Excavations at Greyfriars, Gloucester, in 1967 and 1974–5

By I.M. FERRIS


Introduction

Gloucester's Franciscan friary (O.S. Nat. Grid SO 83141836), now commonly known as Greyfriars, stood within the south-eastern quadrant of the medieval town (Fig. 1). A large part of the friary church, a fraction of the original complex, still stands on the site and is a Guardianship...
Monument. The guardianship area lies within a larger Scheduled Ancient Monument that also includes the cemetery area to the north. The monument is bounded today by a public open space to the north, designated a Conservation Area, by a covered market building to the east, by Greyfriars Lane (Via Sacra) to the south and by a library occupying the two westernmost bays of the church.

In 1966 the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works (later the Department of the Environment) began consolidation work on the monument. Some years previously a fire had seriously damaged the north aisle and its roof timbers and had severely scorched the fabric. Part of the roof survived in the nave but it was removed during restoration by the Department. The decision was then made to retain the shell of the unroofed church and to establish a floor level more or less as it had been at the friary’s dissolution in 1538.

This report brings together the results of two separate campaigns of excavation at Greyfriars, the first in 1967 (directed by D. Mynard), to the east of the standing remains, and the second in 1974 and 1975 (directed by J. McKiernan and H. Davies), inside the monument itself as a prelude to the lowering of the floor surface (Fig. 2). A watching brief on the site in 1991 produced no new evidence or finds. This report also includes an archive description of the standing remains and of the removed roof structure, so as to bring up to date the reporting of the work at the site. A discussion of the historical background is partly based on archive notes by the late L.E.W.O. Fullbrook-Leggatt. Part of the east range of conventual buildings, extending

**Fig. 2.** Greyfriars church: excavated areas.
c. 22 m south of the south wall of the nave was recorded by Henry Hurst in 1971–73 and awaits publication (pers. comm. John Rhodes).

The 1967 excavation took place during the redevelopment of a large area to the east of the standing remains which included the position of the former east end of the friary church. The rescue conditions of the work and the needs of the developer dictated the strategy and techniques of the excavation. After the end of the formal archaeological excavation the building work was monitored by John Rhodes, and the following account makes use of observations from his watching brief.

After the demolition of houses on the site, an area 23 m long (E–W) by 7 m wide (N–S), immediately to the east of the monument (Fig. 2), was cleared of building rubble and mechanically stripped, under archaeological supervision, down to significant archaeological levels. A number of narrow trial trenches was then cut within the main area to establish the depth and sequence of deposits, only Trenches 1 and 2 being continued to any depth. Excavation then proceeded in plan in targeted areas.

The recording system involved the keeping of a daily site notebook/diary. Layers and features were assigned numbers from a single continuous sequence starting at 1. For the purposes of clarity in this present report, and to avoid confusion between layers and features of the 1967 and those of the 1974/75 excavations, the 1967 features have been renumbered with the prefix MF (i.e. Mynard feature) while the 1967 layers retain their original numbers but are prefixed with the letter M.

The 1974/75 excavations took place in part of the nave and north aisle, in an area 25 m (E–W) by 14 m (N–S). The site was subsequently subdivided into ten areas, each with a letter and number code of reference. This system of subdivision was also employed in the finds and archive reporting and it has been retained in this report. The north aisle was divided into Areas A1, B1, C1, D1 and E1 (A1 being in the east and E1 in the west) and the nave into Areas A2–E2 (A2 corresponding with A1 to the north and so on). The columns and piers were also numbered using this system.

The brief for the excavations limited excavation of intact stratigraphic deposits to a depth of c. 1 m, the depth to be affected by the proposed landscaping within the church. However, the opportunity to examine deposits below that level was afforded by the cleaning out of the backfill of a number of post-medieval cellars and the lifting of their floors. In addition, the examination of the layers exposed in the sides of a number of recent features provided further evidence for the nature of the earliest activity on the site.

Activity at the Greyfriars site has been divided into three periods covering eight phases. Period 1, comprising Phases 1–3, relates to pre-friary activity. Period 2, comprising Phases 4–5, covers the life of the friary up to the Dissolution. Period 3, comprising Phases 6A, 6B and 7, relates to the post-Dissolution use of the site.

Following an outline of the historical background and a description of the standing building, the archaeological evidence is presented below phase by phase within each period. This is followed by reports on the various categories of finds, and finally by a discussion of the excavation data from each period and a synthesis of all the Greyfriars data presented in the report. The two campaigns of excavation reported on here were conducted under very different circumstances and used different systems of recording. However, the combination of the reports adds an important element to our understanding of the friary church.

Finds from the excavations described here are in Gloucester City Museum (catalogue numbers 80, 82–83/1967; 28/1974; 13/1975). A large quantity of architectural fragments, tiles and other material from Greyfriars is housed in the English Heritage museum store at Toddington, Gloucestershire.
Measurements and dimensions given in the narrative text below are all metric. Both metric and imperial scales appear on the accompanying drawn figures, to allow conversion and comparison between the two systems.

Historical Background

The first Franciscan mission to Britain, a small party consisting of four clerks and five lay brothers, was sent in 1224, as the result of a decision taken at the last General Chapter which St. Francis himself attended. The impact of the mission was sudden and considerable. Three houses were ‘founded within the first two months of their arrival ... and by 1230 sixteen houses had been established’ (Martin 1937, 3).

The founding of the Gloucester Greyfriars was under the guidance of the provincial minister Agnellus of Pisa (Page 1907, 112). This probably occurred shortly before 1231, as there is a record of a grant of timber, in March 1231, from the Forest of Dean by Henry III, presumably needed for building purposes (Dallas 1932, 117). Such was the strictness of the rules of the Franciscan order at this time that the first building was probably no more than a simple wooden structure. References to the building of the church allude to a severe rebuke to one of the friars and his overseer for the painting of the pulpitum (Martin 1937, 83) and, in 1246, to a grant of 100s. for carrying building timber to the church which was still then evidently unfinished (Martin 1937, 83). Further building, possibly of the conventual buildings, was in progress in 1256 when the friars were granted six oaks from the Forest of Dean (Martin 1937, 83).

As the rules of the order forbade the holding of property, the sites of its houses were vested in the communes (communitates) of the towns. That this happened at Gloucester is confirmed in a release (c. 1230) from Thomas, Lord of Berkeley, ‘to the commune of the burgesses (commune burgensium) of Gloucester, on account of the easement of the Friars Minor there dwelling of all the piece of land in Gloucester that he bought of the said burgesses for 10 marks’ (Stevenson 1893, no. 319); further land grants were made in 1239, 1285 and 1359 (Page 1907, 111–12). It is also known that Ralph of Maidstone, bishop of Hereford, resigned his see, took the habit of a Grey Friar, and became an inmate in 1239 (Silvester Davies 1889, 176). On his death he was buried in the church choir at Greyfriars ‘in a certain arch in the north part of the presbytery’ (Martin 1937, 83). Although Henry III, Edward I and Edward II are mentioned as benefactors of the house (Fosbrooke 1819, 294), the main supporter of the friary throughout its existence was the Berkeley family, and Lady Isabel Berkeley, who died in 1452, was buried in the friary church.

The friars’ lodging and conventual buildings were on the south side of the church, by an area that later came to be known as the Friars’ Orchard. The friars’ property extended to the town wall on its south and east sides (Herbert 1988, 291). In 1246 Henry III granted the friars a turret in the wall in which to hold schools of theology and a way called ‘Scademan’ between it and their houses (Close Rolls 1242–7, 447). About 1265, William Geraud of Matson gave the friars the right to pipe water from what is now called Robinswood Hill (Fullbrook Leggatt 1968). He gave similar rights to the Benedictine abbey of St. Peter and, in the course of time, a serious dispute arose between the two houses concerning this water. It resulted in an investigation by Edward the Black Prince in 1355 which led to an agreement between the abbey and the friary in 1357 (Stevenson 1893, nos. 962, 966; HMC 12, 413–14). The dispute between the Greyfriars and St. Peter’s was not the first; in 1285 there was a serious disagreement over burial rights (Page 1907, 112). In 1438 the friars granted the bailiffs and community of Gloucester three quarters of their share of piped water, thus initiating the supply to the city (Stevenson 1893, no. 1112; Herbert 1988, 62).
The earliest evidence of the form of the church is a crude drawing in black and red in a 1455 rental of houses in Gloucester (Stevenson 1890). It shows a nave and chancel with a low central tower and spire. The absence of a north aisle suggests that this may have been added when the church was rebuilt early in the 16th century (Dallas 1932, 120). William, marquess of Berkeley, who died in 1492, bequeathed money towards the upkeep of the church but it was his nephew Maurice, Lord Berkeley, who began the substantial rebuilding of the church in 1519. A codicil to his will (he died in 1523) refers to ‘the re-edifying and building of the church and chancel and stalls ... which work I have now begun and in case I die then my executors substantially to finish the same’ (Martin 1937, 84). This work has become known as the ‘Berkeley rebuild’.

At the time of its dissolution the friary was described as ‘a goodly house much of it new buildd specially the church, choir and dorter; the rest small lodgings; divers leases out for years of lodgings and gardens; no lead but a conduit and small gutters’ (Martin 1937, 85). An inventory made at that time also refers to a library. There were only five brothers present and many may have fled abroad in 1534 or 1535. There had been 31 brothers in 1337 (Page 1907, 112). After the suppression of the house in 1538, Henry VIII leased it in 1542, with its buildings and land, for 21 years to John Jennings, a member of the king’s household (Stevenson 1893, no. 64). The following year Jennings assigned his lease to Thomas Payne, merchant of Gloucester (Stevenson 1893, no 65), who in 1556 passed his interest in the property to Thomas Pury. The Pury family was still associated with it in 1623 (Stevenson 1893, no. 1287). The deeds of 1556 and 1623 mention the water supply granted by the friary in 1438. In 1610 Thomas Pury conveyed the site to the city corporation ‘by whom it is held on lease’ (Fosbrooke 1819, 297). It is not known when the conventual buildings were destroyed. Under the terms of the royal lease of 1542 the king excluded all buildings that had been ordered to be demolished and carried away, and it may be that they were razed then. Speed’s map of Gloucester of 1610 shows a nave and aisle, a round tower at the east end of the nave, but no conventual buildings. The map suggests that the chancel had been demolished by then.

The post-medieval fate of the church has been one of mutilation. It is recorded that it suffered considerable damage from the royal artillery during the siege of 1643. Colonel Massey, the governor of the city at that time, had headquarters in part of it (Atkin and Laughlin 1993). Possibly the chancel was taken down as a consequence of the damage done. The nave and the north aisle were turned into a brewery shortly after the Dissolution and continued in this use until the mid 18th century (Herbert 1988, 291). The Snell family, some of whose personal property was found in the excavations (see Fig. 14, no. 3), is attested as resident at Greyfriars from 1656 to 1791 when Nicholas, Thomas, John and the elder and younger Powell Snell successively paid rent. John Snell (1682–1726) married Anna Maria Huntington in about 1713 and became M.P. for Gloucester in 1713, holding the post until his death in 1726 (pers. comm. John Rhodes and Brian Frith. A more detailed note on the Snell family connection with Greyfriars, with full bibliographic references, is deposited as part of the excavation archive). The church was later turned into private dwellings and, subsequently, into business premises. About 1810 a substantial town house was built at the west end by Philo Maddy (Rudge 1811, 314). From 1831 to 1850 part of the building was a dispensary and an apothecary lived there (Herbert 1988, 272). In the mid 1850s the building was a lodging house used as a sailors’ home which moved to another site in Gloucester in 1862 (ibid. 211). From 1852 to 1876 a schoolroom was registered for public worship at the Greyfriars (ibid. 334) and a second school was sited there in the 1870s (ibid. 318).

The maps of Gloucester by Hall and Pinnell (1780) and by Cole (1805) show only gardens between the east end of the church and the town wall. That of Causton (1843) marks three attached buildings on the chancel site. Until 1968 Suffolk House, a 19th-century building, stood
close to the east end of the reduced church, Causton’s map showing it separated by a narrow open space from the most easterly of the three attached buildings noted above. Suffolk House was variously used as a private school, the Liberal club, and a children’s library.

A number of prints of the church indicate the state of the building and its surroundings in some detail. The earliest of these (Gloucester Library, Gloucestershire Collection, prints 60.46), dating from 1721 and after a drawing by Stukeley, shows a well-maintained structure, though no indication of its use at this time can be discerned (Fig. 3). The bowling green in the foreground had been laid out in the early 18th century (Herbert 1988, 291). Three further prints (Gloucestershire Collection, prints 60.3, 60.50, 60.60), all drawn from a north-east prospect, show the building looking rather run down, with new small windows inserted at the east end and numbers of chimneys (varying from print to print) indicating that the interior had been divided up into dwelling houses (Fig. 4). Though these prints are not closely datable, they obviously predate the construction by Philo Maddy in 1810 of the substantial classical style residence set into the west end of the church. In 1860 a 16th-century pewter chalice from a priest’s grave was found on the site by Henry Arkell, a local builder, probably during the building of Suffolk House. A 15th-century alabaster relief depicting John the Baptist’s head was probably uncovered at the same time. Both finds are now in Gloucester City Museum (pers. comm. John Rhodes).

The 16th-Century Church

The standing remains of the 16th-century church have been considered in detail in three accounts on which the following report is based (Dallas 1932; Martin 1937; CHAU 1994). The
1994 survey was based on a photogrammetric survey and the resulting illustrations provide a record of the walls in their present state of repair ahead of any further consolidation of the monument. It is hoped that a full analytical survey of the building will also be undertaken.

The stone used in the construction of the church is largely oolitic limestone, with lias being used for core infill and below-ground features. The stone appears to have been used both for its aesthetic appeal and for its technical qualities (pers. comm. Francis Kelly). The dominant oolitic limestone is a pale, whitish stone from the nearby Painswick quarries.

The monument consists of the nave and north aisle of a Hallenkirche or hall-church structure c. 33 m long and 14 m wide (Fig. 5). The standing remains consist of three walls, the north wall with external buttresses, the south wall with buttresses surviving at window level and the central arcade. The church was lit from north and south by seven large four-light windows, with most of the arches and much of the tracery in their heads surviving intact. A six-light window at the east end of the aisle retains its jambs; its head and the remains of its tracery were dismantled by the department of the Environment in 1968. Nave and north aisle are almost the same width and are divided by an arcade of seven bays with slender lozenge-shaped moulded piers, of which only four and the eastern respond remain (Martin 1937, 86–7). The original west front no longer exists. At the east end the chancel arch still stands with its moulded arch and responds intact (Dallas 1932, fig. 1). Below and between the large windows survives stone blind panelling which must have covered most of the church interior wall surface. The only surviving element of the
choir is the start of its north wall and the jamb of a window, the position of which, Dallas
argues, indicates the impossibility of there having been a masonry tower between the nave and
choir, something which is confirmed independently by the excavated archaeological evidence
detailed in Phase 5 below.

The nave and north aisles were roofed separately, with access to the valley between the two
via a spiral staircase within the east pier of the arcade. Two bays of the original roof of the nave
survived until the 1960s and are described below. There is no surviving evidence of medieval
entrances to the church. Externally decoration is limited to the windows, apart from the modern
replicas of two stone shields set on the south nave wall 'bearing the arms of Chandos . . . and
Clifford of Frampton' (Martin 1937, 89). The original shields are in the English Heritage
museum store at Toddington. The end buttresses on the south side rise from window sill level,
like those in the centre, 3.6 m up, and presumably rose from above the former cloister. Below,
the wall was thickened with a coved cornice along its face. Reconstruction drawings of the
interior have recently been prepared (CHAU 1994, figs. 12–13).

Most post-medieval features were stripped out and the scars rendered over by the Department
of the Environment in returning the building to its medieval stonework. However, the blocking
of the central arcade with brown limestone remains at ground level and two cross walls have
also been retained. The wall between bays 5 and 6 has reused medieval stone with brick lacing.
A possible fireplace was set at ground-floor level, and a doorway at first-floor level was later
blocked. There are also a doorway through the arcade blocking and the remains of windows and
a cupboard on the south side. Joist holes on the retained cross walls indicate the existence of
three floors, as is clear on old prints, with the fourth storey an unlit attic. Access would have been by the medieval spiral staircase with a doorway cut at the new first-floor level. Evidence for post-medieval entrances to the building survive in bay 1 on the south side and bay 5 in the north aisle.

The Medieval Roof by Beric Morley

In 1968, whilst the Greyfriars building in Gloucester was in the early stages of conservation, the remains of a medieval roof over the nave were exposed. Only the part covering the easternmost two bays survived and that was not in very good condition. Photographs of it were taken in situ after the removal of the roofing tiles (Fig. 6). It was then dismantled and moved to the nearby Blackfriars for storage. In the course of time it was decided to treat the walls of the Greyfriars as a standing ruin, making it impossible to consider reinstating the surviving section of roof. This was retained in store for ten years before the decision was made to reuse some of the timbers for repair work to a roof at Bowhill, Exeter, and another at Leigh Barton, Kingsbridge. Some timbers remained at Blackfriars as a sample, while others are in the English Heritage museum store at Toddington.

The surviving length of roof, from the eastern end of the nave, was 8.5 m long and covered, approximately, the first two architectural bays. The roof itself was framed into four bays. These were defined by five pairs of principal rafters, linked by two lines of purlins, but no ridge piece. The purlins supported three pairs of common rafters per bay. Two of the pairs of principal rafters, the central and western ones, were each tenoned into a tiebeam across the nave. They thus formed closed trusses. The untied pairs can be thought of as intermediate trusses. One of these was used at the east end so as not to obscure the chancel arch which rose almost to the top of the gable wall.

In the main trusses, five substantial studs were placed on the tie rising to the soffits of the rafters. Tracery panels were once inserted between them. From the two fragments that remained, and the larger number to be seen in the 1968 photographs, it appears that these panels were fairly narrow, forming a bridge between each stud and its more central neighbour. The soffit edges of the principals were chamfered with poorly cut stop-and-runout stops, top and bottom. The chamfer was, however, interrupted twice on each rafter, turning by means of a mason’s mitre to meet the soffit chamfer of the purlins. The same chamfer passed the studs by, as these were narrower than the principals, so their chamfers did not meet with those on the latter. These chamfers, on all four edges of the studs, were stopped at the bottom, but ran off the top, except in the case of the central studs, where there were plain runouts. The soffit edges of the tiebeams were also chamfered and stopped. All joints were simple mortice-and-tenons.

The lesser trusses were, in fact, of larger scantling than the main trusses as they did not have the extra support provided by the tiebeams and studs. Their principals were longer than those of the main trusses as they did not have to stand on the tiebeams, but rested directly on a wall plate. They had soffit chamfers which turned to meet those of the purlins, exactly as in the main trusses. Also like the main trusses, the principals met at the top with a mortice-and-tenon on the south and north sides respectively.

The purlins were cut in short lengths to span each bay, and their ends were simply tenoned into the principals. Stiffening was provided by wide, but thin, windbraces. There were two tiers of these rising from the principals to meet at the centres of the purlins. Two nicks from the bottom corners of each brace enabled this end to be set in a mortice in the principal. At the upper end the pairs of braces were shaped to abut with a vertical join. The head of each pair
Fig. 6. Greyfriars: medieval roof in 1968 before being dismantled.
then fitted in a wide mortice cut right through the purlin. Each windbrace was cut with a marked curve, and the soffit edges had a narrow chamfer stopped at each end. The work was somewhat approximate, and the finish inferior to that of the straight timbers.

The principals, and presumably the common rafters, must originally have sat on wall plates. No timber from these survived; none could be identified in the 1968 photographs. It must be assumed that the timber had rotted or been eaten away. However, some idea of the size of timber used was given by the jointing at the feet of the subsidiary truss principals and at the ends of the main truss ties. The subsidiary principals were designed to sit in wide shallow mortices in the top of the plates, which must thus have been at least the width of a 45 degree diagonal across the principals; i.e. at least 0.35 m. A figure of about this size was confirmed by the tying joint of the main trusses. This was a cross-cut lap-dovetail, a simplification of the earlier type of lap-dovetail with entrant shoulders. It required a plate at least 0.32 m wide. It is clear from the photographs that the wall plate lay along the inner face of the walls, and that the rafters and tiling led into a stone gully along the wall head. This must have been at a level below that of the wall plate to prevent it becoming sodden.

The roof showed the sort of simplification in design accepted in the 16th century. It was a workmanlike job with only the simplest joints, and no attempt had been made to give strength by, for example, running the purlins across several bays. The functional nature of the main trusses, with their unattractive and intrusive ties, was only slightly alleviated by the chamfering and small traceried panels. But the location of the roof in a church of the Friars Minor may explain its austerity, even if the contemporary walling below cannot be described thus.

EXCAVATIONS

Period 1: Pre-Friary Activity

Phase 1: Roman buildings (Fig. 7)

Features and layers of this phase were exposed in only a few areas. In the west were revealed two short stretches of wall foundation, F103 (aligned E–W) and F200 (aligned N–S). F103 was seen in an area 2.4 m long and 0.8 m wide, and consisted of a bedding of Lias, oolite and red sandstone rubble (225) with some fragments of tile included in the general matrix, which was bonded with a cream brown mortar. F200, in a stretch 1.8 m long and 0.7 m wide, consisted of a depth of at least 0.6 m of tightly packed lumps of oolite (85).

To the west of foundation F200 was noted a sequence of floor surfaces and occupation deposits, but their precise relationship to F200 was uncertain due to truncation by later robbing. The sequence consisted of a very hard charcoally surface (138) at the lowest excavated level, on which were concentrated patches of ash and charcoal, overlain by a wedge-shaped deposit of clay (137) thinning out towards the north. The clay, possibly a floor, was cut by a small gully, F46, backfilled with a charcoal-flecked and iron-stained brown clay (134). Overlying the clay (137), and sealing the cut for the gully, was a c. 0.15-m thick dump of a grey-green sandy clay, heavily flecked with charcoal (120). Further less substantial spreads lay above, including a patchy silt mixed with lumps of clay and charcoal (119), a mixed sandy loam (109), and a sandy silty loam mixed with clay, charcoal flecks and small stones (108). On these spreads a 0.10-m thick floor surface (107) had been laid consisting of cobbles set in a charcoal-flecked orange sandy mortar. The sequence continued with a dump of clay and charcoal mixed with orange sand (106) overlain by a very hard, and possibly burned, sand (105), and a laminated deposit of charcoal and clay (104). Over 104 was a patchy hard surface of burnt clay and charcoal (102), overlain itself by a thick dump of mixed clay (101), the upper surface of which was cut by a Phase 2 robber trench which had removed the walling courses above foundation F200.
Fig. 7. Greyfriars: Period 1, Phases 1–3.
It seems likely that layers towards the base of the sequence (138, 137, 134, 120, 119, 109), and gully F46, were cut by foundation F200, and that the layers above (108, 107, 106, 105, 104, 101) represented occupation inside a building marked on its east side by F200. Over 15 m to the east another wall foundation, MF1, was exposed, similar in make-up to F200, while further east still, the line of a N–S wall was noted during building work in 1967.

Other glimpses of Roman activity were even more tentative. During the excavation of the foundation trenches for the church pier/column A3 (Fig. 2), the excavators noted, in section only, a sequence of three layers (326, 327, 328) which included many lumps of Roman tile or brick in their make-up and which may have been construction or destruction deposits. In Area E1 an isolated patch of ?road metalling, formed of rammed cobbled and stone in an orange-brown sandy mortar matrix (160), was exposed at the base of a truncated pit of a later phase; the depth of this deposit suggested that it also belonged to Phase 1.

Further south, in Area E2, a patch of tessellated floor (175), much disturbed by later intrusions, was exposed during the stripping of a later brick floor; unfortunately this was not recorded in plan and so does not appear on Fig. 7. Tesserae were found redeposited in a number of contexts around the site and they may be derived from the disturbance of the pavement. In the section face of Section S2 (Fig. 8) a Roman occupation sequence, including opus signinum floor surfaces, was recorded.

Pottery from Phase 1 is tabulated (Table 1). It dated from throughout the Roman period. Samian dating from Flavian to late Antonine was also recovered. In the uppermost deposit of the Section S2 sequence (353) were two coins of 337–41 A.D. and 350–60 A.D.

**Phase 2: Robbing (Fig. 7)**

A robber trench, F30, was cut along the line of F200, robbing the facing stones down to the foundation coursing, and was then backfilled. The lowest backfill deposit (84) of F30, in addition to containing roof tiles, tesserae and oyster shells, also included quantities of good quality building stone, some of it dressed and faced. This material must have either been missed or have been deemed unsuitable by the stone robbers. Above layer 84 was a deposit of mixed mortar or lime (83), overlain in turn by a deeper deposit of coarse yellow sandy mortar mixed with stone fragments (64, 82). The upper backfill deposits consisted of pure charcoal (63), a charcoally loam (62) and a grey flecked mortary loam (61) which was cut by a post-medieval cellar.

A robber trench, F104, aligned N–S, had removed a wall set at right angles to F103. Trench F104 terminated short of F103 and was 1.35 m wide, 1.10 m deep, steep-sided and flat-bottomed. It was backfilled with a single very mixed deposit (220) of light brown sandy mortar and dark grey clay loam containing many lumps of Lias and oolite, small fragments of red sandstone, roofing slate, tile flecks, mortar lumps and charcoal.

Trench F104 had been cut by a second robber trench running along wall F103 (Fig. 8, Section 3). This had itself been cut by a later feature and was only recognisable by its fills. Only its northern edge would have lain within the small area excavated. The sequence of robber trench deposits was as follows: over the stone foundation F103 was a thin horizon of mixed grey clay loam, with brown-grey sandy mortar, dark grey loam, grey clay streaks, charcoal, mortar, oolite, Lias and pebble inclusions (224), overlain by a mixed cream-brown sandy mortar with inclusions of charcoal, oolite and other material, and lumps of opus signinum flooring (223). This, in turn, was under a 0.25-m thick layer of grey-black sandy loam with crushed oolite flecks, iron slag and some small fragments of stone (222). Over this deposit was a thick skim of creamy-brown sandy loam and crushed oolite (221), separating it from a green-brown loamy clay with mortar flecks, a few small stones, some flecking of red sandstone and crushed oolite (220). This was in turn overlain by a deposit that was little more than a skim of creamy mortar (219), and a
Fig. 8. Sections 1–3 (for locations see Figs. 7, 9 and 16).
truncated and disturbed upper layer of green-brown loam with specks of light brown mortar and red sandstone (218).

No robber trench associated with MF1 was noted. It had presumably been truncated by later activity. In the side of a Phase 4/5 grave-cut was a horizon of stone slates, perhaps broken roof tiles discarded during the demolition process. Pottery dating from throughout the Roman period was recovered (Table 1).

**Phase 3: Dark earth deposit**

Spread across the whole area of the excavations, though cut away or truncated in many places, and overlying the demolition horizon of Phase 2 was a thick deposit of ‘dark earth’.

In the west, in the area excavated in 1974/75, this deposit was c. 1 m thick and consisted of a very fine dark grey/black loam with grit inclusions (260), with a more mixed version to the south (303, 337 and 394; Fig. 8, Section 1) including fragments of red sandstone, Lias, Roman roof tiles and charcoal. To the east, in the 1967 area of excavations, the dark earth (M9, M10) was recorded in Trenches 1 and 2 as being c. 1.3–1.5 m thick and containing quantities of residual Roman material as seen in the west. The difference in thickness between the dark earth in the west and that in the east may be due to Phase 4 levelling.

Cut into the dark earth were two truncated intercutting pits, F149 and F156. Pit F149, elongated in plan, had steep sides and a flat bottom. It was 0.6 m deep and had been backfilled with a dump of oolite lumps and Lias rubble in a fine brown loamy matrix (351), overlain by a fine black-brown loam with inclusions of Lias and oolite (350). Pit F156, seemingly circular, though only a portion of the feature was excavated, was backfilled with a single deposit of mixed loams, mortar and rubble (403).

Medieval pottery recovered from Phase 3 is tabulated (Table 2). Two thirds of the pottery was 12th-century in date with the remainder of 13th–14th-century date. The single sherd of Oxford Fabric AM may be intrusive. Fifteen fragments of medieval roof tile were found (Table 4). Datable fabrics were of 13th–15th century date. F156 contained 13th-century pottery.

**Period 2: The Friary**

**Phase 4** (Fig. 9).

The remains of the first stone church were very fragmentary indeed and were represented by wall foundations and robber trenches marking wall lines (Fig. 10). Other stretches of walling could be obscured beneath the standing walls of the Phase 5 church, due to some degree of correspondence in plan. The south wall of the nave of the first church, F146, F134 and F133, was composed of ten courses of Lias slabs and blocks (347) overlying at least ten further courses of Lias and oolite blocks forming the foundation of the wall (Fig. 8, Section 1). The wall was examined in two stretches, giving a length of c. 23 m from its turning in the east to the limit of excavation in the west. A building break or joint noted towards the east end of the wall between the two stretches F134 and F133 marked the position of an external buttress. This joint could mark the position of the west side of a walking place (see below, Discussion). Wall F133 was of a distinct build, possibly suggesting phased construction of the church; it was built of red sandstone and oolite blocks with a number of plastered ashlar blocks, pieces of window tracery and other architectural fragments in its make-up (319). From what structure this material was derived must remain uncertain, though it is possible that the builders of the second stone church could have topped off the wall F133 with material from the demolition of the first church, as a prelude to building up from this level.
Fig. 9. Greyfriars: Period 2, Phases 4 and 5.
A foundation trench, Fl47, for the south wall was examined in two sections. The trench backfill was a mixed dark brown-black loam with inclusions of oolite, Lias, red sandstone, clay and tile (348 and 396–8: Fig.8, Section 1), but few artefacts useful for dating purposes were recovered from the fill.

A stretch of the east aisle wall of the building was examined, particularly along the northern part of its length, between the later piers A1 and A2 and ending as a buttress to the north of A1. Here again was the suggestion of two phases of construction, with two distinct wall foundations, F111 and F114, side by side. Wall F111 consisted of blocks of Lias and oolite (266) in a light grey mortar of which eight courses were exposed. The second wall, F114, built up against the east side of F111, was of larger sandstone and oolite blocks (269), only the upper two courses being cleaned and exposed. The wall was one course in width with a proper face to the east only, and perhaps for that reason should be interpreted as a thickening of wall F111 for structural reasons, rather than as a separate wall in its own right. It is worth noting the similarity of material used in the construction of the wall to that in stretch F133 of the south wall. Built up against, and projecting from, the west face of wall F111 was a platform of stone, F106A, possibly an altar base.

The only other relict stonework of Phase 4 was observed beneath piers A1, A2 and A3. There was noted a similarity in construction, in materials used and in the mortar to the eastern stretches of the southern wall.
Though no opportunity was provided for examining the walling under the north aisle wall of the present standing building, it would appear that there is a great deal of correspondence here with that seen in the south. A tomb built into the wall just to the west of pier Al would appear to belong to Phase 4 (Figs. 11–12). The tomb, F119, was an oblong stone structure, 2.5 m (E–W) by 1.2 m (N–S) and 1 m high, containing a chamber with an arched opening on the east. It was constructed of blocks of coursed Lias (275) and some reused architectural fragments in oolite which could be part of a later repair. The interior was rendered with white mortar or plaster, and the floor formed of a hard white mortar mixed with stone chippings (278). The chamber was backfilled with a deposit of mixed grey and dark loam with inclusions of Lias and red sandstone (277), overlain by a thicker backfill of a mixed light grey sandy mortar with Lias, oolite and red sandstone lumps and blocks, some of them dressed and faced (274). No human remains were recovered from inside the chamber.

Surviving interior features in the nave and north aisle were few. Directly overlying the Phase 3 dark earth were the patchy remnants of a 0.01–0.05-m thick mortar floor screed, varying in colour from white (152, 182, 235, 344) to buff (259, 298) and yellow-brown (199, 300, 304, 334),

---

**GLOUCESTER GREYFRIARS**

**EXCAVATIONS: 1967 and 1974/75**

**TOMB F119: ELEVATIONS**

![Fig. 11. Elevations of tomb F119.](image)
361, 405, 407), with tile impressions visible in places in the mortar and one small patch of tiles found in situ, though haphazardly laid, in Area CI.

Aligned N–S, and in line with the building break between F134 and F133 in the south wall of the nave, were four postholes (from the north F268, F267, F335 and F336), all stone-packed and with a c. 0.14-m square void where the posts had stood. Though not regularly spaced (there may originally have been more postholes) they may mark the position of a timber screen wall on the west side of a walking place.
A trench, F99, in Area D, was ‘L’-shaped, 1.4 m wide and 1.05 m deep with a ‘U’-shaped profile, stepped down and narrowing to a flat base (Fig. 8, Section 3). Its earliest backfill consisted of a grey brown-green silty clay loam with inclusions of red sandstone, oolite, cream-brown mortar and pebbles (212). Overlying this relatively thin deposit was a tip, evidently deposited from the north, up to 0.54 m thick and composed of a green flecked, grey-brown gritty clay loam with inclusions of mortar, red sandstone flecks and numerous fragments of Lias and some of oolite (211). Overlying 211 were other tipped deposits (210, 208) containing many stone chippings and mortar flecks. The position and shape of F99 do not really favour its interpretation as either a robber trench or a foundation trench, and though evidently later than Phase 3 and cut by features of Phase 5, it does not easily fit in with the Phase 4 church. The fact that its backfill contains so many pieces of worked stone, stone chippings and mortar, perhaps suggests that it is related to the construction of other stone buildings nearby and that it was backfilled prior to the building of the Phase 4 church.

During the 1967 excavations to the east, there was further evidence for the Phase 4 church having undergone at least one major alteration to its plan, despite the fact that the friary levels here were more severely truncated than in the west. A 6.5-m stretch of the north wall of the choir, MF12, survived in good condition although robbed away to its east, while only a small portion of the south choir wall, MF13, remained. Some 20 m further east, walling forming part of the east end of the church was recorded during the contractor’s building operations. It must be assumed that these were footings reused in Phase 5.

A c. 1.75-m wide cross-wall, MF14, aligned N–S, and with coursing carrying on downwards to a depth of at least 3.65 m below the church floor level, butted on to the south wall of the choir. It seems to represent a foundation wall for a stone tower, of internal dimensions at ground level roughly 3.9 m (E–W) by 6 m (N–S) (Fig. 13). It also seems that this tower, with a walking place below, replaced a previous walking place and tower arrangement. The residual 12th-century pottery from Phase 4 is counted in with pottery from the later phases (Table 2). Only a handful of datable sherds would have been contemporary with Phase 4. All were of 13th–15th-century date.

Phase 5 (Fig. 9)
Examination of the Phase 4 walling suggests that as a prelude to building work beginning in Phase 5 the previous structure was demolished to ground level and the walling topped off before construction began again in Painswick Oolite. The Phase 4 layout seems to have been closely followed. The standing walling of the nave and aisle is described above (The 16th-Century Church) and the following account concentrates on the excavated remains.

Inside the nave and north aisle the Phase 4 tile floor was removed, though a few tiles were left in situ, and the ground surface was then raised by the dumping and levelling of mixed loams (188, 247, 256, 292, 331, 333, 345), stones and mortar (141), and mixed Lias and red sandstone rubble in white mortar (3l2) to a level c. 0.30 m above the previous floor. Over the top of this dump was spread a white oolite mortar screed for a tile floor that survived in patches (F86, F136, F137).

In the choir no sequence of floors was established, save in one place where a mortar screed spread (M8), seen in Trenches 1 and 2 to directly overlie the dark earth of Phase 3, had some patches of tile surviving in situ (MF3) in its surface. The now levelled tower cross-wall (MF14) was in one place seen to be overlain by a c. 0.2-m depth of soil, on top of which was a mortar screed with a fragment of tile set into it. Unfortunately, there was no remaining direct stratigraphic link between this sequence and the wider spread M8. Surface M8, or at least its uppermost part, respected a stretch of walling (MF2) which itself, in part, overlay the levelled wall.
MF14. Wall MF2 was only 0.45 m wide and was constructed of small thin stones bound in a reddish clay mortar. Its position in the choir, in addition to its plan and form, suggests it to be part of a choir stall.

The spacing of buttress foundations at the north-east corner of the choir, seen during building work, shows that in its final form the choir was six bays long. It seems that the final church had a chapel or chapels to the south of, and leading off, the choir. The isolated nature of the robber pit MF10 of Phase 6, evidently dug to remove a pier base rather than along a stretch of continuous walling, testifies to the one time existence of arches sprung from such piers to form an arcaded or partially arcaded wall. This arrangement may have existed in Phase 4 but there is no evidence for it, and the one surviving fragment of choir south wall (MF13) has the tower cross-wall MF14 butted against it or butts itself against MF14. If the latter, a Phase 4 south choir wall could lie on a line slightly to the south of MF13.

A final structure is found outside the north-east corner of the nave, built against the nave wall. Only a small part of this structure was uncovered and it had been badly disturbed by later intrusions. It consisted of an E–W wall (F206) built of faced oolite and Lias (513), forming a corner with a N–S wall, F202, built of Lias slabs in a buff yellow mortar (510) and butted up against the build of pier Al. Inside the angle formed by the walls was spread a mortar and sandy gravel floor surface (512).

Pottery from Phase 5 is tabulated (Table 2). As with Phase 4 only a few sherds dated to the 13th–15th century would have been contemporary with the phase. Five sherds of intrusive post-medieval pottery were recovered (Table 3).
My next step is to work on the text of the next page, where I will continue the description of the burials in the friary church as well as the post-dissolution activity in Phase 6A, which includes the brewery.
gully, F32, c. 4.5 m in diameter internally, very shallow, only c. 0.15 m in depth, and backfilled with a brown stony soil (30). It enclosed an area surfaced with small stones and cobbling (91). It is possible that this feature represents the remains of a horse-mill, with gully F32 being the path worn out by the tread of the horse. Such mills may have been relatively insubstantial and it is likely that both brewers and bakers used their own horse-mills when they could (pers. comm. Richard Holt). The example at Greyfriars may have been a malt-crushing mill, and it
Fig. 15. Greyfriars: Period 3, Phase 6A.
fits in well with other identifications of horse-mills (Atkinson 1960–1). F32 must have been in use for only a relatively short time as it was backfilled in a single action, soon after which portions of the flagging, 89, slumped into its fill. Over the top of the backfilled feature, between C1 and C2, was built a N–S aligned wall, F6, creating, with F20 to the west, a separate room or unit c. 4 m (E–W) by 6.5 m (N–S). Inside the room thus created was spread a surface of small stones in sand (33/41), cut to the north by three small postholes (F16, F17 and F18). To the west of wall F20 were cut two large pits, F24 and F60 (Fig. 8, Section 1), through spreads of make-up, which elsewhere were seen to bed the pitched stone surfacing, 57. Both pits were roughly circular, with a diameter of c. 2 m, and there was evidence for both having been clay-lined. F24 was backfilled with clean pink clay, overlain by mottled clay, mortar and stones (66), and pit F60 with a mixed brown loam containing quantities of brick and stone (169). Both were obviously intended for storage purposes, the clay lining suggesting their use as vats. A badly truncated wall (F76) lay to the west of the pits.

A further attempt to subdivide the interior of the building was made by the insertion of wall F142 southwards from pier B2, but this has been badly disturbed by later features and it is not possible to recreate the form of the new layout in this area. Wall F142 was built of reused medieval masonry, oolite rubble and faced with brick (339).

In the south-west corner of the area excavated in 1974/75 a cellar was created, Cellar 5, with walling, F55 (Fig. 8, Section 2), and a brick floor (164). The relationship of this cellar to other internal features cannot be gauged as part of it lies under the building to the west, while dividing walls and upper flooring arrangements have here been largely destroyed.

A number of isolated features also belong to this period of activity. Beneath a Phase 6B feature in the north-west were excavated two intercutting pits, F53 cut by F52, the fill of F53 (156) containing a loomweight or spindle whorl (Fig. 19, no. 9). To the east of gully F32 was a complex of 28 stakeholes or postholes, F157, the main group of which clusters to form a distinct structure, an elongated ovoid in shape with an empty interior; the function of this feature is, again, uncertain.

Outside the standing structure the choir walls had been levelled and were then heavily robbed, though the foundation of the Phase 4 stone tower and the east end of the church remained largely intact below ground. Sections were excavated through a number of robber trenches (MF6, MF7) and robber pits (MF5, MF10, MF11) and good groups of finds were recovered from the backfills of MF10 and MF11 which are dated 1730–50 (Figs. 21–5; Fig. 26, nos. 1–2). The N–S aligned trench MF15 and the partially excavated well MF8 probably relate to activity and buildings further to the east. No post-Dissolution surfaces were excavated here.

Phase 6B: Dwellings (Fig. 16)

A series of cellars was now dug, while the Phase 6A Cellar 5 still remained in use. Cellar 4, belonging to Greyfriars House and only part of which lay within the area of excavation, was floored with a mixture of flagstones and brick (128) and had a fireplace inserted into its east wall. Cellars 2 and 3, interlinked, were both floored with brick (26). Wall F6 was used to form the side of this cellar, with the addition of walls F9 and F8. Brick racks or bins were built along the east wall. Wall F20 was rebuilt along the line of its original foundation. Cellar 1 was only partially excavated. To the west of wall F20 and the east of Cellar 4 a brick floor, F76A, was laid, and a long sinuous drain, F23, ran across the whole area, with two feeder channels, F23A and F58 (numbered 79 and F155 in Fig. 8, Section 1), and a stone-lined pit, F25, at its north end to act as a soakaway. It was probably late in Phase 6B that the walling between the aisle piers was built, presumably on the line of an earlier wall or screen.
GLOUCESTER GREYFRIARS
EXCAVATIONS: 1967 and 1974/75

PHASE 6B

Fig. 16. Greyfriars: Period 3, Phase 6B.
The pottery from Phases 6A and 6B was studied as one group. There was much residual medieval material (Table 2). A few 16th-century sherds were found but the majority of the pottery was of 17th- and 18th-century date (Table 3).

**Phase 7 (Fig. 17).**
With the abandonment of the individual units and dwellings within the eastern end of the shortened church, the cellars were infilled, the site levelled and new floor surfaces laid, either of flagstones (49), pitched stone (150) or concrete (412) and mortar (8), a tile floor (1) being set into the last. The great majority of the pottery found was residual (Tables 2–3).

**FINDS**

**ROMAN AND OTHER COINS by A.S. Esmonde Cleary**

The ten Roman coins are entirely typical site-finds for a Romano-British site. All but two of them, nos. 3 and 5 from layer 353, were residual in medieval or later deposits.

5. House of Constantine, 350–60 A.D.; LRBC II copy as 25 (2); 1974/75, layer 353, Phase 2 or 3.

**SMALL FINDS (Figs. 18–19) by D.F. Mackreth (nos. 1–3) and I.M. Ferris (nos. 4–12)**

1. Copper-alloy brooch. Colchester derivative. The spring was held in the Polden Hill manner and was mounted on an axis bar held by pierced plates at the ends of the wings, the chord by a rearward-facing hook behind the head of the bow. Each wing has a vertical moulding at its end. The junction of the bow with the wings is masked by a curved moulding springing from the wing. Down the centre of the upper part is a sunken bead-row. On each side at the bottom of this is a diagonal lenticular boss. The lower bow is plain. The foot is missing.

   A member both of a common family whose distribution lies in the West Midlands and the Marches, and one of the chief decorative varieties within that. The dating has recently been reviewed (Mackreth forthcoming) and the conclusion is that it dated from the last quarter of the 1st century A.D. to c. 150/175 A.D.; 1974/75, layer 30, SF 13, Phase 6A.

2. Copper-alloy brooch of unclassified type. The pin is hinged. On the head is a cast-on loop on a pedestal which has a groove across it. The head of the brooch is an emaciated trumpet flaring out to form short wings, at the end of which is a triple vertical moulding. The head rises from a disc which has a broad and narrow cross-moulding above and below. On each side of the disc is a pair of lipped mouldings, each with a central groove. The disc has a deep annular groove and the centre is recessed for red enamel. In the centre is a separately made boss with radial groves. The boss is held in position by two prongs which are bent back behind the disc. The fantail foot has a groove across the bottom and the central recess for enamel, now discoloured, with three reserved circular spots.
Fig. 17. Greyfriars: Period 3, Phase 7.
Fig. 18. Small finds, nos. 1–6 (scale 1:1).
Belonging to a distinctive group found mainly south of the Humber, the design possibly derives from the Hod Hill type whose distinctive feature is the central disc, the mouldings above and below and a wing on each side (e.g. Richmond 1968, 113, fig. 56.3). If so, the earliest form of the present brooch should have evolved by 70 A.D. as virtually all Hod Hills had ceased to be used by then. The dating available for the present design is, as usual, weak: Newstead, 80–c. 200 A.D. (Curle 1911, 324, pl. LXXXVI.24); Camelon, c. 80–90 A.D., or c.140–165 A.D. (Christison 1901, 406, pl. A.4). If the origin of the design has been correctly determined, the Camelon example should belong to the earlier occupation. The fantail foot would also fit better then than later. A pointer to this being the correct line of development is given by a slightly more common design in which the disc is much reduced and the stud disappears; the flared trumpet head usually has stepped sides; the fantail foot is more prominent; and the enamelling usually consists of a line of lozenges, with infilling triangles on each side, down the middle (e.g. Hattatt 1987, 148, fig. 49.988), although other designs of a more Celtic character occur. An example from Rampton, Nottinghamshire (to be published), should be intermediate between the two patterns: it has a large disc like the present example, and had once had a central boss, and has a large fantail. The dating of the developed form is very poor: Silchester, mid 2nd century (Boon 1969, 47, fig. 6.8); Rudston, Yorkshire, 2nd century (Stead 1980, 95, fig. 61.14); Prestatyn, Clwyd, late 3rd/ early 4th century (Blockley 1989, 96–7, fig. 39.21). On the analogy of Trumpet brooches, this type should have passed out of manufacture between c. 150 and 175 A.D. On purely typological grounds, therefore, the Gloucester brooch should date from c. 70 A.D. to the end of the 1st century, by which time the common run of 2nd-century brooches had developed; 1974/75, layer 260, SF 102, Phase 3.


4. Copper-alloy strap terminal, probably Romano-British and military; length 50 mm, width 25 mm, maximum thickness 10 mm; layer M17, SF 10, Phase 6.

5. Copper-alloy spoon with twisted shaft, bowl decorated with floral and scrollwork motifs; length 122 mm; layer 96, SF 56, Phase 7.
6. Silver napkin ring with fluted edges inscribed FVB? Birmingham plate 1921 (Wilkinson 1975); average width 16 mm, diameter c. 40 mm; layer 96, SF 54, Phase 7.
7. Ferrous blade with whittle tang; length 80 mm, width 15 mm, thickness 2 mm; layer 303, SF 21, Phase 3.
8. Fragment of Roman melon bead, blue glass paste, abraded condition; length 15 mm, diameter c. 20 mm; layer M16, SF 20, Phase 6.
9. Globular stone spindle whorl with flattened upper surface; length 15 mm, diameter 28 mm; layer 156, SF 37, Phase 6A.
10. Bone weaving tool?, roughened but highly polished, tip missing. Upper part of handle decorated with criss-cross incised lines (Brown 1990, 225–32, fig. 47.210); length 151 mm; layer 30, SF 22, Phase 6A.
11. Bone tapered handle, undecorated; length 60 mm; unstratified, SF 20.
12. (not illustrated). Bone handle, wheel-turned, decorated with three bands of incised lines around shaft; length 60 mm; layer 28, SF 8, Phase 7.

MEDIEVAL WINDOW GLASS (Fig. 20) by L. Bevan

All the glass catalogued is light green in colour.

1. a–e. Five fragments of window border with foliate motifs executed in black and yellow paint, 14th century (Kerr 1989, fig. 71.69, 107, 168; Newton 1980, fig. 20.2); 1974/75, layer 500, SF200, Phase 7.
2. Quarry with rose and foliate design in deep red paint. The naturalistic drawing of the rose itself suggests a dating in the third quarter of the 14th century, though the almost abstract stylized rendering of the foliage often indicates a later date (Newton 1980, figs. 17.5, 19.3); 1974/75, layer 158, SF 81, Phase 6A.
3. Fragment with linear tendril and circular motifs executed in deep red paint, possible border fragment. Circles are a typically 14th-century background design (Kerr 1990, fig. 103.901.11); 1974/75, layer 158, SF 81, Phase 6A.
4. Border fragment with broad-leaf foliate motif delineated by deep red paint. A close parallel for this design is an element of a ‘foliage trail’ of the type reported at Wolvesey Palace, Winchester (Kerr 1990, fig 2.900.12), of 12th- to 13th-century date, though the Gloucester piece must be later; 1974/75, layer 139, SF 80, Phase 6A.
5. Fragment of border glass with a design surrounded by deep red paint, possibly poorly executed fleur-de-lis motif, a common class of design during the 14th to 15th centuries (Newton 1980, fig. 20.6), or part of a ‘foliage trail’ as no. 4; 1974/75, layer 89, SF 23, Phase 6A.

![Fig. 20. Medieval window glass (scale 1:1).](image_url)
I.M. FERRIS

Small quantities of 18th- to 19th-century vessel glass, mainly from bottles or flasks, were recovered from deposits of Phases 6 and 7. Two groups of glass are catalogued: one, Pit Group 1, from layer M5 in pit MF11 (nos. 1–2: inset Fig. 22) and the other, Pit Group 2, from layer M16 (nos. 3–16: inset Fig. 22 and Fig 21), the backfill of the robber trench MF10, along the south side of the chancel. The quantity of glass vessels at the extensively excavated Eastgate site at Gloucester follows a well-defined pattern of peaks and troughs by phase (Vince in Heighway 1983, 173). An apparent nadir 1680/1690 is followed by a rise up to 1710 and a still more dramatic rise to a zenith 1730/1740, perhaps reflecting the growth of glassmaking in Gloucester city itself. It seems likely that the glass catalogued below is of local manufacture and dates to the early–mid 18th century.

1. Opaque drinking vessel or cup. Fragments of at least one other such vessel were found.
2. Light green bottle or flask, with scar left by removal of seal.
3. Seal from bottle, depicting animal rampant and the cipher I and A S. The cipher identifies the seal, and probably the whole of Pit Group 2, as the property of John and Anna Snell, whose crest was a rampant demi-talbot (pers. comm. John Rhodes: Trans. B.G.A.S. 31 (1908), 218).
4. Green-brown, patinated ‘onion’ bottle. Fragments of at least six similar bottles were also found.
5. Dark green bottle.
6. Green, thin-walled flask or bottle.
14. Elongated jar with moulded fluting, in clear glass.

Fig. 21. Post-medieval vessel glass from Pit Group 2 (scale 1:4).
Fig. 22. Pottery from Pit Group 1 and, inset, vessel glass (scale 1:4).
15. Part of foot and stem of clear, stemmed drinking glass.
16. Part of foot and stem of clear, stemmed drinking glass with purled bowl, stem pinched at the top into four lobes and a folded foot.

**ROMAN POTTERY by I.M. Ferris**

**Introduction**

There were 985 sherds of Roman pottery from the Greyfriars excavations of 1967 and 1974/75, of which 887 (90% of the assemblage) were from post-Roman deposits and features. In Phases 1 and 2 there were no good groups worthy of publication and therefore discussion here will be limited to a description of the fabrics present and their relative quantities in Phases 1 and 2 where relevant (Table 1). The coarse pottery was sorted into fabric type groups at the end of the excavations, and a preliminary report on the samian was prepared by Hedley Pengelly; this report is based on that earlier work. The type fabric series (prefix TF) is that in use at the Gloucester City Excavation Unit and described in Heighway 1983 (microfiche appendix B1). Some subsequent subdivision of types has been undertaken, with comments on the mortaria and the colour-coated wares by Peter Leach.

**Table 1. Occurrence of Romano-British pottery in Phases 1 and 2.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TF1A</th>
<th>TF3</th>
<th>TF4</th>
<th>TF5</th>
<th>TF7</th>
<th>TF8</th>
<th>TF9A</th>
<th>TF9C</th>
<th>TF10</th>
<th>TF11</th>
<th>TF13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabrics**

TF1A Oxford Parchment ware, 4 sherds (<1% of the total); 4th century.
TF3 Mica-coated ware, local, 18 sherds (1.8%); late 1st–early 2nd century.
TF4 Dorset Black Burnished ware, 344 sherds (34.9%); early 2nd–mid 4th century.
TF5 Micaceous Grey ware, 93 sherds (9.4%); 3rd–4th century.
TF7 Local white-slipped flagons, 23 sherds (2.3%); late 1st–early 2nd century.
TF8 Samian, 120 sherds (12.2%); 1st–2nd century.
TF10 Amphorae, 15 sherds (1.5%).
TF11 Local micaceous/Severn Valley, 201 sherds (20.4%).
TF12 Colour-coated wares, 121 sherds (12.3%), subdivided into TF12A, Oxford, 80 sherds; TF12B, Nene Valley, 30 sherds; TF12C, New Forest, 2 sherds; TF12D, local, 2 sherds; TF12J, Rhenish, 7 sherds. All 3rd–4th century except 12J late 2nd century.
TF13 Oxfordshire fine White ware, 11 sherds (1.1%); 2nd–4th century.

**Samian** (TF8) by H. Pengelly

A total of 120 sherds of samian was recovered, only 14 being from Roman contexts. The majority of the sherds (93) were from Central Gaulish products, a lesser amount (25) from South Gaul
and two were definitely sherds from East Gaul. Only samian vessels from Phases 1 and 2 are described. SG = South Gaulish, CG = Central Gaulish.

1. Forms 18, SG, Neronian or, more probably, early Flavian (also occurs in 159); 15/17, SG, Flavian, no later than 85 A.D.; 18, SG, Flavian or Flavian-Trajanic; layer 106, Phase 1.
2. Form 27, SG, Flavian; layer 107, Phase 1.
3. Two joining fragments of form 27, SG, Flavian or Flavian-Trajanic; layer 119, Phase 1.
4. Two joining fragments of form 37 in the style of Mercato and associates, SG, c. 90–110 A.D.; form 27, SG, Flavian or Flavian-Trajanic; layer 120, Phase 1.
5. Form 27, SG, Flavian-Trajanic; layer 137, Phase 1.
6. Forms 29, with scroll in upper zone, SG, c. 80 A.D.; 33, two sherds, CG, Antonine; 79, with turned circles on floor, CG, late Antonine (also occurs in 28); layer 175, Phase 1.
7. Form 31R, CG, late Antonine (also occurs in 59 and 72); layer 326, Phase 1.

Three stamps were found, all occurring in post-Roman contexts.

1. Form 33 with fragment of stamp, not identified; layer 130.
2. Form 15/17 or 18, SG with stamp of Rufinus of La Graufesenque, in use c. 60–90 A.D.; layer 176.
3. Form 38 or 44, two joining fragments with stamp of Lupinus of Lezoux, CG, c. 150–180 A.D.

A graffito was found on a Form 31 vessel, CG, mid to late Antonine; layer 390. A samian tessera was also found, probably cut from the area below the decoration on a bowl of form 37, CG, Hadrianic-Antonine or Antonine; layer 260.

**ROMAN TILE** by I.M. Ferris

Most of the Roman tile collection had been redeposited and derived from post-Roman contexts. The material has not been quantified but is listed in the archive. A certain amount was discarded before measuring.

**MEDIEVAL AND POST-MEDIEVAL POTTERY** by I.M. Ferris, D. Mynard, and A. Vince

*Introduction*

A total of 1,275 sherds was collected and divided into 35 fabric groups and a miscellaneous group of unidentified sherds. The small number of sherds and the high amount of residual and intrusive pottery mean that only two useful associated groups can be published (Figs. 22–5). The pottery is described by fabric and quantified by phase (Tables 2–3). Phases are grouped together on Table 2 where residuality can be demonstrated. Quantification is by sherd count, an unsatisfactory method when dealing with complete or substantially complete vessels, mainly from two contexts associated with stone robbing. The percentages shown are rounded to the nearest whole number and do not include the miscellaneous, unidentified group.

The type-fabric numbers (prefix TF) assigned to each group are those that were in use at the Gloucester Excavation Unit in 1975 with subdivisions based on subsequently published groups (Heighway 1983; Garrod and Heighway 1984). The 1967 pottery was classified by D. Mynard and the 1974/75 by A. Vince; the fabric definitions of the latter's report form the framework for the present text. The full fabric descriptions have been published in Heighway 1983 (microfiche appendix B2). A total of 77 sherds noted in the post-excavation records was not identified and has now been lost. Some 19th-century pottery was discarded.
Table 2. Occurrence of medieval pottery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>1–2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6–7</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41B</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>(41%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>(23%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Occurrence of post-medieval pottery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>(36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 23. Pottery from Pit Group 2 (scale 1:4).
Fabrics

TF40 Malvernian rock-gritted fabric (cf. TF52).
All the sherds could be from cylindrical, sagging-based cooking pots. Cooking pots of this type in this fabric are found in many contexts throughout the West Midlands. In general the date assigned to them is 12th–14th century, the earlier vessels being handmade with thickened everted rims and the later ones being wheel-made with inturned rims. Given a 15th-century date for the surviving church floor only the Phase 3 examples can be in situ. Two sherds from Phase 1 must be intrusive.

TF41B Oolitic limestone-tempered fabric (cf. TF41A), unglazed; Gloucester Early Medieval Ware.
The majority of the sherds could come from globular-bodied, sagging-based cooking pots, mainly with everted rims, though a couple of club rims are present. Parallels can be found in Heighway 1983 (fig. 76.7,
9–10) and Darvill 1988 (fig. 12.1 and 13; fig. 13.23). There seems little doubt that this is a locally produced 12th-century ware (Heighway 1983, 126). All sherds in Phases 4–7 must be residual.

TF42 Quartz sand-tempered fabric (cf. TF50), unglazed.

There are probably several sources for pottery represented in this fabric in Gloucester and therefore without recourse to mineral analysis this group must be seen as miscellaneous.

TF43 Quartz sand and oolite-tempered fabric, unglazed.

Pottery of this type forms a small part of the 12th-century assemblages from elsewhere in Gloucester (Heighway 1983, 126) and therefore the sherds from Greyfriars must be in residual contexts.

TF44 Oolitic limestone-tempered fabric, glazed; North Wiltshire.

The characteristics of the fabric are the same as those of TF41. The source, though, can now be traced to Minety, Wiltshire. Handmade, unglazed vessels in this fabric appear in 12th-century contexts elsewhere in Gloucester and the later, glazed wares were shipped to the town until the late 15th or early 16th century (Heighway 1983, 126–30).

TF45 Shell-tempered ware, unglazed; Oxford Fabric B.

This fabric is probably wholly residual in the later medieval period.

TF50 Quartz sand-tempered fabric, glazed, miscellaneous.
Fig. 26. Clay pipes (scale 1:1).
The fabric characteristics are the same as those for TF42. The same comments apply concerning possible sources.

TF51 Stamford Ware.
The pottery is late 11th/early 12th-century in date, and those sherds found in layers later than Phase 3 must be residual.

TF52 Malvernian rock-tempered, glazed; Malvern Chase Ware.
The pottery is likely to be from the late 13th to 15th century.

TF53 Ham Green Ware (Barton Fabric B).
Early to mid 13th century in date.

TF54A Micaceous, quartz-free fabric, glazed; Herefordshire Border Wares. 
Probably late 13th to 15th century.

TF54B Sgraffito Ware, Newent Glasshouse (Fig. 23, no. 1).
The characteristics of this fabric are the same as those of TF54A but the sherds have been separated because of their distinctive decoration, scratched through a white slip and covered with a clear lead glaze. Sherds with the same decoration and fabric have been found with late 17th/early 18th-century kiln waste at Glasshouse Green, Newent (Vince 1977).

TF54C Newent Glasshouse (Figs. 22, nos. 1–2; 23, no. 2).
Fabric as TF54A, above, but with white slip trail and glazed. Vessels of this type are represented amongst wasters from Glasshouse Green, Newent (Vince 1977).

TF58 Staffordshire, cream-bodied hollow wares; Midlands Yellow.
In Gloucester found in contexts from early/mid to late 17th century (Heighway 1983, 135). The sherd in Phase 4 must be intrusive.

TF59 Surrey/Hampshire Border Wares.
Found in Gloucester in contexts of early/mid 17th century onwards, though manufactured from late 16th century (Heighway 1983, 135).

TF60 Cistercian Ware.
One of the characteristics of this group is that the vessels are usually small, thin-walled, of a red fabric with a thick iron-rich glaze and are often overfired. Such conditions mean that in many cases it is not possible to assign sherds to a fabric group on the same basis as other type-fabric groups. First found in Gloucester in the early 16th century (Heighway 1983, 132).

TF61 Staffordshire black glazed.

TF62 Tin-glazed; miscellaneous (Figs. 22, nos. 3–5; 23, nos. 3–10).
The isolation of individual sources for tin-glazed wares depends on the technical and decorative characteristics of the vessels, not of the fabric. The identification of the products of different centres therefore depends on the discovery of waster heaps or inscribed pieces linking certain techniques or patterns with particular centres. Common techniques and shapes made at numerous centres cannot at present be characterised visually. At other sites in Gloucester such wares range in date from the late 17th to mid 18th century, the largest group from the Eastgate site being products of the Bristol or Brislington kilns (Heighway 1983, 134–5). The sherds in Phase 4 must be intrusive.

TF63 Flowerpot Ware.
This is a subdivision of TF42 based solely on the shape of the vessel, which is usually wheel-thrown.

TF64 Staffordshire wheel-thrown plates (Figs. 23, no. 11; 24, nos. 12–13).
Dated mid 17th century onwards.

TF65 Tudor Green Ware.
The fabric is very similar to that of TF51 and TF81. Produced in both early (14th-century) and later (early 15th-century) forms.
TF66 Porcelain (Figs. 22, nos. 6–8; 24, nos. 14–17).
   The illustrated vessels, from two pit groups, are Chinese porcelain, including sherds of the Kang Hsi period (1662–1722), probably towards the end of the period, and of Yung Cheng (1723–35).

TF67 White, salt-glazed stoneware.

TF68 Miscellaneous German stonewares.
   One Frechen base and a sherd from a Bellarmine jar were found.

TF69 Cream Ware.

TF70 North Devon Wares.
   Found in Gloucester in contexts dating from the mid to late 17th century onwards (Heighway 1983, 135).

TF71 Transfer-printed ware.

TF72 Combed slipware (Figs. 22, no. 9; 24, no. 18; 25, no. 19).
   As TF64, with two layers of slip (first brown then cream) which are then combed (Kelly and Greaves 1974, fig. 12). Early to mid 18th century.

TF73 Moulded slipware
   As TF72, decoration is formed by pressing the vessel into a mould, the relief decoration is then supplemented by trailed slip. Later 17th to mid 18th century.

TF74 Staffordshire, mottled brown-glazed ware (Fig. 22, no. 10).
   Similar to TF64, TF72, TF73. Early to mid 18th century.

TF75 Black-glazed, variegated fabric.
   Mid 18th century. In Phase 4 the sherds must be intrusive.

TF79 Staffordshire brown-bodied hollow wares.
   Possibly mid 18th century. In both Phases 4 and 5 the sherds must be intrusive.

TF81 South-west French Wares; Saintonge.
   Given the similarity of south-west French wares to English wares of various periods the identification of these wares as from a French source may not be definitive. Possibly early/mid 16th century in date.

TF83 Iron-free, quartz sand-tempered fabric, glazed; Oxford Fabric AM.
   While lamps in this fabric appear in Gloucester in early/mid 13th-century levels (Garrod and Heighway 1984, 82), jugs in the same fabric are later. This sherd from Greyfriars therefore may be intrusive in Phase 3.

TF94 Westerwald stoneware (Figs. 22, no. 11; 25, no. 20).

TF95/TF96 English stonewares (Fig. 25, nos. 21–4).
   Into this group has been put all stoneware except white English salt-glazed stoneware (TF67). The sherd in Phase 4 must be intrusive.

Illustrated groups
Both the published groups of pottery come from Phase 6 features excavated during the 1967 season; they are the backfill of pit MF11 (Group 1) and the backfill of robber trench MF10 (Group 2) dug along the side south of the chancel. In addition to pottery the features also contained glass vessels and bottles and clay pipes. These are illustrated alongside the pottery to retain the integrity of the assemblages, though they are described under separate headings in the finds report.

Group 1 (Fig. 22)
1. Shallow bowl; Newent Glasshouse (Vince 1977, fig. 5.25); TF54.
2. Shallow bowl; Newent Glasshouse (Vince 1977, fig. 5.27); TF54.
3. Chamber pot; TF62.
4. Chamber pot; TF62.
5. Drug jar; TF62.
6. Tea cup; TF66.
7. Tea cup; TF66.
8. Tea cup; TF66.
10. Cup; TF74.
11. Jug; TF94.

**Group 2 (Figs. 23–5)**
1. Dish with sgraffito decoration; TF54.
2. Squat jug, Newent Glasshouse (Vince 1977, fig. 4.1); TF54.
3. Large bowl; TF62.
4–8. Ointment jars; TF62.
10. Plate; TF62.
11–13. Wheel-thrown slipware plates; TF64.
18–19. Combed moulded slipware plates; TF72.
20. Westerwald tankard; TF94.
21–4. English stoneware tankards; TF95.

**Discussion**
Both groups of pottery appear to fall into the period c. 1730–50. The presence of Yung Cheng (1723–35) sherds in the Group 2 assemblage is noteworthy, as is that of the four English stoneware tankards bearing the excise mark AR under a crown, thereby dating them to after 1704. Of the other wares it is worth noting vessels from the Newent Glasshouse kilns in both groups. Those kilns operated c. 1676–1750 (Vince in Heighway 1983, 134), with pottery from this source being uncommon before c. 1680 and becoming a major earthenware source in the first quarter of the 18th century (Vince 1977, 28).

**Medieval and Post-Medieval Roof Tiles** by A. Vince
The type-fabric numbers used in this section are the same as those used above for the pottery. There are 50 fragments of ceramic roof tile, all having some glaze on the upper surface; none is complete enough to tell either the total length or height. The occurrence of tile is tabulated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>TF50</th>
<th>TF52</th>
<th>TF54</th>
<th>TF84</th>
<th>TF85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 4). A total of 29 pieces occurred in TFs 50, 52 and 54 described above. Other type fabrics were:
TF84 Rounded siltstone inclusions, glazed. 1 fragment present. Fabric characteristics; large siltstone inclusions, up to 5mm across, with quartz-sand.

TF85 Laminar, quartz-tempered, glazed. 19 fragments. Fabric characteristics; abundant quartz sand tempered, a tendency to split parallel to the surfaces.

The sources for TF50, TF84 and TF85 are not known. Quartz sand could come from many sources. Grain size analysis would indicate if the three fabrics were from the same source. The large inclusions in TF84 have been compared with shale and geological clay samples in Gloucester City Museum but are not similar. TF52, containing fragments of Malvernian rock, must come from an area within two or three miles of the Malvernian outcrop and probably comes from Hanley Castle, Worcestershire, where there are documentary references to potters from the 12th to the late 16th century. TF54 roof tiles have been found at three kiln sites on the Gloucestershire–Herefordshire border, at Upton Bishop, Glasshouse Green, Newent, and Haind Park Wood, Dymock, and could presumably have been made anywhere on the Devonian outcrop.

The occurrence of all five fabrics in Phase 3 presumably dates them to the mid 15th century or earlier. The main problem with dating roof tiles at a continually occupied site such as Gloucester Greyfriars is that the same ridge tiles continued to be used in some cases from period to period. Therefore, although most roof tiles occur in late and post-medieval contexts, they may well be earlier. The frequency of different fabrics is probably insignificant given the small size of the sample.

MEDIEVAL FLOOR TILES

A large quantity of medieval floor tiles was recovered from excavations at Greyfriars. These are being reported on separately.

CLAY PIPES by I.M. Ferris

Clay pipes were found in a number of contexts of Phases 6 and 7, and intrusively in two contexts of Phase 5. The majority came from the topsoil and upper levelling deposits. Some pipe fragments may have been discarded. Only a selection of pipes from statigraphically interesting contexts or with stamps is illustrated. The classificatory systems are those devised for the products of the Broseley and Gloucester kilns (Atkinson 1975; Peacey 1979) while the stamps have been checked against published lists (Oswald 1975).

Illustrated pipes (Fig. 26)
3. Broseley type 5; stamp on heel of Richard Legg. Given the date range of this type the maker is either Richard Legg 1 (1621–1700) or, more likely, Richard Legg 2 (1665–1714); intrusive in layer 321, Phase 5.
4. Stem decorated with zig-zag rouletting and stamped with initials SM inside a heart. Given the dominant sources for pipes found in Gloucester (i.e. Bristol, Broseley and Gloucester itself) this may be the stamp of Samuel Morris of Bristol, recorded as being active in production in 1628; however, a Samuel Mathews is noted as apprenticed to Robert Lane, pipemaker in Gloucester, in 1695 (Peacey 1979, 51); topsoil.
HUMAN REMAINS by C.R. Oyler

The following report is a summary of the reports on the human remains from both the 1967 and the 1974/75 excavations. The full reports are in the site archive.

Catalogue

For nos. 1–8 heights are given according to the formulae of Pearson (minimum given) and Trotter and Gleser (maximum), and for nos. 9–18 using Trotter and Gleser only.

1. Incomplete burial; male; age probably over 65; height 5'7"–5'9"; left radius and ulna show mild bowing; moderately severe osteoarthritis of lumbar region; 1967, M10 (burial 1).
2. Incomplete burial; probably male; age probably 45–55; 1967, M11 (burial 2).
3. Male; age early 20s; height 5'9"; bowed femora; 1967, B1 (M1).
4. Female; age 35–40; height 5'11"–5'2"; 1967, B2 (M2).
5. Male; age 30–40; height 5'4"–5'6"; 1967, B3 (M3).
6. Male; age probably 70+; height 5'7"–5'9"; 1967, B4 (M4).
7. Possibly female; age c. 6, 1967, B5 (M5).
8. Fragmentary burial; possibly male; age 3–4; 1967, B6 (M12).
9. Male; age c. 50; height 5'6"–5'7". The presence of a large middle meningeal artery and the probable aneurysm could allow one to conjecture that this person would be prone to headaches, perhaps of the migraine type. He might also be a victim of epilepsy. The cause of death is not known, though if the aneurysm burst, this would precipitate a fatal stroke. No disease other than 'normal' spinal osteoarthritis is found; 1974/75, Grave 1 (F27).
10. Female; age c. 45; height 5'4"; 1974/75, Grave 2 (F33).
11. Probably female; age c. 12–13; height unknown. A piece of iron has penetrated the right leg just below the knee, from behind, and an attempt has been made to remove it without success. There is no healing of the wound and death must have come soon after the accident, either from shock, loss of blood, or septicaemia. There is no other sign of disease or injury. A second individual is represented by two foot bones only; 1974/75, Grave 3 (F41).
12. There were three skeletons in 1974/75, Grave 4 (F42).
12A. Male; age 45+; height 5'7"–6'0". The loss of almost all the teeth and extreme arthritis of the right hip may be due to degenerative arthritis.
12B. Female; age not less than 35–40 and not more than 45–50; height c. 5'1". There was some early osteoarthritis but this is not excessive. Dentition was very poor. There is considerable periostitis involving the whole shaft of the right tibia.
12C. Male; age 45+; height unknown.
13. Very few bones representing one adult, there were also a few bones of a child. Female; age 55–60; height unknown; 1974/75, Grave 5 (F57).
14. Male; age c. 50+; height 5'7"–5'8". Some little early osteoarthritis but apart from occasional lumbago this would not have caused much trouble; 1974/75, Grave 6 (F74).
15. Female; age 60+; height 5'3"–5'4". Severe osteoarthritis of the spine; 1974/75, Grave 7 (F70).
16. Male; age 20–25; height c. 5'4"; 1974/75, Grave 10 (F100).
17. Probably female; age 50+; height c. 5'3"; 1974/75, human remains in pit F15. In addition to the main individual represented there are parts of another two or three burials.
18. Human remains in pit F28 (1974/5). There are not less than four and in all probability six burials redeposited in this pit. Their fragmentary nature makes both ageing and sexing problematic.
18A. Male; adult; height c. 5'9".
18B. Male; adult; height c. 5'9", less powerfully built than 18A. Possibly same individual as 18E.
18C. Female; age 60–70; height c. 5'.
18D. Sex unknown; age 60+.
18E. Possibly male; age c. 35; possibly same individual as 18B.
18F. Sex unknown; child.
DISCUSSION

Period 1

The area that was subsequently to become Greyfriars lay in the south-east corner of the Roman town, evidence for the internal layout of which c. 250 A.D. has been recently brought together by Garrod (Garrod and Heighway 1984, fig. 7). The nearest substantial excavation to Greyfriars was undertaken on the site of the New Market Hall in 1966 (Hassall and Rhodes 1974), and the results there help to throw some light on the rather ephemeral remains of Period 1 at Greyfriars.

The sequence of buildings at New Market Hall consisted of two periods of timber structures followed by two periods of masonry buildings, the second masonry period consisting of alterations to the existing structures. The walls of the masonry buildings had been extensively robbed but good floor surfaces survived, including mosaic floors added at a later date. The roofs were of slate, with ceramic tile being used for individual features like the portico of one of the buildings. The earliest stone structures were dated to the Hadrianic period, with the later well-appointed building reflecting the wealth and pretensions of the town up to the 4th century (Hassall and Rhodes 1974, 32). The decay and subdivision of these buildings in the 4th century is part of a general phenomenon at Gloucester (Heighway 1984, 228–9). The buildings, even as empty shells, stood for some time before final collapse or demolition and robbing. The Roman buildings at New Market Hall, or rather their robbed and levelled remnants, were sealed by a deep deposit of black loam containing residual Roman material, as well as 11th- to 13th-century pottery (Hassall and Rhodes 1974, 50).

Thus, while at Greyfriars it is uncertain, because so little of the Roman horizon was seen in plan, whether there were one or two buildings present, it would seem logical that construction, refurbishing, decay, and robbing followed a similar broad sequence to that at New Market Hall. Whether any of the pre-masonry periods are present beneath the limits of excavation at Greyfriars remains unproven. The majority of the Roman pottery at Greyfriars (90% of the assemblage) is residual but would seem to broadly agree with the date range of the activity at New Market Hall. The Roman coins, of which two are in a Roman horizon and the other eight residual, date from Carausius (286–93 A.D.) to House of Valentinian (364–78 A.D.). The two coins in a late Roman layer (353) are of 337–41 A.D. and 350–60 A.D. No finds are in situ to date the robbing of the stone buildings.

The appearance of the dark earth deposit of Phase 3 at Greyfriars and at New Market Hall, has a wider significance within Gloucester and beyond. Within the town the extent of the dark earth is considerable (Hurst 1974). The earth has received micromorphological analysis (Bell and MacPhail 1983; MacPhail 1983) which has advanced the interpretation of the deposit as purposely dumped material for urban cultivation. However, much more micromorphological research on the Gloucester dark earths, perhaps also involving the plotting and analysis of artefactual material within the soil (Deansway Archaeology Project 1990, 9–13), is needed before the whole deposit can be interpreted as being derived from one process. Studies of dark earths from other towns such as Norwich and York suggest formation by the disposal of refuse over a number of years in restricted areas, as opposed to the ‘cultivation’ model proposed for London and Gloucester (MacPhail 1981 and 1983).

The dating of the Greyfriars dark earth presents a problem. It overlies the levelled and robbed remains of Roman buildings and is itself overlain by the Phase 4 church. Finds within the dark earth were not collected in plots or spits and thus no attempt can be made at assessing the rate or date of the accumulation. Taken as a single assemblage it is noticeably mixed, including a great deal of residual Roman material, and contaminated with occasional post-medieval finds.
The medieval pottery within the soil is of 12th-century date with some 13th-century sherds (Table 2). There was no late Saxon pottery (such as Gloucester TF41A or TF47).

Period 2

The two campaigns of excavation, the study of the standing remains and former roof structure, and documentary research together allow a more detailed picture of the history of the friary church to emerge. Though only two main phases of church building have been assigned to the excavated data described above, there are a number of hints or suggestions amongst this data of further phases or sub-phases of building or alteration. All of this activity must be telescoped into a relatively brief span, between the foundation of the house in or shortly before 1231 and its surrender in 1538. Documentary records relating specifically to building activities or to the church refer to the supply of timber in 1231 (though this may not necessarily have been for building purposes), to an argument some time before 1235 concerning the appropriateness of an elaborate window and a painted pulpitum, to a grant for carrying timber for the church fabric in 1246, to a burial in the choir in 1246, to a bequest for the repair of the church in 1492, to the details of the so-called Berkeley rebuild from 1519, and to the state of the building at the Dissolution.

There was no evidence for any timber structure on the site, or for any build-up of deposits above the Phase 3 dark earth, prior to the construction of the first stone church of Phase 4. However, the scope of the excavations may not have been broad enough to locate evidence of footings for timber framing which can often be missed in restricted exposures. What form the first stone church took cannot be stated with confidence because of the truncation of the remains by later intrusions and the occasional correspondence in plan of later walling and also because of the limiting briefs and circumstances of the reported excavations. That the first stone church was under construction some time before 1235, and that it was something of an exception in certain details from the generally modest early Franciscan churches, is shown by the furore caused by the nature of the screen (pulpitum). The plans of other early Franciscan churches seem to follow a broad general pattern (Martin 1937, 13–16; Butler 1984, 129–31), with an unaisled nave and an unaisled choir, often undivided, though sometimes with a screen between these two sections of the church, reserved respectively for the use of the laity and the exclusive use of the brothers. A well-defined division between nave and choir, formed by the creation of a walking place (often with a belfry tower above), soon developed, and, as a result of the phenomenal early success of the Franciscans and of a general urban expansion, the original simple form was soon modified by the addition of an aisle or aisles to the nave and the area used for preaching to the people. In churches built after 1300 the fully-aisled nave was de rigueur (Martin 1937, 16), and there is evidence of enlargement or rebuilding at 34 Franciscan churches, usually involving the provision of aisles, between 1270 and 1320 (Little 1917, 73).

It therefore seems likely that the original Phase 4 church at Gloucester Greyfriars was a simple, though unusually ornate, nave-and-choir construction. Perhaps the only walling of this building encountered during the excavations was the stretch of south nave wall, F146/F134, with its distinct build. This church would have been 8 m in width, its length being presently unknown. The addition of the north aisle, with the consequent doubling of the width of the church in the west, would have involved some demolition and rebuilding, which could account for the presence of reused architectural fragments in the fabric of Phase 4 wall F133. It seems likely that a screened walking place divided the nave and choir at this stage (though whether this was the case in the earliest church cannot be said) and that wall F111 later was strengthened.
by the building of wall F114 along its eastern side to increase its width, and therefore perhaps its buttressing capacity, for the addition of a tower over the walking place.

Later still, in Phase 4, a substantial stone bell tower was added to the church. The final, composite, Phase 4 church had internal measurements roughly as follows; nave and aisle c. 37.5 m long and c. 15 m wide; walking place tower c. 6 m E–W and c. 8 m N–S; and choir c. 29 m long and c. 8 m wide.

The Phase 5 Berkeley rebuild, started in 1519, seems to have involved the virtual demolition of the Phase 4 church. Building in most places is seen to begin at ground level, utilising the levelled Phase 4 walls as foundations. It is certain that chapels now led off the choir to the south, though these may have existed previously; there was no fixed rule for the addition of chapels nor is there any chronological framework for their adoption after the general acceptance of more grandiose church plans from 1270 onwards (Martin 1937, 21). The small projecting structure off the north-east corner of the nave may be a porch. Although there are few precedents for this, save a north porch at Oxford Greyfriars (Butler 1984, 131), as the Berkeley church is so late in construction it may not altogether be appropriate to seek parallels for certain features in the older churches. Interpretation as a sacristy has also been suggested although the presence of the plinth here would prohibit an access from the church (CHAU 1994, 4.1.01). It is worth noting the roofing of the church, with (as the evidence of prints tells us) the nave and the aisle being roofed separately; the line of the nave roof was presumably continued over the choir. This double span ‘has no parallel among English houses of the Mendicant orders’ (Martin 1937, 87). The simplicity and austerity of the roof trussing has been noted above.

The use of all parts of the church interior for burials, though these cannot be adequately phased chronologically, is a reflection of the popularity of Franciscan churches as places of burial for the laity in exchange for bequests. Only a few documents relating to such arrangements are known for Gloucester Greyfriars. One indicates that John Banbury, a leading burgess and merchant who died c. 1404, chose to be buried in the church (Herbert 1988, 62). A disagreement with St. Peter’s abbey in 1285 arose when monks from the latter removed a body about to be buried at the Greyfriars (Page 1907, 112). Other establishments possess rich and detailed lists of benefactors and their often very specific requests for the precise locations of their graves inside the churches, for example at Canterbury (Martin 1937, 45–6) and Coventry (ibid. 67–9). Since only two names of burials within the Greyfriars church is known, including Lady Isabel Berkeley, it has not been possible to connect specific burials with known individuals at Gloucester, though some degree of importance must surely be attached to the individual or individuals for whom the tomb F119 was constructed and to the one for whom the probable large grave F160 was dug.

This summary account of the development of the church and its use cannot be fitted into any tighter chronological framework through the analysis of artefacts recovered from levels and features of Phases 4 and 5. The paucity of pottery from these phases is not surprising; once Roman and earlier medieval residual sherds, and a number of obviously intrusive post-medieval sherds, have been discounted there are only seven sherds of pottery from what might be considered significant contexts. The date ranges of the three fabrics and the forms represented by these seven sherds (TF44, TF52, TF54) make close dating impossible. The few architectural fragments found in reused contexts in Phase 4 do not lend themselves to close dating. The few in-situ patches of floor tiles may provide, when studied, useful broad dating, though the reuse of these tiles and their resetting cannot be discounted.

**Period 3**

A survey of the house at the time of its dissolution described the friary and the church as ‘goodly ... new builded’ and it seems likely that the whole church, after the stripping of ecclesiastical
fittings and fixtures, was passed on as a single property. When visited by Leland, on one of his journeys undertaken between 1535 and 1543, the church was described as ‘now a brewhouse’ (Toulmin Smith 1964, 58), and it is likely that the choir was still standing. Indeed, it has been suggested that it was only after extensive damage had been done to the building in the Civil Wars that the choir was pulled down. It no longer stood when the site was drawn by Stukeley in August 1721, while two very good groups of pottery from its robber trenches date to the first half of the 18th century, probably c. 1730–50. The rescue nature of the 1967 excavations meant that the area of the choir was machined down to, or close to, the friary levels which were, in any case, already greatly disturbed, so that no evidence of post-friary activity was recorded here, save that of deeply-cut negative features mainly associated with stone robbing.

The use of the building as a brewery continued to the mid 18th century, and its well-preserved external appearance is shown on a number of prints. The activity of the brewery is represented by the features and layers of Phase 6A, the truncated nature of evidence at this level producing a rather incoherent picture. The large clay-lined vats, F42 and F60, would fit with the business of brewing, while further space would be needed for storage (and processing?) of raw materials and of the finished product. The provision of food and drink was an important facet of the economy of a provincial town like Gloucester (Ripley 1980) and the brewery would have formed part of a larger network of services. The occupation of the church in the Civil Wars interrupted the life of the brewery, but despite damage to the building, the brewery reoccupied the structure until the mid 18th century when it ceased to trade and the building was sub-divided into individual dwelling units, represented by Phase 6B; in most cases the evidence of that sub-division is seen only at cellar level. Part of the premises was later reoccupied for business purposes and for dwellings or tenements, but this is not reflected in the archaeological record.
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