has been to describe the structures and finds from the excavation, assess their significance, and demonstrate their association with the historical evidence for Tewkesbury manor, from the Domesday Survey of 1086 to the observations by John Leland in the 1540s. The broader aim has been to argue that Tewkesbury’s development as a medieval town was a result of patronage by secular lords, leading to its first charter of incorporation in 1575. To achieve this the report begins with an outline of the layout, fabric, and history of the medieval town and of the documentary evidence for the manor. The second part considers the feudal context of the remains at Holm hill, the nature of the honour in Anglo-Norman England, the emergence of Tewkesbury as the caput of the honour and the descent of that honour from the pre-Conquest period until its dismemberment in the 14th century. The third part describes the structural, artefactual and environmental remains found on Holm hill, including those of the major buildings; a timber hall of late Anglo-Saxon date, the ailed hall which replaced it but which was burnt down, and a first-floor hall, erected in the later years of the 12th century. Emphasis has been given to the evidence which reflects the high status and the military and equestrian character of those holding the manor, ranging from weaponry and ornaments to decorated stone mouldings and floor tile. The final part considers the meaning of the archaeological evidence and outlines the most plausible hypothesis for the evolution of the town and the adoption of urban characteristics after the Conquest under the direction and influence of successive Anglo-Norman earls and their successors.

In accordance with current practice in archaeological management, the finds and records from the excavation, together with the results of subsequent research, have been the subject of an assessment, the main purpose being to frame research objectives and to propose how these could be fulfilled. The assessment identified the evidence which should be studied and published, together with that which should be held for the future as a ‘research archive’. Because the report preparation and the publication have been selective, information will be held in archive for further research. The finds, site records, and other documentation prepared during the post-excavation process but not included this report are referred to when necessary and are catalogued and held by Tewkesbury Borough Council.
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PART ONE

TEWKESBURY

Sources

There are numerous sources for the history of Tewkesbury. Some bear directly on the abbey, the manor, and the town itself but many have as their subject persons or events incidental to Tewkesbury’s history. Whatever their value, the researcher must acknowledge a greater or lesser debt to these sources, the most important of which are mentioned here.

The earliest documentary source is the Domesday Survey of 1086. Monastic annals, surviving from a number of houses, provide an account of events and individuals from a religious perspective. Compiled in the 13th century, the annals for Tewkesbury abbey (published in the 19th century: Luard 1864) begin with the death of the Confessor and end abruptly in 1264. Apart
from listing successive abbots and bishops and recounting monastic events, they also include the births, marriages and deaths of the secular patrons and emphasise the close connection between the abbey and the earls of Gloucester, its greatest benefactors. From the end of the 12th century the Pipe Rolls and other records of the Exchequer and Chancery contain references to royal expenditure and actions relating to the manor and town of Tewkesbury. These provide a record of events and transactions and they increase in number (and value) in the later medieval period. For the battle of Tewkesbury in 1471 an eye-witness account (Histore of the Arrivall of Edward IV: Bruce 1838) left little doubt (in Yorkist terms) of the prevailing circumstances and course of the conflict. The account is also of interest in that it did not refer to the existence of ruined buildings south of the town at that time.

In the 1540s John Leland, the king’s antiquary, included Gloucestershire in two of his itineraries. His description of and commentary on ‘Theokesbyri’ (Toulmin Smith 1909) provide the first ‘modern’ and ‘historically conscious’ summary of the history and topography of the settlement. Of particular interest is Leland’s observation of the site of the manor of Tewkesbury—his account of this and its relationship to the archaeological evidence from Holm hill is a preoccupation of this report.

William Dugdale’s Monasticon Anglicanum, published c. 1675, includes an account of the foundation and history of Tewkesbury abbey. The merits of Dugdale’s work have been assessed recently (Pepin 1980) and, although its importance as a source was acknowledged, attention was paid to the extent to which Dugdale and others have drawn, without due acknowledgement, upon a manuscript compiled by Francis Thynne (d. 1608), Lancaster Herald. Pepin highlights the emphasis given by Dugdale and later authors to the influence of ecclesiastics in the history of the abbey at the expense of the role of its secular patrons, a reading apparently not supported by close scrutiny of Thynne’s work. The History and Antiquities of Tewkesbury by William Dyde was published in 1790, with a second edition in 1798 and a third in 1803 (Elrington 1976). Dyde, a Tewkesbury printer and bookseller, obviously relied upon the research of earlier historians, from Leland to Atkyns and Rudder, and his history also included a map of the town. The History of Tewkesbury (1830) by James Bennett followed the general layout of Dyde’s history (which Bennett curiously failed to acknowledge). Not only did Bennett, also a local printer and bookseller, command the sources of local history but he demonstrated a prescient skill in his awareness of archaeological evidence and its value. In its own account of the borough of Tewkesbury the Victoria History broadened the range of topics to include social and economic history, as well as secular and ecclesiastical architecture and the origins and development of the settlement (V.C.H. Glos. 8, 1968). As the millenium, the beginning of which was marked by the Domesday Survey, approaches its end it has been fortunate that the town’s history has been served so well by the Victoria History. This section acknowledges a great debt to its researchers. Most recently a general account of the history of the town (Jones 1987) has proved informative and helpful.

Outline History of Tewkesbury

Tewkesbury has a significant location west of the Midlands plain and on the edge of the Welsh March. The settlement developed at a position on the river Severn navigable by sea-going vessels and on occasions fordable. The Avon meets the Severn at Tewkesbury and it represented a major river crossing on an ancient land route along the east bank of the Severn. The early settlement grew at the centre of an agriculturally rich area, bounded by the Cotswold scarp to the east and by the undulating landscape of north-west Gloucestershire beyond the Severn. The parish of Tewkesbury lies along an outcrop of Jurassic Lower Lias which manifests itself in alternating bands of clay and stone, the clay being pale blue/grey in colour. The settlement
originated in the Oldbury on an alluvial deposit of sand and gravel and the highest point of this deposit was the focal point of settlement from early prehistoric to Roman times.

Evidence for the beginnings of settlement has been outlined in a recent report on excavations in the town, principally in the Oldbury (Hannan 1993). Prehistoric activity from the earliest period was evidenced by finds of pottery and flint, with the strong possibility of settlement in the Bronze Age indicated by the tightly flexed Beaker-type burial at the Cinema site. The earliest recorded sub-division of the land took place in the Iron Age. The area, being at the confluence of two major rivers and on a major land route, was attractive to settlement, and there was a variety of habitats to exploit—the rivers, their banks, the valley environments, and the high ground beyond, particularly to the east. There was occupation in the Roman period but the character and scale of the settlement remain uncertain. Settlement remained centred on the Oldbury until the end of the Roman period but may have continued well into the Anglo-Saxon period. Situated on the road roughly halfway between Gloucester and Worcester, there is no evidence that Tewkesbury was urban in the Roman period. It is more likely that it was a large rural settlement with several major buildings for the administration of the area. This conclusion is supported by the evidence of Romano-British roof tiles and opus signinum from levels at the Cinema site.

Throughout the middle and late Anglo-Saxon period, Tewkesbury was in the territory of the Hwicce, a sub-kingdom of Mercia, an extensive region ruled over by a succession of powerful figures culminating in the reign of Offa which ended in 796. In the late Anglo-Saxon period Tewkesbury was an estate centre and was recognised as such in the Domesday Survey. A grouping of manors which emerged in the Anglo-Norman period as the honour of Gloucester can be identified before the Conquest. Swein, a son of Godwin, earl of Kent, held a lordship which included Gloucestershire in the early 11th century; Brictric, son of Algar and known as Brictric Meaw, a great thegn under the Confessor (Doubleday and Brownbill 1926), held Tewkesbury with many other manors in counties in western and midland England. The position of the settlement in ecclesiastical terms is less certain. According to the Domesday Survey there was a church in Tewkesbury at the time of the Conquest and it was later claimed that a monastic foundation had been established there in the early 8th century.

Waste and destruction took place at Tewkesbury in the aftermath of the Conquest and the proximity of the Welsh and their border territory, for long unstable, could have been responsible. The manor was held for a time by Queen Maud (d. 1083) who established a market in Tewkesbury. Robert FitzHamon, a loyal follower of the Conqueror, was rewarded by William II with the manor of Tewkesbury and other estates and he founded an abbey at Tewkesbury. The abbey church, consecrated in 1121, was primarily a mausoleum for FitzHamon and his successors and it came to dominate the settlement. FitzHamon's son-in-law, Robert, the illegitimate son of Henry I, was the first to be styled 'earl of Gloucester' and, while he had a residence at Tewkesbury, chose to strengthen his power-base in western England by establishing his caput at Bristol. In the late 12th century Tewkesbury was acquired by Henry II's son John, who continued to be a frequent visitor to the town after he became king in 1199. Under successive lords, including the Clares in the 13th century, the town flourished, expanding to the limits imposed by the flood plain of the rivers. The extent of lordly patronage is reflected in the buildings of late medieval and Tudor date which have survived to the present.

Tewkesbury's history is inextricably linked to the river and a key factor in the settlement's relative economic success was its position on a navigable river with an agriculturally rich hinterland. Grain grown in the region could be sold in the market and shipped to Bristol and the south coast of Wales, just as malt, textiles and leather made in the town could also be sent down river. Boat building must have been prominent; in 1401 Tewkesbury was asked to supply a barge
for Henry IV's fleet. By the 1600s half the vessels trading on the river between Gloucester and Bristol were of Tewkesbury origin and they carried not only grain but also malt and hides to Bristol. By her establishment of a market in Tewkesbury Maud fostered the town's existing trade which the earls of Gloucester were later to encourage through its markets and fairs. A charter of Bordesley abbey 1180 referred to a standard measure of grain with the phrase 'a bishop's quarter at Tewkesbury' (V.C.H. Glos. 8, 141).

Despite evidence of conspicuous commercial activity, there were few references to 'merchants', the earliest being to 'John the Spicer', who was licensed in 1334 to export grain. Numerous trades and crafts were practised in the town. Butchers, bakers, brewers, and innkeepers supplied provisions. Vintners mentioned in the 12th and 13th century were probably linked to manorial viticulture south of the town. The textile industry was represented by dyers and fullers; 'Walker's Lane' was named as such by 1257. Tanners were recorded in the 13th and 14th century and the abbey had a tanning house. In metalworking there were smiths, lorimers, cutlers and ironmongers. Braziers' Lane is first recorded in the 14th century. The most frequently recorded metalworkers, from the 12th to 14th century, were goldsmiths. Also recorded were a glasswright in 1327, a Slater in 1350, and a bell founder in the 15th century. By the 16th century the cloth and leather trades were predominant, being represented by dyers, cappers, tailors, drapers, shearmen, carders, and a woolwinder on the one hand and by tanners, skinners, glovers, saddlers, but mostly by shoemakers on the other (ibid. 142). Surprisingly, given the quantity of malt being shipped to Wales in the 16th century, there were references to only one maltster but he was presumably one of many; brewers and coopers must also have been numerous. The survival until 1975 of an 18th-century malt house on Oldbury Road was an apt reminder of an industry with its origins in the medieval period. Rope Walk among Tewkesbury's many narrow lanes recalled an essential adjunct to ship building and operation. Last but not least, William Camden in the later 17th century noted the manufacture of 'smart-biting mustard', probably a cottage based industry which had earlier achieved a measure of fame in Shakespeare's Henry IV, Part 2.

The battle of Tewkesbury is of particular interest because of its location relative to the conjectured site of the manor of Tewkesbury. The battle, fought in 1471 on the southern edge of the town, was an episode in the bloody confrontation between the houses of York and Lancaster. Although of national significance in this internecine conflict, it was of minor consequence to the town itself. That the battle took place at Tewkesbury was almost by chance; Edward IV had pursued the Lancastrians from southern England and was concerned to engage Queen Margaret in a decisive battle before she could effect a link with Jasper Tudor on the Welsh side of the Severn river. Margaret's force, under the command of the duke of Somerset, was compelled by Edward to give battle. The outcome was decisive in Edward's favour and put paid to Lancastrian ambitions for another decade and a half. The rout of the Lancastrians, and the ensuing carnage associated with their attempt to escape, culminated in the confrontation between Edward's forces and the abbots of Tewkesbury over those who had sought sanctuary in the abbey church.

Although the precise location of the battle remains uncertain, the general area is not in doubt. The battlefields' register, published by English Heritage in 1995, quoted extensively from contemporary sources but emphasised that the only stage of the battle's location over which there was consensus was the pursuit of the fleeing Lancastrians through 'Bloody Meadow' (Fig. 1). All that can be safely deduced from contemporary chronicles is that the battle was fought to the south of the town, with the Swilgate to the east, Southwick Park to the south, the Mill Avon/Severn to the west and the abbey fishponds to the north. Within that area there remains uncertainty over the initial disposition of the forces and the extent to which contemporary buildings, ruins, and enclosures influenced the opening position. There is also doubt as to the pattern of
medieval roads. The *Histoire of the Arrivall of Edward IV* made no mention of formal field fortifications nor the use by the Lancastrians of the surviving walls of an abandoned castle. Subsequent writers have placed the Lancastrian position confronting Edward IV within the general area outlined above, either at the northern limits with Somerset’s troops deployed across the highest point of Holm hill, or to the south with both armies aligned on either side of a moated site, the so-called Margaret’s Camp (Fig. 1). The strongest case for a northerly disposition (Blyth 1961) asserted that Holm hill was the site of the ruins of the ‘castle’; although plundered for decades for stone it would have been chosen by Somerset for the benefit offered by the low-standing remains of any walls. The recovery in 1974-5 of a large number (72) of arrowheads from the topsoil, including several of late medieval form, supports Blyth’s view that the west wing of the Lancastrians was grouped along the crest of Holm hill and while arrayed there came under an opening bombardment from Edward’s force at the bottom of the slope.

Expansion at Tewkesbury in the post-medieval period was constrained by the topography, the surrounding land being prone to flooding, and also by the open field bordering the town to the east of Oldbury Road. Population growth could only be accommodated by increasing the density of settlement, leading to the notorious overcrowding which led to outbreaks of cholera and other diseases in the mid 19th century. The bypassing of the town by the Birmingham–Gloucester railway contributed to a decline in its fortunes, but also led indirectly to the survival of many early buildings. Only in the last two or three decades has Tewkesbury, with some vigour, reasserted its role as an administrative, manufacturing and commercial centre and exploited its great potential for tourism and leisure interests.

**Church and Abbey**

The chronicle of Tewkesbury Abbey printed in Dugdale’s *Monasticon Anglicanum* is based on manuscripts assembled over several generations of scholarship and starts with the tradition of a hermit called Theocus dwelling on the bank of the river Severn. The chronicle asserted that in the reigns of Æthelred and Æthelbald (674–757) two Anglo-Saxon noblemen, Dodo and Oddo, endowed a small monastic community in that place with lands in Stanway, Toddington, and Didcot and that the house was of sufficient importance c. 800 to be the burial place of Brictric, a king of the West Saxons. The Danes, who wintered at Gloucester in 878, were attributed with destruction in the area and there can be little doubt that this included Tewkesbury, where the monastery was twice burnt down. At the end of the 10th century there were only 5 monks at Tewkesbury, the house having been made a cell of the abbey of Cranborne (Dorset) by Hayward Meaw. Hayward’s son, Algar, was succeeded by Brictric, who was dispossessed of his lands after the Conquest. William II as reward for loyalty gave Tewkesbury to Robert FitzHamon who founded a new abbey there and, in the words of the abbot of Cranborne, ‘dedit praedia huius domus monasterio de Theokesbirie’ (Pepin 1980); from 1102 Tewkesbury was the ‘mother’ house to Cranborne. The new abbey was consecrated in 1121, after its founder’s death.

The Domesday Survey is unambiguous and records a church at Tewkesbury in 1066. The *Victoria History* suggested that the Anglo-Saxon church at Tewkesbury was a minster church and not a cell of Cranborne. The phrasing of the Survey implied that the church was not dependant on another religious house. Whatever its status the location of the pre-Conquest church is unknown. The contrary views as to the nature of the pre-Conquest church are not easily reconciled. It is reasonable to assume that Tewkesbury, already the centre of a large estate, would have supported a minster church and its dependencies rather than a monastic cell with several monks. Historical accuracy is rendered more elusive by the suspicion that the monks of
the later medieval period sought to enhance the antiquity of their abbey by chronicling a pre-Conquest history. The abbey acquired extensive holdings throughout the Middle Ages; at its dissolution the value of its possessions in the town, known as 'Tewkesbury Barton', was greater than those of the honour of Gloucester and the value of its estates was £1,595. If the value of the fines and profits on farming and tanning were included, that figure would at least double. When Abbot Wakeham formally agreed to the dissolution on 9 January 1539 Tewkesbury was one of the last houses to be dissolved. Ironically, the buildings declared superfluous by the Commissioners, including the church, survived and were purchased in 1542 by the 'bailiffs, burgesses and commonality' for £483 (V.C.H. Glos. 8, 136; Bennett 1830, 124).

The abbey church was built on a cruciform plan with an apsidal choir and an ambulatory opening upon a series of polygonal chapels; a nave with north and south aisles; a south transept with an apsidal chapel; a north transept with two chapels, and a two storied north porch and a central tower. The church was reputedly built of (or faced with) stone from Caen and roofed in lead. A high proportion of the church survives from the original 12th-century construction, including the arcades of the nave and walls above them, the piers of the choir arcade, the transepts, the west front, the porch and the massive tower. There was a division in the nave which separated the monks' church from that of the lay people. The external wall of the south aisle bears the traces of the demolished claustral buildings. Almost nothing is known of the layout of the Anglo-Norman conventual buildings. Despite centuries of ground disturbance inside and around the church, particularly in the digging and investigation of graves and the translation of human remains, there has been little systematic recording of features below ground. Recently however (1992) the cutting of a water-pipe trench across Abbey Meadow was accompanied by rescue recording which demonstrated that the foundations of the monastic buildings were intact and were associated with large quantities of pottery, floor tile, and decorated stone of 13th- and 14th-century date (Hoyle 1993). There were some additions to the abbey church in the 13th century but the main embellishments belong to the 14th century, when the nave and choir roofs were rebuilt at a lower pitch; the aisles and ambulatory were reconstructed and polygonal chapels and the Lady Chapel (demolished in the 16th century) were added at the east end. On either side of the ambulatory are the funeral monuments which include many of the secular patrons. The founder Robert FitzHamon was re-buried in 1241. Other burials include Hugh Despenser the younger (d. 1326) and his wife Elizabeth (d. 1359), Hugh, Lord Despenser (d. 1349), Edward, Lord Despenser (d. 1375), Guy de Bryan, Lord Bryan (d. 1390), Isabel Beauchamp, countess of Warwick (d. 1439) and Edward of Lancaster, Prince of Wales and son of Henry VI who was killed at the battle of Tewkesbury. Of all the funerals that took place in the abbey church, it would seem that those of the Clares were the most celebrated and the sepultures the most ornamented. If this was the case they appear to have suffered most from the general destruction and spoliation wrought at the times of the Dissolution and the Commonwealth when funeral monuments were a particular target of the reformers. The Clare graves are now marked by 19th-century brass plates set in the choir floor.

Topography of the Town

This section comprises a geographical analysis of the form of the town, preceded by some general observations. The topography, the factors which influenced it, and any contradictions are explored further in part four of this report. The settlement originated in the Oldbury on an alluvial deposit of sand and gravel and spread outwards, mainly to the south, from the highest point. In the medieval period the centre of gravity of the settlement shifted southwards and focussed on the abbey. Its construction at the southern end of the settlement must have had an
impact upon the late Anglo-Saxon settlement and influenced the form of the medieval town. The town’s western boundary was provided by the Mill Avon, a canalisation of the Avon river which was probably associated with the layout and construction of the abbey and which separated the town from a broad expanse of the Severn flood plain (Fig. 1). The medieval town comprised three main thoroughfares which converged at the Cross. Church Street arcs south-westwards from the Cross, the beginnings of a curving sweep which carried the route past the monastic precinct, through the abbey’s industrial area, across the Swilgate river and south to Gloucester. Barton Street extends in an easterly direction from the Cross and forms a continuation of the line of Church Street. High Street, the longest of the three and aligned almost S-N from the Cross swings sharply westwards at its northern end to cross the Avon river on its way to the Mythe. Barton Street, so named in 1257, took its name from a ‘barton’ or grange of the earls of Gloucester which may have stood in the west angle of the junction of Chance Street and Barton Street and provided stabling for the king’s horses in 1203 and 1236. In the medieval and early post-medieval period these thoroughfares were built up along their length, the spread of settlement determined by the extent and frequency of river flooding and by the existence until 1811 of open-field land bordering Oldbury Road.

There is a series of minor thoroughfares which link the three main roads; some of these are at right angles and originated as access corridors to the rear of tenements. Several have a curious form. St. Mary’s Lane is a semi-circular street opening at two places onto Church Street. Its position, almost opposite the entrance of the abbey precinct, suggests that the space it enclosed may once have been open and free of buildings. Another unusual alignment is that of Tolsey Lane which opens onto High Street near the Cross. The irregular course of the lane is in contrast to the nearly straight lines of other lanes which extend the length of tenements fronting the main street. Its form has the appearance of a field lane, shaped by the boundaries of the furlongs of an open field. One view of this road pattern would suggest that Oldbury Road was the original line of communication through the settlement, from the prehistoric period onwards. At its south end it narrowed to enter Nelson Street (recently widened) which continues for only a short distance before entering Barton Street. The Victoria History did not endorse the idea that the main road south originally proceeded along Oldbury Road and continued southwards along either Gander Lane or Mill Lane. It has also been noted that the alleyways extending away from the main thoroughfares do not proceed from the frontage in a straight line but often display a slight turn at one or both ends. These and other observations are now the subject of a more critical and analytical approach.

*Historical Analysis of the Plan Form of the Town* by Dr. Keith Lilley (Department of Geography, Royal Holloway College, University of London)

Over recent years, geographers and archaeologists have used large scale Ordnance Survey plans as a basis for reconstructing the topographies and topographical development of medieval towns and cities (Baker and Slater 1992; Lilley 1994a). The approach they have adopted involves the morphological analysis of town-plans, drawing on the rich legacy of work by M.R.G. Conzen (1960; 1968), which has since proven useful for contextualising and managing archaeological evaluations and excavations (Baker et al. 1993; Lilley 1995). The plan-analysis approach has yet to be applied to Tewkesbury, and so the contribution offered here should be regarded as only preliminary in nature. The purpose is to provide some context for the archaeology of Holm hill and to furnish some general ideas about the origins and development of medieval Tewkesbury.
The plan of Tewkesbury, illustrated in Fig. 2, embodies different patterns and forms of streets and plots. Subtle morphological differences between these 'plan-elements' can be used as a basis for identifying conjectural phases of early urban growth. By distinguishing differences in the configurations of street systems and plot-patterns, it is possible to define distinct morphological regions or 'plan-units'. The idea is that each of these individual plan-units represents a separate stage of urban development. Such successive phases of urban development have been identified from town-plans elsewhere, in the plans of the largest medieval urban centres such as Coventry right down to those belonging to minor market settlements that proliferated in England during the High Middle Ages (Lilley 1994b; 1995). Tewkesbury's town-plan, like all others, is a form of 'text' that has been authored by individuals and groups throughout the past and which may therefore be read as a narrative of urban change. To understand the meanings of this 'text' requires further historical information, derived both from written and unwritten records, from documentary sources and the archaeological record. Initially, though, attention here will be focussed on revealing what the plan itself can tell us about the influences that shape the historical development of Tewkesbury.

Tewkesbury's town-plan is arranged along two primary axial-streets, one running on a SW-NE alignment and the other running almost due north. Not only are these two axial streets differently aligned, they are also quite different in form. The principal axis seems to be Church Street and Barton Street, which are both rather sinuous and fluid in form. In contrast, High Street is much straighter and appears more artificial in character. Indeed, the streets that comprise Tewkesbury's plan may be divided into two types; those that have curvilinear forms and those that are geometrical. The straight alignment of High Street is matched by Oldbury Road running parallel to the east and also by Chance Street. These three streets together give the northern part of Tewkesbury's historic core a geometric design, which usually is indicative of planned origins. The curvilinear streets, apart from the Church Street-Barton Street axis, are small back-lanes that stretch around the rear of plots, e.g. St. Mary's Lane and Tolsey Lane. To help make more sense of these different forms of streets it is necessary to look also at the forms of associated plot-patterns. On this basis it is possible to identify four distinct plan-units in Tewkesbury's plan, each of which deserves some comment.

Starting at the southern end of the town, Church Street pierces an area of plots and streets that, overall, display strong elements of curvature. This area (plan-unit I) contains Tewkesbury abbey, situated on the south side of Church Street. On the northern side of the street, just to the north-east of the abbey precinct, is St. Mary's Lane. This curious narrow lane forms a loop and encompasses a series of plots that stretch from a slightly broadened section of Church Street as far back as the Mill Avon. The curvilinear outline of the lane is reminiscent of monastic enclosures often identified in the plans of towns in the British Isles and commonly associated with the sites of early churches (Blair 1992). If St. Mary's Lane does reflect a fossilised monastic enclosure of this sort, it presumably relates to a religious foundation that pre-dates the present Norman abbey. The broadened stretch of Church Street, which bisects this suggested early enclosure (and so supersedes it?), may well indicate the site of a later market place, situated outside an entrance to the abbey precinct. Certainly, the plots fronting Church Street indicate that this part of Tewkesbury was closely associated with the abbey and they were perhaps originally created to serve it.

Further curvilinear outlines can be identified in the topography of plan-unit I. For example, the course of Swilgate Lane is curved, as are the back-fences of plots fronting Church Street to the south-west of the abbey church. These alignments can be linked together to form a second, much larger enclosure than the one indicated by St. Mary's Lane (the boundary of this second 'enclosure' is the plan-seam of plan-unit I). The present abbey precinct is, of course, a third...
Fig. 2. Tewkesbury: plan-units I–IV based on form and pattern of the town’s streets and property boundaries (coloured green).
enclosure. However, these 'enclosures', delimited by the curving nature of plots and streets around the abbey, do not together make up a coherent, uniform pattern, but instead, overlap one another. The multiplicity of these different curved features is perhaps a reflection that each of the 'enclosures' has a separate origin, with each representing a certain stage in Tewkesbury's ecclesiastical history. According to 12th-century sources, there are traditions of a monastic foundation at Tewkesbury dating to the early 8th century (Binns 1989, 87). The long-standing continuity of Tewkesbury as a place of Christian worship would help to corroborate the view that the morphology of plan-unit I reflects changing patterns of pre-Conquest monastic settlement.

To the north of the area of plan-unit I, the Church Street axis curves towards the east and, at the junction of High Street, becomes known as Barton Street. This road junction, the Cross, is the focus of an area (plan-unit II) which is markedly different in form from other parts of Tewkesbury's town-plan. The Cross is a slightly broadened stretch of street fronted by three series of plots, each with rather regular forms. The broadening of this street and its name reflect its former function as a market place, but in character the street is quite unlike the large market places that were often located outside the gates of pre-Conquest abbeys in Midland towns, and it is also unlike the large cigar-shaped market places so characteristic of medieval new towns, such as Burford, Moreton-in-Marsh and Chipping Campden, established in the Cotswolds during the 12th/13th centuries for livestock markets (Lilley 1994a; Slater 1996; Beresford and St. Joseph 1958). Instead, the relatively unpretentious dimensions of the Cross are more akin to commercial streets developed during the 11th century, such as Earl Street in Coventry and High Street in Southampton (Lilley 1995; Lilley forthcoming).

The plots fronting the Cross on its western side stretch back to the Mill Avon and extend along the street from St. Mary's Lane to Tolsey Lane. The latter leaves High Street close to the Cross and then curves away northwards behind plots fronting High Street (Fig. 2). On the east side of High Street, the curving alignment of Tolsey Lane coincides with a primary plot-boundary which is itself aligned with East Street. Taken as a whole, this alignment represents a prominent morphological boundary, and it may reflect a pre-urban feature. Certainly, this boundary demarcates a clear difference between the geometrical forms of streets (and plots) to the north and the more fluid forms of streets and plots of plan-units I and II to the south. The plots fronting the north side of the Cross, in the angle between High Street and Barton Street, have had their tails sub-divided to form derivative plots which front High Street. However despite these sub-divisions, the surviving primary plot-boundaries within this corner-block show that the original principal frontage was not High Street but Barton Street. This series of primary plots extends eastwards along Barton Street as far as Chance Street. Like the plots on the west side of the Cross, those on the south are quite deep and curving. The overall homogeneity reflected in the form of these plot-patterns, together with the broadened street-space, suggests that the area of plan-unit II was established to accommodate and stimulate increased commercial activity in Tewkesbury. One possible context for this development is the 'new market' and borough, which, as Domesday Survey records, was founded by Queen Maud soon after the Norman Conquest.

To the east of the Cross, along Barton Street, the plots are shallower and more rectilinear than those in plan-unit II. The back lane, East Street, is indicative that this part of Tewkesbury was planned and formally laid-out, although the sinuous form of Barton Street spoils the overall geometry of plan-unit III. In contrast the orthogonal nature of High Street and its associated plots show much clearer indications of geometrical design. High Street itself, as noted above, is straight along its whole length and is artificial in appearance. At its northern end, the straight alignment stops and High Street takes on a more fluid form. This pattern is also followed by
Oldbury Road which runs parallel with High Street and acted as a back lane for plots fronting the street's eastern side. The implications of this are that High Street and Oldbury Road were at some time subject to realignment and straightening, in association, perhaps, with the laying out of plots along its length. The plots fronting High Street are a little deeper on its west side and stretch up to a back lane (a continuation of Tolsey Lane) called Back of Avon, which follows the river side. The dual river- and street-frontage would once have made these particular High Street plots lucrative assets for their property holders. Indeed, the close arrangement between river and road is surely no coincidence, and High Street was perhaps designed with the idea that a river-side frontage would enhance the commercial position of Tewkesbury as a small port situated mid-way between Gloucester and Worcester at the confluence of the Severn and Avon rivers. In this sense, the straight cut of the Mill Avon and the realignment of High Street could have been contemporary developments.

Although High Street, Back of Avon and Oldbury Road share consistent geometries, the associated plot-patterns reveal subtle signs that they were laid out over former arable strips. The slight 'S'-shaped curve of some of the boundaries of plots along High Street, particularly at its northern end, is reminiscent of the curve seen in fields of ridge and furrow. To the east of Oldbury Road there are further indications of relict field patterns in the arrangement of field boundaries shown on the Ordnance Survey plan (cf. Fig. 2). The impression given by these pre-urban features is that the area to the north of the curving boundary delimited by Tolsey Lane had once been a large arable field which subsequently formed the basis of a phase of urban development. Urban property would have been a more profitable use of land than cultivation, especially along the river frontage when High Street was laid out. In this case, perhaps the relict field lands to the east of Oldbury Road were also earmarked for urban development but were not built over? If so, this would help account for the similarity between the geometrical form of East Street (which contrasts with the form of Barton Street, as stated above) and the straight alignments of High Street and Oldbury Road. Equally, the straight alignment of Chance Street, which runs parallel with High Street, could originally have been part of this same scheme but as it has no associated plot-series this street presumably remained undeveloped (at least until the 19th century when it became the focus of renewed building activity).

As a whole it looks as if the area north of plan-units II and III was deliberately reconfigured for urban development, but that only one part of this area, the lucrative riverside frontage and High Street, was properly built up. Also, the geometrical forms of the streets and plots appear to have been imposed on an earlier landscape of field-lands, which in part survived. The development of this area was evidently designed to encourage further urban activity at Tewkesbury. As such, this area (plan-unit IV) perhaps represents a stage of urban expansion belonging to the 12th century, since this was a period when geometrical and orthogonal town designs became more common in England, especially during the years following the civil wars of Stephen's reign (Lilley forthcoming). Moreover this temporal context relates to a surge of interest in Tewkesbury, particularly under John, as is indicated in the possible rebuilding of the first-floor hall at Holm hill and the construction (or refurbishment) of a bridge over the Avon at the northern end of High Street (close to but possibly not on the site of the present King John's bridge). If these interpolations are accepted, then the likelihood exists that High Street (plan-unit IV) was established under royal authority. Likewise, following Domesday, the area of the Cross (plan-unit II) was also probably a royal initiative. In effect, therefore, Tewkesbury's town-plan seems to have been shaped initially by ecclesiastical control and subsequently, by royal interests. Although speculative in nature, these observations provide a conjectural view of Tewkesbury's early topographical development; starting with a small religious community and settlement in the pre-Conquest period (plan-unit I) which, after the Norman Conquest, was successively extended,
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first by Queen Maud in the late 11th century (plan-unit II), and then twice in the 12th century (plan-units III and IV), latterly perhaps by King John.

This preliminary analysis of Tewkesbury's town-plan offers a spatial framework in which to place the fragments of its archaeology. The temporal dimensions of this framework can clearly be argued with, but with relatively little written evidence relating to Tewkesbury's early history, the morphology of the town's streets and plots becomes a valuable means of supplying an additional source of historical information. Such an approach, so often under-utilised, relies on the synthesis of cartographic, documentary and archaeological material, which in turn depends on continued inter-disciplinary co-operation. Unfortunately, the continued erosion of Tewkesbury's historic urban fabric has left some large holes in its plan. As is so common in small towns, modern redevelopment has eradicated the lines of ancient plot-boundaries. Efforts to safeguard these formerly conservative and long-lived townscape features are needed, since their removal spoils for ever the intrinsic quality of town-plans as a source of information for geographers and archaeologists alike.

The Manor of Tewkesbury and 'Holm Castle'

Agriculturally, the medieval manor was a large demesne farm. At the Conquest there were 12 ploughs and 50 serfs on the farm; by 1220 the bailiffs of the earl of Gloucester had to account for 28 plough teams. The inquisition post mortem of Gilbert de Clare in 1296 indicated that the demesne comprised 740 acres of arable, 200 acres of parkland, 176 acres of meadow and 50 acres of pasture. From this time on however demesne farming was in decline and Elizabeth Despenser (d. 1409) was the last owner to hold demesne in hand. By the end of the 15th century the income of the manor was generated from rents, fines, tolls and perquisites of the courts.

The location of the site of the manor of Tewkesbury, a principal concern of this report, has attracted attention since John Leland described the remains of a 'castle' at Tewkesbury in the 1540s. Leland wrote of 'a castel caullid Holme' having stood south-west of the abbey, a location corroborated by his description of the site relative to the Mill Avon, 'passing harde ther by Holme castelle goith into Severne'. Leland observed that the site included ruins of the bottoms of walls. The attempts to identify the site of 'Holm castle' have, on occasions, become enmeshed in the other Tewkesbury conundrum, the location of the battle of 1471. Leland described the castle lying to the south-west of the abbey; such a direction took a line through Holm hill. Dyde (1790) believed that earthworks in the fields south-east of the abbey now known as the Vineyards were connected with the battle. Bennett (1830; 1840), despite his reading of Leland, argued that the earthworks recorded by Dyde were those of Leland's 'castle'. In the Vineyards he observed trenching in 1821 and the discovery of 'a quantity of rubbish and mortar, many painted bricks, and also large solid masses of common bricks and stones' in 1826. In connection with the 'shelving banks' cut through in 1821 he recorded 'hewn stones of great size and thickness, cemented with lime, sand and gravel, found 5 or 6 feet below the surface'. Spurrier (1886) proposed that the site of the castle was evident in the form of Wynyard Moats, the largest of the abbey fishponds in the low-lying ground south-east of the abbey and adjoining the Vineyards. These fishponds were fed by a leat in which there had been a weir to hold water back. A 14th-century account of the abbey kitchener records expenditure on a weir, iron work, carpentry, repairs to walls, on wages and gratuities for the servants of the weir, and on the purchase of fish for stocking (Blyth 1961). North (1890) described a visit in 1884 to the 'rising ground facing the west end of... the Abbey' with an old man who remembered stone and 'rubble' being got out of the ground in 1826; 'it was always said when he was a boy, a grand house once stood...'. Bazeley (1903) supported Spurrier's interpretation setting the castle in the abbey fishponds, the
Wynyard Moats, and explained that it was built there to command Gander Lane, 'the only entrance into Tewkesbury from the south'. Bazeley believed the battle of Tewkesbury took place around Margaret's Camp. A coherent view was advanced by Blyth (1961) who, while principally enlarging on a reconstruction of the battle, argued that Leland's observations left no doubt as to the location of the castle. He recounted the evidence in 1933 of 'an old Tewkesbury man' that here had been 'some sort of fort' on Holm hill, and also commented on the use (by a colleague and himself) of a metal probe on the hill to test the existence of masonry below the ground. Blyth disputed that the 'masses of common bricks' described by Bennett had anything to do with an early castle and argued that they probably related to the remains of a windmill built in 1742. Blyth then set out his hypothesis, with some conviction, for the castle and for the general appearance of the building which he believed had been erected to replace that destroyed by Waleran in 1140.

In connection with documentary evidence for the manor and its location, attention has often been drawn to a medieval miniature from a manuscript in the library of Ghent University which depicts the 'Battle of Tewkesbury' (Ghent MS. Archaeologia XXI, 11). It shows two opposing armed forces, with archers in the foreground and mounted knights just beyond them. Various individuals are wielding weapons, several lie dead, and archers are about to unleash arrows at point-blank range. In the distance stands a complex of buildings, marked by a high wall, above which there are round and squared towers, many with spires. In response to the suggestion that this miniature might record the appearance of the battle and town, caution has been urged: 'the representation has little documentary value... the artists of medieval miniatures display little sense of history... there is no reason to suppose that artists possessed any specialist knowledge about the subjects that they were portraying' (Pamela Porter, Department of Manuscripts, British Library, pers. comm.). It has also been claimed that a painting (for photograph see the project archive) in private hands in Tewkesbury in the mid 1970s depicts 'Holm castle' in the form of a Gothic ruin on high ground overlooking a river and a cottage. It was believed, by the owner at that time, to have been painted by Turner, who is thought to have worked in the area at the end of the 18th century. It has been noted that 'the painting is not the work of J.M.W. Turner. The handling is somewhat crude and completely unlike his, even during the early years of his development... it is likely that it dates from the period 1795 - 1805, when the late eighteenth century picturesque style was still favoured by professional drawing-masters and their amateur pupils... the drawing is by a competent but not specially able, amateur' (Ian Warrell, British Collection, Tate Gallery, pers. comm.).

Documentary Evidence for the Manor and Holm Hill, compiled with the assistance of David Aldred

An objective of the documentary research has been to investigate whether the excavated site was that observed by Leland in the 1540s and if this in turn was the site of the manor house of the earls of Gloucester. The documentary evidence that the site at Holm hill was the manor house of Tewkesbury is persuasive and is presented here.

1066-86: According to the Domesday Survey, in 1066 Tewkesbury was at the head (in capite) of a large manor comprising 95 hides, of which 45 were in demesne. The demesne supported 12 ploughs and 50 serfs. The manor also included 16 bordars who were living circa aulam, two mills worth 20s., a fishery, and a salt pan in Droitwich. The Survey also records that a church existed in Tewkesbury in 1066. For a county with a high proportion of slaves in its population
at the close of the Anglo-Saxon period (Darby 1954) the number of serfs is not unusual. Of greater interest is to speculate where they would have been living. An earthwork enclosure was created in the post-Roman period in the Oldbury and may indicate continued settlement on the higher ground to the north. In interpreting aula as used in the Domesday Survey caution has been advised since it may equate with ‘manor’ and have no reference to any architectural feature (Julian Munby, pers. comm.). If the bordars were indeed living around a ‘hall’, that building could have been the timber hall (Building A) excavated on Holm Hill. There was, however, a dearth of building evidence or finds (except a fragment of loomweight) of this date to link that hall to the Domesday evidence. The value of the manor was £100 but, as a measure of the dislocation at the time of the Conquest, it had dropped in value to £12. By 1086 when the number of demesne ploughs had increased by one, and the population of serfs by 22, the value had partly recovered to £50. Part of the rise in value was no doubt due to the grant of a market and the establishment of 13 burgesses on the manor by Queen Maud after 1066.

1121–1127: during this period numerous charters, of which c. 300 have survived, were enacted and witnessed at Bristol, Tewkesbury and elsewhere by successive earls of Gloucester, namely Robert, William, Henry II’s son John (later King John), Amauri de Montfort and Geoffrey de Mandeville (Patterson 1973). According to the chronicle of Tewkesbury abbey (cf. Atkyns 1712) Earl Robert ‘was wont every Sunday in the year to have the abbot... and 12 of his monks to dine with him’. As Robert, based in Bristol castle, carried the burden of keeping the Angevin cause alive in England, the opportunities for him to conduct hospitality on such regular basis in the later 1130s and early 1140s were perhaps minimal. The chronicle’s statement must reflect a situation wished for by the abbey rather than one that was real.

1140: Waleran, earl of Worcester, descended upon the Gloucester area and, amid general destruction, burnt down the magnificum domum of the earls of Gloucester at Tewkesbury (Chronicle of John of Worcester, ed. Weaver 1908). This event followed closely the return of Robert, earl of Gloucester, to England in 1139 and, while it may have been part of a wider disorder in Stephen’s reign, it could also have been a response to this further demonstration of opposition to Stephen. It is claimed in this report that Building B at Holm Hill was the house that was destroyed; there was some evidence from the investigation that parts of the structure had collapsed under intense heat.

1201–1211: the Pipe Rolls include a succession of entries for Tewkesbury linking King John and royal expenditure to buildings there.

1201: for chimneys and windows at Tewkesbury (Pipe Roll Soc. new ser. 14, 55)
1203: in repairing the houses of the king at Tewkesbury (ibid. 16, 41)
1205: in repairing the houses of the king at Tewkesbury (ibid. 20, 18)
1206: in repairing the houses of Tewkesbury and other manors 70s. 7d. (ibid. 20, 18)
1207: in repairing the houses and granges of Tewkesbury 75s. (ibid. 22, 219)
1208: in repairing the houses and the granges 17s. 6d. (ibid. 23, 114)
1209 (25 Nov): King John (was) at Tewkesbury this day (ibid. 29, 154)
1211: in the expenses of the king and queen on many occasions at Tewkesbury £22 0s. 0d.
... and in roofing the new kitchen and dovecot and in roofing the houses and in preparing brattices (bretachesis) £12 4s. 2½d... and in roofing one granary and larder and one chamber... and in mending the grange 20s. 2d. And himself the king in his chamber 100 marks (ibid. 28, 68)
These references reflect John’s apparent interest in the Worcester–Bristol region in particular and in England in general, in contrast to his father’s pre-occupation with responsibility for a far wider domain. The mention of the ‘houses of the king’ emphasises uncertainty over the origins of Building C at Holm hill. Since there would have been no large-scale rebuilding until after 1160 due to the disruption of Stephen’s reign, and given the dating of the later group of fragments of stone moulding, Building C could have been constructed in the last two decades of the 12th century. While Earl William maintained the honour of Gloucester from Bristol castle (until its sequestration by Henry II in the 1160s) there was no motive to construct a hall at Tewkesbury on the scale of Building C. The attainment by John of the honour of Gloucester after 1183 could have been the spur to the construction and it is perhaps significant that the Pipe Rolls for 1185 and 1187 record the inclosure of parkland south of the town. The Pipe Roll for 1211 indicates frequent visits of the king and queen to Tewkesbury and the reference to brattices could indicate the growing insecurity in which John found himself, following an attempted ambush near London in that year (Dr. D. Williams, University of Leicester, pers. comm.). One of the shortcomings of the investigation was the failure to examine a broad feature aligned NW–SE revealed by the resistivity survey (Fig. 5). It may have formed an enclosure to the main complex of buildings.

1241: the greater chapel at Tewkesbury was to be repaired where necessary and maintained, a glass window to be placed therein and another in the lesser chapel of the chamber; the second wardrobe of the chamber was to be repaired; and the other building there was to be suitably maintained and the land of the stew of Clare repaired (Calendar of Liberate Rolls, 1240–5, p 66).

1243: 10 marks were to be paid in expenses of a bailiff keeping the manor of Tewkesbury during that time; and £10 for the keeping of the castle of Clare for every year during which he had it (ibid. p. 169).

1296: Gilbert, earl of Clare, and Joan his wife jointly held the manor (of Tewkesbury) of the king in chief by the gift of King Edward I. It included the capital court, with its buildings, gardens, and dovecots, worth 15s. a year. There are there in demesne 740½ acres of arable land, and the acre is worth 6d. . . also one windmill worth 20s. (Abstracts of Inquisitions Post Mortem for Glos. 1236–1300, pp. 180–1).

1307: the manor includes a capital messuage, with a garden, a vineyard, and a vivary and it is worth 13s. 3d. a year. There is also a dovecot worth 3s. a year, a park with wild beasts, containing 80 acres, and it is worth in underwood 40s. a year. The sum of the demesne is by the year £21 6s. 8d. There is there a certain market town in which there are 70 burgesses, who hold 145 burgages (ibid. 1302–58, pp. 89–95).

1314: Gilbert de Clare, late earl of Clare, held in his demesne as of fee on the day that he died (23 June 1314) the manor of Tewkesbury of the king in chief by knight service. There is there one capital messuage which is worth 12s. a year with a garden, vineyards, and a vivary adjacent, also one dovecot which is worth 2s. a year . . . sum of the value of the whole manor with the borough £131 5s. 6d. (ibid. pp. 148–150).

The death in 1314 of Gilbert de Clare, without male heir, brought the fortunes of the Clares, as a great magnate family, to an abrupt end. Despite few references to the nature of the buildings at Tewkesbury, the Clares were at the zenith of their power, wealth and influence in the early
14th century; from this time the documentary evidence is ambiguous but points to a gradual deterioration of the buildings and impoverishment of the estate at Tewkesbury.

1327: in the said manor (of Tewkesbury) there is one capital messuage which is valued with a garden at 12s. a year, and a dovecot which is valued at 3s. a year (Public Record Office, SC 11/249).

1337: in this manor (of Tewkesbury) there is a capital messuage with a close adjoining, worth nothing over and above the keeping up of the houses; there is a windmill there which cannot be valued because it is in a bad state and so broken down that it cannot grind (Inquisitiones Post Mortem for Glos. 1302–58, pp. 262–4).

1349: a chief messuage and a small preserve is worth half a mark yearly and not more because the preserve is worth nothing; there is a certain rent of ‘La Home’, in the hands of customary tenants. There is a windmill which pays yearly 20s. (ibid. pp. 332–4).

1359: there is a capital messuage there, worth with the gardens, vines and vivary adjacent, half a mark a year ... dovecot worth 6s. a year ... a mill worth 20s. a year ... a certain farm there from La Homme from a piece of land in the hands of customary tenants (ibid. 1354–1413 pp. 3–4).

1375: Edward Despenser held from the king in chief, in his demesne as of fee, on the day he died, the manor and borough of Tewkesbury by knight service ... the buildings in the said manor are worth nothing a year beyond the reprises ... there is a dovecot there worth 40d. (ibid. pp. 95–6).

1433: half a meadow at Windmill hill was leased to Richard Chapman for 12d. Used to be 2s. 6d., decrease because in part destroyed by the road leading from the ferry to Tewkesbury ... a park stocked with animals ... other buildings within the manor occupied by lord's servant for use of the lord ... labourer hired for 4 days to repair wall of lord's stable and other buildings within the lord's manor of Barton ... door of great stable repaired and door of stable below the great hall there (Glos. R.O., D 184/M 16).

The declining values of the buildings need not necessarily reflect abandonment and decay as the value came from the produce of the land; the buildings themselves had no real value and their upkeep was a drain on resources. The burial of the Despensers in Tewkesbury abbey during the 14th century would suggest the manor house functioned as their base within the honour. The account of 1433 is much clearer in setting a terminus post quem for the site as a habitation. Later references indicate the site continuing its ancillary functions.

1471: if the Lancastrian position immediately before the battle of Tewkesbury was along Holm hill, facing down the slope away from the Swilgate, eyewitness evidence made no reference to the presence of ruined buildings or earthworks on the hill (Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recovery of His Kingdomes from Henry VI AD 1471, ed. Bruce 1838).

1504: among the lands in Tewkesbury named was Homehill, alias great garden (Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1494–1509, p. 371).
1528-9: according to an account of this year, the farm of buildings within Tewkesbury Barton manor includes a stable, 2 barns, a kitchen and cow house... a close called upper garden with a dovecot in the same, situate in close of the earls of Gloucester and a certain close vulgarly called le Home. Rents include 13s. 4d. for a close called outer garden. Rents allowed include that for a close called Holme Hill, alias Upper Garden, alias Great Garden. The accountant is charged with 53s. 4d. for pieces of old timber for a certain stable in the Barton which had fallen down for lack of repair. The said stable and kitchen had been devastated for some years (Glos. R.O., D 184/M21).

1540s: 'Theokesbyri...it standith in laeva ripa Avonae a good flite shot above the confluence of Avon and Severne. Ther is a greate bridge of stone at the northe ende of the town, and ther a little above the bridge Avon brekith into 2. armes. Yet the bridge is so large that both cum under it. The right arme cummeth into Severn with yn a flite shot of the bridge, and at the pointe of this arme is the townke key for shippes caullid picardes. The other arme cummeth dowe by the side of the town and the abbay, leving it on the este, and so passing harde ther by Holme castelle goith into Severne. Bredon...it stondith on the lifte ripe of Avon 2. miles dim. above Theokesbyri. Ther is a little broke caullid Suliet (Swilgaye) cuming dowe from Clive, and enterith into Avon at Holme castelle by the lifte ripe of it. This at sodayn raynes is a very wylde brooke, and is fedde with water faulling from the hilles therby.

Ther be 3 streates yn the town meating at the market cross, whereof the chiestest is caullid the Highs. There was no other paroche church yn the town but the west end of the abbey chirche. King John beying Erle of Glocester by his wif caussid the bridge of Tewkesbyri to be made of stone... King John gave to the mayntenance of this bridge the hole tolle of the Wensday and Saturday marketes in the towne, the which they yet possess, turnynig it rather holey to their own profite then repARATION of the bridge. Ther was at the south west ende of the abbay a castel caullid Holme. The tyme of the building of it is oncertayne. It is certyne that the Clares Erles of Glocester, and especially the redde Erle, lay much at Holme. Ther hath beene in tyme of mynd sum partes of the castel stonding. Now sum ruines of the bottoms of waulles appere' (John Leland, Itinerary 4, ed. Toulmin Smith 1909).

Thus begins the account by Leland of his observations of the topography and manor of Tewkesbury. Not only does his description provide evidence to link the excavated site with the manor house of the earls of Gloucester, but it also mentions intensive stone-robbing in progress, an outcome which so hampered the recovery of evidence in the archaeological excavation.

1607: 'in it (Tewkesbury abbey) he (FitzHamon) and his successors earls of Glocester were buried. They had the neighbouring castle of Holmes, now almost gone' (William Camden, Britannia, ed. Richard Gough 1806).

Later references include Edward Popham's pulling down an old wooden windmill in 1747 and replacing it with a brick building (Glos. R.O., DC/W/5/1) but they also include conjecture, culminating in 19th-century antiquarian conviction about the location of the manor site.

In summary the following can be gleaned from these documentary extracts. The earliest reference to a building in Tewkesbury which might be associated with the manor is the pre-Conquest hall of the Domesday Survey. The next reference concerns the destruction of the house of the earls of Gloucester in Stephen's reign. In the first decade of the 13th century there were frequent references to repairs to buildings reflecting the frequent visits to Tewkesbury by King John and in 1211 there was a major rebuilding. The references in the Pipe Rolls must relate to buildings at Holm hill. Decline set in at an unspecified date during the 14th century and the site had been
abandoned as a manor house by 1433. The records following the 1314 inquisition post mortem of Gilbert de Clare reflect the process of division of the Clare inheritance and the decline in value of the ‘appurtenances’ of the manor. By the mid 16th century only the gardens remained as significant features on the hill. The most important observations were those made by Leland, who no doubt had the benefit of local information and saw stone robbing in progress, resulting in his unhesitating association of the ruins with the manor house of the earls of Gloucester at Tewkesbury.

Status and Patronage

As a settlement, Tewkesbury had the potential to develop and achieve regional status. Sited at the junction of the rivers Avon and Severn, and midway between the county towns of Gloucester and Worcester, it benefitted in various ways notably as the location of a Benedictine abbey which became a mausoleum for several major aristocratic families and a number of minor royal burials, the caput of a great honour, and the recipient of the patronage of several baronial families. The positive attributes of the settlement have already been noted. These influenced its choice by the Normans as the location of a monastery and their encouragement of a market; successive secular patrons were to promote and foster growth. King John, aware of its value to the town’s commercial prospects, allowed market tolls to be used for the construction and/or repair of the Avon bridge. The customs of the borough derived from privileges granted to the burgesses by Earls Robert and William in the 12th century and confirmed by the Clares and ultimately, in 1337, by the Crown. These customs established the burgages as heritable and alienable, conferred on the burgesses freedom from tolls and the rights to exclude outsiders from their community and themselves to be subject to their own borough court, instead of to the manor court. Such privileges supported the view that the town had a corporate ‘character’ before 1575. However, in the 14th century, despite the apparent vesting of some corporate functions in the borough court and its independence of the lord of the manor or his steward, Tewkesbury was neither described as a borough nor taxed as one. In 1575, at the request of the earl of Leicester, the Crown granted a charter of incorporation, establishing a common council, a self-governing body to regulate burgesses and all other inhabitants alike. This status was enhanced in 1605 and 1610 by two charters of James I, covering the appointment of a coroner, the holding of sessions of the peace, and representation as a borough in Parliament.

Tewkesbury had emerged in the Anglo-Saxon period as an estate centre. Under Anglo-Norman control its role in an agriculturally rich area was enhanced by its strategic value. Although not bestowed with a castle comparable to that at Beeston or Montgomery, its position on the Severn river, on the edge of the March, provided another base from which Wales could be subdued and controlled. To ensure its mercantile success, privileges towards the town’s inhabitants were readily granted by a succession of noble patrons, from Maud and FitzHamon to the Tudor and early Stuart monarchs. Tewkesbury flourished and its population increased to c. 2,000 by the end of the medieval period. Its urban growth was ultimately constrained by physical circumstances, but the results of sustained and benevolent patronage are still in evidence.
PART TWO
THE EARLS OF GLOUCESTER

Introduction

Although honours were at the centre of royal and baronial concerns, few historians seem to have considered the origin and nature of honours in their own right, with the exception of Round (1895) and Stenton (1932). This account acknowledges a debt to them both. The sources for the families associated with the honour of Gloucester are varied and include the compilations of early genealogists. More recent studies range from a helpful summary of the life and achievements of Robert, the first earl of Gloucester, in Given-Wilson and Curteis (1984) to a wide-ranging survey of medieval nobility in Europe (Crouch 1992). The starting point for any study of medieval honours remains the monumental Complete Peerage, compiled initially by George Edward Cokayne (1825–1911), Clarenceux King of Arms. His researches, as genealogist and historian, were ably carried forward by many others including J.H. Round and, in the case of ‘Gloucester’, by H.A. Doubleday and J. Brownbill (1926). Round’s contribution to the Dictionary of National Biography (1908) is another essential work of reference and more recently there have been valuable studies by Ward (1956) and Altschul (1965).

‘Honour’, from the Latin honor, was a word of varied meanings. Early use seems to have been for any estate which gave a man dignitas, a position of authority, in his time. The kingdom of England was an honour in the sense that it conferred enormous dignity and responsibility on its holder. An ‘honour’, comprising manors, boroughs and other assets, and usually measured in knights’ fees, was the fief of a great lord, normally held of the king. The term was current in the 11th century but not frequently used in early records, despite being the highest strata of feudal organisation under the Anglo-Norman kings. Honours were essentially the fiefs of the greater tenants in chief or barons, who, as well as providing military service, were the king’s counsellors. They had responsibility for using their experience and elementary legal knowledge in the interests of the king. The clusters of fees which made up a great honour had a social as well as a military significance; the reputation of a great lord depended on the knights bound to him by homage. The knights of an honour perceived of themselves as peers (pares) of that honour. The division of England into these great lordships began in the pre-Conquest period but was given new form by the settlements William I made upon his followers. The origins of the honours which existed under Henry III could be found in the 11th century. The administrative centre of an honour was usually its lord’s chief residence and the honour was often named by the Normans after the chief place within it. If a lord acquired more than one honour, by marriage, inheritance, or royal grant, the separate existence of each honour was maintained with care. In practice an honour was a complex of fees held of a particular lord, rather than a territory with a single estate as its centre. The head (caput) or chief place of an honour did not have to be vested with a castle, although most of the great honours had a castle as their administrative centre. Equally a lord could possess an important castle without it being the head of his honour.

Some common features of the honour in Anglo-Norman England include the lands being either scattered over a wide area or, where more concentrated, intermixed with the fees of other lords. This was the result of royal policy followed by William I in granting the lands of Anglo-Saxon thegns so as to extend the influence of trusted adherents or kinsmen and to avoid compact and potentially threatening lordships. The subsequent conferring of honours continued in the
same way. Despite the opportunities offered by the instability of Stephen's reign there was no
evidence of the consolidation of honours. Dispersal of the manors within honours worked in
the baronial interest; it was an advantage to have wide influence, and it fostered useful alliances.
For barons with Welsh interests, estates in central England provided valuable military and finan-
cial resources. In the administration of an honour a lord was confronted by judicial and admin-
istrative responsibilities which were a reflection, on a lesser scale, of those of the king in his role
as lord of the greatest honour, the kingdom of England. There were parallels in the administra-
tion of honours with the way kings ran their households; sheriffs and justiciars were appointed
to the households of great honours. The administration of an honour turned on the steward
who wielded power comparable to the royal justiciars. He was the baron's executive officer and
an indication of his elevated status in the baron's entourage can be seen in the case of the earl
of Northampton's steward who held 30 knights' fees.

*The Honour of Gloucester*

In the reign of Edward the Confessor Brictric, a great thegn, held Tewkesbury and other estates
forming a great landholding based on the lower Severn valley and south-west England (Double-
day and Brownbill 1926). After the Conquest Brictric's manors, which comprised the nucleus of
what was to become known as the honour of Gloucester, were granted to Maud, the queen of
William I, and on her death in 1083 William took possession of them. William II granted
the manors to Robert FitzHamon as reward for his loyalty to the Conqueror. Upon FitzHamon's
death Henry I granted the estates to his natural son, Robert, thereafter titled earl of Gloucester.
Henry also increased the value of the honour by adding to it Bristol castle. Earl Robert's son
William succeeded to the earldom in 1147 but was obliged to surrender the castle to the Crown
in the 1160s. When the Clares acquired the honour of Gloucester in 1217 they gained lands
across southern England, Wales and Ireland. Most of these lands lay in the west and south-west
of England, but some were in the Midlands and eastern England, including Kent and Surrey.
In Wales, the honour included the lordships of Glamorgan and Gwynllwg. The continuing
exclusion of Bristol castle from the honour was not accepted by the Clares as just or final.

*The Earldom of Gloucester to 1217*

The title 'earl of Gloucester' did not appear until 1122 when Henry I conferred it on his son
Robert. Robert FitzHamon who had been granted Brictric's estates by William II has been
referred to by antiquarian authors as 'earl of Gloucester' but was never named by this title in
the many charters he witnessed.

Robert, earl of Gloucester, was born c. 1090 and brought up in the royal household, his father
having become king in 1100. By his 20s Robert had established himself as one of his father's
chief military captains and most trusted counsellors; from 1113 onwards he was a regular witness
to royal charters. In 1107 Robert married Mabel, FitzHamon's daughter and heiress to the
honour of Gloucester which now included not only lands in England and Wales but also in
Normandy. In 1122 he was created earl of Gloucester by his father, the only earldom created
in the reign. With the untimely death of Henry I's son William, in the White Ship disaster,
Robert became the most respected and influential member of the king's entourage. William's
death also left his sister Maud as Henry's chosen successor, but Henry must have recognised
the awesome task ahead of his daughter in having to confront the barons on both sides of the
channel. On Henry's death in 1135 his nephew Stephen moved swiftly to claim the throne for
himself, proclaiming that he had been nominated by Henry only hours before his death. Within
three weeks Stephen was crowned, but his hardest task remained to win over the barons, in particular Robert, the greatest landowner in England, whose sworn allegiance was to Maud.

From 1139 the presence of Robert and Maud in England led to several years of internecine warfare and civil mayhem but by 1141 the battle for succession to Henry I was all but over. The succession to Stephen had to be secured and Maud’s son Henry of Anjou, born in 1133, was the most direct legitimate male descendant of Henry I. Earl Robert never relented in his support of his nephew’s cause and England remained divided. Robert, based on Bristol, held the west, while Stephen retained authority in the east. Robert died of fever at Bristol in 1147, aged 57, as he was preparing yet another campaign against Stephen. Earl Robert had favourable contemporary reviews which recognised his military abilities, integrity, piety, and aptitude for scholarship. He was a fine general and his respect for justice and honour were rare commodities in Stephen’s England. His piety and scholarship were qualities inherited from his father. He retained a strong sense of loyalty and remained steadfast to Maud even when the Angevin cause seemed to be ebbing away.

William, who succeeded Robert, his father, in the earldom in 1147, supported the Angevins but was never the royal familiaris that Robert had been. However he was still a baronial leader of importance and he supported his cousin Henry, who became king in 1154, against rebels in 1173 and against his own brother-in-law (the earl of Leicester) at the battle of Farnham; nevertheless, in 1183 the king arrested him, suspecting his loyalty. William’s incarceration was due in part to the emergence of a dispute with the king which was to become a major theme in the continuing history of the earldom, i.e. the ownership of Bristol castle. From the time of Fitz-Hamon, Bristol and its castle was the largest item in the earls’ accounts. Henry II, when confirming William in his estates, had retained Bristol castle and took it over for the Crown in 1164/5. Henry, despite his professed acknowledgement of the role William’s father had played in securing the throne of England, must have considered the castle too important a stronghold to remain outside royal control. After London and York, Bristol was England’s third ranking town. The castle had been added to the possessions of the honour of Gloucester by grant from Henry I and had become the caput of the honour. Both honour and castle had remained centres of Angevin strength in Stephen’s reign. William, who resided chiefly at Cardiff, tried to regain the castle in 1174 but in vain. He died in 1183 in the king’s custody and was buried at Keynsham.

Henry II diverted the succession to the earldom from the eldest to the youngest of William’s daughters in order to secure for his own son John a great inheritance by marriage. Isabel, William’s youngest daughter, became countess of Gloucester in her own right. Her marriage to John was opposed by Baldwin, archbishop of Canterbury, on grounds of consanguinity but was sanctioned by the papal legate. In 1199 John ascended the throne and all his honours merged in the Crown. He also divorced Isabel, to the consternation of the Roman curia which had earlier over-ruled the archbishop of Canterbury to grant permission for the marriage, and thereby ceased to be earl. To prevent Isabel’s remarriage, which would confer the earldom on her new husband, John imprisoned her. Soon afterwards he made a bargain with Amauri de Montfort, whereby the latter, son of Isabel’s eldest sister Mabel, apparently held the earldom until his death in 1213. Although John retained most of the lands of the honour under his own control, Amauri’s status as earl while Isabel remained countess was certainly irregular. In 1214 John married Isabel to Geoffrey de Mandeville, earl of Essex, at a price of 20,000 marks. Geoffrey therefore became earl of Gloucester but John retained Bristol castle and at the time of Geoffrey’s death in 1216, the honour was in the hands of the Crown, Geoffrey having been in rebellion. In 1217 Isabel married Hubert de Burgh, justiciar of England, but she died only days later and the earldom passed to the son and heir of her sister Amice, wife of Richard de Clare, 6th earl of Clare.
The Clares

The Clares were descended from Gilbert, count of Brionne, who was related to the Conqueror through marriage. Baldwin and Richard, Gilbert's sons, were part of the invading Norman army and assumed positions of importance in England during William I's reign. Richard, nominally 1st earl of Clare, was appointed co-regent of England in 1075 during the Conqueror's absence. He had been granted extensive lands in southern England based on Clare in Suffolk. William I arranged for Richard to marry Rose, sister of Walter Giffard; as a result of this alliance, the fiefdom of the Clares was to be augmented a century later by the addition of half of the Giffard estates. On Richard's death in 1090, his estates were divided between his two older sons. Gilbert, the younger of the two, inherited the English honours of Clare and Tonbridge and became the 2nd earl of Clare. The family fortunes were favoured by Henry I and Richard's sons-in-law, including Walter Trel, were close friends of the king. Members of the family were given high appointments in the church or important fiefs. The grant to Gilbert in 1110 of the lordship of Cardigan was the beginning of the Clare involvement in Welsh matters. Gilbert, who married Adeliza, daughter of Hugh, count of Clermont, died in 1117, but the family continued to benefit from favourable connections and royal generosity. Gilbert's eldest son, Richard, married Adeliza, daughter of Ranulph de Gernons, earl of Chester, and devoted much of his time to securing his father's achievements in Wales. His devotion to Welsh affairs foreshadowed the interests of his successors in the 13th century; he was killed in 1136 in a Welsh ambush. The alliance of marcher lords through marriage was viewed with favour by Henry I who saw the advantage of a cohesive force against the Welsh. Following Richard's death, the honour of Clare and other titles and lordships passed to his elder son Gilbert, 4th earl of Clare. Gilbert, who was also honoured with the title of earl of Hertford by King Stephen, died in 1152. He was succeeded by his younger brother Roger, who resumed campaigning, after the manner of his father and grandfather, against the Welsh. Defeated in 1165 after eight years of warfare, he abandoned the campaign. At his death in 1173 the Clare estates and the earldom passed to his son Richard.

Richard de Clare (1153–1217), the 6th earl of Clare, greatly augmented the estates of the Clare dynasty. In the early 13th century he also emerged as a leading figure in the opposition to King John and in 1215 was charged along with 25 other barons in enforcing the provisions of the Charter. His first major acquisition comprised part of the estates of Walter Giffard (d. 1164). In 1189 King Richard, in need of money for the Third Crusade, divided Giffard's estate between Richard and his cousin Isabel, daughter of Richard de Clare, earl of Pembroke (known as Strongbow) and wife of William Marshall. Both claimed descent from Rose, the wife of Richard, 1st earl of Clare. Richard, the 6th earl, obtained Long Crendon (Bucks), the caput of the Giffard honour in England together with associated manors in Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, and Cambridgeshire. Richard also acquired some of the Giffard lands in Normandy. On the death of his mother Maud, Richard also acquired the honour of St. Hilary, which was later absorbed in the honour of Clare and included lands in Norfolk and Northamptonshire.

Richard's marriage to Amice, second daughter of William, earl of Gloucester, in or just before 1180, was a crucial step in his acquisition of the honour of Gloucester on the death of Amice's sister Isabel in 1217. The honour, with its great political and territorial power including over 260 knights' fees in England as well as the important marcher lordships of Glamorgan and Gwynllwg, passed to Richard, despite his separation from Amice since 1200. He died six weeks later and his son Gilbert inherited the estate. Amice lived out her life in retirement and made no effort to rejoin the earl or to renew contact with her children. She died in 1225.

Gilbert de Clare (1180–1230), 7th earl of Clare and 6th earl of Gloucester, entered a great patrimony including the earldoms of Clare, Hertford and Gloucester. The addition of the
Fig. 3. The Clare estates in 1314 (based on the inquisitions post mortem of Gilbert de Clare, 10th earl of Clare).
Gloucester honour brought him a total of 456 fees, more than any held by any other magnate of his day, with 50 fees in Glamorgan and Gwynllwg. However he failed to recover Bristol. By a series of fortuitous marriages, the Clares in 1217 were in possession of an inheritance which far exceeded the estates in East Anglia that they had acquired at the Conquest. In terms of social prestige, wealth, and knights' fees, the honour of Gloucester and lordships of Glamorgan and Gwynllwg confirmed on the Clares a position of great importance among marcher lords and contributed to making them the most powerful noble family in 13th-century England. Gilbert engaged in many Welsh expeditions, including the capture of Morgan Cam in 1228, and was a great benefactor of Tewkesbury abbey. He married his cousin Isabel, second daughter and eventual coheirress of William Marshall, and by her he had three sons and two daughters. At his death in 1230 his son and heir Richard was a minor. Isabel, who espoused the Clare cause, wanted to be buried next to Gilbert in Tewkesbury abbey. Richard of Cornwall, her second husband, insisted on her burial at Beaulieu abbey (Hants.) but allowed her heart to be transferred to Tewkesbury abbey for interment alongside the body of her first husband.

Richard de Clare (1222–62), 8th earl of Clare and 7th earl of Gloucester; his first marriage was in 1232 to Margaret, daughter of Hubert de Burgh, justiciar of England and earl of Kent. In 1237 Richard married Maud, daughter of John de Lacy, earl of Lincoln and from this marriage he had three sons, including Gilbert his heir, and four daughters. Richard, who came of age in 1243, was the most powerful noble of his time. In addition to his inheritance of nearly 500 knights' fees, he acquired in 1245 a fifth of William Marshall's lands. As a young man Richard was perceived as the 'hope' of the English nobility, but his enemies later claimed that he was susceptible to the advantages of royal patronage and he was accused by Simon de Montfort of 'wanton deceit'. He was judged to be pre-eminently skilled in the law and had a fondness for tournaments. Although he introduced the Austin friars into England, he was not a munificent patron of religion and he figured more frequently as a litigant against religious bodies than as their guardian. Recurring quarrels with Henry III and his son, the Prince Edward, were fuelled by the earldom of Gloucester's claim on Bristol, particularly in 1245 when the contested castle was conferred upon Prince Edward. Richard's death in 1262 was followed by rumours that he had been poisoned. His wife Maud outlived him by a quarter of a century and lived off her inheritance, promoted her daughters, and supported religious foundations.

Gilbert de Clare (1243–95), 9th earl of Clare and 8th earl of Gloucester, succeeded to his father's estates in 1262 and was the most powerful English magnate of his day. Apart from the English possessions, there were immense estates in Wales and Ireland. Despite charges of fickleness in early years, exemplified in his dealings with Simon de Montfort and Prince Edward, many of his contemporaries apparently agreed with the description of him in the Lanercost Chronicle as prudens in consiliis, strenus in armis, audacissimus in defensione sui juris. As leader of the baronage Gilbert confronted Edward on several occasions and his defiant prosecution of hostilities against the earl of Hereford in Wales in defence of marcher rights led to his temporary incarceration in the Tower of London and a heavy fine. Gilbert's father had arranged his marriage to Henry III's niece Alice, the daughter of Hugh de Lusignan, count of Angoulême and La Marche, but despite the birth of two daughters, the marriage was a personal and political failure, and it was ended by papal dispensation. After entering negotiations with Edward I Gilbert married the king's daughter Joan of Acre. By her Gilbert had a son, Gilbert, and three daughters, Elizabeth, Margaret, and Eleanor. After her husband's death in 1295 and until her own in 1307 Joan was to manage the administration of the Clare estates. In 1297 she married, controversially and without the Crown's agreement, Ralph de Monthermer, a member of the Clare familia. Ralph assumed the style of 'earl' in his wife's right and was to lose it on her death.
Gilbert (1291–1314), 10th earl of Clare and 9th earl of Gloucester, became a companion of his uncle Edward II and was frequently involved in Scottish affairs on behalf of the king. In the troubles which culminated in the banishment of Piers Gaveston in 1308, Gilbert remained neutral, Gaveston having married Gilbert’s sister Margaret. In 1311 Gilbert was made guardian of England and in 1313 he was appointed regent. He was killed at Bannockburn in 1314 in a reckless charge which may have followed an altercation with either the king or the earl of Hereford over precedence in battle. Gilbert had married Maud, daughter of Richard de Burgh, earl of Ulster, in 1308 but there was no male heir of the marriage and the great Clare inheritance (Fig. 3) was divided between Gilbert’s sisters: Eleanor, Margaret, and Elizabeth.

Eleanor, born in 1292, had married Hugh Despenser the younger. He became the most powerful baron of his generation but was imprisoned and executed in 1326. Eleanor later married William la Zouche and they both died in 1337. Eleanor’s portion of the estate reverted to the children of her first marriage and later passed from the Despensers in turn to the Beauchamps, the Nevilles (earls of Warwick), Edward IV, and eventually Richard III. Margaret, born in 1293, had married Piers Gaveston. He was murdered in 1312 by Edward II’s enemies and Margaret later married Hugh de Audley, a political associate of the king. Their daughter married into the Stafford family which held Margaret’s portion of the estate into the 16th century. Elizabeth, the best known of the sisters, was widowed three times before the age of 27. Her first marriage was to John, son of Richard de Burgh, on the day after her ill-fated brother Gilbert married de Burgh’s daughter Maud. After John de Burgh’s death in 1313 Elizabeth was abducted by Theobald Verdun, a marcher lord, who died later the same year. In 1317 she married Roger Damory. After his death five years later without issue she lived out a quiet widowhood until her death in 1360. Among various acts expressive of her piety and love of learning were the commissioning of the choir clerestory windows at Tewkesbury and the founding of Clare college, Cambridge.

The importance of marriage in maintaining and expanding the political and territorial power of the Clares was exemplified by the choices of marriage partners made by the last four earls. Their wives were the daughters of earls or, in the case of the 9th earl of Clare, the daughter of the king. The same concern was shown in the arrangements for the marriages of the daughters of the Clares. In the last four generations there were thirteen daughters; of these five were married once, seven twice, and one (Elizabeth) thrice. In every case of re-marriage the daughters had become widows, their husbands having died of natural causes, having been killed in battle, or executed. The pattern of marriages into and out of the family demonstrated that the alliances were motivated by political and territorial considerations, to augment the honours of Clare, Tonbridge, and Gloucester, and to consolidate relationships in the Welsh march, Wales, Scotland and Ireland.

The Demise of the Earldom of Gloucester

The death of Gilbert, 10th earl of Clare, at Bannockburn and the subsequent breaking up of the estate accumulated by the family heralded the end of the earldom of Gloucester and the dismemberment of the honour. In 1337 Hugh de Audley was ‘created in Parliament . . . for ever earl of Gloucester’. Ellis (1963) noted that this creation was expressly limited to Audley and his heirs. At his death in 1347, Hugh’s daughter and only child, Margaret, might have been regarded as the ‘countess of Gloucester’ but she never claimed that right (Doubleday and Brownbill 1926)
and her successors preferred, it seems (Ellis 1963), to hold the earldom of Stafford. The Crown regarded the earldom of Gloucester as having lapsed and although it was revived in 1397 when it was bestowed upon Thomas, Lord Despenser, it was not granted again after Despenser’s execution 3 years later. The authors of ‘Gloucester’ in the Complete Peerage were in no doubt that the earldom ceased to exist on the death of Hugh de Audley in 1347.

PART THREE

ARCHAEOLOGY OF HOLM HILL

(a) Structures

Introduction

It was the possibility in 1974 that Tewkesbury Borough Council might build new offices at Holm hill which led to archaeological rescue excavations in 1974 and 1975. The proposal to develop the site was considered by the council throughout 1974 but a decision to proceed not taken until early 1975. The excavations were therefore undertaken in anticipation that the development might take place. The uncovering of important archaeological remains on Holm hill in the summer of 1974, while achieving an important objective, raised doubts over whether to proceed with the investigation with the development threat still to be confirmed, rather than to wait for a decision and to negotiate for and conduct rescue excavations up to the time of construction. The eventual outcome, a precipitate salvage excavation in early 1975, reflected the approach prevalent nationally and locally to archaeological management at the time. Before the adoption of formal planning guidance in historic environment matters, heritage requirements in 1975 were accorded a lower priority than in the 1990s. A decision by the council to proceed with construction was followed within several weeks by the implementation of the building contract. Construction was preceded by the landscaping of the hill with bulldozer and box-scaper. At the beginning of the construction period investigation and recording were carried out with the aid of a JCB and ditching bucket; in the last stage features exposed during the repeated sweeps of a box-scaper were recorded. Within the area of the hill partly excavated in 1974, as well as immediately around it, all archaeological remains were destroyed by April 1975.

Leland’s observations, made in the 1540s, suggest that the remains of the stone buildings he believed had belonged to the earls of Gloucester, the lords of Tewkesbury manor, were on Holm hill. It was assumed that if the remains of Tewkesbury manor were there, they would be located along the north-east corner of the hill, the highest point above the scarp. A grid, based on the north-east corner of the hill (O.S. Nat. Grid SO88823217), was laid out to facilitate a resistivity survey and any subsequent archaeological recording (Fig. 4). Holm hill is part of a ridge of high ground (the base-line of the site grid was at 18.75 m above O.D. at its east end rising to 21.50 m above O.D. at the west end) to the south of the town and lies several hundred metres south-west of the abbey church. The northern edge of the hill, facing the town, is a steep wooded scarp above the river Swilgate and has been accentuated in recent years by the moving of earth to create the present King George VI playing field. To the south the hill slopes gently southwards, draining into Southwick Brook, and to the south-west it descends into the area known as ‘Bloody Meadow’. The hill commands the approach to the town from the south.
It also overlooks the route to Lower Lode, one of the two crossing points of the river Severn at Tewkesbury before the river was bridged in the 19th century.

 Resistivity Survey by Malcolm White

It was appropriate to conduct a preliminary resistivity survey because the exact location of any surviving remains was not known, there being an almost complete absence of surface features. It was possible that the remains would consist substantially of buried stone and would be readily detected by the survey; the site was situated in terrain which exhibited a consistent resistivity. The method relied upon the passage of an electric current through the soil. Materials with resistance differing from that of the soil, e.g. stone (higher resistance) and organic material (lower resistance), are detected by the corresponding effect on the resistance measured. The survey used a 1 Khz current source of 3 K resistance and 18 volts peak to peak source voltage. The maximum voltage developed at the current probes in the high resistance region of the site was approximately 3 volts; hence the current was sensibly constant. The voltmeter utilised a 709 integrated circuit linear amplifier to provide a full-scale sensitivity of 100 millivolts and an input resistance of 50 K. The initial survey was conducted using the Wenner 4-probe configuration with a one-metre pitch. Linear traverses of the survey grid at intervals of 20 metres revealed a substantial variation in resistivity. Areas of interest (high resistivity) were sub-divided and traversed along appropriate lines. The values of resistivity obtained in various regions can be summarised as follows. 
(a) low values with very small variations between readings or only gradual variation along lines of traverse. These regions were interpreted as areas devoid of stone features.
(b) moderately high readings, twice those of (a), with often wide variation between adjacent readings at one-metre pitch. Early excavation confirmed these regions as consisting of scattered building stone (due to intensive stone-robbing and ploughing) with rubble-filled foundation trenches.

(c) small areas of high resistivity often within (b). These areas have been confirmed as consisting of either close-packed tumble or undisturbed masonry.

It has to be noted that the resistivity survey produced more significant results than were believed possible at the time. Fig. 5, on which the plot of the resistivity survey is superimposed on the outline of the main structures, indicates the success of the method employed. Amongst features identified by the survey but not excavated was the band of moderate resistance forming an E–W line south of the buildings. This may have been the boundary of an enceinte possibly associated with the documentary reference in 1211 to the construction of brattices.

The Nature and Chronology of the Evidence

From the results of the resistivity survey an area of 1,600 square metres was chosen for excavation. Turf and topsoil were removed by mechanical excavator, followed by hand excavation to remove remaining topsoil and expose areas of stone, comprising foundation courses, robbed-out trenches and demolition rubble. The topsoil ranged between 25 and 30 cms in depth and contained fragments of medieval pottery, floor tile and ashlar in oolitic stone, suggesting the presence of at least one stone building of medieval date. The removal of the topsoil, which proceeded from west to east, revealed a surface comprising various proportions of oolitic and lias fragments in mortary sandy earth, from densely packed fragments to a thin scatter. Disproportionate time was spent on recording this surface in the belief that it may have represented a construction surface on which buildings had stood. It became apparent that a shallow sunken trench formed a rectangular outline c. 30 m long by c. 10 m wide on the rubble surface and was roughly parallel with the grid base-line.

Once it was apparent that the surface probably contained little information, a one-metre wide trench was dug in a N–S direction across the rectangle. This exposed straight-sided trenches cut into the hill’s geological formation and filled with mortary sand and fragments of stone. It was assumed that these square-cut features were part of the construction trench of a large stone building of which the superstructure and foundations had been robbed. Apart from the mixed rubble layer, the extent of build-up of deposits on the bedrock was between 10 and 15 cms, surprisingly thin given the scale of construction. The removal of demolition rubble from the construction trenches and the space enclosed by them revealed the surviving constructional features of the building. Apart from a partitioning wall the building was represented almost entirely by foundation trenches, devoid for the most part of the foundations they were built to contain. As the clearing of mortary soil/rubble continued eastwards, the remains of a second stone building were identified. Although far less robustly built, this structure had several courses of wall surviving on shallow foundations in places but extensive robbing had occurred in other parts of it. The construction stone was more fragmentary and therefore probably less attractive to stone-robbers. It was observed that some of the surviving masonry had adopted a shallow wave-like appearance in profile and it was assumed that this had been due to subsidence beneath sections of the walls. Numerous post-pits underlying the stone buildings formed a pattern which seemed to have determined the alignment of both later buildings.

As excavation extended away from the remains of the two large buildings, the character of structures became more difficult to establish. The area around the buildings had been surfaced
Fig. 5. Holm hill: the results of the resistivity survey (coloured green) and a plan of the foundation trenches, foundation courses and lower wall courses of the main structures excavated.
with broken stone to provide a stable ground level and much of this had a worn and smoothed appearance. Small buildings and other structures seem to have been erected on this surface but in very few cases could the form be recognised from the remains or the ‘shadow’ left by the structure. With the exception of the post-pits and several other deep-cut features, the majority of the remains were shallow and rarely exceeded a depth below the surface of 60–80 cms.

Sealed below the levels associated with these buildings was evidence of prehistoric activity, represented by a circular ditch and linear features, with associated pits, containing several fragments of pottery of late Bronze/Iron-Age date. The dating of features on the site (Fig. 6) was difficult for a number of reasons. The archaeological levels were shallow, in most cases being within 30 cms of the field surface. The extensive and compact stone surface laid down in the post-Conquest period had meant that most subsequent activity had been conducted at that level. Items several centuries apart in date were found together on this surface. The absence of certain building materials such as window glass suggested the systematic dismantling of the stone-built halls at an early stage before the wholesale removal of stone. The site had been robbed of most of its building stone resulting in prolonged disturbance to archaeological levels.

A sequence of activity was however demonstrable, the earliest being the prehistoric occupation. This was sealed below a layer of green-grey clay which must have been the result of a later deliberate levelling operation. A date-range for the prehistoric occupation was provided by pottery and by a C14 date from an associated charcoal sample. They indicate that all or part of this occupation took place between c. 500 and 300 B.C. The next evidence recognised was that associated with the positioning and digging of post-pits more than a thousand years later and with the construction afterwards of the two stone-founded buildings. Although there was an assumption that the post-pits were of one or more timber buildings erected in the late Anglo-Saxon period no dating evidence for construction, use, or dismantling/destruction was recognised. The stone buildings were believed to belong to the Anglo-Norman/medieval period because of the finds associated with their remains. However the date of their construction, use, and demolition can only be attributed to a broad period. The suggested form of the buildings, the earlier one an aisled hall, the later one a first-floor hall, does not assist in the provision of dates of construction.

The most abundant finds were pottery fragments and the assemblage has been dated from c. 1200 to the mid 14th century. The coins found on the site date from the reign of Edward I. The metal objects found include a large number of medieval arrow and quarrel heads as well as other items of military and equestrian nature. Many of the projectiles were recovered from the topsoil or from the surface directly below and, although of significance because of their presence, character, and number, they were of limited value in dating the structures. There appeared to be a high degree of continuity in the form of the iron objects; some of the projectile heads of the 12th and 13th centuries were indistinguishable from those of the 15th century. The positions of the opposing forces at the battle of Tewkesbury in 1471 remain uncertain but it has been advocated (Blyth 1961) that the Lancastrian troops under Somerset assembled on Holm hill at or near the position where the excavations of 1974 took place. That theory has implications for interpretation of the projectiles found on the site. In general, comparison with other metalwork collections indicated dates of manufacture and usage of the iron and copper-alloy artefacts from the 13th to the later 14th/early 15th centuries. The fragments of moulded stone from demolition levels were identified as mainly Romanesque, with examples from the early, the middle, and the later 12th century as well as several pieces attributed to the 13th century. The majority of the fragments were recovered within the bounds of, or adjacent to, the foundations of the later stone building.
Fig. 6. Holm hill: general plan of features.
EXCAVATIONS AT HOLM HILL, TEWKESBURY

The historical evidence for the manor has been considered in the previous section of the report. Associations between excavated features and documentary evidence remain unproven but there is strong circumstantial evidence in favour of such connection. The Domesday Survey referred to a pre-Conquest hall (aula) on the manor. The date of construction, use, or demolition of the timber buildings at Holm hill remains unknown. However their alignment was followed so closely in the plans of the later stone-built halls that foundations were cut directly over the line of the post-pits and ultimately caused instability in the later structures as the fill of the post-pits compacted under the weight of the constructions above. The second reference to a building associated with Tewkesbury manor recounted the destruction in 1140 of the magnificum domum of the earls of Gloucester by Valeran, earl of Worcester. In the first decade of the 13th century there were several references to repairs to manorial buildings and in 1211 there was a major rebuilding. By the mid 14th century the documentary evidence indicated a deterioration in the state of the buildings; in 1337 a windmill is recorded as being in advanced disrepair. Contemporary accounts of the battle of Tewkesbury make no reference to buildings, or their ruins, which could be exploited for defensive purposes. Leland’s observations in the 1540s noted the remains of stone buildings on Holm hill associated by him with the former residence of the earls of Gloucester.

The Periods of Occupation

There was evidence for several major periods of activity, based on the stratigraphic sequence, the character of the surviving structures, and associated finds. These periods necessarily are broad because the evidence did not permit closer definition.

Period 1: Iron Age

Several earth-cut features of prehistoric date were recovered under salvage conditions in April 1975 while mechanical earthmoving was in progress. Prehistoric occupation on the hill had not been suspected since there had been no conspicuous finds of residual prehistoric flint or pottery. With the removal by box-scraper of the medieval features and the post-pits of the timber buildings it seemed unlikely that any further occupation levels would be encountered. However, after the lowering of the medieval ground surface by 40-50 cms, features were found sealed below a layer of the loam clay. During successive sweeps by the box-scraper two main features, one circular (290) and one linear (296) and several pits (including 311), were revealed. These were dug into for artefacts and environmental evidence and, as far as circumstances permitted, plans were drawn in the wake of the scraping. Several characteristics were noted. The ditched features were ‘V’-shaped in profile and c. 30 cms in depth from their initial exposure. The fill of the features was dark brown to grey-black, which seemed to result from concentrations of organic residues, ash and charcoal in the fill. It was impossible to judge whether the linear and circular features and the adjoining pits were contemporary but it is significant that, on a site where the archaeological levels were uniformly shallow, the features were buried below a layer of clay, initially believed to be the pre-settlement soil horizon (the so-called buried soil). Such sealing of the prehistoric levels could only be explained by initial landscaping of the site for the timber buildings, by spreading upcast from the digging of the post-pits, or by earthmoving in the Anglo-Norman and medieval periods to create construction surfaces for the stone buildings.

Pottery recovered from two features (290/291 and 311/312) spanned the late Bronze-Age/early Iron-Age threshold. A charcoal sample (HAR 1192/HC-75 F312/AML-753125) from (311/312) provided a C14 date which, although broad in range, encompassed the mid first millenium B.C. and conformed with the dating of the pottery.
Period 2: Late Anglo-Saxon/Anglo-Norman

At an early stage in the excavation large post-holes or post-pits were encountered along the base of the construction trench of the later stone building. These pits, during the construction of the stone building C, had been emptied of their earth fill and packed tightly with stone fragments. These and other pits discovered during excavation were investigated and recorded to a satisfactory standard. In early 1975 more post-pits were revealed but the quality of the recording at that stage was constrained by the development situation and the fill of some of those pits was not removed. This lack of consistency in recovery of evidence and recording has limited the scope for interpretation of the structures. The post-pits and associated features were discovered on the high ground near the crest of slope where the hill dropped sharply away towards the river Swilgate. They formed a complex grouping which extended over 40 metres in length and between 8 and 12 metres in width. Many of the post-pits had been sealed below later walls. Fifty-nine post-pits could belong to Period 2; Fig. 7 indicates those that were investigated fully in the course of the excavation and those that were planned but only partly examined in the later stages of the fieldwork. A number of pits and linear features west of the main group of post-pits have not been included on the plan; they lacked the depth and profile of the majority of the pits and probably had no connection with the other features of Period 2.

The alignment of the post-pits was reasonably consistent and the existence of two broadly parallel rows was apparent. The northern line extended nearly 40 metres in a fairly straight ENE–WSW direction. The main southern line was less regular. The depth of the pits varied; those examined in the base of the construction trench of Building C were only the lower part (the upper part having been removed by the digging of the construction trench). The depth of this group was estimated to have been c. 1.20 m. Those post-pits under the foundation trenches at the west end of the earlier stone building (B) were the deepest encountered on the site. Post-pit (99) was c. 1.70 m in depth. Post-pipes were not in evidence, suggesting that the posts had been removed and the pits then backfilled with the surrounding clay. For those post-pits which were investigated, it was often only the small flecks of charcoal in the fill which made it possible to distinguish the fill from the soil into which the pits had been dug.

No evidence was found for dating the construction, use, or dismantling of the timber building. The structure (A) was evidently earlier than the Anglo-Norman/medieval stone-founded buildings but the single sherd of Anglo-Saxon pottery found on the site was not in a context which could assist in the dating of the building. Despite this shortcoming in the evidence several factors should be noted. The post-pits, sealed below the construction levels of the Anglo-Norman buildings, were part of at least one major timber building which must have been of imposing scale and constructed on the edge of a scarp to accentuate its height. The alignment of the stone buildings followed closely that of the timber building(s) and points to dismantling of the latter to make way for major stone edifices. The Domesday Survey recorded that in 1066 16 bordars lived around a hall (aula) on Tewkesbury manor. On balance there must be a presumption that the timber buildings at Holm hill were associated with such a hall. The number and disposition of the post-pits permitted "reconstruction" in plan of the form of buildings (e.g. Fig. 7, A1, A2) which may have stood on the hill at some time before Period 3.

Period 3.

This period, from the mid 11th to the mid 14th century, provides most of the evidence for activity at Holm hill. It was characterised by the construction and occupation of two large stone-built structures following the alignment of the earlier timber hall with other buildings and spaces located to the south and south-east. Although there was no unambiguous link between the excavated structures and the manorial buildings, there is a strong possibility that the excavated remains were those of Tewkesbury manor, to which reference was made in Pipe Rolls and other medieval documents. It was evident during the initial removal of topsoil that there had been stone structures on the hill and the remains of two major stone buildings eventually emerged, one having succeeded the other. Period 3 has therefore been approached as 3a and 3b, not because there was a clear chronological horizon but rather to draw attention to the succession and change in character of the structures.
Fig. 7. Holm hill: plan of post pits.
Period 3a: Anglo-Norman (mid 11th–mid/late 12th century)

The first major structure identified on site was Building C (Period 3b). As excavation progressed it was evident that there was an earlier stone-founded building B immediately to the east. This had survived as a series of foundation courses and robbed-out foundation trenches. Building B (Fig. 8), mainly the west end, was investigated partially in 1974 and under salvage conditions in 1975. The evidence showed that B measured 30.5 m in external length and comprised a hall measuring 18.5 by 13.5 m internally with a solar/service block at the west end.

The solar/service block. The west end of B was a rectangular structure with foundations indicating four chambers at ground-floor level. It has been interpreted as a ‘solar/service’ block. The best preserved part of the structure was on the east side, where a N–S wall (83) was founded in a shallow construction trench and in places several courses of walling and foundations, averaging 1.2 to 1.3 m in width, survived. The west wall of the block had been supplanted by the foundations for C. The south wall of the block was represented by a construction trench (57) largely robbed out; at its west end it terminated in a marginally deeper trench, which may have been the construction trench for a buttress at the south-west corner, matching that of a buttress at the south-east corner. Along the outer line of the foundation trench (57) of the block was a squared pit (111) set diagonally against what must have been the south wall. This feature was interpreted as the cess-pit associated with a garderobe chamber. The evidence from the four chambers was as follows.

South-west chamber. This was bounded on the west by the construction trench of C, and elsewhere by robbed-out construction trenches (57), (88) and (86). In the south end of the chamber was a shallow broad trench extending across the space of an E–W alignment. Part of the chamber was surfaced with a mortar material. In one of the corners the wall was angled across the corner.

North-west chamber. The northern limits of this space lay beyond the limits of the excavation trench. The north end of the foundation trench intruded into a space possibly caused by a hearth being built into a wall. The robbing out and absence of other features made it difficult to attribute function.

North-east chamber. This was the largest of the four spaces created in the block. There was an area of scorched clay (95) and another of a mortar material (96). The presence of large worn slabs on both sides of (83) where it formed a wall to the chamber confirmed an entrance into the chamber from the hall to the east.

South-east chamber. This, the smallest of the spaces, was also linked to the hall by an opening in (83). A segment of a stone foundation protruded into this chamber from (83) and the foundation trench crossed a corner of the chamber.

Although these ground-level chambers were devoid of evidence for furnishing or use, that they were of varying size suggests they had different functions. The two chambers on the east side were linked by openings to the hall's screen passage. Although it was stone-founded there was no evidence whether the service/solar block was stone-built, timber-framed, or a combination of both. The foundation courses were distorted due to the frequent subsidence of the stone coursing into the fill of the post-pits below. At both the southern corners of the block, buttresses had been added to stabilise the building.

The hall. The evidence for the hall was less satisfactory. Some of the surviving features were recovered in 1975 from the salvage excavation and in the course of this low-level recovery it was suspected that an additional component of B lay further east beyond the hall. The foundation trench on the south side of the hall was excavated in 1974 and was not as soundly based as those for the walls in the solar/service block. A group of flat, edged stones, supported by others set upright against them, capped the foundations at the point where the south wall (182) met (83) and marked an entrance to the hall at its south-west corner. A similar arrangement was found, under salvage conditions, at the hall’s north-west corner where laid stone formed a step approaching an opening in the wall. The foundation trenches, mostly robbed-out, formed the outer wall line of a hall measuring 18.5 by 13.5 m.

The entrance to the hall at its south-west and north-west corners opened into a passage which was screened along part of its length. The footing of a structure (198) was traced south from the north wall (348) and provided a passage between 2.20 and 2.30 m wide. Extending east from the line of the screen
Fig. 8. Holm hill: plan of Building B.
base was a large area of daub (197). Two concentrations of stone slabs east of the screen base were subsequently identified as the mortary and stoney fill of two sub-rectangular pits. Both had cut the fill of earlier post-pits. Their place in this structure is uncertain but they may have been associated with a gallery extending out from the solar above the service block. Alternatively they could have been the remains of two of a series of stone slabs underpinning an arcade of timber posts which supported the hall. The width of the hall and the far from robust character of the foundations for its north and south walls bring into question the nature of the structure's roof span. Such a width could only have been spanned with supporting arcades of timber posts. It is most likely that the posts of the earlier timber hall, or their post-pits, were used to create an aisled hall and that the outer walls supported flanking aisles; that would explain the walls' apparent light construction. Thus, two rows of post-pits, or a set of stone pads forming a shallow plinth above them, were probably utilised to provide the main structural arrangement for B. From the sampling carried out under salvage conditions, the pits were wider and deeper (c. 1.70 m) than the post-pits west of B and their spacing within the hall accorded with a role in supporting the roof.

The context of B. It was unlikely that B stood alone and it was almost certainly part of a complex including agricultural, industrial, domestic, or religious buildings to the south. Among the additional buildings may have been barns, a kitchen, a chapel, and a dovecot. It was, however, very difficult to distinguish the activities that would have accompanied B from those that would have been associated with C. It was assumed that the overall layout of buildings was established during the time of B, and was modified during the life of the later hall (C). Within the area of systematic excavation in 1974, the evidence for ancillary structures was fragmentary and conveyed an impression mainly of timber structures raised on a compacted stone surface. The levelling of the site by box-scraper in 1975 exposed remains of rectangular and circular stone-founded buildings to the south-east and these could have represented a barn (306) and dovecot (344) respectively. The recording of the ancillary buildings was hampered on the one hand by a general lack of coherence in the form and solidity of their remains and on the other by the greater attention paid to the main buildings. Some structures were identified in a limited fashion in 1974; others were recorded in 1975 as well as circumstances permitted.

One group of buildings extended almost directly south from B, other buildings stood to the south-east, and one structure formed an outlier to the east. The features immediately south of B were defined by shallow foundation/wall courses bordering expanses of crushed oolite and this combination of shallow footings formed a series of small sub-rectangular plots extending east from (181). The alignment of the surviving wall footings, bedded in a densely packed scatter of lias rock fragments showing varying degrees of wear, conformed to that of the main buildings (B and C). These remains were bordered by another shallow-bedded feature (131) on an alignment matching that of the halls. Immediately south of this was a broad band of heavily worn and smoothed lias stone (127) which extended westwards from the eastern limit of the excavation to merge with a broad expanse of worn stone 2 to 3 m wide occupying the space south of C. In line with (181) a narrow cut across (127) was the only survival of some construction which must have controlled access along (127). On the north edge of (127) a cluster of floor tiles, associated with fragments of wall (304), was observed fleetingly and recorded. South of (127) the line of (181) was continued by the base course of another feature (128). The south edge of (127) was distinct and it was bordered by an expanse of more angular and less worn stone fragments (189). Adjacent to (128) a pit, or the butt end of a ditch (125), was exposed at the limits of the excavation. Evidence of further features was recovered to the south and south-east of these limits in 1975. Several lengths of a foundation course (306/410) indicated the remains of a large rectangular building; beyond that, near the eastern limits of the hill, the box-scraper exposed part of the stone foundations for a circular-based structure (344) c. 6 metres in diameter. To the south of (128) a variety of features was noted, including a small stone circle accompanied by ash and charcoal (200/202), narrow ditches also containing ash/charcoal, and fragments of walling extending as far as a small pond, 70 metres from the main buildings. To the east of B fragments of wall foundations (302) were observed extending along the scarp edge from the east wall of the hall. These fragments seemed to form a rectangular base and, in the light of a recent review of the nature of buildings in medieval England (Blair 1993), they may have represented the remains of a chamber separate from the hall.
Fig. 9. Holm hill: plan of Building C.
Period 3b: Medieval (mid/late 12th–mid/late 14th century)

The main feature of this period was the construction, use and demise of Building C, immediately to the west of B. Building C (Fig. 9) was the first major structure examined. As the removal of topsoil proceeded traces of timber buildings were sought in the stone tumble. Doubts over this approach led to the cutting of a trial trench in a N–S direction, from the scarp edge across the stone tumble. The trench demonstrated that the tumble was of little if any archaeological value and highlighted the need to remove it as quickly as possible. Removal of the tumble and the fill of the foundation trench revealed both the scale and potential importance of C and the extent of stone-robbing. Enough of the foundations survived however to demonstrate the quality of the construction. The foundation trench was, on average, 1.8 m wide and 60 to 70 cm deep with vertical sides. There was one point where the trench was not of consistent depth; at the south-east corner it was, for a short distance, 30 cm shallower than elsewhere. Excavation was to reveal a rectangular ground plan; sufficient of the foundation courses had survived robbing to demonstrate the care with which they had been laid and to convey an impression of the solidity and robustness of the building which stood here in the 13th century. Fragments of stone moulding found in the rubble pointed to imposing and highly decorated elevations. The internal measurements of the structure were 27.2 m long and 7.4 m wide. The foundation trench remained regular in width except at two points. On the south it widened 30–40 cm on both sides over a length of 2.5 m to accommodate broader foundations; on the north it was widened to the same extent over a length of 4.5 m. These two points probably represent reinforcing of the foundations to bear the weight of fireplaces and chimneys.

Internally there were several significant features. The lower courses of a stone wall traversed the ground floor, with an opening c. 1 m wide midway along it. This wall must have separated the undercroft into two spaces, c. 15 and 11 m long respectively. On the east part of the floor, a stone plinth (62), 50 cm square at its base, survived in situ in the rubble; it had provided a supporting surface 35 cm square. This plinth was halfway between the partitioning wall and the eastern construction trench and it had been set into a shallow pit cut into the floor. Subsequently two other shallow pits, both capable of receiving blocks of stone with the same dimensions as the plinth, were found equidistant from, and on either side of, (62); they must have been recesses for similar plinths. During salvage excavation in 1975 other structural features were recorded. On the north side of C there were two flanking structures forming small rectangular additions; there appeared to be another feature on the west wall. Also at the west end of C, a rectangular structure comparable in width to the hall and defined by shallow foundations was exposed in box-scraping. It was either a subsidiary component of C or an earlier structure supplanted by the hall.

The context of C. The most conspicuous feature was an area of smoothed and compacted liai stone (80) lying south of the hall and covering several hundred square metres. This area, which sloped gently southwards, was entered by the ‘corridor’ of compacted stone (127) approaching from the east. A shallow ditch (116) flanked the south wall of C for the eastern two thirds of the hall’s length; it had the form of a ‘drip trench’. At the east end this ditch turned southwards and wended down the slope of (127) to become a storm water drain (118) crossing the area of compacted stone. At many places the area of worn stone was overlaid by roughly circular spreads of oolite chippings, as well as charcoal and ash. It was impossible to judge whether they were contemporary with the use and repair of the hall or whether they belonged to the dismantling and demolition; the latter seemed more likely.

Period 4: Late Medieval–18th century

The levels encountered at an early stage of the project were associated with dismantling, demolition and robbing of the fabric of the buildings, particularly C. The intensity of the robbing can be gauged by its thoroughness and by the realisation that between 490 and 550 tonnes would have been incorporated in the structure of C above ground. By the 1540s Leland was able to observe only the ‘bottom of walls’; in the space of two centuries the buildings on the site had been removed. They had no doubt been quarried stone by stone to provide material for building a range of structures in the surrounding area perhaps including other manorial buildings and town houses.
**Period 5: Modern** (18th century–the 1970s)

The recent history of the site included the gradual levelling of the field through cultivation, accompanied by the formation of a boundary ditch along the crest of the scarp above the river Swilgate, until there were no surface indications of what lay beneath. The other significant change was the growth of trees along the north slope of the scarp and also along the eastern boundary of the hill, where another scarp was created by the formation of a cutting for the main road from Gloucester to Tewkesbury. Bennett (1830) reported on roadworks adjacent to the house of industry in or soon after 1827 which involved lowering the hill and ‘cutting off many of the angles’. In 1974 the excavation was undertaken to establish if the site was that of the manor and the following year groundworks in advance of the building of the council offices destroyed the remaining archaeological evidence for the site and its context.

---

**(b) Finds**

**Introduction**

The excavations were carried out in 1974 and 1975 and the post-extraction stage took place two decades later. Over the period there were major changes in reporting archaeological discoveries and a research-orientated approach promoted by English Heritage has been followed here. The assessment for such an approach imposed the need to justify academically the various levels of recording and reporting. The artefacts and environmental evidence from this project have been subjected to such a scrutiny. Priorities for reporting have been linked to the value of the evidence and the areas of historical understanding which study of the evidence will augment. As a result while some categories of finds have been reported fully, the relative quantities of others have been merely noted. Within some categories, particular classes have a bearing on the research questions related to the site’s role and others are of secondary interest. In the case of the ironwork, the military, equestrian and high-status character of the assemblage has provided the principal interest. The presence of other iron objects such as keys, locks, hinges, and nails has been indicated but they have not been reported in detail. This approach has also been applied to the deposition of the finds in the archive; some categories will be retained in their entirety, others by a sample.

---

**PREHISTORIC FLINT AND POTTERY** by Alan Saville (Department of Archaeology, National Museums of Scotland)

Thirty-one flint artefacts were collected. None was apparently from a secure context with which it was likely to be contemporary. A small mixed collection of this type is of very limited value, but it does suggest that the location was never a focus of earlier prehistoric settlement. Sherds of handmade, undecorated prehistoric pottery were recovered from two separate contexts. The pottery was characteristic of pre-Belgic Iron-Age pottery from the region. One of the contexts contained charcoal with, according to radiocarbon determination (HAR-1192), a wide age-range in the mid 1st millenium B.C. (755–200 cal B.C.). Details of the flints and sherds are in the site archive.
ARCHITECTURAL STONWORK AND MOULDINGS by Richard Halsey (English Heritage)

The stonework, in the form of demolition rubble, is very fragmentary and represents a small fraction of a substantial building. Nevertheless, most of it appears to be of 12th-century date judging from the style of the carved fragments and the diagonal tooling and falls into two periods: beak heads and perhaps the singular large pelleted discs are of c. 1140–60, the highly finished and complex beaded circle decoration and finely moulded pieces date to c. 1170–80. The fragments are too small to judge their provenance (the curvature can only occasionally be detected), but the use of such motifs elsewhere strongly suggests the building had highly decorated doors and windows. This is what one can expect to see in a manor house belonging to a great nobleman. Although comparative examples are rare, the work of Bishop Hugh de Puisset (1153–95) at Durham castle and of the Redvers family (1130) at Christchurch Castle Hall (Dorset) set some idea of the richness of decorative detail that could be used on buildings of such status. St. Mary’s Guildhall, Lincoln, which dates to c. 1160–70, is the most complete highly-decorated secular building of the period to survive in England; it has carved string-courses and cornices as well as ornate doors and windows. The late 12th-century Oakham Hall (Rutland) is perhaps the finest Romanesque secular building in England and, although of a generation later than the stone buildings on Holm hill, amply demonstrates the quality and elaboration that can be expected (Wood 1974).

As the Oakham arcades have their closest stylistic parallel in the choir of Canterbury cathedral, ecclesiastical buildings provide the clearest parallels for the Holm hill material. Unfortunately nothing at Tewkesbury abbey, the nearest significant ecclesiastical site, is comparable, except the ubiquitous chamfer and groove hood-moulding. The earls of Gloucester were great benefactors of the abbey and William, the 2nd earl, may have contributed to the rebuilding of the monastic offices destroyed in a fire in 1178 (V.C.H. Glos. 8, 124–5). However, William was most devoted to the Augustinian house he founded at Keynsham in 1167–72 and where he was buried in 1183 (V.C.H. Somerset 2, 129). Excavations of the abbey site at Keynsham have produced a great deal of later 12th-century material, and its fine quality is echoed in the later pieces discovered at Holm hill. Augustinian houses at Bristol, founded c. 1148, and Wigmore, founded 1172, also have comparable material (Knowles and Brooke 1972). As most of the features at Holm hill are repeated in buildings and sites, especially parish churches, within fifteen miles of Tewkesbury, it seems that a local group of craftsmen was employed. On an assumption that the principal buildings of major patrons like the earls of Gloucester set fashions, it is possible that Holm hill provided a model adapted for local churches by the same craftsmen. However, in the absence of evidence from major 12th-century buildings in the area, such as the monasteries (especially the cloisters) at Tewkesbury, Gloucester, Evesham, Pershore and Worcester, the most that can be firmly surmised is that the Holm hill pieces belong to a building of high quality with decorative motifs employed by craftsmen operating locally in the second half of the 12th century.

Twelfth-century fragments. Most of the stonework is of fine grain limestone, made pink from the effects of heat. The fire must have occurred when the building was standing and not after its demolition, as the colouring rarely goes more than two or three inches beyond the face of the stonework. The stone itself is not burnt, but the uniformity of the colouring suggests a strong source of heat, such as a collapsed roof burning on the floor. Notable is the lack of weathering and the almost total absence of evidence for colouring or limewash. Some very finely carved mouldings survive in almost pristine condition which, even if reddened by heat, suggests an
internal location. Only one small piece of limewash is visible to the naked eye and is on a stone that could have been an external plinth. From what is known of 12th-century secular buildings, the greatest amount of decoration was applied to the exterior (particularly to the surrounds of windows and doors), but this makes the lack of weathering and of traces of surface decoration all the more puzzling. Perhaps the stones come from one major feature, such as a main entrance (with a timber porch?), which for some reason was burnt and never redecorated.

Four pieces could be attributed to the house destroyed by Waleran, earl of Worcester, in 1140 or, from their simple detail and large scale, to a subsidiary position in a later 12th-century building. Of these, two pieces of plinth (of which Sm15 has the only trace of limewash seen) and a large-scale chamfered stone (Sm14) that could be a plinth or an abacus might well come from a later 12th-century context. The fourth piece is of an upright base (Sm16) which from its contours alone might be dated between c. 1100 and 1120. It is, however, very finely finished and is of a type found in the Cotswolds, e.g. at Elcstane, and usually dated about 1160; therefore it probably belongs to a post-1140 building. Unlike the other three stones but like most of the 12th-century fragments, it is fire-reddened but the date of the reddening is of course not known. Fragments of hood-moulds and stone courses form the largest group of pieces.

In the 12th-century it was common practice to encircle a whole building with continuous string-courses that rose over windows and doors to form hood-moulding. The variations in the groove and chamfer motif at Holm hill demonstrate influence from further afield, and suggest the presence of a number of windows and doors.

The most ornate pieces of hood-moulding (Sm1–2), with a delicate relief of alternating semi-circles and points applied to a broad hollow chamfer, belong to the later phase of work (c. 1160–70). There is a hood-moulding of virtually the same size as well as design around the nave door of the church of St. Nicholas at Ashchurch (about two miles east of the site). The distinctive, sharply pointed chevron, the use of individual drilled balls set within a hollow chamfer moulding and the coiled hood-stops of Ashchurch are exactly paralleled in the doors at the parish churches of Bishop's Cleeve (about six miles south of Tewkesbury) and Elkstone (about 15 miles south). The Cleeve and Elkstone examples also have the Greek key decoration in common and enough other small sculptural details to suggest that they are the product of the same group of masons. Beak-head decoration (Henry and Zarnicki 1958) was used extensively at Elkstone and a number of fragments of this distinctive feature were found at Holm hill. Interestingly, there appear to be at least two sizes of head. Although a variety of shapes was possible in one door, such as the south door at Elkstone, it is possible that some fragments come not from beak heads around an arch but from monster hood-stops like those on the chancel arch at Elkstone or the doors at Bishop's Cleeve. The Holm hill fragments indicate that these heads followed the local type of an almond-eyed monster, first seen on the hood-stops of the tower arch at Deerhurst (c. 1000) and in use as hood-stops until at least the end of the 12th century. The details of ribbed hair and drilled eyes and most especially the open beak showing saw-teeth (Sm3) can be paralleled in the Elkstone doorway. The use of such teeth is not recorded elsewhere. There are also three pieces of blank triangular stones (Sm17) that may have been similarly set within an arch, as on the south door of the nave of Iffley church (Oxfordshire), where fully carved beakheads are also used. It is possible that all these pieces of monster/beak heads date from c. 1140–60.

Another common feature of the locality is the extensive use of beading within mouldings. Two pieces of fire-reddened stone have beads set in a channel between a flat and a chamfer; Sm22 has a hollow chamfer and the beads are more ovoid and are separated from each other in a deeper channel than on Sm23. There are drilled beads of a large diameter (c. 20 mm) on a weathered and fire-reddened fragment (Sm24). These describe a segment of a circle such as is seen on one of the biggest pieces of stone found (Sm8). Unfortunately, the stone is so damaged
Fig. 10. Holm hill: architectural stonework and mouldings, Sm1–6.
that no detail remains of the underlying feature, but it may have been another beaded circle. Intersecting beaded circles can be seen on columns and capitals from c. 1140 (Lincoln cathedral west door, Reading abbey cloisters), but they are rarely used to decorate arches. The best example dated to c. 1160 is on the outer order of the southern arch to the gateway at St. Augustine's abbey at Bristol (now the cathedral), though the intersections follow a complicated pattern. A similar decoration can be seen on fragments from Wigmore abbey (founded 1172). Another damaged piece of lightly reddened stone at Holm hill (Sm25) has a beaded zig-zag which is difficult to place. The flat area adjacent is diagonally tooled and seems to show some setting out lines, as if most of the face was covered over (perhaps within other mouldings?). However, the stone does not appear to have any curvature. It might have formed the outside edge of a three-dimensional chevron or beak head, the beads being the top moulding following the principal decoration as on the west door at Ifley church. Otherwise, a similar zig-zag can be seen on the flat intrados of the transverse arches of the vaulting of the chapter house at Bristol cathedral, dated like the gateway to c. 1160.

The finest finished stones found at Holm hill (Sm26–28b) belong to an order of complex undercut chevron laced with small (c. 140–150-mm diameter) beaded circles set at right-angles to each other. From other late 12th-century examples, it can be assumed that the face and the underside of the arch comprised touching circles, with chevron roll-moulding on one face and flower buds or petalled flowers on the other (perhaps the underside). Sm10 is possibly from this complex moulding; it is carved from the same white fine grain stone and the roll-moulding is of the same dimension and tooling. The sharply pointed petal sits at the junction of the two rolls, a design incorporated in the east window of Elkstone church. Sm32 is from a similar design but the scale of the motif is larger. Neither fragments Sm26–28b nor pieces of c. 45 mm diameter chevron roll (e.g. Sm29), likely to belong to this decoration, are fire-reddened. The larger beaded circles (e.g. Sm8) are carved from a yellow, shelly limestone of coarser grain than the whiter stone of smaller intersecting beaded circles. The latter are likely to be a decade or more later in date and this evidence therefore suggests that highly decorated arches were being created in the period 1160–80. More mundane 12th-century architectural fragments of roll-mouldings and shafts with diameters ranging from 40 to 300 mm and three fragments of scalloped capitals (Sm11, 30 and 35) cannot be provenanced on the building. The use of the octagonal form (Sm 11) is noteworthy and a delicately carved piece (Sm9) that must be from an ensemble of hair (like a monster’s beard?) or decorative foliage is an intriguing survival.

Post twelfth-century fragments. A few stones can be attributed to the 13th century. Most are fragments of roll-mouldings with added fillets, as on Sm33. On Sm31, a fragment of round column base, the seating for the detached shaft is visible. None of these pieces is fire-reddened and, as there are so few of them, it can be supposed that little work was done after the 12th century. No pieces of date later than c. 1300 have been identified.

Catalogue

The catalogue entries describe fragments of architectural stonework and mouldings which were selected for their significance from the assemblage of pieces collected during excavations. They indicate the main characteristics of the fragment and the architectural feature from which it is likely to have come, together with the context on site and its period. Each fragment has also been classified according to the geology of the stone (petrology types: 1–4) as defined by Diana Sutherland in her report on the geology of the building stone. Finally a date of construction and probable incorporation into a building has been given.
Fig. 11. Holm hill: architectural stonework and mouldings, Sm7–8.
Sm1, 2 Fragments of hood-moulding (Fig. 10) with relief of alternating semi-circles and points applied to a hollow chamfer.  
LXX (44) and LXI (4), Periods 4 and 3  
Holm Petr type 1  
Mid 12th century

Sm3 Fragment of monster head (Fig. 10) with fire-reddened tip of a curving beak flanked by saw-teeth.  
LXXI (2), Period 3  
Holm Petr type 1  
Mid 12th century

Sm4 Fragment of monster head (Fig. 10) showing drilled right-hand almond eye (cf. Sm20).  
L (1), Period 5  
Holm Petr type 1  
Mid 12th century

Sm5 Bottom half of a ridged beak (Fig. 10) broken from the roll it used to grip; fire-reddened.  
LXXI (2), Period 3  
Holm Petr type 1  
Mid 12th century

Sm6 Fragment of a monster head (Fig. 10) showing beak with a ridge or noseband, lightly fire-reddened.  
LX (4), Period 3  
Holm Petr type 1  
Mid 12th century

Sm7 Top half of a monster head (Fig. 11) with two drilled almond-shaped eyes below a ridged mane and the beginnings of a grinning mouth. The stone is fire-reddened and damaged but the head is the same scale as Sm3, 12, 19 and 21. It appears to be from a beak-head voussoir rather than from a hood-stop.  
LXI (3), Period 4  
Holm Petr type 1  
Mid 12th century

Sm8 A segment of a circle (Fig. 11) c. 250 mm in diameter with 4 beads set separately on a flat band with raised edges. At the centre of the circle is a petalled flower and a secondary square slot seems to have been made within it. A further linear feature runs beneath the beaded band and follows a circle, having emerged from beneath the flower. A secondary rebate occurs on the reverse of the stone.  
LXXI (3), Period 4  
Holm Petr type 2  
Mid 12th century

Sm9 Thin slice of coarse grained limestone (Fig. 12); the top and bottom edges are converging and a tight curled feature emerges from the point. Could be from a monster-head mane/beard or be part of foliage decoration (cf. the frame of the tympanum of the south door at Elkstone).  
LXX (30), Period 3  
Holm Petr type 2  
Mid 12th century

Sm10 Fragment from complex chevron (Fig. 12) with sharply pointed petal at the junction of two rolls, meeting at an angle of 45 degrees.  
LXI (4), Period 3  
Holm Petr type 1  
Last third 12th century

Sm11 Lower part of an octagonal scalloped capital (Fig. 12) with integral astragal; underside of the base shows setting out lines for positioning the shaft, each side being c. 65 mm long. An unstratified fragment of an octagonal shaft had similar dimensions.  
L (28), Period 4  
Holm Petr Type 1  
Mid 12th century
Fig. 12. Holm hill: architectural stonework and mouldings, Sm9–12, 16, 20–1.
Sm12  Top right-hand corner of a fire-reddened beak-head voussoir (Fig. 12) including the ear (cf. Sm7 and 18). The flat chamfer moulding is also visible.
   LX (10), Period 4
   Holm Petr type 1
   Mid 12th century

Sm13  Fragment of a plinth.
   XL (82), Period 3
   Holm Petr type 1
   Early 12th century?

Sm14  Large scale chamfer stone, from a plinth or abacus.
   XI (94), Period 3
   Holm Petr type 3
   Early 12th century?

Sm15  Fragment of plinth, including trace of limewash in simple grooved moulding.
   L (28), Period 4
   Holm Petr type 4
   Early 12th century?

Sm16  Fragment of upright base (Fig. 12) finely finished, fire-reddened.
   LX (10), Period 4
   Holm Petr type 1
   Mid 12th century?

Sm17  Three pieces of blank triangular stone, probably from decorated archway.
   LXI (3), Period 4
   Holm Petr type 1
   Mid 12th century

Sm18  Fragment, weathered, of monster head, possibly top left-hand ear or mane.
   XXXI (1), Period 5
   Holm Petr type 2
   Mid 12th century

Sm19  Fragment of monster head with fire-reddened parallel ridges possibly from a mane or eyebrow
   (cf. Sm7) or from a beak (cf. Sm21).
   LI (119), Period 3
   Holm Petr type 1
   Mid 12th century

Sm20  Fragment of large-scale monster head (Fig. 12) with fire-reddened, drilled left-hand eye and forehead. It is possibly from a hood-stop (cf. Sm4).
   LII (1), Period 5
   Holm Petr type 1
   Mid 12th century

Sm21  Two fragments of a monster head (Fig. 12) part of the forehead (cf. Sm7). Larger piece is triangular in section with parallel ridges (cf. Sm19) converging at apex and following either the tip of the beak (in which case the two lumps either side of the apex form nostrils) or the eyes (in which case the lumps are at the hairline).
   LX (41), Period 3
   Holm Petr type 1
   Mid 12th century

Sm22  Fragment of beading within a moulding. The beads, in a channel against a hollow chamfer, are ovoid and separated from each other.
   LX (28), Period 4
   Holm Petr type 1
   Mid 12th century

Sm23  Fragment of beading within a moulding (Fig. 13).
   LXX (30), Period 3
Fig. 13. Holm hill: architectural stonework and mouldings, Sm23, 25, 28A–B, 30.
Holm Petr type 1
Mid 12th century

Sm24 Fragment of a circular feature, weathered and fire-reddened; beading within a moulding, and the beads are drilled and of large diameter (c. 20 mm).
LXI (80), Period 3
Holm Petr type 1
Mid 12th century

Sm25 Fragment of lightly reddened stone (Fig. 13) with beaded zig-zag; the flat diagonally tooled adjacent area shows setting out lines.
L (28), Period 4
Holm Petr type 1
Mid 12th century

Sm26, 27, 28a and 28b Fragments of complex chevron (cf. Fig. 13) possibly from a feature incorporating beaded circles with chevron roll-moulding running in and out of the circles on one face and opening flower buds or petalled flowers filling the circles on the other.
LXI (1), LX (4), unstratified, LXI (80), Periods 5 and 3
Holm Petr type 1
Last third 12th century

Sm29 Fragment of chevron roll, one of many pieces likely to come from the complex chevron Sm 26–28b.
LX (28), Period 4
Holm Petr type 1
Last third 12th century

Sm30 Fragment of finely carved scallop capital (Fig. 13), fire-reddened, with a flat return to the upright edge of the scallop, indicating its use as a nook shaft, perhaps from an internal window.
LXX (34), Period 3
Holm Petr type 1
Mid 12th century

Sm31 Fragment of moulded round column base, the shaft of quite large diameter (c. 220 mm).
HC75 (421), Period 5
Holm Petr type 2
13th century

Sm32 Fragment from complex chevron in fire-reddened stone.
LXX (30), Period 3
Holm Petr type 1
Last third 12th century

Sm33 Ovoid roll-moulding with added fillet; a fragment from a hood-mould or string-course.
LX (1), Period 5
Holm Petr type 1
13th century

Sm34 Fragment from the base of a capital with an integrated astragal, but might be from a moulding.
LX (1), Period 5
Holm Petr type 4
12th century

WHETSTONE by Fiona Roe

The whetstone is in the form of a rectangular block weighing 220 grams, with a nearly square cross section except that the four edges are bevelled. It measures 9.55 cm in length, while the section is 3.4 by 3.2 cm. The block is a buff-coloured, slightly micaceous medium-grained sandstone, reddened at one end from burning. A thin-section was made (R. 284), which demonstrated that the stone consists of c. 80% angular quartz grains with a few rock fragments, which are
mainly chert and quartzite, a small amount of muscovite and black opaque matter and c. 15% of iron-stained amorphous material which includes some altered feldspar. The grains, c. 0.1 mm in size, are fairly well sorted. The whetstone was found in 1975 in a layer of oolitic and lias fragments (413) south of the buildings.

The most likely source for this stone appears to be the Coal Measures of Derbyshire and Yorkshire. It is a variety of sandstone in frequent use during the medieval period (Moore 1978) and it was apparently first used for whetstones during the Roman period when it may have been distributed with Millstone Grit for querns and millstones. Coal Measures sandstone was still being utilised in the 19th century, when a number of quarries supplied suitable stone for scythe-stones and whetstones (Farey 1811, 1, 437–9) and observation of the materials used for grindstones (ibid. 436) suggests that these could also have been used for whetstones.

The exclusive occurrence of the above makes it impossible to suggest a close source for the material used for this whetstone. However comparable finds have been recorded from medieval contexts in Gloucester and Worcester (Roe forthcoming (a) and (b)). Similar whetstones are also known from medieval contexts in Oxford (Palmer 1980, 195 and fiche 2 DO 5; Hardy 1996, 258). The whetstone from Holm hill probably derives from an extensive and long-lasting network of trade in Coal Measures sandstone from the Pennine area.

DAUB

Daub, dried and fired to varying degrees of hardness, was noted and samples were recovered from levels in and around the remains of the buildings. The daub has not been analysed or studied and, following consultation with AML, only samples will be retained in the site archive. The daub on the site probably derived either from clay drying on exposure to the air over long periods or from industrial activity. However that found in the area of Building B could have been the result of the exposure of parts of that structure to intense heat (possibly during its destruction in 1140).

LOOMWEIGHT

A fragment of an annular loomweight c. 50 mm long and 35 mm thick was found in a layer of gravelly sand (LXX 79). The fragment was of fired clay, reddish orange on the outer surface and grey/blue in the interior. Although fragmentary the find is significant because of other evidence (Domesday Survey; remains of timber buildings) for occupation on Holm hill in the late Anglo-Saxon period. Annular loomweights were common in the early and middle Anglo-Saxon period but gave way to bun-shaped weights in the late Anglo-Saxon period; the warp-weighted loom with which they were used went out of use in rural contexts during the 11th century, earlier in towns (Rogers 1997).

FLOOR TILES by Dr. Alan Vince (Department of Archaeology, University of York)

Floor tiles of three fabric groups and c. 180 kgs in total were found in the robber trenches and demolition levels of Building C and also in an area south-east of the stone-built halls. The latter location suggested the site of a chapel.
The fabrics

Droitwich-type tiles. The fabric of these tiles is described in the site archive (Nenk 1986, DROIT). Three samples were thin-sectioned (M381, 382 and 383) and their petrology compared with Droitwich-type tiles from other sites, including Gloucester and Keynsham. The results of this analysis suggest that the Holm hill tiles were obtained from the same source as tiles known to have come from this industry. The majority of the tiles were 'printed', i.e. they have a two-colour design in which the pattern was formed of a thin white clay slip. Experimental reproduction has shown that the slip was applied to the tile either before or after stamping rather than to the wooden die as the term 'printed' might imply. Only fifteen designs were represented, all single or repeating patterns; six were heraldic designs. Undecorated tiles of the same quarry size (c. 120 mm square) were also found, some of them being covered with white slip. Some tiles had been converted into border tiles by snapping along lines scored into the tile surface before firing. Forty-two fragments of mosaic tile in the same fabric were also found. They were of ten separate shapes. Two of these tiles were inlaid with a fleur-de-lis pattern whilst the remainder were either coated with a plain lead glaze (appearing black) or had a copper-stained glaze over a white slip. These mosaic tiles were present in both the robber trenches and the area of the putative chapel. Cf. Figs. 14–16, 1-32, 34–7.

White-firing clay. Three tiles were off-white in colour and were covered with a copper-stained green glaze. The fabric of these tiles is described in the site archive (Nenk 1986, WHITE FABRIC TILE) and one sample (M384) was examined in thin-section. All have a right-angled triangular shape with sides of 120 mm and were cut along the diagonal before firing. Cf. Fig. 16, 33.

Sand-tempered red earthenware. Ten fragments of unglazed tile had a sandy texture and were decorated with freehand ring-and-dot stamps. One (M385) was examined in thin-section. All had keyed bases. Cf. Fig. 16, 38.

Discussion

Sources. The Droitwich-type tiles are tempered with a rounded quartz sand typical of, and presumably derived from, a terrace deposit within, the Severn valley. The lack of petrological variation in samples of this group taken from sites as far apart as Shropshire and Dyfed together with the presence of tiles stamped with the same dies at widely separated sites suggests a single source for the tiles. A location of this source in the Worcester region has been suggested partly because of the similarity of the fabric with ceramics of known Worcester origin and partly because of the historical evidence for the importance of the tile industry in Worcester in the later medieval period. The only archaeological evidence for production of tiles of this type comes, however, not from Worcester but from Droitwich, eight miles to the north-east.

The presence of a fragment of oolitic limestone in the fabric of one of the white-firing tiles suggests that these too had a relatively local origin whilst the unglazed sandy tiles are similar to many Worcester-area products. None of the floor tiles need therefore have originated more than 30 miles from Holm hill. It is worth noting, however, that in the 1320s or 1330s floor tiles were being manufactured even closer to Holm hill in Malvern Chase. No tiles of this type have been found at Holm hill, although they are known from Tewkesbury abbey.

Dating. There is no stratigraphic evidence for the date of the Holm hill tiles. Their archaeological contexts, such as they are, are consistent with the floors of which they were part having survived until the site was abandoned. Since the white-firing, green-glazed tiles and the unglazed ring-and-dot decorated tiles are apparently unique in the region there is no comparative evidence for their date. The Droitwich-type tiles, however, belong to a well-known 'factory' but there is little useful evidence for dating them. The 'printing' technique is known to have been
Fig. 14. Holm hill: floor tile forms and designs, 1–17.
used in the late 13th/14th century in south-eastern England, although in the Severn valley tiles were still produced in the early 14th century using a thicker ‘inlaid’ slip (Vince and Wilmott 1991). Some Droitwich-type tiles, including a fragment from Holm hill (15), were decorated with designs which were clearly derived from those produced in the London area in the late 13th or early 14th century and termed the ‘Westminster tiler School’. Given the long currency of 13th- and 14th-century floor tile designs this link does not provide any additional evidence for dating either the Droitwich-type industry in general or the Holm hill tiles in particular.

Better evidence comes from a series of tile pavements or collections which can be dated by their architectural or archaeological context. The earliest is the pavement surrounding the tomb of Edward II at Gloucester cathedral. There is reason to believe that these tiles are the surviving remnant of a reflooring associated with the rebuilding of the east end of the cathedral in the mid 14th century and there is certainly no reason to suppose that the tiles date to immediately after the burial of the king in 1327. Further evidence is provided by the tiles used in the Singing School pavement at Worcester cathedral. As Keen has demonstrated, these tiles were laid c. 1377 and consist of two groups, both of Droitwich-type tiles. The first group comprising the ‘Westminster tiler’-influenced type described above is thought, on account of its unimportant position and lack of coherence in layout, to consist of tiles reused from elsewhere. The second group comprises tiles laid diagonally in groups of 4, 9 and 16 with bands of plain tiles separating them; these tiles are more likely to have been made c. 1377. A collection of loose and relaid Droitwich-type tiles from St. Oswald’s priory, Gloucester, can also be divided into groups, representing two distinct periods of flooring. No independent evidence exists for the date of either group. Tiles from the surround of FitzHamon’s tomb at Tewkesbury abbey and dated to c. 1399 were clearly made at the time of the flooring and appear to have been substantially undisturbed. Finally, a Droitwich-type tile pavement in the Beauchamp chapel at the abbey, dating to c. 1435, incorporates a well-known 16-tile pattern.

The decorated square tiles from Holm hill are most similar to the earlier of the groups from St. Oswald’s priory and to the tiles from the surround of Edward II’s tomb at Gloucester cathedral. Some of the designs are found in the Worcester Singing School pavement, but were not made with the same dies. There is no evidence to show the relative date of the Holm hill and Gloucester pavements but the use of snapped border tiles is generally an early feature and is inconsistent with the type of layout employed at Worcester in the late 14th century. On balance, therefore, the square tiles are likely to be of mid 14th-century date.

Two-colour tile mosaic is extremely rare in the Severn valley and it is not found further west (Lewis 1976). In northern and eastern England, however, it has been discovered in mid 13th- to early 14th-century contexts. A good parallel for the original layout of the Holm hill pavement is a design given by Eames (1980), based on tiles from Meaux (Yorkshire). Similar elements are also known from Christ Church cathedral, Dublin. The design consists of a major circular pattern, made up with concentric bands containing different elements. The lozenge and triangular-shaped tiles from Holm hill are likely to have been arranged in star patterns in such a band. Other mosaic elements from Holm hill probably come from the spandrels between these large circular panels, which probably contained circles (made of one or more tiles) of varying diameters. Mosaic pavements of this type required a large number of different elements, all of which had to be produced within narrow tolerances for the pavement to fit together. Those at Holm hill must have formed a substantial element in the internal ornamentation of the buildings in which they were laid. If the tile mosaic and square tile pavements are of similar date then one in the mid 14th century is the most likely, although one in the later 13th to early 14th century cannot be ruled out.
Fig. 15. Holm hill: floor tile forms and designs, 18–25.
**EXCAVATIONS AT HOLM HILL, TEWKESBURY**

**Status.** Floor tiles were an expensive form of flooring as their use during the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries in the Severn valley clearly shows. Late 13th- to early 14th-century floor tiles are found almost exclusively on the sites of major religious houses and castles e.g. Goodrich castle (Hereford and Worcester) and Newton St. Loec castle (Bath and North East Somerset). By the mid 14th century they occur at lesser religious houses and in some parish churches e.g. at Bredon (Hereford and Worcester) (Vince and Wilmott 1991). It may well be that they were used more commonly in parish churches than the evidence of survival suggests; few parish churches have been excavated in the region and at least two of Gloucester’s parish churches (St. Mary de Lode and St. Nicholas) have mid 14th-century Droitwich-type tile pavements. By the 15th century, however, decorated tiles can be found in large numbers of parish churches and in small quantities on secular urban sites.

The presence of a decorated tile floor on a secular site in the Severn valley in the mid 14th century is unusual but not unique. Floor tiles of 14th-century date have, for example, been found on the site of the abbot of Gloucester's residence at Over. How far down the social scale the use of floor tiles had descended by this time is unclear. At present, however, the floor tiles and especially the tile mosaic at Holm hill suggest something grander than a standard manorial complex such as that excavated at Acton Court, Iron Acton (Bell forthcoming), and most likely an establishment patronised by a leading magnate or prelate. The identity of this patron might be hinted at by the similarity between the mosaic tiles from Holm hill and those from Christ Church cathedral, Dublin, where one circular band contained heraldic designs clearly related to those used at Holm hill on the square tiles (Fig. 14, 8) but with the lion facing the opposite direction. The significant area of comparison is in the bottom corners of the tiles, which in both the Dublin and Tewkesbury examples are filled with roughly parallel lines.

**Original place of use.** Floor tiles found on a late 13th- or 14th-century complex appear to have had a restricted use although the evidence is clouded by the subsequent reuse of much of the material. At Holm hill it is highly unlikely that the entire upper floor of the hall was tiled, and the quantity of tile fragments is not as great as one would expect from an extensive tile pavement such as that at St. Oswald’s priory. It is most likely that the decorated tiles were used in a limited area such as a dais in the hall. The cluster of tile fragments in the south-eastern part of the site may be evidence for the location of a chapel, as suggested by the excavator. It is, however, notable that the floor tiles from both areas include mosaic tiles and an alternative hypothesis is that both groups of tile originated in the same pavement and ended up in separate locations as a result of activity at the time of demolition. The cluster to the south-east would then be interpreted as a dump of demolition debris.

**Catalogue of illustrated tile forms and designs (Figs. 14-16)**

The designs are grouped according to fabric and form. The original code used in the site archive is given after the catalogue number

**DROITWICH-TYPE BORDER TILES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 A</td>
<td>small square (standard tile cut into four)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 B</td>
<td>as 1 with white slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 C</td>
<td>as 1 but scored diagonally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 D</td>
<td>as 1 but scored and snapped into triangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 E</td>
<td>as 4 with white slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 F</td>
<td>as 3 with white slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 G</td>
<td>scored into two rectangular tiles; each scored for division into four triangles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 16. Holm hill: floor tile forms and designs, 26–38.
DROITWICH-TYPE SQUARE TILES WITH HERALDIC DECORATION

8  6  rampant lion
9  7  fleur-de-lis
10 10  arms of de Clare
11 12  unidentified arms
12 13  arms of England
13 14  unidentified arms (either a single fleur-de-lis or perhaps the arms of Cantelupe)

DROITWICH-TYPE SMALL SQUARE TILES

14 15  fleurs-de-lis set diagonally

DROITWICH-TYPE SQUARE TILES WITH REPEATING PATTERNS

15  1  flower in diagonally-set square
16  2  overlapping circles and square or lozenge with a notched outer edge
17  3  flowers in circles within diagonally-set cross
18  4  fleur-de-lis in diagonally-set square
19  5  fish in 'vesica' (two quarter circles)
20  8  lion in circular band with fleurs-de-lis in corners
21  9  spread eagle. Probably the same stamp was used for 21–23 but because of damage to the stamp and/or warping of the tiles they cannot now be reconstructed.
22  9  spread eagle
23  9  spread eagle
24 11  unidentified fragment
25 16  fleur-de-lis in diagonally-set square

DROITWICH-TYPE MOSAIC TILES

26  M01  triangle
27  M02  lozenge, some containing fleur-de-lis, some plain
28  M03  isosceles triangle with curved smaller side
29  M04  segmental tile from narrow circular band
30  M05  rectangle with concave shorter side
31  M06  complex shape with two concave and one convex sides
32  M06A  as 31 with single keyed base
34  M08  tile for use in the spandrel at the corner of main circular panel
35  M09  tile for use at the junction of two or four large circular panels with smaller circular panel
36  M20  flower lobe
37  M21  probable flower lobe

WHITE FIRING CLAY

33  M07  triangle

SAND-TEMPERED RED EARTHENWARE

38  square tile decorated with freehand ring-and-dot stamps in inscribed band and petals

POTTERY by Dr. Alan Vince (Department of Archaeology, University of York) and Beverley Nenk (Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities, British Museum)

The entire pottery assemblage from Holm hill has been examined over a period of two decades by Alan Vince. The majority of the pottery was, however, recorded in detail in 1986 by Beverley Nenk, then of the Museum of London. Vince identified the wares and Nenk produced detailed fabric descriptions based on those identifications as well as the detailed record of forms, typology and decoration. A small quantity of sherds individually recorded by the excavator was not available for study in 1986 but was identified and recorded by Vince in 1995. The stratigraphic analysis of the data was carried out in 1995 and was based on a periodised matrix supplied by the excavator. Copies of the pottery phasing database and the original pottery recording sheets are deposited with the site archive.
Wares and fabrics

The pottery database comprises 4,450 records, each representing one or more sherds of the same ware, form and decorative details in the same context. All but 204 were capable of being identified to Common Name or Ware level. A few sherds of Romano-British date were found, together with a single late Anglo-Saxon sherd. Most of the pottery dated to the medieval period and there was a sizable collection of post-medieval pottery, represented by small sherds. Of the 68 medieval and post-medieval fabrics identified 49 could be assigned a Common Name. The identifiable medieval fabrics, 29 (a further 7 could not be recognised and were assigned a code describing their principal inclusions) in all, have been assigned a name and described in detail in the site archive (Nenk 1986) and are listed below with their recording code, a brief description and source.

Romano-British Pottery. Twenty sherds were found with a median weight of 6 gm. These small sherds are likely to represent the ‘background’ scatter of pottery of this date found on almost every excavation in the Severn valley.

Late Anglo-Saxon Pottery. A single sherd of a Stafford-type ware cooking pot (Code: CHEST) was found in the topsoil. This small sherd, weighing only 7 gm, is not conclusive evidence for the existence of a habitation site near Holm hill in the late Anglo-Saxon period, although, unlike Romano-British pottery, late Anglo-Saxon pottery is quite rare in the Severn valley and has only been recorded on a handful of sites.

Medieval Pottery. Thirty six separate fabrics were recorded within the collection of medieval pottery from Holm hill (Table 1).

Table 1: medieval pottery fabrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>code</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>catalogue no.</th>
<th>source and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Bristol Redcliffe ware</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOS TF110</td>
<td>A distinctive ware with sandstone and calcareous sandstone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between Ledbury and Ross-on-Wye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOS TF41B</td>
<td>Gloucester-type fabric 41B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vale of Gloucester (Haresfield?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOS TF54</td>
<td>Gloucester-type fabric 54</td>
<td></td>
<td>Herefordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOS TF79</td>
<td>Gloucester-type fabric 79</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOS TF99</td>
<td>Gloucester-type fabric 99</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG</td>
<td>Ham Green ware</td>
<td>18–21</td>
<td>Ham Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOND</td>
<td>London-type ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>London area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYVE</td>
<td>Lyveden/Stanion ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lyveden and/or Stanion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>Malvern Chase ware</td>
<td>22, 27–47</td>
<td>Malvern Chase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINETY</td>
<td>Minety-type ware</td>
<td>23–5, 48</td>
<td>Minety (Wilts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC ISKW</td>
<td>A lead-glazed wheelthrown ware with iron-rich and quartz sand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC ISW</td>
<td>A wheelthrown ware with iron-rich and quartz inclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC IY</td>
<td>A handmade ware with iron-rich inclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC LSGW</td>
<td>A green-glazed wheelthrown ware with limestone and quartz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: medieval pottery fabrics (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>code</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>catalogue no.</th>
<th>source and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MISC LY</td>
<td>A handmade limestone-tempered ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC MED</td>
<td>Undescribed medieval wares</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC SGKW</td>
<td>A plain- and green-glazed wheelthrown quartz-tempered ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC SGKW 3628</td>
<td>A distinctive plain and green-glazed quartz-tempered ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC SGKY</td>
<td>A plain- and green-glazed wheelthrown quartz-tempered ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC SGW</td>
<td>Green-glazed wheelthrown quartz-tempered wares</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC SGW 3629</td>
<td>A distinctive green-glazed wheelthrown quartz-tempered ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC SGY</td>
<td>Green-glazed handmade quartz-tempered wares</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC SKNW</td>
<td>A white-slipped glazed wheelthrown ware with quartz inclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC SKW</td>
<td>Glazed wheelthrown wares with quartz inclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC SKY</td>
<td>Glazed handmade wares with quartz inclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC SW</td>
<td>Wheelthrown wares with quartz inclusions</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC SY</td>
<td>Handmade wares with quartz inclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTF</td>
<td>Malvern Chase tripod pitcher fabric</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Malvern Chase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCOT1</td>
<td>North Cotswolds 1 ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Cotswolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Nash Hill ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nash Hill (Wilts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXAC</td>
<td>Oxford fabric AC</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Oxfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXAM</td>
<td>Oxford fabric AM</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Brill and/or Boarstall (Bucks.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUE</td>
<td>Rouen-type ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rouen area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAIG</td>
<td>Saintonge smooth green-glazed ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saintonge (SW France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>Worcester wares</td>
<td>1-17</td>
<td>Worcester area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *a sherd of this fabric is deposited in the Museum of London reference collection.

Post-Medieval Wares. Twenty six post-medieval fabrics were identified, ranging in date from the late 15th/early 16th century to the early modern period (Table 2). With few exceptions, which are self-evident, these wares are described in the Gloucester gates report (Vince 1983). The sherds were remarkably small, with median sizes ranging from 2 gm (CSTN) to 28 gm (MALV PMED) and an overall median weight of 8 gm. The small size is indicative of their having been in a plough soil.
Table 2: post-medieval wares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19THC STONEWARES</td>
<td>19th-century stonewares</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Ashton Keynes ware</td>
<td>Ashton Keynes (Wlts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREA</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Staffordshire and elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTN</td>
<td>Cistercian ware</td>
<td>Unknown including Severn valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREC</td>
<td>Frechen stoneware</td>
<td>Frechen (Rhineland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALV PMED</td>
<td>Malvern Chase post-medieval ware</td>
<td>Malvern Chase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALVP</td>
<td>Malvern Chase pink ware</td>
<td>Malvern Chase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC EARTHENWARES</td>
<td>Unidentified earthenwares</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC N</td>
<td>Unglazed red earthenwares with no visible inclusions</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDGT</td>
<td>North Devon gravel-tempered ware</td>
<td>Barnstable (Devon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Newent Glasshouse ware</td>
<td>Newent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDY MINETY</td>
<td>Minety-type ware–sandy variant</td>
<td>Minety (Wlts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAM</td>
<td>Merida-type ware</td>
<td>Portugal (and Spain?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSOM</td>
<td>South Somerset ware</td>
<td>Donyatt area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STBRS</td>
<td>Staffordshire brown stoneware</td>
<td>Staffordshire and elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STCO</td>
<td>Staffordshire press-moulded slipware</td>
<td>Staffordshire and elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Staffordshire embossed press-moulded slipware</td>
<td>Staffordshire and elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STMO</td>
<td>Staffordshire mottled glazed ware</td>
<td>Staffordshire and elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRE</td>
<td>Staffordshire red earthenware</td>
<td>Staffordshire and elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRE (BLACK-GLAZED)</td>
<td>Staffordshire black-glazed red earthenware</td>
<td>Staffordshire and elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STROAT</td>
<td>Stroat ware</td>
<td>Stroat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STSLBR</td>
<td>Staffordshire brown-slipped light-bodied earthenware</td>
<td>Staffordshire and elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWSG</td>
<td>Staffordshire white salt-glazed stoneware</td>
<td>Staffordshire and elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGW</td>
<td>Tin-glazed ware</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPW</td>
<td>Transfer-printed ware</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>Westerwald stoneware</td>
<td>Westerwald (Rhineland)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stratigraphic assemblages

The pottery from Holm hill was assigned to several of the periods of occupation, the earliest being the late Anglo-Saxon/Anglo-Norman.

Period 2: Late Anglo-Saxon/Anglo-Norman

The pottery from contexts associated with the late Anglo-Saxon or Norman hall comprised 20 sherds of which one is of Roman date. The remainder are of three wares (Malvern Chase, Worcester and Miscellaneous sand-tempered green-glazed wheelthrown wares) and two forms (cooking pots and jugs). Given the small size of this assemblage, it is not possible to analyse this pottery quantitatively. However, it is clear that the assemblage must date to the middle of the 13th century at the earliest, since 11 of the sherds are from juglets of mid 13th-century or later date. If the deposits from which these sherds were recovered date to the 11th or 12th century these later sherds may be intrusive from later deposits or associated with
the destruction of an 11th or 12th-century structure in the mid 13th century or later. The 7 cooking pot sherds are of types which could conceivably date to the 12th century but which are nevertheless common in 13th-century deposits.

**Period 3a: Anglo-Norman** (mid 11th–mid/late 12th century)

Six hundred and eighty two sherds were recorded from deposits associated with Building B. With the exception of 17 sherds they were of types found in the succeeding periods. The exceptions are a mixture of post-medieval wares, such as Ashton Keynes ware, Newent Glasshouse ware and Staffordshire slipwares, and rare types of medieval date. The latter are likely to have been absent from the later Period 3b deposits as much through chance as through their not being in use at the time. GLOS TF41B is one of the few which might date to the 11th or 12th centuries, but it may be residual in its Holm hill context. The relative frequency of the medieval wares is very similar to that found in the succeeding period. Late medieval forms such as cisterns and conical cooking pots are absent.

**Phase 3b: Medieval** (mid/late 12th–mid/late 14th century)

There are 817 sherds of pottery recorded from deposits associated with Building C. Over half of them are of Malvern Chase ware and 166 sherds are of Worcester wares. Twenty nine other wares are present, but only five or six of them are represented by more than a half dozen sherds. Ham Green ware is the most common additional ware (40 sherds), followed by Minety ware (22 sherds) and Malvern Chase tripod pitcher fabric (22 sherds). Tudor and later post-medieval pottery is present in small quantities, indicating that the deposits are not closed groups. If these later sherds are ignored, the assemblage is typical of the mid 13th century. That period saw the transition between the use of handmade jugs and cooking pots and wheelthrown vessels. It was also a period during which small industries each serving a local market were replaced by larger industries with wider, regional markets. The mid 13th century is the last period in which tripod pitchers would be expected in this area (they survived later elsewhere) and the first in which wheelthrown jugs (with a few exceptions none present here) would be found. It is possible that the assemblage is not actually of one date but has early–mid 13th-century, and later 13th- or 14th-century, components. Support for this model comes from a handful of late medieval sherds of types introduced in the mid 14th century. However, these sherds, e.g. a Malvern Chase cistern (CIST) and a Malvern Chase wheelthrown conical cooking pot (WCP/BOWL), are few and perhaps entered the assemblage alongside the post-medieval wares noted above. The most likely interpretation of these assemblages is that the Building B period (3a) is not widely separated in date from the Building C phase (3b), so that a similar range of pottery was found in both periods, in the same or similar proportions.

**Period 4: Late Medieval–18th century**

Six hundred and seventy five sherds were recorded from the robbing of Building C. As in the preceding periods, the range of fabrics and forms is characteristic of the mid 13th century and the pottery includes demonstrably residual material (e.g. RPOT) and post-medieval pottery. There was probably a single late medieval sherd (GLOS TF99). The date of the robbing of Building C cannot be determined as the ceramic assemblage associated with it is so similar to that in the previous periods.

**Period 5: Modern** (18th Century–the 1970s)

One hundred and six sherds were recorded from modern deposits. Of these, 82 were of medieval date and with the range of forms and wares found in the earlier periods. The 82 sherds are undoubtedly derived from the medieval levels below. A single late medieval sherd (GLOS TF79) and 22 sherds of post-medieval date were found. The latter range from the later 17th or earlier 18th centuries to the 19th century. There are too few sherds to indicate any particular concentrations or lacunae within the post-medieval fragments.
The chronology of Holm hill

The pottery from the Holm hill excavations might be used in two ways to interpret the site's chronology. Firstly, sherds stratified in deposits assigned to a particular period can provide a *terminus post quem* to that period. As discussed above, there is little difference between any of the medieval periods on the site, whilst the modern period contains a scatter of late 17th-century and later pottery. Secondly, the character of the assemblage as a whole, when compared with the stratigraphic development of the site, can indicate the periods of occupation and the relative intensity of rubbish disposal in each. Given the lack of vertical build-up on rural sites this latter approach is probably more appropriate to Holm hill. As on almost every excavation in rural Gloucestershire, there is a small quantity of Romano-British pottery from the site. From this evidence there is no reason to believe that Holm hill was particularly close to a Romano-British settlement. The single sherd of late Anglo-Saxon date is, by contrast, unusual in a rural Gloucestershire context and, whilst on its own it does not demonstrate that there was a late Anglo-Saxon settlement on the site, it may represent one not far away.

The later 11th and early 12th centuries are recognisable in the Severn valley by the presence of locally-made handmade spouted pitchers and by rare sherds of Stamford ware. No such vessels were found on the Holm hill site. Roller-stamped Malvern Chase tripod pitchers, of similar date, are also absent from Holm hill. Later 12th-century assemblages are recognisable by Minety ware and Malvern Chase tripod pitchers, both of which are present in some numbers. However, these types continue into the 13th century and there is no way of differentiating earlier or later vessels. Nevertheless, from the ceramic evidence, it would seem that the later 12th century was the earliest at which there was significant occupation on the site. It is unlikely, but possible, that earthmoving in preparation for structural activity might have removed all traces of earlier occupation, but that would not explain the presence of Romano-British sherds and the late Anglo-Saxon sherd. Early to mid 13th-century assemblages are recognised in the mid Severn valley by new types of glazed ware. They include Malvern Chase sand-tempered tripod pitchers and Worcester and Ham Green ware jugs. Non-local wares characteristic of the period include Rouen ware and its London-type ware copies. All these types are present at Holm hill and, since their use does not continue into the later 13th century, are good evidence for large-scale occupation on the site before 1250. Mid 13th-century and later assemblages, however, are identifiable by the presence of wheelthrown jugs from centres such as Malvern Chase, Bristol, Nuneaton and the Brill/Boarstall area on the Buckinghamshire/Oxfordshire border. This type is present in large quantities at Holm hill. Unfortunately, in the absence of large closed assemblages, it is not possible to refine the dating of medieval assemblages of the later 13th century onwards. The range of wares identified as more common in late medieval deposits includes several types found at Holm hill, e.g. GLOS TF79, GLOS TF99, MALV WCP/BOWL, MALV PIP. These types are, however, rare at Holm hill and may have arrived on the site after the occupation had ceased. Later 15th- and early 16th-century pottery assemblages in the Severn valley are characterised by Malvern Chase wares - principally pipkins, cisterns, jars and jugs - together with Cistercian ware and Tudor-Green ware cups and Raaen stoneware drinking jugs. There are three Cistercian ware cup sherds from the site, none from stratified deposits, and a few sherds of Malvern Chase jars but otherwise no evidence for Tudor activity. From about the 1530s onwards, a pinker fabric with less quartz sand temper was used at Malvern Chase; three sherds of this fabric have been found at Holm hill. Two sherds of Frechen stoneware drinking jugs might be of a similar date although this type continued in use to the mid 17th century. The post-medieval activity on Holm hill consists of a spread of material (which may well include the late medieval and Tudor pottery discussed above) ranging in date up to the 19th century.
Discussion

Late 13th- and 14th-century pottery use in the Severn valley. None of the stratigraphic assemblages is ceramically coherent nor is it possible to reconstruct the original assemblages on paper because cooking pots from the same centres were used in Periods 3a and 3b. Also the majority of the pottery is of a single period, dating to the transition from early to late 13th-century types. However some general statements can be made about the Holm hill material in terms of 13th- to 14th-century ceramics in the Severn valley.

First, 61% of the identifiable medieval sherds was from jugs, 28% from cooking pots and 11% from other vessel types. This composition is unusual for the high proportion of both jugs and the other vessel types. One implication is that it is the small proportion of cooking pots which is significant. There are two possible explanations. Either cooking vessels of some other material (i.e. metal) were used instead of pottery or the main cooking area was elsewhere. This second possibility is perhaps unlikely considering the extensive watching brief carried out on the site. Fragments of dripping pan were present in some numbers (34 sherds) and indicate that at least the roasting of meat on a spit took place in the area in which the pottery was used.

Second, the proportion of ‘non-local’ to ‘local’ pottery seems to be quite high and numerous non-local types are present. However, this apparent characteristic too may be due to the small proportion of cooking pots, which were usually obtained from sources closer to a site than were jugs and other vessel types. Of the jugs at Holm hill 85.5% came from one of three sources: Malvern Chase, Worcester or Ham Green. Whilst the relative proportions of the three wares might vary from site to site these sources would form the majority of pottery at any late 13th- or 14th-century site in the mid Severn valley. The 22 sherds of Lyveden/Stanion ware are therefore less unusual than appeared at first sight and they form only 0.9% of the jug sherds from the site.

Imports from the continent are represented by two wares, Rouen and Saintonge. Neither is common in the mid Severn valley. There are no sherds of Rouen ware recorded from either Gloucester or Hereford, both of which towns have produced much larger collections of 13th/14th-century glazed wares than Holm hill. Saintonge ware has been found at Gloucester, Hereford and Worcester but only in very small quantities. One of the few sherds from Hereford comes from excavations on the site of the castle. Both Rouen and Saintonge wares have been found further south at Chepstow and Bristol. It seems that these imports were quite common on coastal sites but rare inland or higher up the river Severn. The reason for this must be that these pots were not usually transferred to carts or river craft for inland distribution. Their presence at Holm hill is therefore probably significant. It may indicate either the economic ‘pulling power’ of the inhabitants of the site or that people were travelling to the site with their possessions.

High-status pottery assemblages in England and Wales. The Holm hill pottery is distinct from other assemblages of 13th/14th-century pottery in the Severn valley by its high proportion of jugs (or low proportion of cooking pots) and by the presence of sherds from non-local sources and of small quantities of imported French pottery. These characteristics imply that the inhabitants of Holm hill in the Anglo-Norman and medieval period differed from those of other sites in the Severn valley by their use of metal cooking vessels, their inter-regional contacts and their access to imported goods. The characteristics can be compared with those of pottery from other high-status sites. Many of the castles of Wales and the Marches have been investigated but the pottery collections from most of these sites have often been recovered in an uncontrolled manner and it would be unwise to assume that they are representative. Nevertheless, there are clearly
some assemblages which conform to the Holm hill pattern (e.g. Bristol castle well and some Welsh castles) whilst others apparently do not (e.g. Goodrich castle, St. Briavels castle and Ludgershall castle, Wilts.). There are fewer collections from monastic contexts with which to compare the Holm hill pottery although this is probably due to investigation being concentrated on the church and clausal buildings rather than on areas where rubbish may have been discarded. The pottery from Chepstow priory may be comparable to that from Holm hill, but one must take into account that Chepstow was a medieval port with direct access to French pottery, which is more common in general at Chepstow than at Holm hill. There was also a strong connection between Chepstow and Bristol, by which route non-local pottery entered the former port.

Chepstow does, however, appear to have very few cooking pots in comparison to jug sherds. Medieval manorial sites are similarly poorly represented in west-country and Welsh excavations. Acton Court, at Iron Acton, may indicate some of the problems involved in using such data. This site has been extensively excavated for the Bath Archaeological Trust and a large pottery assemblage recovered. Cooking pots are the predominant vessel form throughout the medieval sequence. However, detailed study suggests that most of these vessels were brought onto the site in a pre-manorial period, represented by quarry pits and drystone walling, and that they are present in later layers only as residual sherds. The small quantities of pottery associated with the manorial period itself are mainly Bristol Redcliffe and Nash Hill jugs and a few sherds of Saintonge ware. It is possible that Acton Court had a use of pottery similar to Holm hill but the collection is too small and the taphonomy of the site too complex for this to be proved.

In conclusion, there is possibly a pattern in pottery use at a number of high-status settlements in the west of England and in Wales which compares with that found at Holm hill. This pattern cannot be further investigated at present because of the nature of the pottery collections from most of these sites and the complex stratigraphic sequence at others.

The post-medieval pottery assemblage in its local setting. Although the material is too sparse and too fragmentary for a detailed study, the post-medieval pottery from the Holm hill excavations demonstrates neatly the character of the pottery in and around Tewkesbury in the later 16th century and later. The local wares in the later 16th and early 17th centuries came mainly from the Malvern Chase whilst black-glazed cups were obtained from other sources. By the early 17th century, however, coarse red earthenwares originating from sites considerable distances to the south and south-west were in use in Tewkesbury. They include Newent Glasshouse ware, Stroat ware from Stroat near the mouth of the Wye, and South Somerset wares from Donyatt, and, dating from the last quarter of the 17th century or later, North Devon gravel-tempered ware. These wares are an indication of the influence of Bristol and the Severn river trade on pottery supply in Tewkesbury. Other non-local wares came from north Wiltshire (Ashton Keynes and Minety) and the Staffordshire potteries. Imported wares include Rhenish stonewares (Frechen and Westerwald), which by the later 17th century have a nationwide distribution. There is also, however, a sherd of Merida-type ware, which presumably is another indicator of contact with Bristol.

Catalogue of illustrated medieval pottery (Figs 17–20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Corpus Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LI 117</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LI 1</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LI 80</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 17. Holm hill: medieval pottery, 1–13.
Fig. 18. Holm hill: medieval pottery, 14–26.
Fig. 19. Holm hill: medieval pottery, 27–38.
Fig. 20. Holm hill: medieval pottery, 39–51.
### EXCAVATIONS AT HOLM HILL, TEWKESBURY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Corpus Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LI 117</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LXXI 2</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LX 31</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>XLI 94</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>XL 82</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>XXXI 1</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>XXXI 1</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LX 28</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>XLII 122</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LXI 117</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LI 1</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>LXX 172</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LXX 172</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>LXI 133</td>
<td>WORCS</td>
<td>PIP</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>LXXI 2</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LXXI 132</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>LI 80</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>XL 82</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>LI 1</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>JAR</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>L 30</td>
<td>MINETY</td>
<td>SPP/JUG</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>XXXI 124</td>
<td>MINETY</td>
<td>TRIP</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>LI 1</td>
<td>MINETY</td>
<td>TRIP</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>LI 1</td>
<td>MTF</td>
<td>TRIP</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>LI 119</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>LX 28</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>LX 28</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>XXIX 1</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>XXXI 124</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>LIX 23</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>CP/BOWL</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>LI 80</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>PIP</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>LI 117</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>DRIP</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>XXIII 1</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>DRIP</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>LI 80</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>DRIP</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>LI 80</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>DRIP</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>LI 80</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>(unknown)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>XXIII 1</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>BOWL</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>LXX 30</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>BOWL</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>XL 82</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>BOWL/LID</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>XL 1</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>CAUL</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>LI 119</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>CIST</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>XL 1</td>
<td>MALV</td>
<td>LOUV</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LI 1</td>
<td>MINETY</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>LI 80</td>
<td>MISC SW</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>LI 80</td>
<td>OXAM</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>LI 117</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>JUG</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MORTAR

Quantities of mortar and large amounts of mortary sand were encountered in the excavation of levels and features associated with Buildings B and (mainly) C. Samples of mortar were collected but after consultation with AML were not analysed. A selection of the mortars has been deposited with the site archive in the event of future research.

GLASS

Several hundred fragments of glass were recovered; it had been anticipated that window glass contemporary with the halls would be found in destruction levels. The assessment (Jill Kerr, 6 January 1994) indicated that the majority of the fragments were vessel glass and that those which were of window glass were of post-medieval date. The absence of fragmentary coloured or painted window glass of 13th-century date was surprising in view of the documentary evidence for installation of windows in 1241. An Anglo-Norman first-floor hall would have had glazed windows and on the dismantling of this structure the windows would have been removed intact and transferred elsewhere. The small fragments of vessel glass thought to be of medieval date were examined (Reino Liefkes, Victoria and Albert Museum); one was of Venetian manufacture or in the Venetian style (16th–17th century) and the other was English (15th–17th century). The identification and dating of both was limited by the small size of the fragments.

IRON AND COPPER-ALLOY OBJECTS by Dr. Carole Morris

A variety of metal objects, the majority of iron and copper alloy, were found during the excavations. These were mainly of medieval date but included some that were post-medieval and modern. The assemblage comprises weapons (73), equestrian equipment (175) of which 153 were horseshoe nails, personal equipment, mainly dress accessories, buckles and brooches (43), tools (3), locks and keys (16), construction and structural objects (26), and nails and nail-like objects (c. 4,420). The extent of reporting on the metal finds was determined by their relevance to the priorities of the post-excavation project, which included the demonstration of the high-status, military, and equestrian character of those who held the manor in the 12th to 14th century. For this reason, some categories of the finds have not been included in this report but these are held, with their documentation, in the site archive. The reported finds are grouped according to function rather than to material.

The assemblage is characterised by a large number of projectile heads, a quantity which exceeds that normally recovered during the excavation of castles and mottes. The identification by AML of remains of wooden shafts from within some projectiles and of coatings of metal on outer surfaces has enhanced the study of the collection. Investigative conservation in the analysis period focussed on non-ferrous coatings on iron artefacts, including the large collection of arrowheads, and on mineral-preserved organic material such as haftings for arrowheads and handles of knives and laces contained in lace shapes. Some caution has been exercised in the attribution to periods of the metal objects because of the shallowness of the levels on the site and because of the strong possibility that some projectiles represent ‘fall-out’ from the battle of Tewkesbury.

The catalogue entries in the following sections indicate the material of each item/find (Bone; Fe–iron; Cu–copper alloy) and its suggested function, together with a detailed description and where relevant, possible dates and parallels. Dimensions (L–length; W–width; Th–thickness; D–diameter) are in millimetres and, where they vary, the maximum is given. The last line of each entry gives the excavation context and small finds number, ending with the Ancient Monuments Laboratory (AML) and X-ray number.
Weapons

ARROWHEADS

The typology of arrowhead shapes developed by Ward Perkins (1940, fig. 16) has served as a convenient basis for classification for over fifty years. Most of the 72 arrowheads from Holm hill fit well into eight of his twenty medieval types but a relatively homogeneous group of exceptions form another type (plain conical socket with added flange) which had yet to be discovered and/or considered when the Museum of London medieval catalogue was written. For consistency with Ward Perkins typology it is proposed to call this type Type 21. All the arrowheads have conical sockets which were fitted over the sharpened ends of their wooden shafts. Although on this site we can never be absolutely certain whether any individual arrowhead was used for hunting or for military use – the manor here probably housed hunting parties and military groups at various times throughout its history – similar types of arrowheads have been grouped below according to which function was most likely. Scientific examination and analysis of the arrowheads at the AML using X-ray fluorescence techniques identified where the iron had been coated in a non-ferrous plating and often determined the constituent metals in the alloys used.

Hunting arrowheads

Conical Sockets with Barbs (Types 13, 14 and 15). Socketed arrowheads which have barbs short relative to the socket. Type 13 are the earliest form. They were possibly used in battle as late as the 13th century but even on military sites are only found in small numbers. Early examples have been found at Dyserth castle, north Wales, occupied between 1241 and 1263 (Ward Perkins 1940, fig. 17, 12), and Rumney castle, south Wales, occupied from the 11th century to c. 1295 (Lloyd-Fern and Sell 1992, fig. 13, 2 and 14). Only one of this type has been recognised among the Holm hill assemblage (F17), dating to Period 3. A similar example was found in London (Ward Perkins 1940, pl. xv, 26).

The more elaborate examples of socketed and barbed arrowheads, such as Types 14 and 15 whose barbs are often as long if not longer than the socket, were designed specifically for hunting and belong mainly to the 14th and 15th centuries. Sometimes called broad heads, they were usually flat, unlike the very thick and angular barbed quarrel heads used with crossbows (cf. HMSO 1976, 32). Nine examples of the broad head types for longbows have been found at Holm hill (Fe2–10); they date from Periods 3 and 4 (mid 11th to late 16th century). Type 14 has convex curved barbs, whereas Type 15 has straighter barbs. From the 13th century onwards, large barbed and socketed arrowheads like these were undoubtedly the normal types used as hunting arrows (Ward Perkins 1940, 68), and in the later medieval period barbed arrowheads were confined to the chase (ibid. 66). For comparison with those from Holm hill, a barbed arrowhead of Type 15 found at Caergwrle castle, north Wales, probably related to a short-lived occupation between 1278 and 1283 (Courtenay 1994, fig. 15, 5), a 15th-century barbed arrowhead of Type 14 was found in Beverley (Goodall 1991, fig. 111, 573), eight barbed arrowheads were found at the manor site at Rattray (Aberdeenshire) dating from the late 12th/early 16th century (Goodall 1993, fig. 39, 169–76), a broken Type 15 arrowhead was found on a croft site at the deserted medieval village of Goltho (Lincolnshire) probably dating from late 14th/early 15th century (Goodall 1975, fig. 41, 96), and three more barbed arrowheads were found on the deserted medieval village site at Seacourt (Berkshire) (Biddle 1961–2, fig. 30, 10–13).
Fig. 21. Holm hill: iron objects, Fe1–6.
Examples of a smaller socketed arrowhead with a leaf-shaped outline formed by two narrow bars fitting close to the socket (Type 16) have also been found at Holm Hill (Fe56–62). It is not certain whether any of this type would have been used primarily for hunting, as they are probably related to Type 21 and are likely to have been just as useful as a military arrowhead.

Fe1 Barbed and socketed arrowhead (Fig. 21); triangular head with broken tip; bars missing. Type 13. No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 54 mm; W (head) 14 mm; D (socket) 9–10 mm
LI (117) s53; Period 3; 940665; A9668

Fe2 Socket from a socketed and barbed arrowhead (Fig. 21); most of the head and bars now missing; fragment of head remains on one side of top of large conical socket. Probably Type 14 or 15. Coated with copper.
L 56 mm; W (head fragment) 13 mm; D (socket) 17 mm
XXXII (1) s53; Period 5, 940485; A9654, A9775, A9780

Fe3 Barbed and socketed arrowhead with triangular head and rounded tip (Fig. 21); fragment of conical socket tapering in profile towards head; remains of downward-curving barb on one side only (with rounded curve between the barb and where it was attached to the socket); the other side broken; both bars missing. Type 15. No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 59 mm; W (head) 22 mm; D (socket) 8–9 mm
XL (94) s53; Period 3; 940529; A9658

Fe4 Socketed and barbed arrowhead with triangular head and rounded tip (Fig. 21); head formed by forging two long narrow bars above a conical socket (broken around rim); rounded curves between the bars and where they are attached to the socket; barb ends broken. Type 15. Coated with copper.
L 66 mm; W (head) 29 mm; D (socket) 10–11 mm
XLII (122) s15; Period 3; 940545; A9659, A9776, A9779

Fe5 Socketed and barbed arrowhead with triangular head (Fig. 21); head formed by forging two long narrow bars above a conical socket, with possibly two more thin narrow bars forming a central ridge on both sides and extending from the socket to the tip (these bars have been revealed by corrosion of the arrowhead); rounded curves between the bars and where they are attached to the socket; one barb end broken; remains of a possible rivet at the socket rim which would have held the head on the wooden shaft. Type 15. No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 88 mm; W (head) 33 mm; D (socket) 10–11 mm
LXI (3) s13; Period 4; 940574; A9661, A9776, A9779

Fe6 Socketed and barbed arrowhead (Fig. 21). Socket missing so only very thin, flat, triangular head with the remains of two long bars and a central midrib survives; tip broken (cf. Fe2 which is probably a socket from which the head and bars are missing). Type 15. No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 45 mm; W (head) 38 mm
LXI (2) s59; Period 3; 940590; A9661

Fe7 Socketed and barbed arrowhead (Fig. 22); triangular head with convex curved sides and the remains of two long bars with broken tips. Type 14. No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 77 mm; W (head) 38 mm; D (socket) 13 mm
L (28) s22; Period 4; 940618; A9664, A9694, A9777, A9778

Fe8 Socketed and barbed arrowhead with triangular blade (Fig. 22), pointed elliptical in cross-section; long, hollow conical socket tapering in profile towards triangular head; the lower edge of the head has traces of a rounded curve (part of the circumference of a circle of very small diameter) between the top of the socket and the barb on each side, a feature which is also very marked on Fe3–5 and is typical of some elaborate barbed arrowheads; slight traces of a downward-curving barb on one side; both bars broken and missing. Probably Type 15. No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 85 mm; W (head) 23 mm; D (socket) 10 mm
LI (1)s13; Period 5; 940635; A9667, A9776, A9779

Fe9 Very large socketed and barbed arrowhead with triangular head and convex curving sides (Fig. 22); one barb is complete and ends below the rim of the socket; the other barb is broken; both are curved on their inside edges; head formed by forging the two bars above a conical socket, with a central
midrib on both sides extending from the socket to the tip. Type 14. Coated with copper.
L 94 mm; W (head) 50 mm; D (socket) 11 mm
LXXI (3) sf35; Period 4; 940672, A9669, A9777, A9778
Fe10 Very large socketed and barbed arrowhead with triangular head (Fig. 22); head formed by forging two long narrow barbs above a conical socket, with a central midrib on both sides extending from the socket to the tip, very pronounced rounded curves between the barbs and where they are attached to the socket (part of the circumference of a circle of very small diameter); both barb ends broken. Type 15. Coated with copper.
L 103 mm; W (head) 45 mm; D (socket) 10 mm
LXXI (132) sf47; Period 3; 940676, A9668, A9777, A9778

Military arrowheads

The arrowhead used in battle had to be compact and heavy to penetrate the ever-increasing bulk of defensive plate armour (Ward Perkins 1940, 66). Whereas early medieval military arrowheads, from the pre-Conquest period to the 13th century, had broad flat blades with marked shoulders (ibid. fig. 16, 1 and 2), from the 13th century more compact types appear and in the 14th century they alone are used (ibid. 67).

Most of the military arrowheads found at Holm hill are the simplest, most compact form possible—merely a conical sheath fitted over the sharpened end of the wooden shaft (Type 5). A variation of this type (not noted by Ward Perkins) has added side flanges which are attached all the way down the socket and usually end at the socket (Type 21). Sometimes the flanges produce a triangular outline, following the cone (e.g. Fe42), whilst in other examples the flanges are curved and form a more leaf-shaped outline (e.g. Fe44). In some arrowheads, the lower ends of the flanges are deliberately left unattached and form small barbs, but these usually end above the socket rim (Type 16). Others have smaller curved flanges attached to a conical socket and end a long way above the socket rim to form a leaf-shaped outline (Types 4 and 10). The other solid, compact military type found at Holm hill is the needle-like spike of Type 7; the projectile is solid and square in cross-section and tapers to a point above the usual conical socket. Ward Perkins considered that Types 7-10 were developed in answer to the increasing use of defensive armour, the combatting of which demanded a weapon slender enough to enter any crack but sufficiently heavy to pierce cloth or leather, and that the bullet-shaped Type 5 replaced them to some extent in the 15th century (ibid. 68, 70).

Plain Bullet-Shaped/Conical Socket (Type 5). This type forms by far the largest group from Holm hill (30 examples). Although some examples are very bullet-shaped with a slightly rounded convex outline, others are more conical with straighter sides. None has added flanges or barbs. They are plain and are pointed with hollow metal tips for the ends of wooden shafts. They vary tremendously in length and diameter, reflecting the handmade, forged nature of the product and the slightly varying diameters of the shafts. All but two of the dateable examples are from Period 3 contexts and can therefore be dated to before the mid 14th century. The two exceptions were found in Period 4 levels, which are associated with the demolition and robbing of the medieval first-floor hall (C) and which date to the mid 14th/late 16th century. Many of the other examples were found higher up in the topsoil and may be late medieval in date, perhaps even from the battle of Tewkesbury in 1471. Similar Type 5 arrowheads have been found at Moorfields in London (Ward Perkins 1940, pl. xv, 19), in 12th- and 13th-century contexts in Perth (Ford 1987, 130, fig. 65, 63), in a 13th/14th-century level in Norwich (Goodall 1993a, fig. 176, 1862), in a 13th/mid 14th-century context at the deserted medieval settlement at Lyveden
Fig. 22. Holm hill: iron objects, Fe7-10.
(Northants.) (Steane and Bryant 1975, fig. 45, 10), and in late 13th/late 14th-century levels at Wharram Percy (Goodall 1979, figs. 63–4).

Five of the Holm hill arrowheads (Fe20, 25, 28, 38 and 39) have ridges/grooves down opposite sides. These are not the remains of side flanges but may represent an intermediate stage between Type 5 and Type 21, the latter having definite (and sometimes wide and elaborate) flanges which usually extend to the bottom of the socket. A similar Type 5 arrowhead with ridges was found at Worship Street in London (Ward Perkins 1940, pl. xv, 20).

It is possible that some arrowheads of Type 5 were used with crossbows, although military crossbow heads were usually square (or triangular) in cross-section; the term quarrel derives from the French carré or square (HMSO 1976, 32). A complete crossbow arrow with a Type 5 iron head is preserved in the British Museum (Ward Perkins 1940, 68).

Fe11 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and rounded tip (Fig. 23)
Coated with a copper/tin/zinc alloy.
L 34 mm; D (socket) 12 mm
XXXII (1) sf7; Period 5; 940487; A9654

Fe12 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides; broken near socket. Coated with copper.
L 22 mm; D (socket) 10 mm
XL (82) sf22; Period 3; 940504; A9656

Fe13 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip; broken near socket. Coated with copper.
L 31 mm; D (socket) 13 mm
XL (82) sf32; Period 3; 940507; A9656

Fe14 Socketed, bullet-shaped arrowhead with straight sides and convex rounded tip. Coated with copper.
L 25 mm; D (socket) 10 mm
XLI (1) sf16; Period 5; 940519; A9657

Fe15 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip, now broken; one side broken from socket to tip. No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 21 mm; D (socket) 14 mm
XLI (94) sf44; Period 3; 940534; A9659

Fe16 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and rounded tip. Possibly originally coated with copper of which a small trace was found.
L 37 mm; D (socket) 12 mm
XLI (94) sf44; Period 3; 940536; A9659

Fe17 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip (Fig. 23); broken down one side and around the socket. Coated with a copper/zinc alloy.
L 30 mm; D (socket) 10 mm
XLI (1) sf10; Period 5; 940541; A9659

Fe18 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip. Coated with a copper/zinc alloy.
L 18 mm; D (socket) 9 mm
XLI (1) sf11; Period 5; 940542; A9659

Fe19 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and rounded tip; broken around socket. Coated with a copper/tin/zinc alloy.
L 28 mm; D (socket) 11 mm
LX (10) sf35; Period 4; 940565; A9660

Fe20 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip; broken around the socket; possible ridges down length on two opposite sides. Coated with a copper/zinc alloy with traces of lead.
L 39 mm; D (socket) 11 mm
LXI (1) sf5; Period 5; 940572; A9661

Fe21 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip, now broken (Fig. 23). Coated in copper. Mineral-preserved wood in the socket identified as Salix sp. (willow) or Populus sp. (poplar/aspen).
Fig. 23. Holm hill: iron objects, Fe11, 17, 21, 23, 28, 34-5, 38, 41-2, 45-6, 50, 54.
L 32 mm; D (socket) 11 mm
LXI 4282 (35) sf14; Period 3a; 940575; A9661
Fe22 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip, now broken; also broken around the socket. Coated with a copper/zinc alloy.
L 35 mm; D (socket) 11 mm
LXI 7876 (1) sf17; Period 5; 940577; A9779, A9661, A9776
Fe23 Socketed, bullet-shaped arrowhead with rounded sides and convex rounded tip (Fig. 23). Coated with a copper/zinc alloy.
L 22 mm; D (socket) 9 mm
XXXI (1) sf4; Period 5; 940596; A9662
Fe24 Socketed, bullet-shaped arrowhead with straight sides and convex rounded tip. Coated with a copper/tin alloy with possible trace of nickel?
L 19 mm; D (socket) 9 mm
XXXI (124) sf22; Period 3; 940608i; A9662
Fe25 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip; broken around the socket; possible ridges down length on two opposite sides. Coated with a copper/zinc alloy.
L 42 mm; D (socket) 14 mm
XXXI (124) sf22; Period 3; 940608ii; A9662
Fe26 Socketed, bullet-shaped arrowhead with rounded sides and convex rounded tip. Coated with a copper/zinc/tin alloy.
L 26 mm; D (socket) 10 mm
L (1) sf13; Period 5; 940615; A9662
Fe27 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip, now broken; also broken around the socket. Coated with a copper/zinc alloy with traces of lead.
L 33 mm; D (socket) 13 mm
L (30) sf42; Period 3; 940624; A9662
Fe28 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and blunt, rounded tip (Fig. 23); broken down one side and around the socket; two distinct narrow ridges on opposite sides of the arrowhead are each outlined by a groove at either side. Coated with a copper/zinc/tin alloy.
L 36 mm; D (socket) 12 mm
L (30) sf45; Period 3; 940626; A9662
Fe29 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and rounded tip; broken around the socket. Coated with a copper/tin alloy.
L 24 mm; D (socket) 11 mm
LI (1) sf14; Period 5; 940636i; A9667
Fe30 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and broken tip.
L 40 mm; D (socket) 9 mm
LI (1) sf19; Period 5; 940640; A9776, A9779, A9667
Fe31 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides. No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 24 mm; D (socket) 9 mm
LI (1) sf24; Period 5; 940642i; A9667
Fe32 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides; broken around socket. Mineral-preserved wood in the socket identified as Salix sp. (willow) or Populus sp. (poplar/aspen). No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 19 mm; D (socket) 10 mm
LI (1) sf24; Period 5; 940642ii; A9667
Fe33 Socketed, bullet-shaped arrowhead with rounded sides and convex rounded point. Coated with copper.
L 24 mm; D (socket) 9 mm
LI (1) sf24; Period 5; 940645; A9667
Fe34 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and rounded tip (Fig. 23). Coated with a copper/tin alloy with a trace of zinc.
L 38 mm; D (socket) 12 mm
LI (1) sf6; Period 5; 940649; A9667
Fe35 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and rounded tip (Fig. 23). Coated with a copper/tin alloy. Mineral-preserved wood in the socket identified as *Salix* sp. (willow) or *Populus* sp. (poplar/aspen).

L 36 mm; D (socket) 11 mm
LII (1) sf21; Period 5; 940655; A9668

Fe36 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and rounded tip; broken around socket. Coated with copper.

L 22 mm; D (socket) 11 mm
LII (1) sf22; Period 5; 940656; A9668

Fe37 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip; broken around socket. Coated with copper.

L 48 mm; D (socket) 9 mm
LXX (10) sf42; Period 4; 940693; A9672

Fe38 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip (Fig. 23); broken down one side and around the socket; two distinct narrow ridges on opposite sides of the arrowhead. Coated with a copper/tin alloy.

L 37 mm; D (socket) 12–13 mm
XXIV (1) sf1; Period 5; 940704; A9672

Fe39 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and rounded pointed tip; broken down one side and around the socket; two distinct narrow ridges on opposite sides of the arrowhead, at least one delineated by a groove by the side of it. Coated with a copper/tin alloy.

L 32 mm; D (socket) 13 mm
LXXX (1) sf4; Period 5; 940720; A9675

Fe40 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and rounded tip. Coated with copper with a trace of lead?

L 39 mm; D (socket) 10 mm
LIV (M/S) sf5; Period 5; 940728; A9675

**Plain Conical Socket with Added Flange** (Type 21). These arrowheads are basic Type 5 ‘cones’ with added side flanges attached all the way down the socket. They are similar to Type 16 arrowheads in that their flanges often make them leaf-shaped. However, in most examples the flanges come right down to the socket rim and in all cases they are completely fastened to the socket, are attached from the tip right down to the lower ends, and they do not have barbs like Type 16. Type 21 (15 examples) forms the second largest group from Holm hill. The earliest dateable example is Fe48 from a Period 3a context which relates to the ailed hall (mid 11th to mid/late 12th century). Two others dating to Period 3 could be as late as the mid 14th century, and one found in Period 3b/4 levels could be associated either with the construction of building C (late 12th century) or its demolition (mid 14th/late 16th century). Many of the undated examples were found in the topsoil and may be late medieval in date, perhaps even from the battle of Tewkesbury in 1471. Elsewhere two arrowheads with small narrow side flanges (rather than barbs) attached to a conical socket have been found in levels relating to the short-lived occupation of Caergwrlle castle between 1278 and 1283 (Courtenay 1994, fig. 15, 6 and 8). Like Holm hill, this site also produced a Type 15 barbed hunting arrow and an armour-piercing projectile Type 7 arrow (ibid. fig. 15, 5 and 10).

This type of arrowhead was probably used at the same time as Type 5, especially if some of the Type 5 heads were used for crossbow quarrels.

Fe41 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip (Fig. 23); curved side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, starting just below the tip and ending just above the socket rim. Coated with copper/tin/lead alloy.
L 35 mm; W (head) 19-20 mm; D (socket) 15 mm
XXXII (1) sf6; Period 5; 940486; A9654
Fe42 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides (Fig. 23); straight-sided side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, forged together above the cone to form a pointed tip, and ending with rounded edges at the socket rim. Coated with copper/tin alloy.
L 45 mm; W (head) 23 mm; D (socket) 14 mm
XXXII (126) sf26; Period 3; 940494; A9654
Fe43 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip; straight-sided side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, starting at the tip and curving inwards to end at the socket rim; socket broken. Coated with copper/tin alloy.
L 36 mm; W (head) 18 mm; D (socket) 13 mm
XL (1) sf12; Period 5; 940500; A9656
Fe44 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip; curved side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, starting at the tip and ending at the socket rim make the outline leaf-shaped (unlike Types 4 and 10 there is no socket below the flanges). Coated with copper.
L 52 mm; W (head) 23 mm; D (socket) 13-14 mm
XL (82) sf29; Period 3; 940506; A9656
Fe45 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides (Fig. 23); slightly concave-sided side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, forged together above the cone to form a pointed tip, and ending with rounded edges just above the socket rim; broken around socket. Coated with copper/tin alloy.
L 38 mm; W (head) 21 mm; D (socket) 14 mm
XLI (1) sf2; Period 5; 940512; A9656
Fe46 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip (Fig. 23); narrow curved side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, starting at the tip and ending just above the socket rim, make the outline leaf-shaped (unlike Types 4 and 10 there is no socket below the flanges); broken around socket. Coated with copper/tin/zinc alloy.
L 41 mm; W (head) 15 mm; D (socket) 13 mm
XLI (1) sf3; Period 5; 940513; A9656
Fe47 Socketed conical arrowhead originally with straight sides, now badly broken; straight-sided side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, forged together above the cone to form a pointed tip, and ending with rounded edges just above the socket rim; flanges now very broken; arrowhead broken around socket and on both sides. Coated with copper/tin alloy.
L 41 mm; W (head) 19 mm; D (socket) 12 mm
XLI (1) sf6; Period 5; 940514; A9656
Fe48 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip, now broken; remains of side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, starting at the tip and ending at the socket rim. Coated with copper/zinc alloy.
L 32 mm; W (head) 13-14 mm; D (socket) 12 mm
XLI (58) sf19; Period 3a; 940522; A9658
Fe49 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip; curved side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, forged together above the cone to form a pointed tip, and ending just above the socket rim; flanges now broken. Coated with copper/zinc alloy.
L 37 mm; W (head) 17 mm; D (socket) 11 mm
XLI (1) sf22; Period 5; 940523; A9658
Fe50 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip (Fig. 23); curved side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, forged together above the cone to form a pointed tip and ending just above the socket rim, make the outline leaf-shaped (but unlike Types 4 and 10 there is no socket below the flanges); flanges and socket now broken slightly. Coated with copper/tin/lead alloy.
L 42 mm; W (head) 16 mm; D (socket) 12 mm
LX (1) sf5; Period 5; 940555; A9660
Fe51 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides; straight-sided side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, forged together above the cone to form a pointed tip (now broken), and ending with slightly bulging rounded edges at the socket rim. Coated with copper/tin/zinc alloy.
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L 37 mm; W (head) 21 mm; D (socket) 12 mm
XXXI (1) sf9; Period 5; 940599; A9662

Fe52 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip; curved side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, starting at the tip and ending at the socket rim make the outline leaf-shaped (unlike Types 4 and 10 there is no socket below the flanges). Coated with copper/tin alloy.
L 50 mm; W (head) 23 mm; D (socket) 14 mm
L (10) sf30; Period 4; 940619; A9662

Fe53 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip; fragments of two side flanges, now very broken. Coated with copper.
L 29 mm; W (head) 8 mm; D (socket) 8 mm
LXXI (2) sf48; Period 3; 940677; A9668

Fe54 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip (Fig. 23); curved side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, starting at the tip and ending with a slightly concave narrowing at the socket rim, making the outline leaf-shaped (unlike Types 4 and 10 there is no socket below the flanges). Coated with copper.
L 41 mm; W (head) 16 mm; D (socket) 13 mm
LXX (30) sf36; Period 3b/4; 940690; A9672

Fe55 Socketed conical arrowhead with straight sides and pointed tip; narrow curved side flanges on opposite sides of the cone, starting at the tip and ending at the socket rim, make the outline leaf-shaped (unlike Types 4 and 10 there is no socket below the flanges); flanges now broken in places. Coated with copper/tin alloy.
L 56 mm; W (head) 18 mm; D (socket) 12 mm
M/S (403) sf9; Period 5; 940725; A9675

Conical Socket with Added Flange/Barbs (Type 16). Type 16 socketed and barbed arrowheads are very similar to Type 21 since their flanges make them leaf-shaped and in most examples come down almost to the socket rim. However, the flanges are not completely fastened to the socket but are attached at the tip with their lower ends set slightly away from the socket to form barbs. They may have been hunting or military arrowheads. Most parallels suggest they are generally a later medieval type, and many date from no earlier than the 14th century. Seven examples of this type have been found at Holm hill. Fe58, dating from Period 3b, was associated with the late 12th/mid 14th-century first-floor hall (C), whereas the rest were found in the topsoil. Two similar examples have been found in Perth, one dating from the early 15th century (Ford 1987, 130–1, fig. 65, 62 and 65), another was found on a croft probably deserted in the late 14th/early 15th century at Goltho (Goodall 1975, fig. 41, 97), one was found at Threave castle (Galloway) dating from the mid 15th/mid 17th century (Caldwell 1981, fig. 12, 107), and one was found in Norwich dating from 1400–1600 (Goodall 1993a, fig. 176, 1865).

Fe56 Socketed and barbed arrowhead with a leaf-shaped outline (Fig. 24); conical socket with remains of one separate narrow barb fitting close to the socket and tapering to a point which ends above the socket rim; other barb missing. Coated with copper/tin/lead alloy.
L 34 mm; W (head) 16 mm; D (socket) 11–12 mm
XLI (1) sf14; Period 5; 940517; A9656

Fe57 Socketed and barbed arrowhead with a leaf-shaped outline; conical socket with what appear to be side flanges but which X-ray evidence reveals to be separate narrow barbs only attached at the arrow tip and fitting close to the socket; tip of one barb now broken, the other has an angled point which ends above the lower edge of the socket. Coated with copper/tin/zinc alloy.
L 44 mm; W (head) 16 mm; D (socket) 11 mm
XLI (1) sf15; Period 5; 940518; A9657, A9776, A9779

Fe58 Socketed and barbed arrowhead with a leaf-shaped outline (Fig. 24); what appear to be side flanges are in fact separate narrow barbs only attached at the upper end and fitting close to the conical
socket; barbs taper to points and end above the lower edge of the socket; one barb broken. Coated with copper.
L 42 mm; W (head) 15 mm; D (socket) 13 mm
LX (3) sf31; Period 3b; 940564; A9660

Fe59 Socketed and barbed arrowhead (Fig. 24) with two narrow side barbs attached at the upper end and fitting close to the sides of the conical socket; barbs taper to points and end 10 mm above the socket rim; one barb broken. Coated with copper/tin/zinc alloy.
L 36 mm; W (head) 12 mm; D (socket) 10 mm
XXXI (1) sf13; Period 5; 940603; A9662

Fe60 Socketed, conical arrowhead with straight sides and blunt, rounded tip; broken around the socket; traces of two ridges, on opposite sides of the arrowhead, which are not fixed all the way down the socket and are probably parts of barbs making this a Type 16 arrowhead. Coated with a copper/tin alloy.
L 38 mm; D (socket) 14 mm
LI (1) sf14; Period 5; 940636ii; A9667

Fe61 Socketed and barbed arrowhead (Fig. 24) with two side barbs forged together above the tip to form a point and fitting close to the sides of the conical socket; barbs taper to rounded points and end just above the socket rim. Coated with copper/tin alloy.
L 41 mm; W (head) 23 mm; D (socket) 13 mm
LXX (1) sf1; Period 5; 940678; A9668

Fe62 Socketed and barbed arrowhead with two side barbs forged together above the tip to form a point and fitting close to the sides of the conical socket; barbs taper to rounded points and end just above the socket rim which is broken. Coated with copper/tin/nickel alloy.
L 43 mm; W (head) 23 mm; D (socket) 12–13 mm
LXX (1) sf7; Period 5; 940679; A9668

Conical Socket with Leaf-Shaped Head (Types 4 and 10). Seven examples of these types have been found at Holm hill. Arrowheads with long sockets and broad, flat, leaf-shaped heads (Type 4) are fairly well dated to the early medieval period (Ward Perkins 1940, 68). More compact leaf-shaped arrowheads with shorter sockets (Type 10) may date from the 13th century onwards and there are six examples of these from Holm hill, three of them from Period 3 (mid 11th to mid 14th century). Other examples of leaf-shaped heads have been found at sites such as Rayleigh castle (Essex) dated to before c. 1270, Ragnhildsholmen in Sweden dating between 1257 and 1308, Alsnö in Sweden dating to the late 13th century and London (ibid. 68, fig. 17, 5–6, 18, 21–22; pl. xv, 1, 16 and 18). A complete example of a Type 10 arrowhead was found in the gatehouse/bridge area of the moated site at Writtle (Essex) (Rahtz 1969, fig. 47, 58), dating to c. 1425–1521. Two leaf-shaped arrowheads from Wharram Percy date from the late 13th/late 14th century and possibly the 16th/20th century respectively (Goodall 1979, fig. 63, 61; fig. 64, 106) whilst three similar arrowheads found at Threave castle (Caldwell 1981, fig. 11, 73; fig. 12, 108–9) date from the late 14th/mid 15th centuries and the mid 15th/mid 17th centuries. All three sites show that this type of arrowhead continued in use after the 15th century.

Fe63 Arrowhead (Fig. 24) with conical socket (now broken) and small flat leaf-shaped head made by curved flanges at each side at the top of the socket; one flange broken. Type 10. No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 42 mm; W (head) 18 mm; D (socket) 10 mm
XL (82) sf21; Period 3; 940503; A9656

Fe64 Arrowhead (Fig. 24) with conical socket (now broken around rim) and small flat leaf-shaped head made by hammering the top of the socket and additional curved flanges at each side at the top of the socket. Deep grooves between the flanges and socket. Type 10. Coated with copper/tin/lead alloy.
Fig. 24. Holm hill: iron objects, Fe56, 58–9, 61, 63–5, 68–71.
L 46 mm; W (head) 18 mm; D (socket) 15 mm
XLI (1) s1; Period 5; 940511; A9656

**Fe65** Arrowhead (Fig. 24) with conical socket (now broken around rim) and small flat leaf-shaped head made by curved flanges at each side at the top of the socket. Type 10. Coated with copper/zinc alloy.
L 41 mm; W (head) 15 mm; D (socket) 14 mm
XLI (94) s32; Period 3; 940527; A9658

**Fe66** Arrowhead with conical socket (now broken around rim) and small flat leaf-shaped head made by angled flanges at each side at the top of the socket; trace of possible grooves down the side of the flanges where they meet the socket side. Type 10. Coated with copper/tin alloy.
L 44 mm; W (head) 19 mm; D (socket) 13 mm
XXXI (1) sf10; Period 5; 940600; A9662

**Fe67** Arrowhead with conical socket and remains of small flat leaf-shaped head made by curved flanges at each side at the top of the socket. Type 10. Coated with copper.
L 36 mm; W (head) 10 mm; D (socket) 10 mm
L (30) sf41; Period 3; 940623; A9662

**Fe68** Arrowhead (Fig. 24) with conical socket and remains of narrow leaf-shaped head made by curved flanges at each side at the top of the socket. Type 10. Coated with copper/zinc alloy.
L 39 mm; W (head) 9–10 mm; D (socket) 11 mm
LXXI (2) s441; Period 3; 940673; A9668

**Fe69** Arrowhead (Fig. 24) with conical socket (now broken around rim) and solid midrib above the socket; the remains of a long, narrow leaf-shaped head made by curved flanges at each side of the midrib. Type 4. No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 95 mm; W (head) 15 mm; D (socket) 11 mm
XXII (21) sf12; Period 5; 940481; A9657

_Socketed Long Projectile_ (Type 7). The two dateable examples of this type of arrowhead from Holm hill were found in Period 3 layers and must date before the mid 14th century. The type is long-lived, with the earliest examples dating to the late Anglo-Saxon period, e.g. St. Neots (Addyman 1973, fig. 19, 9), Thetford (Goodall 1984, fig. 144, 299–301) and York (Ottoway 1992, fig. 309, 3918–19, 3921). One of the earliest dated medieval arrowheads of this type was found in an occupation layer at King’s Lynn (Norfolk) dating to c.1150–1200 (Goodall and Carter 1977, fig. 134, 61). Similar examples have also been found at Moorfields in London and at Dyserth castle in Wales, the latter occupied between 1241 and 1263 (Ward Perkins 1940, pl. xv, 12; fig. 17, 8–9), and in late 12th/13th-century levels in Norwich (Goodall 1993a, fig. 176, 1860–1). Two more arrowheads of this type, one measuring 195 mm in length, were found at Rumney castle (Lloyd-Fern and Sell 1992, fig. 13, 21 and 11) and date to c. 1184 and c. 1270–95 respectively. Another complete example 138 mm long was found in a late 13th/late 14th-century level at Wharram Percy (Goodall 1979, fig. 63, 62), one was found in a late 13th-century context at Caergwrle castle (Courtenay 1994, fig. 15, 10), two others were found in early/mid 13th- and late 13th/early 14th-century levels in Beverley (Goodall 1992, fig. 82, 472–3), two came from early 14th/early 16th-century levels at Rattray (Goodall 1993, fig. 39, 179), and one was found at Goltho which may have been deserted in the late 14th/early 15th century (Goodall 1975, fig. 41, 99). All these examples show that this was a long-lived type of arrowhead (and therefore presumably very effective).

**Fe70** Arrowhead (Fig. 24) with conical socket (now broken around rim) and solid projectile above the socket which is square in cross-section and tapers to a point. No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 93 mm; W (head) 6 mm; D (socket) 9 mm
XXXI (124) sf21; Period 3; 940607; A9662

**Fe71** Arrowhead (Fig. 24) which probably originally had a conical socket (but is now broken off and missing); solid projectile above the socket survives and is square in cross-section and tapers to a
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point. No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 68 mm; W (head) 8 mm
LII (80) sf27; Period 3; 940659; A9668

Fe72 Arrowhead with conical socket (now broken around rim) and slender solid projectile above the socket which is square in cross-section and tapers to a point. No non-ferrous coating detected.
L 53 mm; W (head) 5 mm; D (socket) 10–11 mm
LII (1) sf29; Period 5; 940660; A9668

Discussion

Arrowheads are not uncommon finds on medieval manorial, military or even urban sites. They are usually found as single items or in small numbers. The large quantity of arrowheads found at Holm hill makes the site exceptional and almost unique in terms of this type of military smallfind. There is also marked variation in date and type.

In comparison with the Holm hill collection the sixteen arrowheads recovered from Rumney castle (Lloyd-Fern and Sell 1992, fig. 13), another manorial site which belonged to the Clares, are, in general, earlier in date, Rumney castle being abandoned c. 1295. Consequently, most of the arrowheads are types dating from the 12th/13th century which are not found at Holm hill. The overlap is provided by two armour-piercing Type 7 arrowheads (ibid. fig. 13, 12 and 11) dated to c. 1184 and c. 1270–95 respectively and two Type 13 barbed arrowheads (ibid. fig. 13, 2 and 14). Although some of the Holm hill arrowheads are firmly dated to Period 3 (up to the mid 14th century), many are not and were found in the topsoil. The evidence from Rumney, together with supporting evidence from other sites, suggests that many of the Holm hill arrowheads are probably late medieval in date and that some may even be associated with the battle of 1471, when there was no contemporary occupation at the manor site.

It is also possible that some of the Holm hill ‘arrowheads’ were heads for crossbow bolts. This is especially true of Type 5 which was found in the largest numbers. The crossbow was employed in all the armies of Europe by the end of the 11th century. Richard I of England, an expert in its use, was killed by a crossbow bolt at Chaluz in 1199 and John included crossbowmen in his castle garrisons. From the late 13th century the crossbow was gradually replaced in England by the longbow, mainly because of the cheapness and speed of release of the longbow, but crossbows were used alongside longbows (HMSO 1976, 1). Edward I employed crossbows in his Welsh campaigns of the late 13th century, as did Edward III and Henry V in their wars in France in the 14th and 15th centuries (ibid. 2). The crossbow remained the favourite weapon on the European mainland until the latter half of the 15th century whereas in England and Wales the longbow was the common arm of the people in the 14th and 15th centuries (Payne-Gallwey 1958, 4). In open warfare, the longbow could discharge five or six times more rapidly than the crossbow, but in offence or defence of fortified positions, the crossbow was often superior to the longbow; it had accuracy and power, it could be strung and fired from a place of concealment through peepholes and slits in rooms no more than six feet high and it did not require the strength, skill and practice necessary for the longbow (ibid. 7–9). Crossbows may, therefore, have been available for the defence of the manor at Holm hill. Some bolts intended for use against men in buff coats or in light armour, such as foot-soldiers, were sharply pointed, a description which fits the Type 5 arrowheads reasonably well when they are compared to the square-faced crossbow bolt heads normally used against mounted men with breastplates and helmets (ibid. 18).

Fifty seven of the seventy two arrowheads from Holm hill had been coated with a non-ferrous plating. Most of them have been interpreted as military arrowheads. Only four of the broad
hunting arrowheads had been coated, and with plain copper, and not an alloy. Many variations of copper alloys used for coating the fifty seven arrows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>copper</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper/tin</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper/zinc</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper/tin/zinc</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper/tin/lead</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper/tin/nickel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper/zinc/lead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theophilus, in his treatise *On Divers Arts* written in the 12th century, explains how iron objects were brazed and surface finishes applied (Hawthorne and Smith 1979, 186-7). For copper/tin alloy he writes that one should

make an alloy of two parts copper and a third of tin, and crush it to a powder in an iron pot; then burn some argol, add a little salt to it, mix it with water, Smear it all around, and sprinkle the powder [presumably the alloy] around it. When it is dry, Smear the mixture around it again more thickly and put it on live coals. Then carefully cover it all around [with charcoal]... and braze it; let it cool by itself and wash it. In this way you can braze anything of iron you want, but it can not be gilded in any way.

For coating an object with tin he suggests another method:

first file it and, before touching it with your hand, while it is freshly filed, throw it into a pot of melted tin with tallow and stir it about with tongs until it becomes white. Then take it out, shake it vigorously, and clean it with bran and with a linen cloth.

Since all the coated Holm hill arrowheads used some form of copper/copper alloy, they may well have been coated using a method like the former one described.

Why were these military arrowheads plated? In the past, the study of iron small finds from archaeological sites was somewhat limited. In more recent years, metallurgical analyses of the platings on such finds show that non-ferrous plating was a common practice. Many medieval iron objects were probably plated to improve their appearance, for example 9th/11th-century spoons, strapends, buckles and keys from Coppergate in York were plated with tin and to a lesser extent copper alloys (Ottoway 1992, 721–5). Tin-plated iron has the appearance of silver. Items such as military arrowheads, which could not be expected to be recovered, were possibly plated to inhibit corrosion, particularly during periods when they were stored together in large numbers as seems possible at Holm hill. Any base near the Welsh border would have been on constant military alert. Various documentary references suggest how arrowheads/arrows were stored. In 1232 the constable of St. Briavels castle had to supply stave-built barrels in which to put quarrels (*Close Rolls*, 1231–4) and in 1256 or 1257 the constable sent twenty barrels full of quarrels to Abergavenny castle of which six were to be delivered to Builth, two to Monmouth and seven to White castle (Public Record Office, SC 6/1094/11). The barrels may have been filled with arrows, but it is more likely that they would have contained only the iron arrowheads, which, if they were made of unplated iron, could have rusted into an unusable lump if they became damp during a long period of storage! A late 15th/early 16th-century illustration of crossbow bolts, shafts and heads appears in the catalogue of the arsenal of the Emperor Maximilian I (1459–1519) and shows loose metal heads being stored in both a stave-built cask and a wooden chest (Payne-Gallwely 1958, fig. 9). It is possible that arrowheads and crossbow
bolt heads were stored in this way at Holm hill and that some of those found in the excavations were never mounted on shafts.

All the arrowheads from Holm hill were forged with hollow conical sockets into which the sharpened wooden shaft could be glued and sometimes pinned with a small rivet. At least thirteen of the Holm hill arrowheads have mineral-preserved wood in their sockets which shows that they were originally mounted. In three arrowheads the wood is sufficiently preserved to allow species identification as *Populus* sp. (aspen or poplar) or *Salix* sp. (willow), although these are notoriously difficult genera to tell apart at microscopic level. Aspen wood from Britain's only native poplar (*Populus tremula*) was the usual species used for medieval arrow shafts. In the 15th century, when longbowmen were an important part of the king's fighting force, statutes forbade patten- and clog-makers to use aspen because such a use forced up the price of arrows (4 Hen. IV, c. 9; 4 Hen. V, Stat. II, c. 3). The diameters of the arrowhead sockets give some clues as to the diameter of the shafts. Those on military arrowheads vary between 8 and 15 mm whereas the largest, on a heavy broadhead hunting arrow (Fe2), is 17 mm.

**KNIFE/DAGGER**

Fe73 Knife dagger blade fragments? (Fig. 25); single-edged blade with triangular cross-section; flat back with straight back edge; straight blade edge; tip broken and missing; remains of probable whittle tang.
L 162 mm; W 15–16 mm.
LI (1) sfo; Period 5; 940633; A9667

Cu1 Copper-alloy dagger chape (Fig. 25) made from plain, undecorated sheet metal cut into a triangular shape, with two adjoining sides of the triangle bent inwards and overlapped to form narrow hollow chape with rounded point; upper open end has slight 'U'-shaped outline with the front and back edges curving upwards to meet at points at the side; upper end perforated by two small rivet holes to fasten chape to leather sheath (not survived); polished.
L 29 mm; W 13 mm; Th 6–7 mm
XXXV (1) sfo; Period 5; 940805; A9667

![Fig. 25. Holm hill: iron and copper-alloy objects, Fe73; Cu1.](image-url)
Daggers carried during the 12th and 13th centuries were mainly triangular-sectioned and double-edged, although examples with single-edged blades are known. What is important for interpreting the status of the Holm hill site is that by the latter years of the 14th century the dagger had become part of the equipment of both the knight and the man-at-arms (Wilkinson-Latham 1973, 45). Medieval knife daggers with narrow stiletto-like blades are a common type and are well represented by many examples in the Museum of London (e.g. Ward Perkins 1940, pl. xii, 2–4). They are usually dated to the 14th and 15th centuries, but a knife dagger or small single-edged sword of the late Anglo-Saxon period (possibly 11th century) was found in a hoard of iron and copper-alloy artefacts at Nazeing (Essex) (Morris 1983, 32, fig. 3, 3a) and had a similar narrow single-edged blade with a flat back like Fe73.

Metal dagger chapes were only used on the sheaths of military daggers or of the more elaborate forms of civilian dagger. Most surviving leather sheaths belonged to ordinary knives or knife daggers and have no terminal or chape (Ward-Perkins 1940, 284). Neither leather sheaths nor complete daggers or knife daggers have survived at Holm hill, but blade fragment Fe73 and chape Cu1, in addition to the large amount of arrowheads, support the suggestion that the site was frequently occupied by people of high status and their armed followers. The form and date of dagger chapes are closely related to those of sword chapes, and at the end of the 14th/beginning of the 15th century chapes were particularly adapted to the slender pointed form of sword and dagger blades, with plain chapes being succeeded by ones with ‘U’-shaped openings (ibid. fig. 86, 12). A dagger chape similar to Cu1, made by folding over the copper-alloy sheet but with a deeper ‘U’-shaped open end, was found in London (ibid. fig. 88, 3), whilst a slightly larger chape but with similar proportions to Cu1 was found at Caergwrle castle and probably dates to the late 13th century (c. 1278–83) (Courtenay 1994, fig. 15, 13). This last chape has all the features noted on Cu1—sheet metal folded over, rounded point, slight ‘U’-shaped outline at upper end and rivetholes for fastening it to the leather sheath.

**Horse Furniture**

**SPURS AND SPUR ATTACHMENTS**

Fe74 Broken fragment (Fig. 26) of a very slender rowel spur with incomplete sides (no terminals surviving); sides are ‘D’-shaped in cross-section and are horizontally straight, curving outwards from a complete neck at the end of which is a short rowel box c. 12 mm long with the fragment of a rowel still held in place by a rivet. Coated tin/copper/zinc alloy.

L 52 mm; L (neck) 30 mm; W 51 mm; Th (where sides meet) 8 mm; D (rowel) c. 18 mm
LII (1) sf9; Period 5; 940651; A9668

The Holm hill find is a very unusual rowel spur in that its sides are horizontally straight, a feature of many earlier prick spurs of the 11th and 12th centuries (e.g. spurs from London and Oxford in Ward-Perkins 1940, fig. 29) but one extremely unusual on rowel spurs until c. 1500. After the 12th century, and until the mid 15th century, nearly all spur sides plunged forward to curve or bend under their wearer’s ankle. Rowel spurs first appeared in the early 13th century and gradually replaced prick spurs. Many early examples like that from Holm hill were very slender (Ellis 1993, 185). A very slender 13th-century rowel spur (albeit with plunging curved sides), dated to 1240–1300 and with a small rowel as Fe74, was found at the manor site at Rattray (ibid. fig. 39, 167), and similar slender 13th-century rowel spurs have been found at sites
in London (Ellis and Egan 1995, figs. 95 and 97, 327–8), at Beeston castle (Cheshire) (Ellis 1993a, fig. 112), and Rhuddlan (Flintshire) (Ellis 1994, fig. 17, 7). They all differ from the Holm hill spur in that their sides are curved.

Since the earliest rowel spurs followed the general form of contemporary prick spurs (Ellis and Egan 1995, 127), it is possible that the Holm hill example is both a very early rowel spur imitating the horizontally straight sides of prick spurs and an early find in a residual context. If it is an early 13th-century find, it may date to the end of the period of occupation of the aisled hall or to the beginning of the occupation of the first-floor hall. Alternatively, after c. 1450 the sides of spurs gradually became less strongly curved and by the last quarter of the century they were often fairly straight horizontally, although their front ends often turned upwards to the terminals (ibid. 130). A straight-sided spur of the 15th/16th century was found in Bedford (Baker et al. 1979, fig. 174, 1390) and another dating to the mid15th/early 16th century at Wharram Percy (Goodall 1979, fig. 65, 115). Fe74, found in the topsoil like many of the Type 5 arrowheads, may therefore date from the latter part of the 15th century and could be related to the battle of Tewkesbury in 1471.

Spurs were often coated with tin to improve their appearance and make them shine like silver. As well as being functional objects they had a fashionable importance and were a status symbol for the horseman; gilded spurs generally signified knighthood (Ellis and Egan 1995, 124). Fe74 has been ‘tinned’ by coating in an alloy which mixed tin with small amounts of copper and zinc. It would probably have been applied in the method described by Theophilus in the 12th century (Hawthorne and Smith 1979, 187). Some spurs found in London have similar coatings (e.g. Ellis and Egan 1995, 136, 139). Since spurs were often used in wet conditions, the tinning would also help to prevent corrosion.

Fe75 Hook attachment (Fig. 26) for spur leather? Flat sub-circular/oval body with broken, curved hooked extensions projecting from opposite sides of the body. Coated with tin (with small amounts of copper and zinc).
L 35 mm; W 16 mm; Th 14–15 mm
LXI (80) sf41; Period 3; 940583; A9661

Hook attachments for leather spur straps seem to have been used from the 13th century and into the post-medieval period and it is rarely possible to date individual finds except from their context (Ellis 1995, 149). Several iron hook attachments with oval plates similar to Fe75 have been found in late 14th-century contexts in London, one in situ on an iron rowel spur (ibid. fig. 106, 370–1; fig. 101, 341), and others with rectangular plates have also been found (ibid. fig. 106, 365–8). A small 13th/14th-century iron hook attachment with an oval plate was found in Norwich (Ellis 1993b, fig. 170, 1808).

BIT

Fe76 Complete two-link mouth-piece of a snaffle bit (Fig. 26); each link (or cannon) is a figure-of-eight loop with a central rounded boss between the two loops; the links are joined so that the horizontal axis of one is perpendicular to that of the other; one link (L 54 mm) is longer than the other (47 mm); no evidence for the cheek-pieces survives.
L 93 mm; W 14 mm; Th 13 mm
LII (113) sf9; Period 3; 940666; A9668
The basic form of the medieval snaffle bit consisted of a simple mouth-piece, usually with two links (or cannons), and at either end a cheek-piece to which the reins were attached; the cheek-piece could be a plain simple ring or more elaborate with wings or bars. Ward Perkins established a typology for both medieval mouth-pieces and cheek-pieces (1940, figs. 19a–b) and stated that a bewildering variety of types among the surviving specimens made it impossible to show more than the commoner forms (ibid. 77). This remains true over fifty years later. From surviving material, it is evident how many different varieties of two-link mouth-pieces there are, and how few of them have close parallels. Ward Perkins typology is still generally useful, although recent finds, especially from London, have required certain revisions (Clark 1995a, 46–51).

The mouth-piece from Holm Hill is of Ward Perkins's Type 2, an ordinary two-link piece of a type used universally at all periods and with all types of cheek-pieces and proportionately commoner at the beginning than at the end of the medieval period (Ward Perkins 1940, 81). Two-link medieval mouth-pieces have been found at various sites in London (ibid. fig. 21, 1–3; Clark 1995a, fig. 35, 3), in a late 13th-century (c. 1270–95) level at Rumney castle (Lloyd-Fern and Sell 1992, fig. 16, 27), and at Threave castle in a context dated c. 1370–1455 (Good and Tabraham 1981, fig. 11, 89).
STRAP CONNECTOR

Fe77 Hooked buckle/strap connector for horse harness? (Fig. 26). Oval frame with flat triangular plate projecting from one long side, ending in broken hook at apex of triangle; triangular plate perforated by hole containing remains of buckle pin loop? (on X-ray).

L 48 mm; W 44 mm; Th 13 mm

M/S (beneath 82) sf25; Period 5; 940724; A9675

There seem to be few parallels for this object as a buckle. A copper-alloy spur buckle with a square frame, rectangular plate and hook, and a hole for a missing buckle pin, found at Lyveden (Northants.) had the same arrangement of features but was made of copper alloy and was slightly smaller than Fe77 (Steane and Bryant 1975, fig. 43, 60). The Lyveden example and similar 14th-century spur buckles with oval or round plates and integral hooks from the Trig Lane and Billingsgate sites in London (Ellis and Egan 1995, fig. 97, 330; Egan 1995a, fig. 109, 378) suggest that Fe77 could have been buckled onto a strap and also could have acted as a strap connector in the same way as spur buckles (cf. Ellis and Egan 1995, fig. 91). A small 15th/mid 16th-century spur buckle with a hook, oval frame and circular plate was found in Norwich (Ellis 1993b, fig. 170, 1809). In form (and presumably function) Fe77 is also similar to slightly smaller strap connectors used with horse harness and bridles. A complete example of a rectangular loop with hook was found attached to the cheek-piece of a snaffle bit from Baynard's castle in London (Clark 1995a, fig. 35, 2); the bit originally would have taken a 15-mm wide rein or head strap. Other strap connectors similar to that from London have been found at Goltso (Goodall 1975, fig. 42, 129) and Lyveden (Steane and Bryant 1975, fig. 48, 134–5). The loop of Fe77 shows that it would have taken a strap 30–35 mm wide. Perhaps the closest parallel in size is a hooked buckle, interpreted as being for harness, from the moated site at Writtle (Rahtz 1969, fig. 47, 56). This was approximately 77 mm long and would also have taken a strap about 30 mm wide.

STRAP LOOP

Fe78 Rectangular strap loop (Fig. 26) made from thin bar of rectangular cross-section; faint remains of a pair of internal opposed projections on short sides, now broken and almost worn away; surmounted on upper surface by incomplete fleur-de-lis design above a short rounded bar.

L 25 mm; W 15 mm; Th 17 mm

L (30) sf40; Period 3; 940622; A9662

Loops were used as keepers on all kinds of leather straps to hold down loose ends. They are usually of two basic types: with a pair of internal projections (as Fe78) where the main part of the strap fitted under the projections and the loose end above them, or with a rivet to fasten them to a strap (as Cu2—see below, section on Personal Equipment). The former type was an adjustable fitting which allowed the strap loop to be moved backwards and forwards along the strap to where it was needed; the latter riveted version was fixed in place. It is not possible to be certain what kind of strap was used with Fe78, but riveted strap loops have been found on spur leathers (Ellis and Egan 1995, fig. 91) and an archer's wrist guard from Billingsgate (Egan and Pritchard 1991, fig. 143). Other possibilities are chin straps on bridle harness (which still to-day use leather keepers) or belts. Some medieval strap loops are made of iron, but many are made of copper alloy (cf. ibid. 229–35). Copper-alloy loops with internal projections have also been found at Exeter (Goodall 1984a, fig. 191, 98–9), Lyveden (Steane and Bryant 1975, fig. 42, 28–9), Southampton (Harvey et al. 1975, fig. 240, 1725; fig. 241, 1736) and York (Tweddel 1986, fig. 97, 729). Strap loops with internal projections seem to be the earliest form and some
Fig. 27. Holm hill: iron objects, Fe79–82, 85.
are decorated on the top (Egan and Pritchard 1991, 231). The decoration is not usually as elaborate as the fleur-de-lis on Fe78 and can take the form of small mouldings in the middle of the top bar (e.g. ibid. fig. 149, 1259–61). The fleur-de-lis, a common medieval decorative motif, appears on many ferrous and non-ferrous items (Egan and Pritchard 1991, fig. 126, 1084 and 1086) including, among other finds from Holm hill, a circular mount (Cu5). Anglo-Scandinavian strap loops found at Coppergate, York, are very similar to Fe78 in that they have wider and more elaborately decorated tops than the medieval examples mentioned above (Ottoway 1992, fig. 297). The strap loops from London with internal projections appear to date from the late 12th to the late 14th centuries (ibid. 233). In the absence of dated iron examples, these dates suit Fe78 which was found in a late 11th- to mid 14th-century context.

BUCKLES

The eight buckles included in this section are all iron and have been interpreted as pieces of horse equipment because of their size. Most of the leather straps which would have been fastened to them would have measured 35–55 mm or more. The rollers present on most of the buckles would have enabled the straps to move without chafing the horse.

Fe79 Buckle with 'T'-shaped one-piece frame (Fig. 27); sides and outside edge are all flattened and rectangular in cross-section; bar is roughly square in cross-section and worn where original pin (missing) was once attached; separate sheet roller on narrower outside edge; strap aperture 53 mm wide at bar end and 23 mm wide at outside edge end.
L 67 mm; W 54 mm; Th 5 mm; D (roller) 13 mm
LXX (10) sf27; Period 4; 940686; A9672

Fe80 Buckle with 'T'-shaped one-piece frame (Fig. 27); sides and outside edge are all flattened and rectangular in cross-section; bar is roughly square in cross-section and worn where the original pin was once attached; pin, which is a separate piece with tapering shank and slightly downward-curving rounded point, has moved from its original position and is now round one of the side bars; separate sheet roller on narrower outside edge; strap aperture 57 mm wide at bar end and 47 mm wide at outside edge end.
L 75 mm (not including misplaced pin); W 60 mm; Th 16 mm; D (roller) 13 mm
MS (403) sf6; Period 3; 940722; A9692

Buckles with 'T'-shaped frames such as Fe79–80 were probably used to link leather straps of different widths, with a wider strap fixed to the bar and a narrower strap to the outside edge. They probably fastened a horse’s girth strap (the broad strap passing under its belly) to a narrower strap on the saddle. In some cases, buckles on more recent girth straps are very similar to the late medieval 'T'-shaped buckles, and this can be seen in a wholesale catalogue of harness and horse equipment dated c. 1910 (Egan 1995, figs. 43–4). When they are found on other sites (e.g. in London), these 'T'-shaped buckles seem to occur only in large forms; oval and ‘D’-shaped frames vary more in size (and therefore presumably in function). 'T'-shaped buckles are a very distinctive and widespread type in the later medieval period; none is dateable to before the late 13th century (ibid. 59). 'T'-shaped buckles similar to Fe79–80 have been found at sites in London, all dating to c.1270–c. 1450 (ibid. 59–61, fig. 45, 39–40 and 47), Thrislington (County Durham) (Goodall 1989, fig. 56, 97), Hull, dating from the late 13th/early 14th century (Goodall 1987, fig. 115, 137), Beverley, dating to the 15th/16th centuries (Goodall 1991, fig. 110, 529–30), and Winchester (Goodall 1990, fig. 139, 1315). The buckle from Thrislington (like Fe81) had been coated with tin.
Buckle (Fig. 27) with trapezoidal frame, the bar being wider than the outside edge; sides and outside edge were probably originally circular in cross-section; pin is a separate piece with tapering shank and rounded point attached to bar; separate sheet roller on narrower outside edge; strap aperture 27 mm wide at bar end and 23 mm wide at outside edge end. Coated with tin with a trace of copper (AML).

L 39 mm; W 37 mm; L (pin) 37 mm
XXXIX (1) sf3; Period 5; 940706; A9672

Buckle (Fig. 27) with rectangular frame, sides and outside edge of which are square in cross-section; pin is a separate piece attached to bar, with 'D'-shaped cross-section, markedly tapering shank and rounded point; separate sheet roller 30 mm wide and 9–10 mm in diameter on outside edge; strap aperture 45 mm wide. No trace of non-ferrous metal coating (AML).

L 57 mm; W 47 mm; L (pin) 48 mm
XL (1) sf4; Period 5; 940497; A9654

Buckle with rectangular frame, sides and outside edge of which are flattened rectangular in cross-section; pin is a separate piece attached to bar, with 'D'-shaped cross-section, tapering shank and rounded point; separate sheet roller originally c. 13 mm in diameter (but now very fragmentary) on outside edge; strap aperture 50 mm wide.

L 67 mm; W 58 mm; L (pin) 56 mm
XXXI (124) sf20; Period 3; 940606; A9665

Buckle pin made of a rectangular cross-sectioned bar; tapers to point and formed into a loop at the other end (11 mm in diameter) to go around bar of buckle frame, only a fragment of which survives in the pin loop.

L 47 mm; W 8 mm
LXI (2); Period 3; 940579; A9665

Buckle (Fig. 27) with 'D'-shaped frame, sides and outside edge of which are square in cross-section; bar is more rounded in cross-section; pin missing; strap aperture c. 35 mm wide. Coated with tin with traces of nickel.

L 55 mm; W 38 mm; Th 5 mm
LXX (30) sf35; Period 3; 940689; A9672

Buckle with circular frame now very corroded; information taken from X-ray; possibly originally square cross-section frame; pin is a separate piece of iron with tapering shank and probably also square/rectangular cross-section, now badly warped out of shape.

D 64 mm; L (pin) c. 65–70 mm
L (30) sf46; Period 3; 940627; A9666

Large buckles with rectangular frames similar to Fe81 have been found on several sites and include an example for a harness strap 55–65 mm wide from mid 15th- to mid 17th-century levels at Threave castle (Caldwell 1981, fig. 12, 116).

HORSESHOES

Recent studies of medieval horseshoes provide a well-established terminology and a framework in which to fit the Holm hill finds (Clark 1986; Clark (ed.) 1995). Four basic horseshoe categories have been suggested—Type 1 ('Pre-Conquest' or 9th/10th century), Type 2 ('Norman' appearing in the mid/late 11th century and used until the mid 13th century), Type 3 ('Transitional' found mostly in the later 13th and early 14th centuries) and Type 4 ('Later Medieval' from before the mid 14th century and used at least until the early 16th century). The Holm hill horseshoes, Fe87–95, fall mainly into the last two categories, reinforcing the later medieval dating of other finds on the site.
Type 3

Fe87 Horseshoe fragment; one branch and part of toe survive; folded calkin; three rectangular nailholes, probably with narrow countersunk slots (X-ray).
L 112 mm; web W 29 mm; Th 5 mm
XXX (82) sf11; Period 3b; 940595; A9664

Fe88 Horseshoe fragment; the end of one branch with a 'right-angle' calkin; two rectangular nailholes, probably with narrow countersunk slots (X-ray); slight lobate profile opposite holes, but not as pronounced as in Type 2 horseshoes.
L 76 mm; web W 29 mm; Th 5 mm
XXIII (1) sf7; Period 5; 940702;

Fe89 Complete horseshoe, now very twisted and buckled; branches end in folded calcins; probably seven rectangular nailholes with countersunk slots; slight lobate profile opposite holes, but not as pronounced as in Type 2 horseshoes
L (estimated when allowance made for straightening object) 115 mm; W 105 mm; web W 29 mm; Th 5 mm
MS (413) sf21; Period 3; 940740; A9673, A9674, A9699

Fe90 Complete horseshoe (Fig. 28); each branch ends in a 'right-angle' calkin; three square/rectangular nailholes down each branch with narrow countersunk slots, one containing a horseshoe nail with an expanded head and lobes at the lower ends which sit in the slot; nail shaft folded outwards, but broken and no clenching survives.
L 99 mm; W 100 mm; web W 28 mm; Th 6 mm
LIV (M/S) sf4; Period 5; 940730; A9693

Horseshoe Fe87, found in a Period 3b context, must date from the mid 12th–late 14th century. Horseshoes of Type 3, with expanded-head nails like Fe90, have been found at Winchester (Goodall 1990, 1056). Examples from London (some with surviving nails) are dated from the 13th and 14th centuries (Clark 1995b, table 8 and figs. 83–5).

Fig. 28. Holm hill: iron objects, Fe90, 92–3.
Type 4
Fe91 Horseshoe fragment; one branch and part of toe survive; no calkin; three or possibly four square nailholes, tapering in profile (X-ray).
L 112 mm; web W 31 mm; Th 4 mm
LXI (3) sf54; Period 4; 940587; A9664

Fe92 Horseshoe fragment (Fig. 28); one branch and part of toe survive; branch ends in a rounded point with no calkin; three rectangular nailholes, tapering in profile, are set very near to the outer edge and, as the toe is very worn, may represent three of a series of equally-spaced holes around the margin.
L 98 mm; web W 31 mm; Th 4 mm
LXX (1) sf11; Period 5; 940683; A9674, A9673

Fe93 Complete horseshoe (Fig. 28); one branch end in a rounded point, the other is squared; no calcins; eight square rectangular nailholes, tapering in profile, are equally-spaced around the margin; toe is worn.
L 118 mm; W 114 mm; Th 5 mm
LIV (M/S) sf3; Period 5; 940737

Horseshoe Fe91, found in a Period 4 context, must date from the mid 14th–late 16th century. Horseshoes of this standard later medieval form are frequently found in late 14th- and 15th-century contexts (Clark 1995b, 96–7), but examples dated to the end of the 13th century have been found at the deserted medieval village of Gomeldon (Wilts.) (Musty and Algar 1986, 154, fig. 14, 40–1). The evidence from London suggests that they were introduced in the later 13th/early 14th century and, that they had almost replaced Type 3 by the mid 14th century, being universal by the 15th century (Clark 1995b, 97; cf. examples in figs. 86–9). Other dated examples include one from a 15th/16th-century context at Writtle (Rahtz 1969, fig. 48, 84) and one from Golttho (Goodall 1975, fig. 42, 127).

Fe92–3 are similar to horseshoes which have been interpreted as a variant of Type 4 found in late 14th-century contexts. The form possibly reflects foreign influences (Clark 1986, 3, fig. 10).

Others
Some of the Holm hill horseshoes are so fragmentary that they cannot be accurately classified. They are possibly of Type 3.

Fe94 Horseshoe fragment; the end of one branch with a folded calkin; no nailholes survive.
L 40 mm; web W 22 mm; Th (excluding calkin) 8 mm
XXXII (126) sf27; Period 3; 940495; A9656

Fe95 Horseshoe fragment; the end of one branch with a ‘right-angle’ calkin; no nailholes survive.
L 54 mm; web W 27 mm; Th 5 mm
XXIV (1) sf5; Period 5; 940705; A9672

HORSESHOE NAILS

Most of the horseshoe nails found at Holm hill were very corroded but X-ray examination revealed considerable detail including individual head types and clenching methods. Nine nails, Fe96–104, were given small finds numbers, one was found in situ in horseshoe Fe90 and others were found within larger nail groups. The nails were of the three usual types found on medieval sites and described in detail elsewhere (Clark 1995b, 86–9, figs. 64, 66 and 70; Clark 1986, figs. 5, 7 and 9).
Fiddle-key shaped head.
Fe96 Horseshoe nail with 'fiddle-key shaped' head with rounded top and flat lower edge; broken shaft and point, no clenching survives.
L 24 mm; head W 15 mm; head L 12 mm; head Th 4 mm
L (1) sf15; Period 5; 940616; A9662

Fe97 Horseshoe nail with 'fiddle-key shaped' head with rounded top and flat lower edge; complete shaft and point, spiral clenching can be seen on X-ray.
L 33 mm; head W 14 mm; head L 9 mm
XL (229) sf5; Period 3; 940718; A9675

This type of horseshoe nail is found on Anglo-Scandinavian and early medieval sites. For example, 50 nails with complete or worn heads were found at Coppergate, York (Ottoway 1992, 707, fig. 308, 3858 etc.). The type is used on Type 2 ('Norman') horseshoes and also on some Type 3 ('Transitional') horseshoes in London (Clark 1995b, 86-7). It therefore remained in use in the 14th century. Other 14th-century nails of this type were found at Waltham Abbey (Goodall 1973, 173) and Perth (Ford 1987, 137). Interestingly, the London fiddle-key nails, where clenched, display a double-clenching method whereby the point is bent over and hammered into the wall of the hoof (Clark 1995b, fig. 64b), whereas the nail Fe97 from Holm hill has a spiral clench. Among the London finds the spiral technique has been shown to be a later method used on nails with expanded rectangular heads with lobes (ibid. fig. 66b). Apparently, the technique has not been recorded anywhere else other than London (ibid. 87) and Holm hill. In London it is used on nails with Type 3 horseshoes dated to 1270-1350 and Type 4 ('Later Medieval') horseshoes dated to 1330-1450. It is thought by those who have studied the London horseshoes to be very much a 14th-century technique (ibid. 88). This suggests that Fe97 and four other fiddle-key nails in the tabulation may be at the later end of the fiddle-key type's date range, overlapping with the use of the rectangular lobed type of nail.

Expanded rectangular head with lobe
Fe98 Horseshoe nail with expanded rectangular head and lobes/ears at the lower corners to sit in the countersunk holes; broken point, no clenching survives.
L 25 mm; head W 11 mm; head L 9 mm
XXXII (183) sf21; Period 3; 940493; A9654

Fe99 Horseshoe nail with broken expanded rectangular head; one lobe/ear at lower corner to sit in the countersunk holes; straight shaft, possibly broken point, no clenching survives.
L 35 mm; head L 9 mm; head Th 2.5 mm
XL (87) sf41; Period 3a; 940510; A9656

Fe100 Horseshoe nail with expanded rectangular head and lobes/ears at the lower corners to sit in the countersunk holes; broken shaft and point, no clenching survives.
L 16 mm; head W 14 mm; head L 12 mm; head Th 4 mm
XLII (85) sf29; Period 3a; 940525; A9658

Fe101 Horseshoe nail with expanded rectangular head and lobes/ears at the lower corners to sit in the countersunk holes; broken shaft and point, no clenching survives; found in same context as Fe104.
L 20 mm; head W 14 mm; head L 12 mm
L (60) sf37; Period 4; 940621; A9662

Fe102 Horseshoe nail with originally expanded rectangular head and lobes/ears at the lower corners to sit in the countersunk holes; now worn down so that little of the head remains; broken point, no clenching survives.
L 30 mm; head W 12 mm
LXX (161) sf49; 940696; A9672
Fig. 29. Holm hill: distribution of horseshoe nails.
Fe103  Horseshoe nail with originally expanded rectangular head and lobes/ears at the lower corners to sit in the countersunk holes (possibly a fiddle-key shape—as seen on X-ray), now worn down so that little of the head remains; broken point, no clenching survives.
L 32 mm; head W 12 mm
XXI (188) sf2; Period 3; 940698; A9672

Fe98–103 are all examples of a type of a nail which was used with Type 3 horseshoes (Clark 1995b, 86–8, fig. 66), typical of the later 13th and early 14th centuries (Clark 1986, 3). Horsehoe Fe90 has a nail of the same type in situ. The type was recognised at Waltham Abbey (Goodall 1973, fig. 13, Type B) generally from 13th-century contexts. At Perth, however, nails of this type were found in contexts dating from the 14th to 15th centuries and at sites such as Lurk Lane, Beverley, they have also been found in late 12th-, 13th- and 15th-century contexts (Goodall 1991, fig. 111, 563c–e).

Small rectangular head.
F104  Horseshoe nail with small rectangular head; shaft now bent and point broken, no clenching survives; found in same context as Fe101.
L 23 mm; head W 8 mm; head L 8 mm
L (60) sf36; Period 4; 940620; A9662

Fe104 is of a type of nail which was used with Type 4 horseshoes (Clark 1995b, 88–91, fig. 70), introduced in London before the mid 14th century (Clark 1986, 3). At present, there are no criteria for dating nails of this type, those from the early 16th century being very similar to those of a hundred or more years earlier. At Lurk Lane, Beverley, a horseshoe nail with a small rectangular head was dated to the 15th century (Goodall 1991, fig. 111, 563r), whereas in Perth similar nails were found in contexts dating to the 16th century (Ford 1987, 137).

The presence of so many horseshoe nails and horseshoe fragments at Holm hill reinforces the notion that the site was frequently occupied or visited by persons and horsemen of military and high status. A plan of the location of the horseshoe nails (Fig. 29) emphasises their distribution on the open surfaced area south of the main buildings, confirming that those arriving at the manor dismounted and left horses here.

Personal Equipment

DRESS ACCESSORIES: BELTS AND STRAPS

Cu2  Copper-alloy strap loop (Fig. 30) with sub-rectangular frame and integral external rivet (now broken); flat rectangular cross-section; top edge slightly curved; one side now worn and broken in one place; cast in mould.
L 13–14 mm; W 16 mm; Th 1.5 mm
L (28) sf32; Period 4; 940779.

Loops were used as keepers on all kinds of leather straps to hold down loose ends. They are usually of two basic types: with a rivet to fasten them to a strap (as Cu2) or with a pair of internal projections (as Fe78—see above, section on Horse Equipment) where the main part of the strap fitted under the projections and the loose end above them. The riveted version was fixed in place while the latter type was an adjustable fitting. The riveted version (especially when
made of copper alloy with a large hole to allow a decorative strap mount to pass through easily) was often used on personal belts; for example, there is one in situ on a belt with other mounts in the Museum of London's collection (Egan and Pritchard 1991, fig. 138).

Many strap loops similar to Cu2 (including a set of five still joined from the mould and never used) have been found in London and most are dated from c. 1270–1400 (ibid. 230–1, fig. 147).

Cu3 Flower-like cinquefoil mount (Fig. 30) made from stamped sheet copper alloy as Cu4; domed with raised centre of two concentric circles perforated by rivethole; five domed petals, each with three "lobes"; some petals damaged.
D 17 mm; Th 4 mm
LII (113) sf42; Period 3; 940787.

Cu4 Flower-like cinquefoil mount (Fig. 30) made from stamped sheet copper alloy as Cu3; domed with raised centre of two concentric circles perforated by rivethole; five domed petals, each with three "lobes"; some petals damaged/broken.
D 17 mm; Th 4 mm
LII (115) sf28; Period 3b; 940786.

Cu5 Circular mount (Fig. 30) made from stamped sheet copper/tin alloy with mercury gilding on the surface (AML); now incomplete; stamped fleur-de-lis design in relief on central flat field surrounded by raised plain border; now distorted, but probably originally flat or slightly curved in cross-section; rivethole survives at base of fleur design; a second rivethole which does not survive was probably positioned opposite this at the top of the fleur.
D 19 mm; Th 1 mm
LXI (3) sf19; Period 4; 940792.

Cu6 Rectangular/square mount (Fig. 30) made from stamped sheet copper alloy; central single rivethole; each side is divided into three rounded lobes/petals by two notches in the edge, giving it an irregular outline.
L 10 mm; W 10 mm; Th less than 1 mm
LXXI (2) sf36; Period 3b; 940801.

Cu7 Anthropomorphic mount (Fig. 30) made of copper/zinc/lead alloy (AML). The mount is hollow at the back and is cast in the form of a human head with either a crown, halo or spiky hair formed by six points radiating from a straight line above the eyes; eyes, nose and mouth are formed by crude lines; a single rivet in situ through the centre of the forehead.
L 13 mm; W 13 mm; Th 5 mm
LXI (3) sf50; Period 4; 940794.

Cu8 Cruciform mount (Fig. 30) made of copper sheet; short, wide arms with concave curved sides forming deeply rounded curves between each arm; ends of arms originally divided into three sections by notches giving undulating outline, but each is now very worn; central punched rivethole surrounded by incised diamond-shaped frame, its points reaching up the middle of each of the cross arms; punched decoration in the form of tiny circles/crescents following the diamond and the curves between the arms; traces of both gold/silver gilding which originally filled the punched circles and the diamond-shape outline (AML); possibly repaired or re-used by an iron rivet through the end of one of the arms.
L 25 mm; W 25 mm; Th 4 mm
LXI 96 (1) sf7; Period 5; 940790

Mounts which were dress accessories were usually attached to leather or textile by rivets. Most of them would have been fixed on girdles and other types of strap such as those used with spurs. Some mounts may have been used on horse harness. Where mounts have survived in situ on an object, they often form matching sets to give an overall effect by repetition, for example on straps (Egan and Pritchard 1991, figs. 108–12 and fig. 121). Cu3 and Cu4 probably represent mounts from a set which may also have included bar-mounts; Cu9 (see below) was found in the same context as Cu4.
Stamped sheet copper-alloy mounts such as Cu3–6 first appear among smallfinds from London in early 13th-century deposits, and they are very common in the late 14th and early 15th centuries. They can be plain circular or can have multi-foil shapes (ibid. 162–3). Small cinquefoil mounts, to compare with Cu3–4, have been found in London (ibid. fig. 117, 944 and 948) but they are not as common as quatrefoil and sexfoil mounts. Cinquefoil mounts made of tin-plated iron were found in situ on a spur strap from Baynard’s castle (Egan 1995a, fig. 111, 388). Other copper-alloy mounts with domed centres and petals and a single separate rivet like Cu3–4, however, include sexfoil and octofoil examples from Billingsgate dated to the mid 14th/mid 15th centuries (ibid. fig. 120, 1007; fig. 122, 1039). Circular copper-alloy mounts like Cu5 with two rivetholes and various designs (not a fleur-de-lis) have also been found in London (ibid. fig. 114, 927–30). Fleur-de-lis designs do occur, for example on a diamond-shaped cast mount and a figurative mount from Swan Lane, London (ibid. fig. 125, 1077; fig. 126, 1086) and on another figurative mount from Billingsgate (ibid. fig. 126, 1084). Small square mounts with single rivetholes and irregular outlines like Cu6 were found in situ on two lengths of leather strap dating to the later 12th century at Billingsgate (ibid. fig. 125, 1064). Cu7, a cast mount in the form of a human head, has no immediate parallels, but cast mounts with single or multiple rivets were not uncommon and were used in the same way as stamped sheet mounts (e.g. ibid. fig. 125, 1077). The larger cruciform mount Cu8 probably was originally attached to a belt or strap by a single central rivet and was later reused by the addition of an iron rivet through one of its arms.

Cu9   Rectangular bar-mount (Fig. 30); cast copper alloy; flat back; convex rounded front with central ridge flanked by two borders with hatching; ridge perforated by central (decorative) hole and at top and bottom by two rivetholes which are countersunk on the back.
L 11 mm; W 6 mm; Th 2 mm
LXI (133) sf60; Period 3; 940795

Cu10 Rectangular bar-mount (Fig. 30) made from folded sheet copper alloy; plain, undecorated with ‘U’-shaped cross-section; perforated at each end by rivethole.
L 19 mm; W 6 mm; Th 2 mm
LI (115) sf44; Period 3b; 940788

Cu9–10 are a type of girdle or strap mount with a width of 10 mm or less equalling no more than half its length (Egan and Pritchard 1991, 209–15). ‘Bar’ is a contemporary term; in Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales the sergeant-at-law wears a ‘ceint (girdle) of silk with barres small’ (ibid. 209). The mounts were usually fixed in rows on straps with their longitudinal axes vertical and they often spanned the full width of the strap. Contemporary effigies and sculptures show this type of mount on men’s waist and sword belts and on horse bridles and chest straps (ibid. fig. 132). They were made either as solid cast pieces (e.g. Cu9) or stamped sheets (e.g. Cu10) and they usually have a rivet at each end for attachment. Bar-mounts were common throughout the medieval period. A set of six mounts almost identical to Cu9 was found in situ on a late 13th/mid 14th-century strap, 8 mm wide, from the Customs’ House site in London (Henig 1974, fig. 42, 238; Egan and Pritchard 1991, fig. 133, 1132 and pl. 5D); each mount, like Cu9, has a central decorative hole and was riveted to the leather strap by two rivets, top and bottom. An early 15th-century mount similar to Cu10 was found at Billingsgate (Egan and Pritchard 1991, fig. 133, 1144). Other copper-alloy bar-mounts have been found at sites such as Rattray manor (Goodall 1993b, fig. 41, 201–2).

Cu11 Plain undecorated rectangular strap end (Fig. 30) made of sheet copper alloy, folded widthways, and originally fixed to strap by a single iron rivet; one long edge has irregular worn indentations along it either caused by wear or by crude cutting of the original sheet used to make the strap end.
L 22 mm; W 16 mm; Th 3 mm
LI (80) sf32; Period 3b; 940785.
Cu12 Two-piece sheet copper-alloy strap end (Fig. 30) which possibly originally had narrow copper-alloy side strips (now missing); the two sheets taper to a rounded angled end with concave sides and are kept apart by a single small copper alloy rivet at the wider end.
L 31 mm; W 10 mm; Th 3 mm
XXIII (1) sf8; Period 5; 940803

Cu13 Two cast? copper (AML) strap ends (Fig. 30) with bifurcated upper ends and plain, markedly tapering shafts, curved in profile and 'D'-shaped in cross-section. Each strap end has its upper bifurcated end decorated on the front with two incised notches and two incised lines on each side, and a 'U'-shaped cut out of the top edge flanked by projections with incised lines; in the centre of the decorated area is a single circular rivet to attach the strap. The lower ends of each strap end are different; (i) has an acorn knop, (ii) has a plain rounded hook curving forwards over the front tip of the strap-end. Both were gilded and the gold is still well preserved on the decorated ends. They were obviously part of a matching set of strap ends.
(i) L 72 mm; W 11 mm; Th 5 mm; (ii) L 63 mm; W 10 mm; Th 5 mm
L (28) sf19; Period 4; 940776

Strap ends are usually made of various copper or other base metal alloys, but some were made of iron. It is not always certain if strap ends were fixed to the ends of girdles, to belts or to some other type of strap, for example spur leathers or shoe straps. It is probable that the wide variety of strap ends made from copper alloy (including Cu11–13) was for use with clothes and costume.

Cu11 is an example of the simplest form of medieval strap end in which a strip of sheet metal was folded widthways and the strap riveted in place between the two faces. Twenty four examples of this type of strap-end have been found in London, none dating to before the late 13th century, and some were made of tin-coated iron as well as copper and copper alloy (Egan and Pritchard 1991, 129; Grew and de Neergaard 1988, fig. 110, i). Some were very similar to Cu11 (e.g. Egan and Pritchard 1991, fig. 83, 578), and the width of one group averaged 16 mm (ibid. 129) which is the exact width of Cu11. In contrast with the cast, folded and decorated strap-ends of the Anglo-Saxon period, folded sheet metal strap ends of the 14th century usually had little decoration and were probably very cheap by comparison (ibid.). Iron strap ends are not as common as those of copper alloy and most of them may not have been part of everyday dress. Iron strap ends made of sheet metal folded widthways (and often tinned) have been found on spur leathers (e.g. Egan and Pritchard 1991, fig. 69, 593; Egan 1995a, figs. 111–12) and on shoe straps of the first half of the 15th century (Grew and de Neergaard 1988, fig. 110, j). Cu11 is more likely to have been attached to a simple belt. Other similar plain strap ends have been found at sites such as Lyveden (Steane and Bryant 1975, fig. 42, 8).

Cu12 is a type of strap-end which was popular by the mid 13th century and had separate front and back plates with side strips about 2 mm wide in between. Although side strips are missing from Cu12, they were almost certainly originally present because only a simple rivet was needed to hold the strap in place (ibid. 138). A similar late 14th-century strap end, found at Billingsgate has fragments of side strip remaining (ibid. fig. 90, 640).

There are few parallels for the two strap ends of Cu13, which seem to be a very elaborate and specialised matching pair for an item such as a girdle. They were found in the same context associated with the demolition and stone robbing of the first-floor hall (C) from the mid 14th century onwards and they may have been attached to the ends of a strap when they were buried. Very few cast copper or copper-alloy strap ends have been found. The closest parallel is a late 14th-century tin-coated, wrought iron strap end from Baynard House (ibid. fig. 85, 607). It has a tapering (but straight in profile) ‘D’-shaped cross-section shaft ending in an acorn knop, its upper end bifurcated with notched decoration similar to Cu13. It also has a plain back like Cu13. At 71 mm, it is also almost identical in length to Cu13(i) and it is not inconceivable that
Fig. 30. Holm hill: copper-alloy and iron objects, Cu2-16, 21-3; Fe105, 110.
both pieces were used in the same way (i.e. perhaps with a girdle strap), the London strap end being a cheaper version of the gilded copper Cu13. It is not certain what the hook on Cu13(ii) would have been for, but if the strap end with the acorn knop was fixed at the other end of a girdle, the hooked strap end may have had a specialised use such as suspending items or perhaps attaching one end of a belt-loom. Considering the date of the London strap-end and its remarkable similarity, it is possible that Cu13 dates to the later 14th century.

Cu14 Buckle plate fragment (Fig. 30) made from sheet copper/lead alloy; originally two rectangular plates separated by two all-in-one strips, folded in half across the strips to form a double-sided buckle plate, recessed for the buckle frame (not extant) and with a slot for the pin (not extant), but now broken across the strips and only one half survives; the fragments of the two strips have kinks in the middle showing where they were originally folded and have subsequently been straightened out; rectangular plate tapers slightly; decorated with a line of punched circles around all four edges; decoration is cut through by the pin slot, showing that the decoration was added before the pin slot was cut; three rivetholes; traces of mercury and gold show that it had been gold-plated using mercury gilding process.
L 43 mm; W 13 mm; Th less than 1 mm
MS (U/S) sf2; 940807.

Buckle plates provided a more secure means of fixing the buckle frame to the strap than folding the actual leather or textile round the frame and sewing the strap to itself. Cu14, the only buckle plate from Holm hill, must have been used with a delicate strap no more than 13 mm wide. Narrow straps no more than 11 mm wide were probably also used with items such as the strap-ends Cu13 and the bar-mount Cu9. A very close parallel for Cu14 is a complete early 13th-century copper-alloy plate from Billingsgate (Egan and Pritchard 1991, fig. 72, 499). It is slightly shorter but has punched decoration around three sides and three rivetholes in the same places as on Cu14. Two extra rivetholes on the London plate (and rough rivets of a different alloy) may have been added at the time of reuse/repair. The central rivetholes on Cu14 may also originally have fixed a stamped mount to match those on its belt strap, as on a late 14th-century buckle plate also from Billingsgate (ibid. fig. 73, 520).

Cu15 Small copper-alloy buckle (Fig. 30) with circular frame, circular in cross-section; split pin is a thin bar of copper alloy with rectangular cross-section, folded around the frame with its pointed ends meeting together; where the pin folds around the frame it is wider and flatter with two incised grooves as decoration.
D 16 mm; Th 2.0–2.5 mm; L (pin) 23 mm
LXI (36) sf15; Period 4; 940791

Fe105 Small iron buckle (Fig. 30) with circular wire frame; iron wire pin bent around the frame into a loop.
D 15 mm; Th 2.0–2.5 mm; L (pin) 17 mm
XXXII (1) sf10; Period 5; 940489

Fe106 Small iron buckle with circular wire frame, now very corroded; broken iron wire pin bent around the frame into a loop.
D 15 mm; Th 3 mm
XXX (1) sf8; Period 5; 940594

Fe107 Small iron buckle with circular wire frame, now very corroded; broken iron wire pin bent around the frame into a loop.
D 14 mm; Th 3 mm
XXXI (124) sf21; Period 3; 940607ii
EXCAVATIONS AT HOLM HILL, TEWKESBURY

Fe108 Small iron buckle with circular wire frame, now very corroded; pin missing.
   D 15 mm; Th 3 mm
   LII (1) s16; Period 5; 940652

Fe109 Fragment of rectangular buckle frame, bar and pin missing; sides are square in cross-section, whereas outside edge is flattened and has shaped, wavy outline with central notch.
   L 27 mm; W 19 mm; Th 3.5 mm
   XXX (1) s2; Period 5; 940593i; A9662

Iron buckles Fe105–9 showed no traces of non-ferrous plating. Small circular buckles found in London with frames less than 20 mm in diameter can be dated to the late 14th and 15th centuries. They are probably from shoes (Egan and Pritchard 1991, 57–65; Grew and de Neergaard 1988, fig. 110, a–c) or hose, and in fact some have been found in situ on straps on shoes and ankle boots. Many of them were made of iron as were the Holm hill examples. The way they were used on the shoes in fashion in the later Middle Ages has been illustrated by Grew and de Neergaard (1988, figs. 106 and 109); the earliest reference to a buckled shoe appears to have been c. 1350 (Steane and Bryant 1975, 118). In view of the date of the London buckles, where 90 out of 96 examples were dated to the early 15th century (Egan and Pritchard 1991, 64), it is possible that the Holm hill finds are of a similar age, with Fe107 dating probably from the mid 14th century and Cu15 from the mid 14th to the mid 16th century. As with many of the arrowhead finds, the three buckles found in the topsoil layer (Fe106, 108–9) may also date from after the abandonment of the site or even from the time of the battle of Tewkesbury in 1471. Similar buckles from other sites include eight from mid 15th-century levels at Lyveden (Steane and Bryant 1975, fig. 45, 1–8), where they are interpreted as for shoes or hose, and one from Wharram Percy dated from 16th century or later (Goodall 1979, fig. 63, 79).

DRESS ACCESSORIES: LACE CHAPES

Cu16 Copper-alloy lace chape (Fig. 30); complete, tapering with an edge-to-edge seam formed by sheet bent to form a tube; untrimmed overlap of metal at narrow free end; fragment of original lace inside chape, probably leather.
   L 26 mm; D 1.5–2.0 mm
   L (28) s24; Period 4; 940778

Cu17 Copper-alloy lace chape; complete, tapering with an overlapping seam formed by sheet bent to form a tube; untrimmed overlap of metal at narrow free end; fragment of original lace inside chape, silk fibres.
   L 18 mm; D 2.5–3.0 mm
   L1 (1) s21; Period 5; 940783

Cu18 Copper-alloy lace chape; complete, tapering with an overlapping seam formed by sheet bent to form a tube; untrimmed overlap of metal at narrow free end; fragment of original lace inside chape, possible flat braid.
   L 31 mm; D 2.5–3.0 mm
   L1 (80) s60; Period 3b; 940784

Cu19 Copper-alloy lace chape; fragmentary, originally tapering with an overlapping seam formed by sheet bent to form a tube; now bent and broken at free end; fragment of original lace inside chape, loosely spun threads forming a braid, silk.
   L (if straight) c. 23 mm; D 2.5 mm
   LX (30) s21; Period 3b; 940789

Cu20 Copper-alloy lace chape; complete, tapering with an edge-to-edge seam formed by sheet bent to form a tube; narrow free end has been finished with the metal bent nearly inwards, possibly by
rotating at an angle against a flat surface; fragment of original lace inside chape, loosely spun threads forming a braid, silk.
L 19 mm; D 2.5–3.0 mm
LXXI (4) sf29; Period 4; 940799

Chapes or tags such as Cu16–20 were used on the ends of leather or fabric laces. They are sometimes referred to as points or aiglets or aiguillettes (Egan and Pritchard 1991, 281). They prevented the exposed end of the leather or plaited textile (e.g. silk) lace from fraying and also helped to thread the lace through eyelets in garments. Among laces in the Museum of London collection a plaited silk example is complete with copper-alloy chapes on each end (ibid. fig. 181); albeit possibly 16th century in date, it does show how chapes were used. Other laces are up to 390 mm long (ibid. 285). Five of the Holm hill lace chapes still contained the remains of fibres which, on analysis by Anna Cselik and Glynis Edwards (AML), were identified in four cases as textile, and in one of them as silk. The fifth lace was probably leather.

Chapes seem to have been used as early as the 13th century. For example, a gross of silk cords for tying on ailettes was purchased for horse trappings for a tournament at Windsor in 1278 (Lysons 1814, 299). Other references appear mostly in the 14th century and later. They include mention in 1343–4 of corsets fastened with silken laces and points and also aketons (jacket-like garments worn with armour) each needing 24 chapes (Newton 1980, 25 and 136). Also, ‘poyn’ts of red leather’ appear in a haberdasher’s inventory of 1378 (Cunnington and Cunnington 1973, 108). Most of the chapes found in London, measuring between 25 and 40 mm in length, were from contexts dating to c. 1330 and later (ibid. 282–4, fig. 184). Chapes from Sandal castle in west Yorkshire appear to have the same date range (Goodall 1983, 232). Other copper-alloy chases with edge-to-edge seams like Cu16 and Cu20 have been found at Northampton (Oakley 1979, 262–3, fig. 113). As with the small annular buckles, chapes appear to have been related to particular fashions in the 14th and 15th centuries when figure-hugging fashions required lacing. Fifteenth-century illustrations from the European mainland depict laces, sometimes with chapes clearly visible, in men’s costume attaching sleeves and hose to garments and on cod-pieces, and in women’s dress at the front of the bodice (and on sleeves?) (Egan and Pritchard 1991, 285–6).

All the dateable Holm hill chapes are associated with the first-floor hall or its abandonment, and they fit well with dates of the mid 14th century or later for the costume types. Finds from other sites reinforce the mainly late medieval dating of these chapes: four chapes were found in levels dating to c. 1350–1450 at Lyveden (Steane and Bryant 1975, fig. 44, 78 and 81–3), one was found at Threave castle (Caldwell 1981, fig. 10, 48), five come from various levels at Writtle (Rahtz 1969, fig. 49, 86 and 88–91), fourteen were found at the Austin Friars, Leicester (Clay 1981, 137, fig. 49, 49–54), and two late 15th/early 16th-century examples were found at Wharram Percy (Goodall 1979a, fig. 56, 26).

DRESS ACCESSORIES: BROOCHES

Cu21 Annular copper-alloy brooch frame (Fig. 30); cast, flat ‘D’-shaped cross-section; slightly wider flattened area perforated by circular hole 3.5 mm in diameter for pin (not extant); gilded.
D 42 mm; D 2–3 mm
LXXI (3) sf33; Period 4; 940800

Fe110 Iron annular brooch or buckle/brooch (Fig. 30); circular wire frame, now very corroded; iron wire pin bent around the frame into a loop with extra transverse (decorative?) moulding where it sits next to frame; X-ray shows that the pin loop sits in a constriction rather than loose on the frame,
suggesting it may be a brooch rather than a buckle. Coated with tin (including small amounts of copper and zinc) (AML).
D 25 mm; L (pin) 25 mm
XXXI (124) sf25; Period 3; 940610: A9662

DRESS ACCESSORIES: PINS

Cu22 Copper-alloy pin (Fig. 30); one piece hemispherical head; thin wire shaft with point intact; now curved.
L 33 mm; D (head) 2 mm; D (shaft) less than 1 mm
XXX (1) sf4; Period 5; 940766

Cu23 Copper-alloy pin (Fig. 30); one piece hemispherical head; thin wire shaft with point intact; now curved.
L 59 mm; D (head) 3.5 mm; D (shaft) less than 1 mm
XLI (82) sf21; Period 3b; 940770

A survey of more than 800 pins from six sites in London has looked at only a sample of pins excavated from 14th- and early 15th-century deposits (Egan and Pritchard 1991, 297-304). It does, however, show that the use of pins had increased considerably by the 14th century and also that a change in manufacturing methods from the 12th century onwards led to a change in size and proportions (ibid. 297). Pin shanks became finer due to the availability of drawn wire and the head, which was made separately, also became smaller. Cu22 and Cu23, very fine wire pins with solid heads, could have been used to pin the folds of ladies' head-dresses, secure veils or other parts of garments. Some of the London pins which are similar to those from Holm hill date from the late 14th century and also have solid hemispherical or spherical heads which were hammered into shape rather than being cast in moulds (ibid. 299, figs. 200–1). Pins found at the moated site at Writtle in 15th-century contexts had solid or wire-wound heads (Rahtz 1969, fig. 49, 93–101).

GAMES AND PASTIMES

Bo1 Bone die (Fig. 31); usual form of medieval die with opposite faces bearing ring and dot motif numbers 6 and 1, 5 and 2, 4 and 3 respectively; cut from solid piece of bone; corners worn and abraded in places.
L 8 mm; W 8 mm; Th 7 mm
XXX (1) sf1; Period 5; 940818

Bone dice are found on many medieval sites and are almost impossible to date. Others of a similar size to Bo1 include a 14th–15th-century 8 mm die from Threave castle (Good and Tabraham 1981, fig. 20, 213).

Fe111 Jew's harp; oval frame; one arm intact, the other broken; reed missing.
L 57 mm; W 37 mm; Th 8 mm
L (30)sf43; Period 3; 940625i; A9662

Fe112 Jew's harp; circular frame; both arms broken; fragment of reed corroded in position between the two arms.
L 64 mm; W 33 mm; Th 6 mm
XLI (82) sf28; Period 3b; 940524; A9658
Jew's harps are fairly common medieval finds. Comparative material for Fe93–4 include an early 15th-century example from Wharram Percy which still retained the stub of the reed on its frame (Goodall 1979, fig. 63, 83).

CASKET MOUNT/HINGE STRAP

Cu24 Cast copper-alloy casket mount fragment (Fig. 31), possibly a hinge strap? Parallel-sided strip, slightly curved in profile, with an angled 'D'-shaped cross-section; each end has a small rectangular bar perpendicular to the length of the strip on which an incised groove is filled with gold; beyond the bars, both ends are broken but originally one would probably have ended in a hinge loop, the other perhaps in a shaped terminal. Coated with gold using mercury gilding process (AML).

L 64 mm; W 11 mm; Th 3 mm
XXII (1) sf6; 940763

Cu24, a high-quality medieval gilded copper-alloy casket fitting, would originally have been rivetted to a wooden casket to act as a hinge between perhaps the lid and the body of a box. The slight curvature in profile suggests that the lid may have been slightly curved/domed from front to back. Various Anglo-Scandinavian iron examples have been found at Coppergate in York (Ottoway 1992, fig. 260, 3322–4; fig. 268, 3475 and 3478), and a complete medieval example from the late 13th/early 14th century was found in Exeter (Goodall 1984a, fig. 193, 194). The Exeter mount had terminals with rivetholes at each end, but the Holm hill mount has slightly different (albeit broken) ends, suggesting a rivethole at one end and perhaps a hinge loop at the other.
KNIVES

All the knives have single-sided, triangular cross-sectioned blades. Blade measurements are only taken at the shoulder where it is the maximum blade width.

Fe113 Knife blade fragment (Fig. 32); straight back and straight blade edge taper towards tip end (which is broken and missing); sloping shoulders form tapering whittle tang (broken).
L 62 mm; W 16 mm; Th 5 mm
XXXII (1) sf19; Period 5; 940492; A9654

Fe114 Small, complete knife blade in bone handle (Fig. 32); straight back and straight blade edge taper towards pointed tip; shoulders perpendicular to short whittle tang which is embedded in a one-piece solid polished bone handle; latter is broken beyond the tang (the end of which is not visible); handle has sub-oval cross-section, with long facets at the sides and underneath the handle to form a grip.
Total L 98 mm; blade L 52 mm; W 11 mm; handle Th 13 mm; blade Th 3 mm
XLI (94) sf37; Period 3; 940531; A9658

Fe115 Small, complete knife blade (Fig. 32); straight back and straight blade edge taper towards pointed tip; shoulders perpendicular to short, straight-sided whittle tang which is broken.
L 75 mm; W 13 mm; blade Th 3 mm
XLI (109) sf47; Period 3; 940537; A9659

Fe116 Knife blade fragment (Fig. 32); straight back; curved blade edge expands away from junction of blade and whittle tang; shoulders perpendicular to fragment of short, straight-sided whittle tang which is broken; tang is circular in cross-section and has what appear to be incised grooves around the tang near the junction with the blade; traces of a band of silver/copper (AML) inlay on the junction between the blade and tang. Found in same context as scale-tang fragment Fe122.
L 60 mm; W 16 mm; blade Th 2 mm; tang Th 5 mm
XXXI (1) sf5; Period 5; 940597; A9662

Fe117 Knife (Fig. 32); straight back which curves downwards towards tip only at the end; blade broken into four fragments, but mainly complete; tip missing; blade edge curves upwards towards tip; blade has straight shoulders perpendicular to a complex whittle-tang arrangement made up of a short section of tang encased in a cylindrical copper/tin/lead-alloy (AML) collar, a circular copper-alloy guard at the back of the collar, and a straight whittle tang of circular cross-section, now broken; the non-ferrous collar has a multi-facetted circumference made up of probably ten facets along its length.
L 174 mm; W 24 mm; blade Th 5 mm; collar D 12 mm
LIX (233) sf1; Period 3; 940721; A9675

Fe118 Knife (Fig. 32); back of blade curves gradually for most of surviving length (blade tip missing); blade edge widens away from the tang, but probably originally tapered again towards the tip; rectangular scale tang which expands towards the end and is perforated by four evenly-spaced rivet-holes still retaining short tubular sheet copper-alloy rivets (latter are a copper/zinc/tin alloy—AML); two small rectangular copper-alloy flanges are soldered and rivetted to the tang either side of the junction of the blade and tang; a circular object seen on X-ray under the copper-alloy flanges is probably a rivet to hold the flanges; flanges flare out slightly and may have been set in front of the handle scales which are now missing, but were probably made of horn as this material has been detected in the corrosion products at the end of the tang.
L 168 mm; tang L 81 mm; blade W 20 mm; blade Th 3 mm; rivet L (and handle Th) 9 mm
XLI (94) sf5; Period 3; 940530; A9658

Fe119 Knife (Fig. 32); only a small fragment of the blade survives; its edge would have dropped away from the narrow junction of blade and tang; solid iron handle/tang which expands from the blade and has a rounded end with a small knob-like terminal; rectangular rebates on each side of the handle for separate organic scales which are now missing; five evenly-spaced white metal (lead/tin alloy—AML) rivets through rebates; non-rebated areas on handle are coated in a lead/tin alloy.
Fig. 32. Holm hill: iron objects, Fe113–19, 121.
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L 86 mm; W 13 mm; blade Th 2 mm
LX (1) sf9; Period 5; 940556i; A9663

Fe120 Knife blade and scale-tang fragment; two iron rivets, 25 mm apart, coated with tin (AML).
L 89 mm; W 15 mm; blade Th 3–4 mm
LX (38) sf29; Period 4; 940562; A9660

Fe121 Knife blade and scale-tang fragment (Fig. 32); blade, straight back, broken tip missing; blade edge would have dropped away from narrow junction of blade and tang; fragment of scale tang with two small sub-rectangular copper-alloy flanges rivetted to the tang either side of the junction of the blade and tang; part of the lower edge of each copper-alloy flange extends down towards the blade edge; flanges are a copper/zinc/tin alloy (AML); traces of organic material show that the scales were probably of horn; possible maker’s mark inlaid in copper in the form of a triangle? shows up on X-ray (AML). Found in same context as scissors Fe127.
L 68 mm; W 18 mm; blade Th 4 mm
LXI (1) sf12; Period 5; 940573ii; A9661

Fe122 Knife scale-tang fragment (Fig. 33) with iron rivet in situ. Found in same context as whittle-tang knife Fe116.
L 37 mm; W 13 mm; Th 2–3 mm
XXXI (1) sf3; Period 5; 940597ii; A9662

Fe123 Knife scale-tang fragment (Fig. 33); parallel-sided with remains of one copper/zinc/lead-alloy rivet (AML); tang ends embedded in a solid iron circular knop with rounded end.
L 37 mm; W 10 mm; blade Th 1.5 mm
L (28) sf49; Period 4; 940628; A9662

Fe124 Fragment of knife blade (Fig. 33) with complete but fragmentary scale tang; short narrow blade with straight back and blade edge; two iron scale tangs between which the blade could be folded are rivetted together and end in rounded terminals which drop below the lower edge of the handle; X-ray shows that the blade fragment is hinged at the front of the handle on an iron rivet and that a shaped piece of iron is fixed by another rivet between the two iron scale tangs; traces of both organic scales (possibly tortoiseshell or horn which has degraded in an unusual way?) and copper/zinc-alloy plates on the outside of the handle.
L 69 mm; handle W 12 mm; blade Th 3 mm; handle Th 9 mm
LII (1) sf24; Period 5; 940657; A9668

Fe125 Knife blade fragment (Fig. 33) with almost complete surviving scale tang; almost parallel-sided blade with straight back and blade edge; scale tang is mainly parallel-sided but widens slightly towards the end; perforated by four unevenly-spaced rivet holes, two of which retain copper/zinc/lead-alloy (lead-brass) tubular rivets (AML); traces around the rivets indicate that the original handle scales were wooden; traces of a copper-alloy strip at the junction of blade and tang; maker’s mark in the form of two crescents back to back on the blade, inlaid with copper with traces of zinc, lead and tin (AML).
L c. 100 mm; blade W 10 mm; tang W 12 mm; blade Th 2 mm
XXXII (1) sf12; Period 5; 940880

Whittle-tang knives such as Fe113–17, with pointed strip tangs embedded in solid wood, bone, antler or horn handles, were used in Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Scandinavian and medieval England. For example over 200 9th- to 11th-century whittle-tang knives were found at Coppergate, York (Ottoway 1992, 558–99). From the later 13th century onwards they gradually seem to have been replaced by scale-tang knives, although both types are found at Holm hill, and late medieval and post-medieval whittle-tang knives are known (Goodall 1993a, 124–8). Dating of 236 knives excavated at sites in London suggests the introduction of scale-tang knives there in the early–mid 14th century and a decline of whittle-tang knives by the early 15th century (Cowgill et al. 1987, table 7).
Scale-tang knives such as Fe118–25, in which the halves of the handle (or scales) were joined together by transverse rivets on each side of the central tang, were common from the 13th or 14th century onwards (Goodall 1981, 56; Goodall 1993a, 128). The top of the tang usually runs in a continuous line from the blade back and can be seen between the two scales, and the handle would have been constructed on the knife, shaping the scales to fit, whereas whittle-tang handles could have been made separately. An illustration of a cutler, dated to c. 1425, shows scale-tang knives with varying numbers of rivets, and the cutler is filing a scale-tang handle to shape (Treue et al. 1965, f. 12v). One of the earliest dated examples of a scale-tang knife was found at Rayleigh castle, abandoned by c. 1270, and the type does not seem to have been illustrated in manuscript drawings of an earlier date (Ward Perkins 1940, 51). It is likely, therefore, that all the Holm hill scale-tang knives date from the late 13th century or later. Some from the topsoil are perhaps even post-medieval. Fe118 and Fe121 have copper-alloy shoulder plates or flanges positioned at the junction of the handle and blade to sit under the end of the scales and cover their ends. Similar plates are found on scale-tang knives from sites such as Norwich (Goodall 1993a, fig. 94, 835), Rattray (Goodall 1993, fig. 33, 40), Perth (Ford 1987, fig. 65, 76) and London (Cowgill et al. 1987, fig. 65, 139). The London knife is dated to the late 14th century and has two copper/zinc/tin-alloy shoulder plates in situ under wooden scales secured together by four rivets. Good parallels for the type of scale-tang knife represented by Fe118 come from Wintringham (Goodall 1977, fig. 43, 15), Threave castle (Caldwell 1981, fig. 11, 85) and Brackley (Northants.) (Morris 1984, sf 120, AML no. 825363). Other scale-tang knives similar to those from Holm hill have been found in 14th/15th century-contexts at Lyveden (cf. Steane and Bryant 1975, fig. 46, 47) and mid 14th/15th-century sites in London (Cowgill et al. 1987, figs. 63–8).

Tools

It is worth noting that the Holm hill site produced very few hand tools of any kind. Their absence is surprising on a manorial site where various crafts and activities would have taken place. Of the few tools recovered, Cu25 may be evidence for commercial activity, Fe126 is probably a blacksmith’s tool, and Fe127 would almost certainly have been used by a member of the household.

STEELYARD WEIGHT?

Cu25 Cast copper-alloy steelyard weight (Fig. 33) in the form of a bird (duck?); hollow oval body, small tail, curved neck, head and beak; eyes are simple circular hollows in the casting; perforated by three holes—a large oval hole on the upper back over which is a squared, arched, loop, and two smaller circular holes (one now broken and enlarged) on opposite sides of the body; all three holes reach through to the hollow interior; body surface is worn and pitted. XRF analysis suggests a copper/lead/tin alloy, with strong traces of lead and also traces of iron and silver. The weight may originally have been filled with lead (which has been melted out) and coated with silver.

L 42 mm; W 17 mm; H 26 mm
LXXI (4) sf28; Period 4; 940798

In the early medieval period, equal-armed balances were usually employed for weighing (e.g. a complete Viking period example from Jättén, Norway: Graham-Campbell 1980, 88, pl. 306). Steelyards were used by the Romans but, apart from a Celtic Christian example from the Isle of Man, they do not appear to have been used again until after a sudden revival in the 13th
Fig. 33. Holm hill: iron and copper-alloy objects, Fe122–7; Cu25–6.
century (Ward-Perkins 1940, 171–2). Cu25 may be a steelyard weight, with a very unusual naturalistic form rather than the usual globular shape, flattened on the top, with a triangular projection for suspension and heraldic devices in shield-shaped panels around the sides (Drury 1926, 1–24; 1931, xlix–li; 1937, 35–42; Ward Perkins 1940, 171–4 and pl. xxxviii). These more common types were cast hollow by a *cire perdue* method and were usually made of latten—a copper/tin/lead alloy containing zinc (Brownword 1988, 2). They were filled with lead after the friable core used in the cire perdue process was removed through a hole in the bottom. Cu25 was not latten but perhaps a leaded bronze. The holes in its sides and top were probably where the core was removed and molten lead was introduced until the correct weight was achieved. The squared loop would have allowed it to have been suspended in the same way as the flattened perforated triangles on the globular weights. Similar squared loops are also found on other cast copper-alloy objects, for example a bell found at Polsloe priory, Exeter (Goodall 1984a, fig. 191, 139).

The heraldry on most of the globular weights dates them to the second half of the 13th century (Ward Perkins 1940, 172–3). There are no parallels for the bird-shaped weight Cu25. This may be because it is of a different date to the globular series which are usually divided into two classes, those with heraldic devices in relief and those with plain cast shields incised with devices; the latter are considered to be provincial and inferior imitations of the former (ibid. 172). Interestingly in the context of the Clares and Tewkesbury, some globular weights of the later 13th century bear the arms of Edmund, 2nd earl of Cornwall, who married Margaret de Clare in 1272 and died in 1300 (ibid.). Weights such as one from the Laking Collection (ibid. pl. xxxviii. 1), which bear the Clare arms, are dated between these years.

Cu25 was found in a layer created by the robbing out of the stone buildings at Holm hill between the mid 14th and late 16th centuries. Considering its worn and broken state, the weight was probably old and obsolete when it was buried, but when whole, it would have been used for some sort of commercial activity possibly at the manor.

**CHISEL**

Fe126 Chisel (Fig. 33); solid one-piece tool with flat octagonal head; shaft is octagonal in cross-section with long facets running down the length; widens and flattens out towards blade edge which is slightly curved in profile.
L 231 mm; head W 18 mm; head Th 16 mm; blade W 18 mm
LXI (2) sf62; Period 3; 940736

An almost identical, but slightly larger, chisel was found on the High Street/Blackfriargate site in Hull (Goodall 1987, fig. 111, 75) in levels dated to the first half of the 14th century. It measures 285 mm in length but has exactly the same octagonal head and shaft and flattened blade edge as Fe126. It was interpreted as a blacksmith's chisel used to cut iron and a similar use can be suggested for the Holm hill find.

**SCISSORS**

Fe127 Blade fragments of a pair of iron scissors (Fig. 33), still crossed and joined by rivet; blades taper, one tip possibly intact, the other broken. Found in same context as scale-tang knife Fe121.
L 60 mm; W 27 mm; Th 5 mm
LXI (1) sf12; Period 5; 940573; A9661
Although scissors were known in pre-Conquest England (Mortimer 1905, pl. cxxv, 837), they were very rare until the 13th/14th centuries when their use increased (Ward Perkins 1940, 151). Even then, in the later medieval period, they were not common and shears continued to be used for normal domestic purposes, in textile crafts, and by barbers (ibid.). If the Holm hill scissors (which were found in the topsoil) are medieval, they must have been an unusual tool, perhaps used by one of the higher-status members of the household.

Nails

Structural nails were recovered in quantity (¢. 4,420) and ranged from small rivet-shaped objects 2 to 3 cm in length to bolt-like items c. 15 cm long. The distribution (Fig. 34) of the nails emphasises that the space immediately south of the main buildings was a working area where nails were in regular use for joinery.

Seal Matrix

_Description_ by John Cherry (British Museum).

Cu26 Copper-alloy circular seal matrix (Fig. 33) in the form of a six part cone with a loop at the top. On the front is a crude engraving of a ship with single mast and a legend in Lombardic lettering that may read (starting at the mast of the ship) PETYE?V. The legend may represent the Christian name Peter abbreviated and a surname. The matrix probably dates to the late 13th or 14th century.
Diameter 17 mm; Height 12 mm
LI (80) s£9; Period 3b

There are a number of small circular personal seals engraved with ships. Four are referred to in the catalogue of British collections (Tonnochy 1952, nos. 568, 582, 591, 634). Such seals are often found in, or associated with, ports and they may have belonged to merchants or traders.

_Additional note_ by Dr. Carole Morris.

A seal matrix of disc form with a bar across the back and a raised eyelet for suspension was found at Rattray, unfortunately unstratified but from a site occupied from the late 12th to late 15th centuries (Goodall 1993b, fig. 43, 269). The central device represents a flat-bottomed boat, possibly clinker-built, with rudder, bowsprit, single mast and cross yard. Around the edge of the matrix is the inscription SIGNUM ROBERTI DE TRABEND.

GOLD BROOCH by John Cherry (Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities, British Museum)

A gold circular brooch (Fig. 35) was found on the surface of the compacted stone area (80) south of the first-floor hall. It provided a stratified example of a distinctive group of small gold brooches. It has an external diameter of 11 mm, a half-round section, and an engraved inscription on the flat side underneath. The pin is original and has a plain collar. Starting at the pin the inscription may be read E SUI ICI E[?] (Evans 1931). Inscriptions on medieval brooches usually start at the pin but in this case it is possible that the engraver started before the pin and
Fig. 34. Holm hill: distribution of structural nails.
Fig. 35. Holm hill: gold brooch.

that the inscription reads IE SUI ICI EN. These are the first four words of a well-known French
gold IEC REN LIU DAMI which occurs on medieval rings, brooches and personal seals and
translates as 'I am here in place of a lover'.

There are three related gold brooches in the British Museum. The one (AF 2673) that bears
most similarities to the Holm hill example has an external diameter of 12 mm and a similar half-
round section with an inscription underneath IO SUI ICI EN L. The other two brooches (AF 2691
and 50, 11-5, 2) are of triangular rather than half-round section and are decorated with an
inscription on the outside and punched circles on the inside. They are both approximately
12 mm in diameter and their legends read IE VLE VLE IVE I EUNEIV and IO SUI FLUR DEFINAN.
The former has no provenance, the latter was found in the Thames near Westminster abbey.
These very small gold brooches could hardly have withstood any great pressure and may have
been purely decorative. It is not easy to suggest a precise date on grounds of epigraphy but the
inscription IE SUI ICI EN LIU DAMI usually occurs, as here, in Lombardic lettering, which was
most frequently used in the 13th and early 14th century, rather than in Gothic lettering which
was used later. The Holm hill brooch probably dates from the 13th or early 14th century.

LEAD

Only 10 fragments of lead were recovered and they were in the form of small strips or sheets,
asphere, a tube and a disc. The function of these items remains unknown. It is surprising that
so few lead objects were found.

COINS AND OTHER CURRENCY by Marion M. Archibald (Department of Coins and
Medals, British Museum)

The items of currency found on site have been catalogued as coins (CC) and jettons and tokens
(CJT). The entries provide the context and period of each coin and jetton, the denomination
and date of issue, and the monarch or other person commemorated, where appropriate, together
with the authority providing the identification. For the jettons and tokens the obverse and
reverse are given. The weight of all items is noted in grams. A concise commentary on the
significance of the items, their likely date of circulation and loss is also provided.
Coins

CC1 Edward I, farthing, class IIIg, 1281.
Wt. 0.32g
This coin is quite heavily worn. It was probably lost c. 1350, but a later deposition remains possible.
XXXII (126); Period 3a

CC2 Merode (Poilvache) Marie d’Artois, 1342–53.
Half sterling (as English halfpenny).
Wt. 0.38g
Ref. cf. R. Chalon, *Recherches sur les monnaies des comtes de Namur* (Brussels 1860), no. 98, which is a penny. A halfpenny is not listed.
This is a very rare coin. Although the designs copy contemporary English issues, such coins are rarely found in England, unlike the earlier sterling imitations which are common here. No doubt, the shortage of small change frequently complained of at this period enabled this coin to pass muster alongside its slightly more valuable prototypes.
XXI (124); Period 3a.

Wt. 1.11g
This coin is a little worn but is not clipped. It is likely to have been lost by 1351, but a later survival cannot be excluded.
L(28); Period 3a

CC4 Ireland, Edward IV, penny. Facing Bust Issue 1475. Quatrefoil in centre of reverse. Mint name (Dublin or Waterford) off flan.
Wt. 0.37g
This coin is typical of the under-sized Irish issues of Edward IV found in English hoards of the early 16th century. It was probably deposited before c.1510 when the common sovereign type pennies of Henry VII had largely superseded earlier issues.
XXX (1); Period 5

CC5 Mary I, groat, 1553–4.
Wt. 1.75g (bent)
This coin is somewhat worn, but not so worn as those in Civil War contexts. It was probably lost before 1600.
LXX (28); Period 4

CC6 Charles II, farthing, 1673 (last digit not certain, but must be 1672–9).
Wt. 4.97g; D. 21 mm
This coin has had the edges beaten up, purpose unknown but possibly to act as a weight.
LII (1); Period 5

Wt. 0.77g
This coin is too corroded to identify a sub-group. It was probably deposited fairly soon after it was issued.
L1 (1); Period 5

CC8 Contemporary forgery of George II halfpenny, Old Head, 1740–54.
Wt. 7.53g
This coin is so worn that little is visible, but the light weight points to its being one of the very common counterfeits circulating in the late 18th century.
LXI (1); Period 5
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CC9  Netherlands, Province of Holland, 1 doit, second half of the 18th century.
Wt. 3.08g
This coin is very corroded but the lion in a wicket enclosure is just visible on the obverse. Foreign coins were banned from circulation in England, but a few coins of approximately the same size as English denominations were sometimes accepted. This piece probably passed as a farthing. It was probably lost before 1800 as the regal issues by Boulton, begun in 1799, superseded the old worn issues of the 18th century, their copies, tokens and the odd foreign coin then in circulation.
LII (1); Period 5

CC10  William III(?) farthing, date illegible.
Wt. 4.52g
This coin is almost completely illegible but is certainly a farthing. The head is probably facing to the right and William III. It was probably deposited at the end of the 18th century.
XL (1); Period 5

Jettons and tokens

CJT1  English jetton (unofficial), early 14th century
Obv. Eight-pointed star pomme in centre with six fleurs-de-lis around, each fleur having a pellet on each side, all within a beaded sexfoil. Usual small circular hollow in centre.
Rev. Rosettes in place of inscription. Cross moline with a pellet in each curve; two pellets radially in each angle, all within inner circle.
Wt. 0.59g; D. 18 mm
Ref. M. Mitchiner, Jettons, Medalets and Tokens Vol I: The Medieval Period and Nuremberg (London 1988). Obverse design not in Mitchiner; reverse is common to many early 14th-century types. This jetton is double struck so the detail of the designs is difficult to decipher. Its style is rather crude, and it may be an unofficial issue. This piece was probably lost by c. 1340.
XIX (1); Period 5

CJT2  English jetton, Edward II–III as pence of Fox type XV, c. 1321–43.
Obv. Alternate pellets and rosettes in place of inscription. Crowned bust from irons of type XV.
Rev. Long cross fleury, three pellets in each outer quarter in place of inscription; a rose in each angle.
Wt. 0.97g; D. 20 mm
Ref. Not in Mitchiner.
This jetton was probably lost by c. 1340.
LXX (28); period 4

CJT3  English jetton, Edward II–III as pence of Fox type XV, c. 1321–43.
Obv. Alternate pellets and rosettes in place of inscription. Crowned bust from irons of XV.
Rev. Long cross crosslet, a cross/patec between two pellets in place of inscription, between outer and inner circles; a trefoil of pellets with a smaller pellet in the centre in each angle.
Wt. 1.00g; D. 19 mm
Ref. Cf. Mitchiner, no. 133, which has no rosettes on the obv. and only rosettes on the rev. This jetton was probably lost by c. 1340.
LX(28); Period 4

CJT4  English jetton (unofficial), mid 14th century.
Obv. Irregularly-placed pellets in place of inscription. Lion to right on a field of lis (some illegible).
Rev. Similar to obverse. Pierced in centre.
Wt. 0.49g; D. 19 mm
This jetton is corroded and not all details are legible, but its crude style and light weight place it in the category of contemporary copies of the official jettons. It was probably lost by c. 1340.
LI (1); Period 5
CJT5  English jetton, Edward I–II as pennies of Fox type X, 1302–7.
Obv. Alternate pellets and rosettes in place of inscription. Facing crowned bust from the irons of type XV.
Rev. Long cross fourchee, two rosettes with a pellet in place of inscription between outer and inner circles; a rosette within a triangle of three pellets in each angle. Usual small circular depression in centre.
Wt. 2.69g; D. 23 mm
Ref. Mitchiner, no. 106.
This jetton was probably lost by c. 1340.
LIX (23); Period 4

CJT6  English jetton, Star and Crescent type, mid 14th century.
Obv. Alternate pellets and T's in place of legend. Star and crescent within inner circle. Usual circular depression in centre.
Rev. Pellets in place of inscription. Three large pellets and three medium-sized pellets around a tiny pellet in centre.
Wt. 3.57g; D. 22 mm
Ref. Mitchiner, no. 247.
This jetton was probably lost by c. 1340.
L (28); Period 4

CJT7  English sterling jetton, c. 1320–40
Obv. Small pellets in place of inscription. Lion to right within inner circle.
Rev. Large pellets in place of inscription. Cross moline with three pellets in each angle. Holed, as usual, in centre.
Wt. 0.76g
Jettons with pictorial types (as here) cannot be dated as precisely as those for which dies were made from coinage punches (as next); this type was probably produced in the same period.
XXXII (1); Period 5

CJT8  English sterling jetton, Edward II–III as pennies of Fox class XV, c. 1320–40.
Obv. Alternate large pellets and rosettes in place of inscription. Crowned facing head within inner circle.
Rev. Large pellets in place of legend, interrupted by long cross fleury, a rosette of five pellets in each angle within the inner circle. Central indentation as usual.
Wt. 2.26g
Ref. Cf. Mitchiner, no. 149.
There is little evidence about the currency-life of jettons, but individually they probably did not remain in use for very long. Although a later survival must be borne in mind, these last two jettons, especially if from strata of the same period, are likely to have been lost by c. 1350.
L (28); Period 4

CJT9  French jetton, period of Charles VII, c. 1418–37 at Bourges, showing the mouton of Berry.
Obv. HVRTE BIEN MOVTON TOVT. Agnus Dei to left, cross of flag has mullet ends (cross breaks into inscription).
Rev. E[...SENT LES SES[QVENS DI]. Cross fleur-de-lissee in quatrefoil within inner circle.
Wt. 0.90g (corroded); D. 22 mm
Ref. Cf. Mitchiner, nos. 546 and 533–7 have HVRTE legend with TOVT; different reverse legends. The Holm hill jetton reverse legend is not in Mitchiner.
LXI (80); Period 3b

CJT10  Nuremberg jetton, second half of 15th century.
Obv. Fictitious inscription. Shield of Bavaria with trilobe cartouche.
Rev. Fictitious inscription. Three lis and three rosettes around a pellet.
Wt. 1.15g; D. 22 mm
Ref. Cf. Mitchiner, no 998 (some variation, especially rev.).
This jetton was probably deposited by c. 1500.

LX (10); Period 4

CJT11 Tournai jetton, early 16th century.
Obv. Rosette sīt nōmen domīni (ill-formed letters). Shield, heraldic details illegible, possibly the rose shield of Tournai within a quatrefoil with a trefoil in each outer angle, all within inner circle.
Rev. Inscription as obverse, but with a trefoil at the end of it. Cross pattée within inner circle, a stylised floral spray springing from the circle in each quarter.
Wt. 3.83g; D. 28 mm
This jetton is considerably worn and may have been deposited c. 1550. It has been deliberately marked by a small circular indentation in the surface of the obverse, probably done in England to indicate, as on English jettons, that it is not a coin (in this case a groat).

XXIV (1); Period 5

CJT12 Lead token, 16th century.
Obv. Voided cross with a pellet in centre and in each angle. Border of strokes.
Rev. Similar but no pellet in centre.
Wt. 2.29g; D. 17 mm (irregular outline)
Ref. Cf. M. Mitchiner and A. Skinner, ‘English Tokens, c. 1425 to 1672’ in Brit. Numismatic Jnl. 54 (1984), no. 87 (some differences), but perhaps more like the earlier Tudor pieces which often have pseudo legends.

XXXI (1); Period 5
Possibly laminated or may be two very thin tokens corroded together.

CJT13 Nuremberg jetton, illiterate series, late 16th century.
Obv. Fictitious legend. Reichspfennig in cartouche, a pellet at each side of the three angles.
Rev. Fictitious legend. Three coins and three lis around rose.
Wt. 1.31g; D. 25 mm
This jetton was probably lost shortly after it was issued, say c. 1610.

LXXX (1); Period 5

Obv. Inscription illegible. Reichspfennig in cartouche.
Rev. HANNS KRAUWINCKEL IN NV. Three crowns and three lis around rosette.
Wt. 1.02g; D. 22 mm
Ref. Cf. Mitchiner, no. 1504 (probably this as it ends NV)
The obverse of this jetton is very corroded, so detail and inscription are uncertain. It was probably lost shortly after it was issued.
LX (28); Period 4

CJT15 Farthing token, Samuel Mosse of Tewkesbury, 1653.
Wt. 0.85g
LII (1); Period 5

CJT16 Farthing token, Elinor Atkinson of Tewkesbury.
Wt. 0.50g
Ref. Williamson, no. 173
Although Elinor's token is undated, it is probably about the same time as the halfpenny of Thomas Atkinson (possibly a relative) which is dated 1667 (Williamson, no. 174). This find confirms evidence from elsewhere that 17th-century tokens usually circulated only within a short distance of their place of issue. It was probably lost not long after issue, as these tokens were superseded by the regal coppers of Charles II first produced in 1672.
LII (1); Period 5

CJT17 Farthing token, Minehead, 'The poore farthing' 1668.
Wt. 1.44g
Ref. Williamson, no. 187.
LXXI (1); Period 5
Discussion

In general, a coin-group from a site is only as comprehensive as the excavation has been. If, as at Holm hill, the excavation has had to be confined to a comparatively small part of the total occupation area, the excavation may not have impinged upon the structures, or areas within them, where money was being handled and lost. The coin-list will then be short, even on a wealthy site.

The excavations at Holm hill were not extensive but they do seem to have been conducted on the principal part of the site with its impressive succession of large halls. The earlier stage of the excavation of the halls and surrounding surfaces was carried out in such a manner that any coins present would have been recovered. The manor with which the site is identified was often visited by its magnate owners and so the shortness of the coin list is therefore rather surprising. Holm hill may be contrasted with Netherton (Hants.), another high-status manorial site which had a large and extensive coin-list (Archibald 1990). The lack of coins need not in itself, however, rule out an identification of the site with the manor, an identification which its location and high-status structures and artefacts otherwise suggest.

There are no coins or jettons earlier than the end of the 13th century. The evidence from Netherton suggests that the odd Anglo-Saxon coin might have been expected on a wealthy manor. Early Norman coins are more rare and their absence is not so significant. The troubles of Stephen’s time increased the money in circulation and sites occupied at that time normally yield a number of his coins. One would not expect a list on the scale of that from Castle Acre castle (Norfolk) (Archibald 1982), but, pro rata, one might have expected a more representative collection.

Short Cross coins struck between 1180 and 1247 are very common as site-finds and their absence from Holm hill, which was visited frequently by King John and was under the Clares throughout this period, is particularly surprising. As the pottery series begins with this high-profile phase, the lack of coins is underlined. If the receipt of rents and payments were handled not in the main hall but, as is more likely, in some adjacent building, the area of the excavation may have excluded the place of these transactions. The first coins recovered at Holm hill are from the 13th and early 14th centuries. They are not regal silver issues, which are quite common elsewhere, but sterling jettons of bronze alloy. There are six official examples, a surprisingly large number. These jettons appear to be isolated losses and not a dispersed group. The purpose of jettons was to assist accounting, but there is some suggestion that they also served to some extent as small change. If the jettons at Holm hill were all individual deposits, they suggest a change of use of the buildings to a place where money was used. This may represent a downgrading rather than an up-grading. This impression of change in use is strengthened by the later coins and tokens from the site.

In conclusion, while it is surprising that some of its wealthy denizens did not lose the odd coin on the site in its heyday, the place in the manor complex where money was handled regularly and in quantity was probably not within the excavated area. Maybe too, the buildings were carefully swept clean and any stray losses retrieved by servants. The sudden up-turn in the numismatic record c. 1300 suggests that the first-floor hall had ceased to be of such high status, but was a place where, unlike earlier times, money was being handled, not necessarily all the time but regularly when rents were due. While the identification of the site with the manor of Tewkesbury needs to be considered carefully, the shortness of the coin-list is not incompatible with such a conclusion.
SLAG

An assessment was made by Dr Catherine Mortimer of AML in May 1994 of 4 kgs of technological debris recovered from the site in conjunction with a large number of iron objects. Some material indicated non-specific high-temperature processes, but most was diagnostic of ironworking. No hearths or furnaces were found at the site. The assessment suggested that ironworking was carried out at or near the site and that some or probably all of it was iron smithing; there was no evidence for smelting. The quantities were not large, suggesting that the activity was of a low level or brief duration or that the area of investigation did not include the centre of ironworking.

(c) Environmental Evidence

ANIMAL BONE by Wendy Parry.

Introduction

Worked bone included the bone die (Bo1); traces of horn or tortoiseshell were found in the handles of two scale-tang knives (Fe 118 and Fe 124).

A total of 2,409 mammal and 130 bird bones together with a single fish bone were recovered during the excavation. These were identified using the reference collection held by the Centre for Extra-Mural Studies, Birkbeck college, London, supplemented by an atlas of animal bone (Schmid 1972). Each bone was recorded individually. Some 1,701 bones were identified by anatomy to species (Archive; animal bone, table 1) with a further 417 to size class (Shackley 1981); 102 bones were unidentifiable (table 2). Sheep and goat totals have been combined as only 6% could be identified to specific species. The age of individual animals was considered by examining epiphyses and teeth but too few examples were present for meaningful inferences to be drawn. Butchery marks were noted and appeared to concentrate on ribs and meat-rich joints of the trunk and upper limbs. Dog gnawing was present on a small number of bones. Due to the small sample size, site phasing has not been used and the bones are discussed as a complete group spanning the full chronological period of the late Anglo-Saxon and medieval occupation of Holm hill. The limited number of bones may be due to lack of excavated primary deposits like rubbish pits and other earth-cut features. More detailed sampling including sieving would have greatly enhanced the recovery of small bones which is particularly important for the identification of birds and fish.

Results

The following species were identified: Cow (bos taurus); sheep/goat (ovis aries/capra hircus); pig (sus domesticus); horse (equus caballus); red deer (cervus elaphus); roe deer (capreolus capreolus); fallow deer (dama dama); hare (lepus europaeus); domestic fowl (gallus gallus); goose (anser anser); fox (vulpes vulpes) and frog (rana temporaria).

Domestic species. Sheep and cattle were the most important animals in the medieval rural economy, not only as a source of meat but also for providing a range of other products and, in the case of cows, traction (Grant 1988, 151–7). This is reflected in the predominance of these species
at Holm hill where 52% of the bones identified were sheep/goat and 18.8% cow. The heavy reliance on sheep is surprising in a high-status diet, even though the meat proportions would be more balanced because cows are larger animals. The relatively low quantities of cattle (cf. Grant 1988, fig. 8.2) may reflect differential disposal, particularly as few pits or middens were sampled. Nearly all the individual bones are present for both species which may imply that animals were butchered at the manor. The bones probably represent medium-sized adult populations. Pigs, providing only 11.2% of the total bone assemblage, are less numerous but still represent an important element in the diet. Domestic pigs could be penned and fed on scraps or turned out to forage in woodland or parks. Only five definite horse bones (0.3%) were found and probably represent animals that died naturally rather than were killed for their meat. Evidence for the presence of horses has also been noted in the ironwork assemblage, with fragments of bits, horseshoes and a range of horseshoe nails. Domestic fowl/chicken (4.1%) and goose (1.1%) are represented together with unidentified bird bone (2.5%). Given poor preservation of small bones and the lack of sieving these figures probably under-represent the total birds consumed. Both domestic fowl and goose are common on the full range of rural settlement. Geese may have been kept or hunted on the marsh lands adjoining the river Severn. The single fish bone certainly under-represents by far the amount of fish consumed. The proximity of the rivers and of the fishponds between Holm hill and the abbey would have provided an abundance of fish in the medieval period.

Wild species. The presence of all three species of deer, red (3.8%), fallow (1.9%) and roe (1.2%) may reflect the high status of the site as hunting these animals was restricted to the nobility who closely guarded their rights. These species were probably not wild in the truest sense but were managed within parks (Stamper 1988, 140–1). Domesday Survey, in listing the resources of the manor, cites a woodland 1½ leagues long and as wide. This could have been a wooded area to the south-west of Holm hill but the first specific reference to parkland in that area is in the Pipe Rolls for 1185 and 1187 (V.C.H. Glos. 8, 112). In 1296 an inquisition post mortem for Gilbert de Clare, 9th earl of Clare, includes the park as demesne. The enclosure of the woodland close to the manor house provided game for the hunt. An assemblage of arrowheads found on Holm hill, many of a military character, included up to 10 of a type used in hunting. The majority of the bones from wild species of animals are from the meat-rich trunk and upper limbs together with some lower limbs. This may indicate that the deer were butchered at the kill sites and the meat was stripped and transported back as joints. Hare, fox and frog bones were also present in the assemblage.

Conclusion

The bones though few in number can be seen as typical of a medieval rural assemblage. The high percentage of sheep/goat bones is unusual, especially for a high-status site. The presence of deer, particularly the newly introduced fallow, shows that the earls of Gloucester and their retainers had the means to vary their diet as well as to indulge their enthusiasm for hunting.

GEOLOGY OF THE BUILDING STONE by Dr. Diana Sutherland (Department of Geology, University of Leicester)

Introduction

The analysis of the geology of the stone imported to Holm hill for building has been confined to those fragments which had an architectural function or were decorated in a distinctive or
significant manner. They have formed the subject of Richard Halsey's contribution to this report.

Four types of limestone were recognised in the 35 samples of stone mouldings examined. They are distinguished petrologically by their texture as seen with the aid of a hand-lens. Most belong to what is arbitrarily classed as Type 1; these tend to be fragments of finely carved stones, including ornamental patterns as well as parts of beasts' heads (with snouts or eyes), and some are reddened by fire. Very few stones are assigned to Types 2–4; these are evidently simpler in their style of working. Tewkesbury overlies Liassic sediments (mudstones and muddy limestones) of the Lower Jurassic, and limestones generally suitable for mouldings and carving were brought from elsewhere. The nearest source was the Inferior Oolite of the Cotswold escarpment and adjacent outliers, including Cleeve hill and Nottingham hill to the south-east, Leckhampton hill further south, and Bredon hill to the north-east. All these have been extensively quarried in the past, and present-day workings are to be found further east in the Cotswolds. Samples of limestone from some of these have been examined for comparison with the Holm hill mouldings, and a brief visit has enabled inspection of some existing medieval masonry in the area.

**Petrology**

*Type 1: oosparite (Samples Sm1–7, 10–13, 16–17, 19–30, 32–34)*

This type is a pale cream oolitic limestone composed of ooliths held in a crystalline calcite matrix. It has an even, homogeneous texture, the ooliths being from 0.5 to 1.0 mm in diameter and mostly spherical. Some ooliths have two zones, the cores being softer, sometimes yellowish brown, and weathering out as hollows. In some samples the spar cement forms a strong continuous matrix and the ooliths are hollowed out. Most noticeable is the general absence of shell debris; though occasionally (e.g. Sm7, 20) a few bits of shell are seen.

This type of pure oolite, free from shell, is distinctive, but it will be appreciated that geologically such a rock is not confined to one stratigraphic horizon. A well-known example is Bath Oolite, from the Great Oolite Group. However, petrologically similar oolite is to be found in the Lower Freestone of the Inferior Oolite around Cheltenham, in particular the rock now known as the Devil's Chimney Oolite (Mudge 1978).

Leicester University sample LEIUG 19268 from the Inferior Oolite of Leckhampton hill is a pale cream oolite similar to Type 1. The ooliths are of even size (0.6–1.0 mm), mostly spherical and a few oval; they are not cored in quite the same way as the Holm example, but have a distinct outer 'rind'. A few echinoid spines and small gastropods are present.

Present-day workings include the Cotswold Hill Stone Quarry north-west of Temple Guiting, where the so-called 'White Guiting' is from the Devil's Chimney Oolite. A sample of 'Bed 1' (the quarry term for a certain part of the freestone, not stratigraphically the first bed) is pure oosparite; ooliths, 0.5 mm in diameter, comprise several zones within the characteristic concentric layering and are closely packed in a calcite cement.

The Inferior Oolite has a long tradition of working along the scarp of the Cotswolds east of Tewkesbury. Richardson (1904, pp. 82–6) described the Lower Freestone as the 'celebrated Cheltenham building stone' which, being relatively free from organic remains, 'is more readily dressed'. Nicholson quoted the Revd. P.B. Brodie who noted that 'each grain is formed of a central nucleus, having layers of carbonate of lime around it; the nucleus is frequently first enclosed in a soft layer, with a hard layer outside'. Mudge (1978) records the thickness of the Devil's Chimney Oolite as 10.3 m at Leckhampton hill and 16 m at Cleeve hill; his sections
indicate the extent of its occurrence, from Selsley hill near Stroud to Bredon hill, thinning towards Bourton-on-the-Hill (see Mudge, fig. 3a).

Oolitic limestones similar to Type 1 also come from the Great Oolite around Bath, particularly the geological unit called the Bath Oolite, described as 'uniform in texture, composed almost entirely of ooliths' (Green and Donovan 1968, p.19). A Leicester University sample of this oolite, LEIUG 14182, from the 'Ridge Upper Bed', Monk's Park Quarry, near Corsham (Wilts.), is a very pale cream oosparite (i.e. composed of ooliths held in spar cement). The ooliths are similar to those of Type 1 in size and appearance and many have the two zones and somewhat soft chalky centres.

**Type 2: oolitic biosparite** (Samples Sm8–9, 18, 31)
This type (e.g. Sm31) is deeper cream to yellowish in colour and conspicuously coarser in texture, with abundant shell fragments, 3–4 mm, generally aligned in the bedding. Various other calcareous grains include crinoid spines and ossicles (simple cylindrical 'beads' and star-shaped *Pentacrinus*), fragments of bryozoa, and small elongate gastropods. Ooliths are less common and some are soft and lacking in structure. The matrix is a spar cement. Sm31 contains a brownish patch, possibly a clast of more ferruginous limestone. Sm8 is more uniformly cream-coloured but has a somewhat ribbed weathering, due to textural banding in the rock.

This limestone is apparently similar to the Lower Limestone of the Cotswold Hills around Cheltenham. For example, the Crickley Limestone Member (Mudge, fig. 2) is described (ibid. p. 613) as coarse-grained limestone 'composed of bioclasts, ooids and superficial ooids... set in a coarse sparite cement. The beds contain a sparse fauna of *Pentacrinus* ossicles, echinoid spines and the small pectinid *Propeamussium* sp.' On the north-west side of Crickley hill it is 5.2 m thick. Mudge reports that it is 'restricted to the Cheltenham and Cleeve hill areas', and it changes in character away from this area.

**Type 3: pisolithic oosparite** (Sm14)
This coarse-textured rock contains abundant ellipsoidal pisoliths, 5–6 mm in length and composed of fine-grained structureless limestone, soft and micritic or 'chalky', which have weathered out of the surface, leaving conspicuous holes. They are aligned with the bedding and tend to be in bands. They are accompanied by ooliths (<1 mm) and various calcareous fossil fragments and shells, all surrounded by spar cement.

It is very similar to sample LEIUG 62063 from the Pea Grit (Lower Inferior Oolite) from Cleeve hill. This is now known as the Crickley Oncolite Member of the Lower Inferior Oolite Formation (Mudge 1978). On Crickley hill it is 2.6 m thick. Richardson (1904) reported that the rock had a very limited geographical range and Mudge (1978) says it is restricted to the Cheltenham and Cleeve hill areas.

**Type 4: sandy spar-cemented limestone** (Sm15, 35)
This limestone has a strong yellow crystalline calcite matrix and a porous appearance, like a fine-textured sponge, where grains have come out. The grains are small (0.2–0.3 mm) and comprise quartz sand together with calcareous particles and sparse flat shell fragments.

A very similar stone is quarried at the present day from the Inferior Oolite north-west of Temple Guiting. It is known as Guiting Stone or 'Yellow Guiting' and locally is overlain by 'White Guiting' (Lower Freestone). Like the Type 3 limestone, it comes geologically from the group of rocks known as the Pea Grit. Richardson (1904) recorded the geographical variation in the Pea Grit, noting that at Crickley hill and also at Cleeve hill the pisolithic type is dominant,
but by Bredon hill there is little pisolitic stone. The 'Pea Grit-equivalent' in the area north-east of Cheltenham is this type of yellow shelly sandy limestone now known geologically as the Jackdaw Quarry Oolite (Mudge 1978).

The 'Slates'

Apart from stone used in walling, chimneys, windows, and doors, there were two types of stone which were used as tiles at Holm hill. One contains small shell fragments, lying flat with the bedding and giving the rock a certain fissility. It also has many small white ooliths (<0.2 mm) with sand cores. The other is a grey sandy limestone with bivalves of various kinds including small round Placunopsis with deeply curved shells. This bivalve is common in some rocks of the Great Oolite Group.

Stonesfield Slate from the Great Oolite around Stonesfield, near Woodstock, was worked from Roman times until 1909 (Arkell 1947). Leicester sample LEIUG 28552 is grey and sandy like the Holm hill example and has sporadic small white ooliths; other Leicester samples are lithologically variable in the proportion of ooliths, sand and shell, but the rock is generally micaceous, and distinctive fossils include plant remains and animal teeth. These have not so far been recognised in the Holm hill samples. Arkell pointed out that the highest quality Stonesfield 'slates' was from a layer up to 1.8 m thick, and was characterised by the distinctive fauna, but that it was confined to an area around Stonesfield only 3.2 km across (Arkell, fig. 27; see also Boneham and Wyatt 1993 fig.1). Arkell reported that tilestones of a crude quality occurred at other horizons, and there is confirmation from boreholes (Boneham and Wyatt, fig. 2). Tilestone indeed seems to have been available over a much wider area, including localities nearer the main Cotswold escarpment where locally Great Oolite rocks cap the Inferior Oolite; Richardson (1904, pp. 160, 163) describes 'slate' quarries near Througham, and Sevenhampton, as well as many others, including one near Hawling.

Discussion

The fabric of Tewkesbury abbey contains stones of the types found at Holm hill. Shafts in the south porch include Pea Grit, also streaky shelly oolite, some bases include pure white oolite (as Type 1), and other bases have limestone with crinoid ossicles, all apparently Cotswold type. The inner doorway includes the yellower oolite. The carved tombs inside the abbey are of fine oolitic limestone with no shell; this resembles Type 1, though it could of course be from further afield.

Bishop's Cleeve church contains a good deal of white oosparite as ashlar, porch mouldings and pillars. Some of it has a streaky banding formed of ooliths of differing size (not obvious in the Holm hill samples) but certainly a more uniform oosparite is here too, similar to Type 1. The stone of the beasts around the doorway arch cannot be easily examined. Deerhurst church is built of assorted blocks of lias and oolite, and its Anglo-Saxon doorways of pale oolitic limestone. The carved beasts look rather like those at Bishop's Cleeve, which seem not to be like the little beasts of the Holm hill fragments.

Although the remains of Hailes abbey (built between 1246 and 1277) represent a building which may have been erected half a century later than Building C at Holm hill, a comparison is instructive. At Hailes the most common stone is a yellow shelly oosparite (similar to Type 2) possibly quarried from the Inferior Oolite near Hailes. Some stones show a ribbed structure on weathering and crinoid fragments are conspicuous in the stone exhibits. There is less of the white oosparite (like Type 1), but there was in any case less carving in this Cistercian house.
However, this white stone can be seen in the recesses in the north wall of the cloister. It is also evident in fragments of vaulting and tracery and in quatrefoil and in trefoil ornaments and excellent carved bosses; all these date from various stages of the building from the later 13th century onwards. This whiter type is reported to come probably from the Cleeve hill area. The pisolitic Pea Grit (Type 3) also was used at Hailes, for example for a column shaft and vault rib described as a pier strengthen. Guiting Power church has Norman stonework, the north and south doorways being of a pale, tough spar-cemented shelly oolite, but the stone is not like that at Holm hill or Hailes.

At first sight the fine white oolitic limestone (Type 1) of many of the Holm hill fragments brings to mind the well-known Bath Oolite. However it is clear that this, and the other rock types, were available within a few kilometres of the site in the Cotswolds. Nevertheless, it is perhaps worth bearing in mind that for certain contracts stone might be obtained from sources some distance away. Quarries in the Bath area perhaps should not be discounted altogether.

PART FOUR
DISCUSSION

This part of the report considers the significance of the archaeological evidence from Holm hill and the extent to which it is complemented by documentary evidence for the manor. It also relates that evidence to the development of the town and demonstrates how, in the Anglo-Norman period, Tewkesbury and the honour of Gloucester, of which it was head, were of consequence to several baronial families, in particular the Clares. Finally it gauges the importance of the honour to those families in their involvement in regional and national events in 13th- and 14th-century England.

The Site of Tewkesbury Manor

There has been interest in locating the site of the medieval manor of Tewkesbury since the late 18th century (Dyde 1790). Various locations have been proposed and it is accepted that the site of the medieval manor has never been established beyond doubt. In the 1430s the high ground south of the Swilgate was called ‘Windmill hill’, suggesting that a windmill was then the most prominent structure on the hill. In 1504 the area had been described as ‘Holm hill’. The name ‘Holm Castle’ was Leland’s description. The scale of the foundations Leland observed being robbed out led him to describe the remains in terms of a fortified dwelling rather than a great house. Later historians argued that the ‘castle’ may have been located towards the eastern end of Holm hill. Bennett’s observations in 1826, published in 1830, promoted this view. As a result an obelisk was raised, as a monument proclaiming the site of the residence of the lords of the manor on what is now the crest of a break of slope northwards to the river Swilgate. Others who ventured opinions on the subject (Spurrier 1886; North 1890) believed that a location between the east end of Holm hill and the river Swilgate was more plausible, Spurrier arguing that the manor had been sited in a low-lying area south of the abbey church and bounded by the river Swilgate on the north. A more recent view (Blyth 1961) maintained that a more westerly
location was likely and that Leland's observations had been misinterpreted. Leland had been explicit in describing the location as south-west of the abbey church. A line in this direction from the great west door of the abbey passes through the hill where the remains of buildings were found in the 1974 excavation and, although caution must prevail, it is not unreasonable to suppose that 'Holm Castle' was among the remains excavated in 1974/5. What is more difficult is to demonstrate an association between the physical remains from Holm hill and the site of the manor referred to in medieval records.

The documentary evidence indicates that in or near the town there was a succession of substantial buildings forming part of the administrative centre of a manor of exceptional size and of an honour of great extent. As earl of Gloucester and later king, John stayed at Tewkesbury on several occasions and he may have been responsible for the construction of one of the buildings while holding the earldom. There are several possible locations for the site of the manor, including the Mythe or in the town of Tewkesbury itself. The Mythe would appear a realistic option given the vantage point offered over surrounding countryside. While the earls of Gloucester evidently maintained a barn in the town, the documentation does not specifically support the location of the manor there. The evidence from Holm hill, comprising the remains of several large halls constructed on the same alignment for persons of high status and/or for important communal purposes, leads to the strong possibility that the excavated site is that of the manor.

The Form of the Buildings at Holm Hill

Although the plans of the excavated remains were not comprehensive it is apparent that a succession of buildings—a timber hall, a stone-founded aisled hall and a stone first-floor hall—was constructed and utilised within a defined area. If the archaeological remains, along with the architectural and historical evidence, are considered and are compared with surviving buildings and with other excavated examples, an impression of the form of the Holm hill buildings can be gauged. It has been observed that 'even palaces formed a series of buildings, separately roofed, loosely tacked together, and added to when required' (Wood 1965). This should be borne in mind when considering the structures at Holm hill.

Building A. The circumstances in which the remains of this structure were recovered permit only general comment. The evidence comprised two parallel rows of post-pits extending nearly 40 metres in length. The most significant feature was the continuity of the alignment of the northern row of pits. By contrast the southern row was not continuous; the eastern end was offset to the south by c. 1 metre. The features may represent a single building (Fig. 7, A1) with a transeptal arrangement but such a plan has few parallels in the archaeological record. A more plausible alternative, in which the features represent two halls, either contemporary or in succession, on an almost identical alignment, is a recurring feature of high-status layout in the pre-Conquest period, for example at Yeaverling and Hatton Rock. At Holm hill both halls would have been in the order of 17 metres long. The failure to identify occupation surfaces and the occurrence of only one sherd of Stafford ware together with a fragment of annular loom weight leave the interpretation inconclusive.

The aisled hall—Building B. This was erected over part of the foundations of the timber building. The differences between the two buildings were of both form and character of construction; the foundations of B were shallow and their inadequacy had resulted in subsidence in the lower wall coursing. The structures initially recorded as B were thought to be the remains of a building
Fig. 36. Holm hill: an impression of the south elevation of the first-floor hall, c. 1230 (drawn by Nigel Coe).
supplanted by C. However in the salvage excavation in 1975 it was realised that the plan of B was coherent and that it represented a building which stood immediately east of the site where C was later built. The remains of B, for the construction of which a number of the most easterly post-pits of A appear to have been reused, have been interpreted as an ailed block, with a chamber block at the west end. Foundations and lower wall coursing defined the ground floor of the chamber block which had solar above. The west wall of the block seems to have been replaced by the east wall of C.

The hall, defined by lengths of the surviving stone-coursed foundations, formed a rectangle (18.5 by 13.5 m). The width must have been beyond the limits of a single roof span and it is suggested a set of post-pits, previously part of A, was reused to erect arcades, thereby creating an ailed hall. The probability that features from A were reused in the hall's construction is supported by the evidence that the post-pits which were examined were deeper and wider than those to the west belonging to the period of the timber building. The reused post-pits formed opposing pairs but they were not equidistant from the flanking 'aisle' walls, varying from 1.8 to 2.7 m from the outer wall. An alternative is that the arcades were supported on stone slabs serving as plinths. Fragments of slabs were found at the west end of the hall. Also at the west end of the hall there was the base of a passage screen. The entrances to the hall in its south-west and north-west corners opened into this passage. It has been assumed that the hall was not stone-built but was supported on stone foundations. The structure was probably roofed with wooden shingles since stone tile fragments were not evident in the immediate vicinity of the hall foundations. The stone mouldings present in the rubble indicated that there would have been decorated windows and doors. It should also be noted that the highest concentration of horseshoe nails occurred near the south-west corner of the hall, pointing to the doorway there as the one most often being used by riders after dismounting (Fig. 29).

The first-floor hall - Building C. This, the last major building erected on the site, had foundations of a scale and character compatible with the provision of an upper floor. Within the bounds of the foundation trench, the space was divided into two areas by a transverse cross-wall with a central opening. The smaller area had been paved with slabs. In the larger area was a stone plinth, the base of a column from which vaulting would have sprung to support the floor above. Further recesses for another two plinths, at the appropriate spacing, were recorded. The foundation trench was widened at two places, on the north and south sides of the building respectively. The larger of these, on the north side, represented the widening of the foundations to receive the weight of a fireplace at first-floor level and chimney above. The widening on the south side was also to support a fireplace and chimney above. The evidence suggests that at first-floor level there was a large open space at the east end and a smaller space (an upper chamber) at the west end. The larger space was over the stone vaulting, which was intended to bear the greatest weight when the hall was the venue for communal events, and was heated by the larger fireplace which was placed on the north side to cause less restriction to sunlight entering the windows on the south side. The hall, occupying the eastern end of the building, would have had a ridge roof following the E-W orientation of the building in contrast to the smaller upper chamber which was ridge-roofed from north to south. This was demonstrated by the extent of the drip trench on the south side of the hall which ran eastwards from a point east of the fireplace widening along that side of the building. An impression (Fig. 36) of the appearance of C based on the site evidence and on a comparison with surviving buildings of the period, suggests how this south elevation would have been dominated by an ornate and richly-decorated door at first-floor level, reached by an external staircase and providing an entrance at the southeast corner of the hall.
Fig. 37. Comparison of hall plans from Tewkesbury (Holm hill) with those of other medieval royal and aristocratic buildings.
It can only be conjecture that the timber hall(s) was built in the 11th century and that it was replaced by the aisled hall B in the early 12th century, the latter event coinciding with Fitz-Hamon's acquisition of Tewkesbury and his construction of the abbey. The aisled hall comprised hall and chamber block and the doorways and windows probably incorporated the stone mouldings identified by Richard Halsey as early 12th century in date. These mouldings may have been reused in the later first-floor hall. The aisled hall was probably the *magnificum domum* destroyed in 1140 and its replacement by the first-floor hall would not have taken place until after Henry II became king. From the later 12th-century character of many of the stone mouldings, it is possible that the new hall wasn't constructed until the last decade of the 12th century, after the earldom of Gloucester had been acquired by Henry II's son John. This theory was advanced in the late 19th century by North (1890), whose interest in Tewkesbury's history led him to link John's frequent visits to the town with the construction of 'Holm Castle' as a building fit for a future king. The scale and character of the first-floor hall represented a major investment of resources at Tewkesbury which would have been unlikely as long as the influence of the earls of Gloucester centred firmly on Bristol. By the later 1160s Earl William had been forced to relinquish Bristol castle in favour of the Crown and following William's death (and burial at Keynsham) in 1183 Henry II took possession of the earldom and granted it to his own son John. The first-floor hall may well have been built as the honorial *caput* of the earls of Gloucester, a function it served until the early 14th century.

**Comparable Buildings (Fig. 37)**

The development of the hall in England has been chartered recently and the longevity and durability of the aisled hall emphasized (Thompson 1995). The proportions of the aisled hall at Holm hill, the earlier of the two post-Conquest buildings there, can be compared with several surviving contemporary buildings, including the bishop's palace at Hereford (Blair 1987) and halls at Clarendon and Oakham (James and Robinson 1988; Clough 1981). Wood (1965) believed that aisled halls 'must have equated with barns'. The need for a large covered space serving a range of functions, including the provision of sleeping quarters for retainers, was solved by the erection of aisled halls. Building B comprised a hall 18.3 by 13.4 m (60 ft by 44 ft); at Bristol, the castle had a late Anglo-Norman aisled hall which may have been of comparable form to that at Tewkesbury.

At Holm hill the aisled hall was replaced by a first-floor hall. Raised on a basement or cellar, first-floor halls were typical high-status buildings in England for several generations after the Conquest, the halls normally being entered by an external stair case. Wood, in a view endorsed by Thompson, considers that the first-floor hall was gradually replaced by the ground-floor hall, other than in places where it was not safe for such a change. The ground-floor hall was seen as more convenient and practical but the events of 1140 in Tewkesbury and the proximity of the Welsh border may explain why the aisled hall gave way to a structure which was more easily defended.

Remains of first-floor halls have been found in or near castles, for example at Richmond (Yorkshire), Framlingham (Suffolk), Grosmont (Monmouth), and Christchurch (Dorset). In those places, the hall was raised on a basement or cellar with large windows for the hall and narrow loops for the basement. As at Christchurch, the basement was entered by a door at ground level and, internally, by an access from the hall. The high table was at the end of the hall farthest from the entrance. Wood suggested a 2:1 division in space between the hall and the chamber, and the buildings at Grosmont and Christchurch share similarities with Building C in the positioning of fireplaces (and chimneys).
Blair (1993) has argued, however, that the notion of first-floor halls represents an outmoded approach to medieval domestic architecture; he proposed that so-called ‘first floor halls’ were really ‘chamber blocks’ accompanied by a separate ground-floor hall and that the first-floor hall, as a multi-purpose building with administrative and domestic functions, was abnormal. Blair, who cited documentary evidence indicating that halls were seldom storeyed, believed that chambers were also single-storeyed and that there were ancillary buildings present, often linked by covered ways. For Blair, Boothby Pagnell, ‘long elaborated as the paradigm of the first floor hall’, represents what would have been a camera, not an aula. The camerae, of stone, have survived better than the open halls which stood near them. Blair insists that no ordinary English manor house with substantial and unambiguous remains of both components has yet been discovered and he is certainly correct in noting that few excavations of secular manor houses of 13th-century date have produced coherent plans. The merits of these arguments require further assessment and research but the evidence from Holm hill suggest that each building there was an autonomous unit, rather than one interdependent on other structures. One characteristic of English manorial planning with its pre-Conquest origin, the practice of aligning buildings axially, was a marked feature of the buildings on Holm hill.

Other Buildings and Structures at Holm Hill

The archaeological features on the hill were dominated by the remains of the major buildings. Apart from the prehistoric ditches, the architectural features were almost entirely of medieval date. If the form of the large buildings was difficult to recover, those of the lesser structures was even more so. Some were identified in a fragmentary form in 1974; others were seen in the earthmoving of 1975 and recorded as well as circumstances permitted. One group extended almost directly south from B, another lay to the south-east, while one structure formed an outlier to the east. The features immediately south of B were incoherent in plan: they could have been roofed buildings or a series of walled yards. The alignment of the surviving wall footings, bedded on a densely packed scatter of fragments of lias rock showing varying degrees of wear, conformed to that of the main buildings but the general impression was of flimsy structures which would have obscured the open aspect of the main buildings to the south. The quantity of horseshoe nails found on the stone surface at the south-west corner of B suggested that horses were stabled or regularly tethered there. Through the middle of these amorphous structures was a ‘corridor’ of smoothed stone which provided the route into the ‘inner ward’ of the building complex. During earthmoving in 1975 fragments of floor tile with the appearance of having been in situ were exposed on the edge of this corridor and suggested the presence of a small chapel on the approach to the main building group; in 1241 repairs were ordered to the ‘greater and lesser’ chapels at the residence of the earls of Gloucester. Some way south of this corridor was an industrial area where concentrations of ash and charcoal indicated residues from the manufacture and repair of wooden and metal objects and fittings. To the south-east, the remains of a large rectangular building suggested a barn with the traces of a circular structure beyond, probably a dovecot; the inquisition post mortem of Gilbert de Clare in 1296 included dovecots among the possessions of Tewkesbury manor. Earthmoving in 1975 revealed the remains of a chamber to the east of B and C and linked to them by a wall.

The approach to the buildings was from the east, with an entrance into an ‘outer ward’, perhaps at a point where the present Gloucester–Tewkesbury road cuts through Holm hill. This outer ward contained the putative barn and dovecot. Continuing past the barn, an area of worn and smoothed stone led to the corridor, noted above, where a narrow slot cut into the stone surface suggested an arrangement for an intermittent barrier akin to a portcullis. Beyond this
entrance a large area of compacted, worn stone formed an open area to the south of C. The
distribution of horseshoe nails in this area confirmed that those coming to the hall on horseback
dismounted and left horses there before walking towards the hall entrance. From observations
during earthmoving in 1975 there were no remains of buildings on the south side of this yard;
the intention must have been to ensure an unobstructed view down the valley towards
Gloucester.

Tewkesbury, situated on the margin of the March, was close to a zone in which there was a
prospect of frequent raids by the Welsh on the estates of Anglo-Norman landholders. The
provision of defences would seem to have been essential for the security of the buildings at
Holm hill. This awareness would have been sharpened for the Clares by their family history,
Richard, the 3rd earl having been killed in an ambush in Wales in 1136. The Pipe Roll for 1211
refers to the construction of ‘brattices’ at Tewkesbury at the king’s expense, a precaution which
may have been prompted by an attempt earlier that year to assassinate John on a journey out of
London. However, evidence of deep ditches and embankments was not found in the excavation.
As noted above, the resistivity survey indicated a pattern of responses on a NW–SE alignment
and forming an oblique line across the hill (and enclosing the buildings), but the physical evidence
of some form of enclosing boundary was not seen during earthmoving in 1975.

Without either enclosing embankment or ditch, the site, on ground sloping gently to the
south, was surprisingly open and unprotected. This apparent lack of defences was in marked
contrast to the situation prevailing at other sites associated with those who held the earldom of
Gloucester at various times, for example the castles at Bristol, Stoke (Suffolk), and Caerphilly
(south Wales). The location of the halls did however exploit the existing topography in that it
was on the edge of a steep scarp where the side of Holm hill plunged steeply into the narrow
valley of the river Swilgate. The height of the scarp above the surrounding area would have
given the buildings a commanding position, dominating not only the southern approach to the
town but also the crossing of the river Severn at Lower Lode.

Abandonment of Holm Hill

The sudden death of Gilbert de Clare, 10th earl of Clare, without an heir in 1314, abruptly
ended the Clare dynasty. The immediate fate of the buildings on Holm hill and the duration of
their occupation remain uncertain. Documentary evidence suggests that the buildings were in
decline by the mid 14th century and the contemporary account of the penultimate battle of the
Wars of the Roses fought south of Tewkesbury in 1471 does not refer to buildings or ruins as
landmarks on the hill. A generation after the battle Leland referred to ‘botoms of wailles’ being
visible there.

The notion of the site’s abandonment from c. 1350 is not supported by the finds evidence.
Continuing occupation is suggested by pottery and metal-work of late 14th century and the
early 15th. Such artefacts cannot be explained simply as incidental losses during demolition work
or during the violent encounter of the battle. Occupation must have continued, perhaps at a
different intensity and for other purposes, into the later 14th century. Gilbert de Clare’s sisters
must have been in occasional residence after his demise in 1314 and Elizabeth de Burgh’s endow-
ment of windows at the abbey in the 1340s suggests a continuing high-status presence at the
manor in the aftermath of the break-up of the Clare estates. It is assumed (from Leland and
other sources) that the Despensers moved the site of the manor to Tewkesbury Park—‘ther is
a fair manor place of timber and stone in this Teokesbyri Park, where the Lord Edwarde Spenser
lay, and late my Lady Mary’. The laying of a tile floor at Holm hill in mid 14th century also
suggests that noble family life continued there, maintained by Elizabeth de Burgh and her sisters,
who found themselves the target of suitors seeking a share of the Clare inheritance. Rather than 1314, the year 1349 was probably the significant turning point in the occupation of the site. With the extinction of the earldom of Gloucester, two years after the death of Hugh de Audley, the motivation for maintaining the buildings on the hill could have receded rapidly.

The Evidence of the Artefacts

The artefacts associated with the embellishment and the use of the buildings not only assist in the dating of the occupation but also illuminate the status and activities of the people connected with the site. The general character of the finds tends towards high status, military and equestrian. The large number of arrowheads, as well as evidence for daggers, swords, garment mounts and many other fittings, indicated periodic residence by people versed in, and frequently preoccupied with, the arts of war and hunting. Tewkesbury must have provided the earls of Gloucester, in particular the Clares, with a base from which not only to manage their estates but also to campaign in Wales; it is inevitable that many items of a military character were lost in visits by armed and mounted men. The finds also demonstrate that in the 13th and 14th centuries the site was frequented by men and women of high rank. Their presence is indicated by the quality of the mounts and other fittings, some gilded, which decorated their clothes and belts.

Some caution must be exercised in attributing all the finds to the period of occupation of the buildings. The recovery of a proportion of the missile heads from the plough-soil may be the outcome of an episode in the battle of Tewkesbury fought on or near the area where the buildings had stood. The contemporary chronicler records that Edward IV, in an opening stratagem, laid down a bombardment on the Lancastrian position. If the duke of Somerset had positioned the Lancastrian right wing on Holm hill, it is possible that some of the arrowheads on or immediately above the extensive stone surface surrounding the buildings may represent fall-out from the bombardment.

Carole Morris has demonstrated that the date range for most of the metal-work is from the 13th to the mid, even late, 14th century. Some finds may be from the early 15th century. This evidence does not tally with the most obvious interpretation of the historical evidence for the manorial buildings as it indicates continuing aristocratic occupation of the hill despite declining values of the manorial buildings. Amongst a wide range of high-status items, the gold brooch was the most significant metal object, not only because of the precious metal content, but also because the find underlines the Clares’ reputed patronage of goldsmithing and the elevated position of the earls in Anglo-Norman society. Alan Vince’s report on the pottery and its implications for dating corroborated the evidence of the metal-work, i.e. that occupation commenced c. 1200 and continued until the mid/late 14th century. The absence of earlier pottery on the site remains inexplicable. Despite the caput of the manor being elsewhere (Bristol) for part of the 12th century, the site of the manor must have been in use, if intermittently, throughout that century. Pottery was in circulation in the area at that time and its total absence from Holm hill calls into question the role of the hill before the end of the century. However, after 1200, the proportion of ceramic table ware, including jugs, was characteristic of a high-status site as was also the tiled pavement decorated with chevrons from the Clares’ heraldic insignia. Alan Vince noted that one of the tile floors was laid in mid 14th century, further endorsing the continuation of high-status residence well into the reign of Edward III. The coin evidence also fell short of expectations for the occupancy and increases the uncertainty about the role of the site in the 12th century.
A balance must be drawn between the evidence for and against Holm hill being the site of the manor owned and used by the earls of Gloucester for several centuries. A succession of halls had stood on the site and were of a scale commensurate with baronial expectations. Gaps and biases in the artefacts, notably the almost total dearth of pottery, window glass, and coins of 12th-century date, made interpretation difficult. On the other hand iron and copper-alloy objects in the form of weapons, ornaments and garment fittings represented the culture of noble men and women, the men often armed and on horseback, the women embracing the aristocratic fashions of the day. While recognising the omissions in the range and quality of the archaeological evidence, it is proposed here that the buildings were those of the manor of Tewkesbury referred to in the Pipe Rolls of the 13th century as domorum R(egis). The 12th-century hiatus can only be explained by the administration of the honour for part of that period from Bristol. The sequestration of Bristol castle by the Crown after 1154 resulted in the later adoption of Tewkesbury as the provisional caput of the honour.

The evidence suggests a plausible, if conjectural, history for the buildings at Holm hill. The timber hall(s) was the aula recorded in 1086 and was replaced by the aisled hall when Robert FitzHamon acquired the manor of Tewkesbury. This hall was destroyed in 1140 and no replacement was provided by Robert, earl of Gloucester, and his son William. They continued to administer the honour of Gloucester from Bristol castle but after his accession in 1154 Henry II took possession of the castle and after William's death in 1183 he conferred the earldom on his own son John. John, later king of England, built the first-floor hall at Holm hill and stayed there on his numerous visits to Tewkesbury. The acquisition of the honour by Richard de Clare in 1217 through his marriage to Amice, daughter of Earl William, began a family association with Tewkesbury which lasted for a century and a half. From 1217 until 1314 four successive members of the Clare family held the earldom of Gloucester among other titles. Their aspiration was to recover Bristol castle as the caput of the honour but, despite persistent pressure on the Crown, the castle was never restored to the honour, and Tewkesbury continued to suffice as the caput. Tewkesbury abbey provided a mausoleum for the Clares a short distance from the large Romanesque hall on Holm hill. Under the Clares only minor structural changes took place at Holm hill and the occasional residence of the earls with their courts resulted in the gradual dispersal on the hill of lost and rejected items of military, equestrian or personal significance. The artefactual evidence belied the notion that the buildings were suddenly abandoned after the death in 1314 of Gilbert de Clare. Instead, occupation continued beyond the mid 14th century, although the value of the buildings declined. At some time in the later 14th century systematic dismantling of the main hall took place, under Edward or Thomas Despenser, and items such as window glass were taken for building the 'fair manor place of timber and stone' at Tewkesbury Park. By the 15th century dismantling had resorted to stone-robbing and demolition.

The Battle of Tewkesbury

The battle of 1471, now perceived in the town as an event of major importance in its history, had little impact, if any, upon the settlement or its inhabitants, but has significance for its link with the archaeological evidence from Holm hill. A succession of descriptive accounts has given varying interpretations of the conflict, especially of the initial positions of the opposing forces. Despite the eye-witness descriptions, there are no precise indications of the positions adopted by the assembled forces. It is generally accepted that the battle took place within a roughly triangular area, with Margaret's Camp at the apex, Lower Lode at one corner of the base, and the river Swilgate, beyond the eastern extremity of Holm hill at the other corner (Fig. 1). A century earlier the manorial buildings loomed large in this landscape; a generation later Leland
Fig. 38. Tewkesbury: sequence of development of the town.
witnessed stone-robbing in progress on the hill. Observations at the time of the battle made no reference to earthworks or ruins providing a redoubt for the Lancastrian troops. One historian’s views (Blyth 1961) on the disposition of those forces amid the remains on Holm hill were discounted during the recent designation of the site as a Registered Battlefield (English Heritage 1995). Two factors support the contention that the Lancastrian troops were drawn up on the hill and neither relies on the notion that ruined buildings there formed redoubts. First, the Lancastrian wing under the duke of Somerset, given a choice of positions south of the town, could do nothing other than line up along the ridge of Holm hill, with the town at its rear. The land falling away to the south would have provided advantages for an army facing attack and intending to turn defence into offensive assault. Second, a proportion of the arrowheads recovered during the excavation possibly represented the barrage laid down by Edward IV before he moved to dislodge the Lancastrians from the hill. It is a reasonable assumption that Somerset’s wing took up position on the hill next to or near the remains of buildings there, while it sustained the opening bombardment by the Yorkists to the south.

Manor and Town

Tewkesbury was one of a number of demesne manors included in the honour of Gloucester. In an early and influential study of the Domesday Survey (Maitland 1892) it was cited as one of the largest manors in medieval England. Its exceptional size, reaching from the river Severn to the Cotswold scarp in the east, embraced a wide range of resources and economic activity, including the cultivation of vines. Before the Conquest the manor was held by Brictric, described as a ‘great thegn’, and it is his manors which appear to form the nucleus of the honour of Gloucester. Privileges granted by Brictric and later lords of Tewkesbury increased the resources of the manor and aided early urban growth there.

Tewkesbury is widely known for the survival of its old buildings. Some may be of medieval origin, but most date from between the 16th and the 18th century. These buildings front the three main thoroughfares in the town and it has been assumed that they occupy the sites of earlier houses built on characteristically extended and rectangular plots, defined by tenement boundaries and almost certainly of medieval date. Despite the large number of surviving old buildings, the comprehensive analysis of the documentary evidence by the *Victoria History*, and some below-ground investigation in the Oldbury, the evidence for charting the evolution of the town allows for many interpretations (cf. Fig. 38).

What is certain is that the most potent factor in the town’s development was the influence of secular lordship. Queen Maud established a market at Tewkesbury in the aftermath of the Conquest and under Robert FitzHamon a Benedictine monastery was built; its church was consecrated in 1121. FitzHamon’s motives included the creation of a mausoleum for himself and his descendants but his longer-term objective was to establish Tewkesbury at the confluence of the rivers Avon and Severn as an urban centre and as a base for the conquest of south Wales, the counterpart to the Norman fortification of the old legionary fortress of Roman *Deva* by the earls of Chester. Tewkesbury served as such a base until Edward I’s comprehensive campaigns of the late 13th century and the endeavours of the Despensers in the 14th century to emulate the Clares’ conquests in Wales.

The creation of burgesses and the construction of the Norman abbey could have been the first stage in the forming of a planned medieval town. Evidence from the 1972–3 excavations in the town showed that in the Roman period and later the focus of settlement was on the highest ground, the Oldbury. The tradition of an early Anglo-Saxon monastery at Tewkesbury is not supported by archaeological or architectural evidence and it can only be assumed that if such a
monastery or minster existed, it stood at or near the site of the remains of the Norman abbey. Blair and Sharpe (1992) have demonstrated the durability and persistence of the circular enclo- sure as the basic form of the pre-Conquest Anglo-Celtic monastery. If St. Mary’s Lane represents the northern segment of the boundary of such an enclosure, that possibility lends credence to the story of a hermitage or church being founded in the early 8th century on the bank of the river Severn. Wherever any early religious house may have been located, FitzHamon’s initiative moved the centre of gravity of the settlement to the south-west. The choice of site for his monastery may have been influenced by religious considerations but it is more likely to have been determined by the supply of water provided by the stream to the south. The creation of the monastic precinct was just one stage in the town’s development, and canalising the river Avon to drive the abbey’s watermill also had the effect of defining the western boundary of the medieval town.

The reconstruction of the form and fabric of medieval settlements has been enhanced in recent years by the analysis of maps, complemented by the study of other historical and archaeo-
logical evidence. The approach commences with the definition of plan-units or areas which ‘reflect, hypothetically, a phase or stage in the morphogenesis of a town’s plan’ (Lilley 1995). Dr. Lilley’s preliminary analysis, reported above, has defined four such stages in the town’s plan. Plan analysis indicates that the primary route through Tewkesbury followed the line from south- west to north-east along Church Street and Barton Street, a judgement based on the slightly sinuous line of this route in comparison to the more ‘geometric’ form of High Street, East Street, and Oldbury Road. This conclusion therefore supported the assumption that in prehistoric times a land route followed the east bank of the Avon river northwards (Webster and Hobley 1968). It is likely that this route crossed the fluvial sand/gravel deposit which underlay the Oldbury area of the town. This situation was altered by the Roman military surveyors in the 1st century A.D. who affected a link between Gloucester and Worcester by a crossing of the river Avon at Tewkesbury; the detection, and confirmation of the line of the Roman road approaching the Mythe from the south (Sanders and Webster 1960) would indicate that the Gloucester–Worcester road crosses the river Avon at or near the crossing chosen by the Romans. The construction or refurbishment of the Avon bridge by King John in the early 1200s testifies to the importance of the road to Worcester at that time.

From the north, the entry of the road into Tewkesbury, having crossed the Avon bridge, is now marked by a sharp turn to the south-west, along High Street; but evidence from boundary ditch alignments in the excavations at the Oldbury suggested that in the Roman period the road continued south-eastwards to the higher ground of the Oldbury where it forked, one branch heading east towards the Cotswolds, the other turning south for Gloucester along the line of the prehistoric route. Although the primacy of the SW–NE line of communication outlined above is highly plausible, there is an alternative view that would argue a north–south line as the earlier route through the river-side settlement. That line would have followed the later Oldbury Road, on the highest land in the area, passed over or through the river Swilgate (near the present footbridge), and continued southwards to resume the line of the present main N–S road at or near Margaret’s Camp. A road constructed in the 1st century would not have needed to follow the northern bank of the river Swilgate to a crossing below the scarp of Holm hill. In 19th-century antiquarian discussions of Tewkesbury’s topography (Spurrier 1886; North 1890), the existence formerly of a more direct route southwards from the town was alluded to but never identified. Evidence for such a route is indicated by Croome’s 1825 map of Tewkesbury (Glos. R.O., TBR/A 18/1) in which an alignment of field boundaries south of the town can be interpreted as the line of a former N-S road. There is supporting evidence from Ernest Greenfield’s discovery in 1967 (V.C.H. Glos. 8, 110) during the construction of the King George VI
playing field of Roman burials in stone coffins; such burials would have been outside the settled area and, in accordance with Roman burial practice, alongside the main route south from the town.

Evidence for the nature of the settlement in the Anglo-Saxon period is almost non-existent, with the possible exception of the post-Roman earthwork features recorded in the Oldbury. There a large ditch had been cut through occupation layers of the Roman period. Later there was a build-up of more than a metre of dark, silty soil, with few finds and cut into by medieval pits. The evidence for Tewkesbury manor provided by the Domesday Survey was, by contrast, of unusual quality and precision. In 1066 a hall and church existed there, together with people of varying social rank. Included in the population were 16 bordars. The role and status of bordars in late Anglo-Saxon England has recently been assessed (Dyer 1994) with the conclusion that they were in part involved in crafts and services, fulfilling tasks essential for the industry and trade which was changing the character of English settlements. The Tewkesbury bordars may therefore have been involved in manufacture and trade and Maud's establishment of a market and 13 burgesses there before 1086 can perhaps be seen as building on and formalising an existing situation, the burgesses being entitled to engage in trade. By contrast the 50 slaves recorded in 1066 were unlikely to have lived near either the hall or the church; they may have occupied land further north on the main road at the Oldbury. The picture that emerges is similar to that suggested by other Anglo-Saxon settlement studies, for example the Raunds project (Parry, forthcoming) in which the elements of individual settlements were physically separated from each other. Another view, however, argues that the Oldbury area was so called because it had been abandoned as a settlement and was characterised by the fossilised remains of earthwork enclosures. If the notion of polyfocal settlement is accepted then it is plausible that in 1066 the hall of the manor stood on Holm hill, a church was sited near the river, and a community of serfs lived at the earlier Romano-British focal point and provided the labour necessary to serve the great demesne manor.

The location of the Domesday church remains unknown and there is no firm evidence that it stood on the site now occupied by the Norman abbey. In the 1970s John Hopkins, master mason, responsible for the fabric of the abbey church, found a short length of wall, surviving to a height of c. 30 cms, in situ beneath the floor of the south transept and comprised of 'herring-bone' construction; the attribution of such construction exclusively to the Anglo-Saxon period has however been questioned (Taylor 1978, 760).

The construction of the abbey, following the unspecified 'waste and destruction' reflected in the marked fall in value of the manor recorded in the Domesday Survey, could have led to the road, if N–S in orientation, being diverted across the promontory of land on which the abbey was built. Although it was important for the monks to preserve the sanctity of their precinct, among their first considerations would have been the provision of an open space next to the precinct to accommodate religious processions and festivals and to allow an unimpeded and awe-inspiring view of the recently completed east end of the great church. A secondary but no less important concern was to exploit the potential for commerce offered by the main thoroughfare passing the precinct gates. St. Mary's Lane is a semi-circular road half-enclosing an area of several hundred metres square on the west side of Church Street. That area may have provided a market for the pre-Conquest settlement or it may have been created as the market place of the early Anglo-Norman town. As with market places laid out in other early towns it could have been infilled as semi-permanent market stalls were replaced by shops with residential accommodation attached. The earliest secular structure recorded in the town, a vaulted basement of 14th-century date, is beneath a house (90 Church Street) standing on the corner of this area. It is possible that the town developed from the nucleus created by the monastery and the St. Mary's
Lane 'market' and that the expansion took the only direction possible, to the north-east along Church Street.

A marked feature of early towns in Gloucestershire and elsewhere is the dominance of the market place, despite piecemeal infilling in the town's layout; 'the great majority of English town plans may be seen to be market-based' (Platt 1976). Tewkesbury would have been no exception and one place for a market would have been at or near the junction of the main roads from the south-west, north and east. The bounds of this market area cannot be defined with certainty but the tenement boundaries suggest that the properties in the angle of High Street and Barton Street are the result of haphazard infilling of a previously open space. By contrast the tenement boundaries further north on both sides of High Street are more regular and ordered. A trapezoidal area, bounded by Barton Street on the south, East Street on the north, High Street to the west, and Chance Street to the east and crossed by the original N–S route (Oldbury Road), could also once have been an extensive market area, subsequently 'colonised' by buildings evolved from market stalls. Unlike many other early English towns, the circumstances regarding growth and expansion operating at Tewkesbury were exceptional. The constraints imposed by the flooding of the rivers meant that there was continual pressure on the higher (and drier) land for building. One tenement boundary on the east side of the High Street describes a 'fault' line, particularly where it extends to the east to meet Oldbury Road, and may represent the northern boundary of a market area; at one end stood the Tolsey and the market cross, at the other the barn and stables of the earls of Gloucester (V.C.H. Glos. 8, 119). From the cross, roads ran to the north for Worcester and Pershore, to the south-east for Gloucester and the Severn crossing, and to the east for the Cotswolds. The establishment of a market place on such a scale could coincide with the widely attested promotion of urban growth in the early 13th century (Platt 1978, 30). Although there is no documentary evidence in its support, there is the possibility that it could have occurred with accession to the manor of the Clares who would have sought to exploit commercial opportunities.

A contrary hypothesis, based on the technique of map analysis, is that Tewkesbury, unlike the Cotswold wool towns, did not require extensive open market areas as its streets would have sufficed to accommodate market trade. This idea is supported by scrutiny of Lilley's plan-units which do not reveal evidence of plot formation from irregular infilling of open spaces. Lilley's provisional analysis also demonstrated that the present configuration of tenements in the angle of Barton Street and High Street was produced by a modification of the earlier frontage on Barton Street as a result of the creation of another frontage on a later N–S thoroughfare (High Street). In the provisional definition of a plan-unit including the High Street frontage it was noted that the largest tenements were on the west side of High Street; Lilley has suggested that this reflected the prosperity derived from direct access to, and control over, goods handled on the banks of the Mill Avon.

The stages in the development of the town in the area between the abbey and the market cross and in the area of High Street remain speculative. Although possibly coincidental, the distance from Oldbury Road to the bank of the Mill Avon is in the region of c. 200 metres (220 yards). The property boundaries between Oldbury Road and High Street and in turn the Mill Avon, display at various points the reversed-'S' curve, which can be interpreted as the encroachment of settlement onto open-field land and the adoption of curving 'lands' as property boundaries and as access lanes between tenements (David Aldred, pers. comm.). This could represent several stages of development: the creation of the Mill Avon following an appropriate contour at the edge of the flood plain and relatively parallel to Oldbury Road; the resumption or layout of open fields on the Oldbury; and the creation of tenements along a new road (High Street) which crossed open-field land on its long axis but made a sharp turn at the north end near the
crossing of the river. The new road along which the town expanded was known as Oldbury Street in 1257 and High Street from the 16th century. The original Oldbury Road was reduced to a rear lane separating the town from an adjoining field which remained 'open' until 1811. Despite uncertainty over the location, the early establishment of the market led to the rapid expansion of the town. Although the town did not achieve corporate status until 1575 Tewkesbury had for long functioned with many of the characteristics and privileges of a borough.

In reconstructing and interpreting the urban landscape, two broadly contrasting theories have been advanced. One sees the primary route as running E–W, with the other streets a later geometric imposition and the medieval markets functioning adequately within these early streets. The other suggests a primary N–S alignment (Oldbury Road) as the early corridor, with the designation of large rectangular and/or semi-circular areas for market spaces. These theories highlight the scope and need for future research, based on gathering dimensions of tenements by plan-unit and integrating other historical material into an urban database, to produce sound models for the relative chronology and form of the medieval urban landscape.

**Tewkesbury and the Clares**

Tewkesbury became the *caput* of a great honour, which included manors, boroughs and other estates, mainly in central and western England, South Wales and Ireland. The honour emerged in the Anglo-Norman period as an important fief and was held successively by Robert Fitz-Hamon, Robert, earl of Gloucester, and his son William. Under Earls Robert and William the *caput* was Bristol castle until William was forced to surrender the castle to Henry II. At William's death, without male heirs, in 1183 the honour passed to Henry II and he granted it to his son John, who became king in 1199. John later exploited the value of the honour by granting it to others and extorting money from the recipients. After the Clares gained the honour in 1217 the ownership of Bristol castle was a source of friction between them and the Crown. The Clares pursued the matter over the next century, but failed to regain the castle. Henry II, when an aspiring claimant to the Crown, had observed how his uncle, Earl Robert, had led the opposition to King Stephen from Bristol castle; the Plantagenets were wary of the prospect of rebellious barons ensconced securely in near-impenetrable castles. For the Clares the loss of Bristol castle placed a continuing strain on their relationship with 13th-century monarchs. Even the marriage of Gilbert de Clare, 9th earl of Clare, to Edward I's daughter Joan of Acre did not cause the Crown to relent over possession of the castle.

The importance of the honour to the Clares cannot be exaggerated. Its acquisition in 1217 consolidated their membership of an inner circle of barons of great wealth and influence. In the 13th century the family exerted considerable power and influence. At the battle of Lewes in 1264, the defeated Henry III elected to surrender his sword to Gilbert de Clare, 9th earl of Clare, judged by the king as a figure among the opposing barons of sufficient *dignitas* to lessen in some degree the abject humiliation of the submission. In 1265, it was Gilbert's decision to abandon the anti-royal faction which resulted in the crushing of de Montfort's rebellion at Evesham. The continuing uneasy relationship of the Clares with the Crown was exemplified by events in south Wales in 1275 when Gilbert, then in conflict with the earl of Hereford, exerted marcher rights in defiance of the king's orders, and as a result was for a short time imprisoned in the Tower of London. The acquisition of the honour in 1217 was not a random event. It was far more likely the outcome of a strategy devised by an ambitious and opportunistitic baronial family to strengthen its power base through the acquisition of land. The marriage in 1180 of Richard de Clare to Amice, daughter of William, earl of Gloucester, seemed unremarkable against a background of continual strengthening of the bonds of aristocratic families through
marriage. The growing opposition of the barons to John in the period leading up to Runnymede was led by Richard and his son Gilbert, their names headed the list of those who secretly met Archbishop Langton at Bury St. Edmonds in 1215 to draft the Charter. It has been shown (Painter 1960) that the Clares were at the forefront of the opposition to King John and were allied to many other magnates in the enterprise by ties of marriage in the senior and cadet lines of their families. Underlying the Clares’ commitment to the baronial opposition and their demand for the king to accept its demands was the awareness that the securing of a great honour was inseparably linked to the fate of Earl William’s daughters.

Why, having gained the honour, did the Clares, denied possession of Bristol castle, choose Tewkesbury as their caput? Among the reasons the following seem most valid. First, the Benedictine abbey provided a fitting mausoleum. Robert FitzHamon had been buried there, but his son-in-law Robert, earl of Gloucester, had chosen Bristol for his burial place and Robert’s son had been buried at Keynsham. Between 1217 and 1314, Tewkesbury abbey church was to receive the remains of the last four earls of Clare and their wives. Second, as a large demesne manor Tewkesbury provided a range of resources and an attractive venue for a baronial residence. Third, as an inland port at a time when transport by land was difficult and uncertain, Tewkesbury, near the limits of navigation for sea-going vessels, was uniquely sited for moving produce and manufactures by water. The advantages of water-borne transport would have been enhanced by the ability to receive imported items without intermediate handling and overland transport. Fourth, for the earls of Gloucester with their estates in south Wales, Tewkesbury had strategic importance. It offered a base, close enough to Wales to enable them to defend their Welsh interests but distant enough not to be devastated in the event of any sudden Welsh insurgency. Finally, acquisition of the honour of Gloucester meant that the centre of gravity of the Clare estates had shifted markedly. Their manors now reached from the North Sea to west Wales and Ireland, but with the Gloucester lands they were concentrated in central and western England and in south Wales (Fig. 3). Tewkesbury was located at the centre of this new group of estates and must have been regarded by the Clares as a suitable, albeit temporary, caput until their claim to Bristol castle was settled.

The development of medieval Tewkesbury was characterised by innovations and investment including the planning of the road system and the layout of the town, the founding of the market, the granting of privileges to those engaged in trade, the building of the Norman abbey and the bridging and canalisation of the river Avon. Benevolent patrons were the most powerful influences in these processes and the intervention of the secular lord of the manor, on occasions the Crown, has shaped the town’s development from the inception of a market soon after the Conquest to the confirmation of borough status, at the request of the earl of Leicester, in 1575.
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