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INTRODUCTION

The Town of Gloucester (Figs. 1 and 2)

The Roman town had its origin in a fort or fortress built in the mid 1st century A.D. to the north of the present city, at Kingsholm. In the mid to late 60s A.D. a new fortress was constructed further south on the higher ground on which today’s town is sited (Hurst 1985, 1–5, 122–3; Hurst 1999a, 114).

The fortress became a *colonia* in the late 1st to early 2nd century and was provided with stone walls, gates and public buildings.1 In the 2nd to 3rd century the river flowed c. 200 m to the west of the town; the riverside was marked by a quayside retaining wall (Hurst 1999a, 123–4). In the area between the river and the fortress wall there was a built-up suburb, including stone buildings (Periods 1 and 2 below). About 100 m to the north of the suburb was a Roman tilery (Heighway and Parker 1982); the site was subsequently used for a late Roman cemetery (Heighway and Bryant 1999, 53).

There is only limited evidence for occupation in the town after the early 5th century (Heighway 1988; Darvill 1988; Greatorex 1991). At the town centre Roman public buildings were levelled and timber-framed buildings superimposed (Heighway and Garrod 1980; Heighway, Garrod and Vince 1979). About 679 a minster dedicated to St. Peter was founded by Osric, ruler of the kingdom of the Hwicce (Finberg 1972, 153–66). The precise site of the minster is unknown. It could have been within the fortress walls or outside it in the riverside suburb (Hare 1993, 27–8). Also in the riverside area was the church of St. Mary de Lode, the subject of this report. During the post-Roman period its site was occupied by a timber building containing burials (see below, Period 3).

The town was dramatically altered c. 900 when a new street pattern was imposed and a new church, soon to be dedicated to St. Oswald, was built (Heighway and Bryant 1999, *passim*). The new church made extensive use of Roman stone, including parts of a temple (ibid. 146). The original site of the temple is not known but it could also have been in the riverside area. The new church of St. Oswald was a royal foundation, richly endowed. Its parish included part of a territory which had once been under the jurisdiction of St. Peter’s Abbey (see below). The church of St. Mary de Lode was in existence by the 10th century (see below, Period 6), occupying a key position in the western riverside area. It was set in a square surrounded by a block of burgage plots (below, p. 102), opposite what was later to be the west and principal gate (St. Mary’s Gate) of St. Peter’s Abbey.
Fig. 1. St. Mary de Lode church and the city of Gloucester: location plan, showing modern streets and the precinct areas of the Cathedral (St. Peter’s Abbey) and St. Oswald’s Priory.
Fig. 2. Anglo-Saxon Gloucester.
After the Norman Conquest a new castle was built dominating the south-west quadrant of the town (Hurst 1984, 76–81), and the north gate and perhaps other gates were rebuilt (Heighway 1983, 33, 53). The abbey of St. Peter was rebuilt from 1089 on a massive scale; the new minster of St. Oswald, though it received a new north transept c. 1120 (Heighway and Bryant 1999, 17, 78–84), soon declined into obscurity (Hare 1999, 42). By c. 1100 the town possessed ten churches, though it seems that none, with the exception of St. Peter, St. Mary de Lode and St. Oswald, had acquired parochial rights of baptism and burial (Heighway 1984, 375–7; Herbert 1988, 292).

The 1978–9 Project

The church of St. Mary de Lode (Fig. 3) has long been considered to be an ancient foundation and when rebuilt in 1826 was found to occupy the site of a Roman building (see below, Appendix, no. 3). When there was a proposal in 1978 to relay the floor of the nave, the opportunity was taken to carry out a small excavation, followed by a more extensive excavation later in the year. The work was carried out by volunteers under the direction of Richard Bryant. In 1979 a grant was made available by the Gloucester City Lottery to fund further excavation. The City Lottery subsequently made another grant for post-excavation work and an interim report was published (Bryant 1980).

Before long the excavation was being cited as providing evidence for an early British church, or it featured as an element in discussion about the continuity of churches from Romano-British

Fig. 3. Views of the present church of St. Mary de Lode. Left, from the south-west showing the nave of 1826 with the tower in the background: Right, from the south-east showing the chancel and tower.
It became clear that it was important to publish the evidence in fuller form, and following a grant from the British Academy the present report was completed.

**DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE** by Carolyn Heighway

*Introduction*

The church is today known as St. Mary de Lode, a name which is first recorded in 1523; it refers to a passage across the River Severn, a branch of which once flowed a few hundred metres west of the church. In medieval times the church was usually known as St. Mary before the abbey gate; in the 16th century it was also known as St. Mary Broadgate (Herbert 1988, 303, n. 11 and 12).

St. Mary de Lode has traditionally been known as Gloucester’s most ancient parish church. Atkyns (1712, 190) mentioned the church as the burial-place of the Roman King Lucius. More convincingly, Fosbrooke (1819, 172) pointed to its large parish and concluded, surely correctly, that this enabled the church to claim considerable antiquity: he speculated that it had been a Romano-British church. The discovery of mosaics under the church in the early 19th century seemed to add credence to this idea. The legend that ‘King Lucius’ was buried at St. Mary de Lode church probably derives from Geoffrey of Monmouth (Thorpe 1966, 126) who stated that Lucius died at Gloucester. Given the nature of Geoffrey’s work, Lucius can hardly be taken as an historical figure. In any case Geoffrey further states that Lucius was buried in the church of the archdiocese, by which he must mean London or just possibly Caerleon (ibid. 125). The legend resurfaced at intervals, some even stating that an (early 14th-century) effigy in the church was that of Lucius, a claim that Fosbrooke (1819, 171) rightly described as ‘absurd’.

*The Parish*

St. Mary de Lode church had a large extra-mural parish which took in much of the suburbs and adjacent areas of Gloucester. The parish included Tuffley, much of Barton Street and Wotton, and parts of Kingsholm, Longford and Twigworth. It was closely enmeshed with the parish of St. Catherine (itself the successor of the parish of the early 10th-century minster of St. Oswald: Heighway and Bryant 1999, fig. 1.12). The pattern existed in the 14th century when the parish of St. Catherine (then still called St. Oswald’s) included parts of Longford and Twigworth (ibid. 12–16). The spiritual jurisdiction of St. Mary’s once extended considerably further; in the mid-12th century the churches of Maisemore, Barnwood, and Upton St. Leonards were subject to St. Mary’s. St. Mary de Lode appears to be the church which served the abbey of St. Peter’s estates in and around Gloucester (Herbert 1988, 303). The abbey had no documented parish of its own in the Middle Ages, and it is a legitimate inference that St. Mary’s parish, which included the manor of Abbot’s Barton, was that of the abbey and may represent the endowment or remnant of the endowment of the old minster of c. 679.

The close physical entanglement between the parish of St. Mary de Lode and that of St. Oswald suggests that both were once combined and that St. Oswald’s parish was taken out of that of St. Mary c. 900 at the foundation of St. Oswald’s church. The explanation of why their division is so intricate may be that the two parishes represent two estates, that of the abbey (St. Mary de Lode) and that of the king (St. Oswald’s), which included the site of the royal palace at Kingsholm. However, there is no exact correlation between abbey land and St. Mary’s parish on one hand and royal land and the parish of St. Oswald on the other. At the Dissolution the
demesne lands of the manor of Abbot’s Barton did all lie in St. Mary de Lode or in parishes which had formerly been dependent on St. Mary’s church.\textsuperscript{6} The parish of St. Oswald’s included the site of the Anglo-Saxon royal palace at Kingsholm and the palace enclosure, but in 1607 the common lands of the manor of King’s Barton lay both in the parish of St. Catherine and in St. Mary de Lode with small parts in Churchdown and Sandhurst (ecclesiastical dependencies of St. Oswald’s) and Barnwood (a dependency of St. Mary de Lode).\textsuperscript{7} Steven Bassett (1992, 28–9) has suggested that if all this territory was originally in St. Mary’s parish, then St. Mary de Lode might simply have continued to serve any royal land which was \textit{not} assigned to St. Oswald’s c. 900.

Apart from the extra-mural tracts described above, St. Mary’s parish included a compact block of land around the church, abutting the west limit of St. Peter’s abbey precinct (Fig. 4). This block of land was the site of the abbey’s burgages — comprising 52 houses c. 1100 — which in the Middle Ages paid landgavel to St. Peter’s Abbey rather than to the Crown (Herbert 1988, 66). In the 16th and 17th centuries this area was one of the poorest in the city (ibid. 70, 110). It is not clear whether this area was also so poor in the Middle Ages, though it must have shared in the

\textbf{Fig. 4.} Detail of Arthur Causton’s 1843 map of Gloucester. The broken line, which has been emphasised, delineates the parish of St. Mary de Lode. As well as large amounts of land outside the city the parish included St. Mary de Lode church, its square, and blocks of tenements all around it.
general decline of town prosperity in the 15th century (ibid. 36). In the 13th century a small property (48 square yards) close to the church (and therefore presumably on the square) had buildings worth one mark (13s. 4d.); a large property (443 square yards) also close to the church had buildings worth 12 marks (£8) (Hart, ii, 242, 244). By contrast, an equally large property of 366 square yards in the lane leading to the river Severn had buildings worth only two shillings (Patterson 1998, no. 344). This suggests there were high-value properties on St. Mary’s Square but much poorer ones on the back street leading to the river. It can probably be assumed that the quayside, and the centre of commerce, had long since migrated further south.

The Church and Churchyard

The first surviving mention of St. Mary de Lode church is in the mid 12th century when Gilbert Foliot, abbot of Gloucester 1140–7, granted the church together with the churches dependent on it — Maisemore, Barnwood, and Upton St. Leonards — to the sacrist to light the altar of St. Peter the Apostle in the abbey church. The church had burial rights at an early date. The presence of five generations of excavated burials contemporary with the 10th–11th centuries (Period 6) suggests that such rights had at least a late Anglo-Saxon origin. In 1197 an agreement was made between Thomas, abbot of Gloucester, and Geoffrey, prior of Llanthony, concerning burials (Patterson 1998, no. 105). In the agreement, parishioners of the church of St. Mary were

Fig. 5. Detail of John Speed’s 1612 map of Gloucester showing St. Mary de Lode church (D) with a small steeple.
regarded as parishioners of the monks of St. Peter, but they could, following a witnessed deathbed request, be buried at Llanthony. Similarly, parishioners of the churches controlled by Llanthony could choose to be buried at St. Peter’s Abbey. The parishioners of St. Mary’s apparently had a special status with regard to burial dues. In 1304, the settlement of a dispute between the vicar of St. Mary de Lode and the monks of the abbey stated that if the parishioners of St. Mary’s chose to be buried in the abbey cemetery, the vicar could claim the same burial dues as if they were buried in his own churchyard (Hart, iii, 228–9). It would appear that St. Mary’s burial rights were a separate and long-established custom. It also confirms that a burial-ground existed at St. Mary’s by the end of the 13th century when other city churches had yet to gain the right of burial (Herbert 1988, 10).

The chancel was said to have fallen down by 1576 when the church needed repairs. In 1643, and again in 1646, during the civil war, the church was used as a prison for royalist soldiers. By the early 18th century, perhaps in the great storms of 1703, a spire on the tower had been blown down (Herbert 1988, 305). In 1825 and 1826 the nave of the church was rebuilt, in a stuccoed early Gothic style designed by James Cooke, a local mason. A gallery was moved to the west end. The tower and chancel, however, were left intact. The church that was demolished had north and

Fig. 6. Detail of J. Kip’s engraved view of Gloucester published in R. Atkyns, Ancient and Present State of Gloustershire (1712).
south aisles, with an arcade of part Romanesque and part 13th-century arches (see Appendix, nos. 1 and 2).

Plans of 1610 and 1712 (Figs. 5 and 6) show a rectangular line around the church, presumably representing the churchyard, with a small open space to the east, just west of St. Mary’s Gate. The space, known in the early 19th century as St. Mary’s Knapp (Pritchard 1937, 25), was the site of the burning of Bishop Hooper in 1555. It was also an area used in the early 18th century as part of the sheep market (Herbert 1988, 260).

The layout, with church surrounded by a churchyard in turn surrounded by house plots, is already indicated in a mid 12th-century abbey lease which mentions a building fronting on St. Mary’s square (placea) (Hart, ii, 244). It is likely that in the Middle Ages the distinction between the burial area and the open space to the east was not rigidly marked or maintained; medieval churchyards were often public places. In the late 15th century a dispute here ended in bloodshed (the churchyard was seen as polluted by this violence and had to be re-consecrated).10 By 1712 there were two alehouses in the west part of the churchyard (Fig. 4); they may have been part of parish life for centuries. They were demolished in 1861 (Herbert 1988, 225).

In 1826 a monument in the form of a small tomb was placed on the site of Bishop Hooper’s martyrdom (Herbert 1988, 251). Later permission was given by the bishop to extend the burial ground to include St. Mary’s Knapp,11 and when the enlargement took place in 1842 (Pritchard 1937, 25) a charred oak post was found on the supposed site of Bishop Hooper’s martyrdom. The antiquary John Bellows (1880) claimed some years later that the removal of the ‘Knapp’ involved the levelling of a mound, but perhaps this was a deduction from the name rather than an accurate account of events.12 Burials continued until 1854.13 The burial ground contained many tombstones c. 1845 when a plan and record were made,14 and there were still tombstones in the 1930s when H.Y.J. Taylor made a manuscript record of them.15

In 1956 comprehensive redevelopment of the area around the church was under way. St. Mary’s Square with its dilapidated buildings, along with the street patterns which had been an element of the abbey property for nearly a thousand years, was swept away. The whole of St. Mary’s churchyard (except for the Bishop Hooper memorial erected in the early 1860s) was sold to Gloucester city council16 and in 1957 a faculty was granted for the removal of any remains and their re-interment in the corporation cemetery.17 It can be assumed that the only remains removed were those with a marker; it is certain that generations of earlier burials still remain under the ground.

THE EXCAVATION by Richard Bryant

Introduction (Fig. 7)

In 1978 a small exploratory excavation trench (I) was opened against the north wall of the north aisle. The aim was to establish whether the remains of the Roman building, first discovered in 1826, could still be found, and to investigate the potential for further work. Later in the same year excavation was carried out within the pew cavities on the southern half of the nave (Trenches II and III). The pew cavities are part of the 1826 rebuilding and consist of air-circulation spaces below the wooden floors on which the pews stand. The joists of the floors were supported by walls which revetted the edges of the cavities, and by longitudinal spine-walls which divide the cavities in two. The overall effect of the introduction of the pew cavities was to raise the level of the nave floor by c. 0.8 m, making it level with the floor of the chancel (Fig. 22). The data recovered from Trenches II and III prompted a decision to carry out a second season of work in 1979.
Fig. 7. Plan of St. Mary de Lode church in 1978–9, showing trench and section locations. The nave has since been partitioned to provide rooms at the west end.
within the pew cavities on the northern side of the nave (Trench IV). Some of the pew-cavity walls were demolished to allow for more coherent exploration of the stratigraphy. Three brick graves were partially removed. The severely constrained areas available were further limited by the need to avoid undermining the foundations of the 1826 piers.

Methodology (Fig. 7)

Trenches were assigned Roman numerals and layers arabic numerals, with a separate numerical sequence for features. Small finds (including worked stone) are prefixed with the letters SF and have their own arabic number sequence. The site archive and finds are in Gloucester Museum (site 5/78). Some finds are currently on display in St. Mary de Lode church.

Table 1. List of periods and phases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Century(ies)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st–2nd</td>
<td>Roman building</td>
<td>1.1, 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>mid 2nd to 4th</td>
<td>Roman building</td>
<td>2.1, 2.2, 2.3a, 2.3b, 2.4, 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Timber building with burials inside it</td>
<td>3.1 (make-up), 3.2, 3.3 (structure), 3.4 (burials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8th to 9th?</td>
<td>Drystone walls with sleeper beam and floors, and postholes</td>
<td>3.5 (drystone structure), 3.6, 3.7, 3.8 (postholes), 3.9 (forecourt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9th to 10th (RC date could be from just before destruction)</td>
<td>Burials, one generation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10th–11th</td>
<td>Building, church; five generations of burials</td>
<td>6.1 (nave), 6.2a, 6.2b, 6.3 (burials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Late 11th</td>
<td>Addition of western annex, use, construction of font base</td>
<td>7.1, 7.2a, 7.2b, 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Early 12th</td>
<td>Robbing of Period 6 west and south walls; construction of nave</td>
<td>7.4, 7.5, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Late 12th through to late 13th</td>
<td>Addition of north and south aisles; tower and chancel built and rebuilt</td>
<td>8.4 (robbing), 8.5 (chancel arch and north wall of tower), 9.1a (construction of north arcade), 9.1b (postholes), 9.1c, 9.2 (occupation layers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Late 13th–14th</td>
<td>Extension of nave arcade to west; extension of chancel</td>
<td>11.1 (orange mortar foundations), 11.2 (occupation), 11.3, 11.4, 11.5, 11.6 (burial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>Robbing of south nave wall foundations between arcade piers; rebuilding of south wall of south aisle</td>
<td>12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 12.4, 12.5, 12.6, 12.7, 12.8, 12.9, 12.10, 12.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15th–16th</td>
<td>Late medieval reflooring</td>
<td>13.1–13.6, 13.8, 13.9, 14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>17th to 18th</td>
<td>Floors and brick-lined graves; refacing of south wall of south aisle.</td>
<td>13.7, 13.10–14 inclusive; 14.2–14.16 inclusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>Rebuilding of church except for tower and chancel 1825–6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19th–20th</td>
<td>Post 1826 church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site sequence was divided into structural periods and these were subdivided into groups of layers and features, called phases and numbered as subdivisions of the periods. These subdivisions are the equivalent of units elsewhere called ‘context groups’ (see a discussion of this issue in Heighway and Bryant 1999, 51) and were used throughout the finds processing and post-excavation documentation. Subsequent re-examination of the evidence has involved revising the span of some of the periods, but it has been decided not to alter the numbers of the phases, since this would involve interference with the site archive at a fundamental level, with consequent likelihood of error. Phases therefore may no longer have the same prefix number as the period to which they are assigned (Table 1).

Roman Structures

Period 1
The evidence for this period consists solely of building debris found in the make-up deposits covered by the construction of the Period 2 building. Below the make-up (in the two small areas sampled to this depth) lay natural yellow clay. A significant proportion of the building debris consisted of painted wall-plaster of fine quality (see below). Late 1st- to early 2nd-century pottery was recovered from the debris layers.

Period 2 (Fig. 8)
The excavation only reached Roman levels in three areas. In Trench IV, east of wall F135, lay a very hard, coarse mortar surface (183), on which was a deposit of fine green silt c. 10 mm deep. Immediately on top of this silt was a black organic layer with some burned timber. Five metres east of these deposits, and continuing eastwards out of the excavation area, the same sequence of layers occurred, as it also did on the south side of the nave east of wall F17 — the mortar floor here was II (86). The similarity of these three sequences suggests that they were all within one large area, Room A, bounded on the west by walls F135 and F17 and on the south by robbed wall F42.

To the west of Room A was Room B, containing a ‘negative’ style mosaic (Fig. 9) with white diagonal trellis decoration against a black background (224). The tesserae were large (c. 20 mm) and made of oolitic limestone (white) and lias limestone (blue-black). This mosaic was the floor of a corridor which, to judge by the border of the mosaic, ended just outside the excavation area c. 1 m to the south. A doorway led from Room B into Room A. The narrow space south of Room B was designated Room C; it probably represents an entrance corridor.

The layout of the rooms may be complemented by information about the mosaics found in 1825. Work on the north wall uncovered a tesselated pavement with scroll and fret decoration and a wreathed border enclosing figures of fish and surrounded by a guilloche. The tesserae were in red, white and grey, and the pavement measured 16.5 feet (5.0 m) east to west and 7.5 feet (2.2 m) north to south (Appendix, no. 3). The room in which this pavement lay was designated Room E for the purposes of this current report. The pavement did not appear in the excavations of 1978–9. Therefore it must be bounded by a wall on its south side, separating the pavement from the courtyard (Room A). Possible confirmation of a wall in this position was provided by the Period 2 destruction debris, which was thicker where it was piled against walls F135 and F17 and also towards the north limit of the excavation.

Two other mosaics were found in 1825. One, which lay near the Room E mosaic, was of large blue and white tesserae, and was probably the same as the mosaic in Room B, continuing the corridor to the north. The other mosaic was discovered under the south side of the new nave and had ‘a fire place, and underneath a flue composed of brick tiles’ (Appendix, no. 3). This last mosaic presumably lay to the south of wall F42 (Room F).
Fig. 8. Period 2. The north point is site north.
Fig. 9. Roman negative mosaic in Room B, looking east.
Subsequently a rectangular pier, III (68), was added to the north face of the right-angled return on wall F17. Earlier wall plaster runs behind the addition. This pier was plastered on all three exposed faces and was later burned. This must be part of the remodelling of an entrance arch between Rooms A and C. Several phases of painted wall plaster were found in Period 2 destruction layers in Rooms A, B and C.

There is plentiful evidence to indicate that part of the building was destroyed by fire. A quantity of burned material, including the remains of a plank or compressed beam, lay over the floors of Room A, though there was none of this material in Room B. Room C was not fully investigated. The threshold and jambs of the doorway between Rooms A and B had been deliberately removed. The burnt material was overlaid by a thick layer of destruction debris including stones and mortar, fired clay roof tiles (some were from a nearby tilery: Heighway and Parker 1982), and painted wall plaster. These deposits were also found in Rooms B and C. Walls F135 and F17 were not, however, covered by this destruction, and they could have stood, reduced in height, for some time after the demolition of the rest of the Roman building. This could explain the apparent influence of their alignment on Period 3. The robbed wall F42 also presumably stood above the destruction levels, but it was robbed out before Period 4.

A substantial fragment of a large column c. 940 mm in diameter (Fig. 39, no. 1) was found lying on the burned layer above the floor II (86) and against the east face of wall F17. The column fragment was covered by the general destruction layer II (42). A second large fragment from a column with the same diameter (Fig. 39, no. 5) was recovered from the lower part of the Period 8 foundation F133 in Trench IV where this cut deeply into the Roman destruction layer. A further three column fragments with the same diameter were found in Period 4 and 7 contexts (Fig. 39, nos. 2–4), while a sixth fragment was re-used in one of the Period 14 pew-cavity walls (Fig. 39, no. 6).

The pottery sealed by the Period 2 building suggests the early to mid 2nd century for the building’s construction. The most important dating evidence is that of the negative mosaic in Room B: two other such mosaics from Gloucester are dated to the mid 2nd century.¹⁸ A radiocarbon date from the beam found in the destruction levels of Room A gives a date between B.C. 100–230 A.D. (2 sigma: see below). The destruction date of the building is not known. It is possible that the site was abandoned for a time before the deliberate levelling of Period 3.

Discussion

The quality of the wall plaster recovered from Period 1 indicates a building of high status, but nothing more is known about this structure except that it was demolished to make way for Period 2 and, therefore, must date to the late 1st or early 2nd century.

The excavated parts of the Period 2 building, together with 19th-century records of other discoveries, show that the building consisted of a range of rooms around three sides of a central space. The surrounding rooms had mosaic floors, and one had a hypocaust. At least two of the rooms (B and C) were also decorated with painted wall plaster. The central space, Room A, contained elements of at least three phases of painted wall plaster, the first of which is of high quality. In the south-west corner of Room A part of a large column was found lying on the burned debris and against the face of wall F17. This column fragment, together with the burned layer, was covered by the general destruction layer, including roof tile. The column would have been 7.5 to 9.5 m high and it fell after the fire but before the rest of the building was destroyed. This suggests that the column was originally part of the structure on the site and stood about 8 to 10 m to the east of wall F17. Columns of this size were not part of any domestic arrangement: they were only found in public buildings.

The riverside area of Gloucester appears to have contained a mixture of activity through the
1st–3rd centuries A.D. There was presumably a commercial quarter associated with the quayside along the river front (Hurst 1999a, 123–4) and there were stone buildings, including a public building that has been interpreted as a classical temple (Heighway and Bryant 1999, 6, 10, 146), a 2nd–3rd-century *colonia* tilyery (Heighway and Parker 1982, pp. 30–1), and a late Roman cemetery (Heighway and Bryant, 1999). Hurst (199a, 124) convincingly proposes that the approach to Gloucester from the west was over a fine stone bridge, and this statement of civic pride and power would be further enhanced by the presence of large public buildings near the river frontage.

It is possible that the St. Mary’s building was part of a temple precinct, but the presence of large columns, a heated room, mosaics and painted wall plaster suggests that it should rather be seen as part of a baths complex. The heated room could, as was suggested in 1825 (Appendix, no. 3) be a *laconicum* (sweating chamber) or an *apodyterium* (changing room) and the column may have come from a baths basilica immediately to the east of the excavated area. Such an arrangement, with an *apodyterium* beside the baths basilica, is paralleled at Caerleon in the legionary baths (Zienkiewicz 1986, 161–70, 223–4). The location, between the city walls and the river, is also paralleled by the ‘Castle’ baths at Caerleon which lie between the fortress and the river Usk (ibid. 35–6).

*Post-Roman and Anglo-Saxon structures*

**Period 3** (Fig. 10)

To the east of Roman walls F135 and F17 the site was covered by make-up layers of compacted loam, more stoney in Trenches II and III. The top 150 mm of this make-up spread across both walls: Sections 4, 5, 6, 20, 21, 29; layers II (55), III (31), IV (161), (200), (218).

Two substantial, roughly squared limestone blocks, F237 and F229, were cut into the top of the make-up layers. F237 was 460 × 340 mm and 150 mm deep. F229 was partly obscured by a 19th-century pew-cavity spine-wall, but the visible part was 400 × 250 mm. The depth of this block is unknown. A levelling layer was then spread which covered all of the south-eastern end of Trench IV (204), (206), (210), filling the cuts for the stone blocks. The flat tops of the blocks were left above the levelling layer. Immediately to the west of F229 lay a series of small mortar or plaster spreads. Each spread showed a line where part had been burned, the yellow colour of the mortar being changed to red. The change in colour may indicate the position of the rendered face of a standing timber wall. A linear east–west feature, F 238, filled with light brown stony loam (205), lay immediately to the north of F229 and cut (204).

Two east–west graves, F239 and F240, and a burial, B16 (Fig. 11; Fig. 33, Section 30), of an adult male with shoulders to the west, were found within the building. The bodies from graves F239 and F240 had been removed and the graves backfilled. A rectangular lias block was found set upright against the east end of F240. The skull of B16 was missing. This was not the result of decapitation, a late Roman rite (Farwell and Molleson 1993, 227), because there was no evidence of cuts or damage to the surviving vertebrae. Instead, the disturbing of the vertebrae indicates that the head was removed after the decomposition of the body, probably at the same time as the graves were emptied.

It is suggested that the stone blocks F237 and F229 acted as pastones for the main supports of a timber-framed building which had rendered infill walls between the vertical timber frames. The burn lines on the mortar spreads indicate that the walls were of different thicknesses (c. 140 mm and c. 200 mm). The narrower wall would have formed internal recesses. The structure was aligned on the Roman building of Period 2, and may have been deliberately placed in relation to the ruined Roman walls. F238 might be the remains of a strengthening wall or a rebuilding of the north wall of the building.
Two of the graves might have been cist-burials: the lias block in F240 may be the remnant of a stone lining to the grave, as may a vertical stone slab found immediately to the north of B16. However, the holes that were dug, to remove the bodies and B16’s head, destroyed the original grave cuts. It is, therefore, not possible to say whether the graves preceded the Period 3 building or post-dated its construction.

**Period 3 destruction and post-burial activity**

The presence of a coin of Theodosius I (388–95) and late 4th- to early 5th-century pottery in the uppermost make-up layers and the levelling layers associated with the padstones suggests a 5th-century or later date for the timber-framed building and for the burials. A radiocarbon dating test was carried out on bones of B16 at the College of Further Education, Manchester but the bones were too heavily contaminated (perhaps by ground water) to provide a date.

The burned mortar or plaster spreads on the north side of the Period 3 building show that it was badly damaged or destroyed by fire. This event may be linked to the deliberate removal of the bodies from the graves F239 and F240 and the head from B16.

A shallow depression F225, lying partly over the back-filled B16, belongs to the immediate post-burial period, as does posthole F244. This large posthole, 22 cm deep and c. 30 cm in diameter, was cut into the top of the back-filled grave F239. The linear feature F238 and the area around some of the burnt mortar or plaster spreads, in the north-west corner of the area, were
covered by a layer of dark, stoney loam IV (198), indicating that at least part of the Period 3 building was no longer standing.

**Period 4** (Fig. 12)
The emptied graves of Period 3, padstone F237, posthole F224, shallow depression F225, and IV (198) were all sealed by a spread of buff mortary loam and crushed stone, IV (196) and (199) (Fig. 30, Section 21). The flatness and smooth compacted nature of the surface of these layers suggests that they were laid as a floor. About 400 mm to the west of the western limit of the surviving floor, a north–south, trench-built, drystone foundation of oolite slabs, F226, was cut into Period 3 layers. The outline of a beam which had rested on this foundation, and had been burned *in situ*, was visible as a fire-reddened strip c. 250 mm wide on the surface of the limestone slabs. Three metres to the south of F226, in Trench III, a robber trench F241 lies directly on the alignment of F226. This is almost certainly a robbed portion of the same foundation and indicates that the timber building, which stood on F226, was over 8 m wide. The north and south walls of this building have not been located. The north wall position has been postulated at the northern limit of the surviving floors, IV (196). It is in an area completely destroyed by foundation F133 of Period 8. The south wall position is also an estimate, based upon the fact that the west wall, present as robber trench F241, did not reach so far south as burial F43. Within the building, and abutting the eastern face of F226 in Trench IV, the floor was covered by a green silty occupation layer, IV (195), cut by a series of small postholes (F209, F210, F213–21). These might represent an east–west partition.
Immediately to the west of F226, the Period 3 levelling was covered by a 1.5 m-wide area of flat stones set in loam, IV (191). A very similar layer occurs to the west of the robber trench F241, III (31A). These appear to form a paved forecourt west of the Period 4 building. The Period 4 structure can thus be interpreted as a large timber-framed building with a paved forecourt to the west. No relevant datable finds were recovered from this period; a worn coin of the House of Theodosius came from the forecourt.

Several burials may be related to the building. B15 was cut in half by the Period 5 foundations F222, and B14 appeared to be the same generation as B15 (Fig. 32, Section 25). Both burials had their heads towards the west. To the west of the forecourt, further south, the legs of B18 were identified (Fig. 29, Section 14). The layers above B18 were cut by a Period 6 burial F39; B18, therefore, probably also belongs to Period 4. A fourth grave, F43 (Fig. 29, Section 6), was cut into the robbing trench of the Roman building in Trench II and was cut by F41 (Period 5).

**Period 5 (Fig. 13)**

Three elements have been included in this period, according to their position in the stratigraphic sequence, but there is no evidence to suggest that they were strictly contemporary.

An extensive layer of dark silty loam covered much of the southern half of Trench IV (180) and was also found in Trench III (30) (Fig. 30, Sections 21 and 29). The surface of this layer was burned black and contained charcoal flecks and a burned plank or beam. The burnt layer also contained slag. It is not clear whether it is waste from industrial use, or derives from the destruc-
tion of a Period 5 building. A radiocarbon date from the burned plank or beam gave a date of 790–1160 A.D. to two sigma variation (HAR 4895; see below).

To the south of the burned area, in Trench II, there was an east–west robber trench, F41. This feature was cut into the backfilled Period 4 grave F43 and covered by the Period 6 southern wall foundation F33/35.

To the north-west of the burned layer in Trench IV, below the foundations (F197) of Period 7, was a mortared stone east–west linear foundation, F222, which continued to the west out of the excavation area. Although very similar in construction to F197, F222 was 270 mm narrower and was separated from F197 by a layer containing the Period 6 burial B19.

F222 does not appear in Section 23 (Figs. 13 and 34) and therefore does not continue far enough to the east to form a north wall for the burned area. It could have formed a buttress to the corner of a building now only defined by the burned surface, or it could have been part of a separate building standing just to the north-west of the burned-surface building. F42 might represent the position of a robbed south wall associated with the burned surface, but the lack of a corresponding deep foundation on the north side of the burned area suggests that it is more likely to be part of a separate building to the south. The ‘missing’ walls of the burned-surface building were probably of timber and could have been built directly onto the ground surface or in shallow construction trenches similar to the Period 6 building. A fragment of a late 9th-century carved cross was found in the burned layer, and this, together with the radiocarbon date, suggest a late 9th- or early 10th-century date for the destruction of the burned-surface building. No dating material was recovered from F42 or F222.

Period 6 (Fig. 14)

Above the Period 5 burned layer was a distinctive series of layers which included a red, burned clay make-up and several white mortar surfaces. This stratigraphy was traced both in Trench III (28), (29) and (38) and IV (178), (179) and (186), cut by the Period 8 wall foundations to north and south and bounded on the west by a shallow north–south robber trench, F193/F47, marking the line of a wall, F228. Under the Period 8 wall, F32, in Trench II was an east–west wall foundation, F33/35, which must have been contemporary with the floor sequence just described. F33/35 was at least 0.85 m wide and varied in depth from 400 to 700 m. The west robber trench F193/F47 was 0.85 to 1.1 m wide but only 220 to 300 mm deep at its maximum. The southern foundation, although of variable depth, was substantial enough to carry stone walls. The west trench could also have contained mortared foundations. It was however very shallow and it seems possible that all the walls could have been timber-framed, standing on stone dwarf walls.

During the life of this structure a north–south trench, F201, was dug across the building about 5 m from the west wall. F201 was 350 mm deep and 650 mm wide and did not reach the north wall. Its south end was observed in Trench III, where later floors had subsided into it.

Outside the west wall of the building, a number of burials was recovered. At least five ‘generations’ of burials, predating Period 7, closely respected the line of the west wall. A ‘generation’ can usually be reckoned as 30 years.19 If this is correct here, then the life of the Period 6 building can be taken as at least 150 years. However, the cemetery at St. Mary’s may have been small for the population it had to accommodate, forcing ‘generations’ to be shorter.

Most of the pottery recovered from the burials is residual Roman; a single small sherd of late 11th-century fabric could be intrusive.

Period 7 (Fig. 15): The western annex

Cutting the north end of the west wall F228 of Period 6 was a foundation, F197, of coursed stones in rammed loam and mortar, 1.6 m wide and 0.8 m deep. F197 continued to the west of the
Fig. 14. Period 6. The burial sequence to the west of Wall F228 begins with B13, followed by B10, B11, B12 (2nd generation), B9 (3rd generation); B7, B8 (4th generation), and B2, B6, B19 (5th generation).
Fig. 15 Period 7.
Fig. 16. F230, the large, circular font or font-base, looking west.
excavation. It was massive enough to carry a considerable masonry structure, such as a tower; however the wall F228 to which it was apparently added was not strengthened in any way, and would not have been strong enough to carry the fourth side of a tower. This western addition contained a series of mortar floors and make-up layers, III (60) and IV (152), (153) and (167), which sealed the Period 6 burial sequence.

At some time after the removal of wall F201 of Period 6, a structure, F230 (Fig. 16), was set centrally in the building about 4 m from the west wall. The structure was bedded onto mortar (132) and consisted of a circular wall (250 mm wide and at least 230 mm high) surrounding a space 1.3 m in diameter, in the bottom of which was rubble packing, IV (207). The feature existed until the 17th century.

Seventeen sherds of pottery of fabric TF41B in the make-up for surfaces both east and west of wall F228 indicate a late 11th-century date. Finds from this period include a hooked tag (Fig. 37, no. 6) and three lead tokens which seem to be unusually early forms of base metal tokens (Fig. 35).

Discussion
Reconsideration of the excavation evidence has led to the realisation that there were in fact two successive early timber buildings: the structure with burials (Period 3) followed by a building with a stone forecourt (Period 4). The earlier building was on a layer of levelled rubble: a similar technique was used on timber buildings dated to the early 5th century at the centre of Gloucester (Heighway, Garrod and Vince 1979, 163–4, building 2). The use of timber-framed surface-built structures was probably part of late Romano-British vernacular architecture (James, Marshall and Millett 1984, 201–3). However, rather than being a timber-framed building set directly on the ground, the St. Mary’s building had uprights on padstones. A parallel for this structure is to be found at Richborough, Kent, where a building interpreted as a late 4th- to early 5th-century church, and associated with an octagonal font, was similarly built of timber with uprights set on stone pads (Brown 1971).

Three east–west burials were found inside the Period 3 building. Two were empty graves, while the third consisted of the headless remains of an adult male. Upright stones had been deliberately placed in B16 and in F240. These could represent robbed cist burials — an element of 5th–7th-century burial in Wales and the West — or are perhaps the remnants of a similar arrangement of which other elements were of wood, e.g. ‘lintel graves’ at Whithorn, Dumfries and Galloway (Hill 1997, 71–3).

It might be claimed that the two empty graves had been dug and never received burials, but the presence of the ‘cist-stone’ in F240 shows that the grave had been used and robbed. The cuts of the robbing closely followed the original grave cuts. This suggests that the grave outlines were known and that there were grave markers of some kind. It is evident that not too much time had elapsed since the burials were first made.

The elimination of the original grave cuts, at the time the bodies and head were removed at the end of Period 3, meant that it was not possible to establish which came first, the building or the burials. However, the burials form a compact, perfectly aligned group that fits neatly within the footprint of the building. This suggests that the building was constructed specifically for the burials, and may be seen as a mausoleum.

Period 3 contains only dating evidence of the late 4th to early 5th century. The absence of artefacts to date 5th- and 6th-century levels is, however, notorious, so, while the most probable date for this period is 5th century, it could be 6th century or even later.

There is no way of knowing whether these 5th-century burials at St. Mary’s were Christian. Nevertheless, their careful disposition in a special building suggests high status, and hence implies that a sacred, dynastic place was being created which if it was not already a Christian site might
subsequently have been converted to one (cf. Bell 1998, 12). At the end of Period 3 the bodies from two graves were removed, together with the head from another. The bodies and the missing head might have been deliberately disinterred for re-interment and/or veneration in a new building after the original building was damaged or destroyed by fire.

After the backfill had compacted in the emptied graves of Period 3, there is little evidence for activity on the site, although the ruined north wall of the mausoleum was covered over and a large posthole was dug. This was all sealed by the construction and floor levels of the Period 4 building which was much bigger than its predecessor. Timber frames were set on drystone foundations. The interior was covered with a smooth floor of crushed stone and mortar, on which lay thin occupation layers. An east–west partition ran the length of the excavated area, dividing the northern part of the building from the central area. Outside the west wall of the building was a forecourt of laid stones, while to the west and south of the building lay burials.

No dating evidence was recovered from Period 4, and the building could, therefore, be of any date from the 6th to 9th centuries. However, the construction technique is similar to that used in later periods, especially Period 6, and a date in the 8th to 9th centuries is suggested. This would mean that the sequence of buildings, as they appear in this excavation, is not continuous, but the alternative — that the Period 4 building lasted for four centuries — is untenable. There must be a lacuna between Period 3 and Period 4, and yet continuity of alignment is maintained. This implies that there were other buildings, perhaps even Roman buildings, close by on the alignment of the mausoleum but outside the excavation area. It is perhaps pushing hypothesis too far to suggest that one such building could have housed the burials and head that were removed from the Period 3 mausoleum.

Period 5 contains what might be parts of three buildings. The main structure survived as an extensive, heavily burned surface. The walls of this building must have been built with no foundations, or in very shallow construction trenches, and have not survived. A deep robber trench might be part of a second building to the south, while a mortared stone foundation could be part of a third building, perhaps a free-standing bell tower, to the north west of the main structure. These buildings could have stood at the same time during the 9th to 10th centuries. The destruction of the main structure is probably late 9th or 10th century.

The structure of Period 6 can be interpreted, with some confidence, as the nave of an Anglo-Saxon church. It appears to occupy roughly the same space as the medieval nave and had accompanying burials. It also had a cross trench, F201, in the nave which looks very like a screen. This building may have lasted, judging by the burials, for 100–150 years, perhaps through the 10th to the 11th century.

In Period 7 a western annex was added to the church. This was probably the same height as the nave. As the foundations probably did not support a tower, they were perhaps intended to carry a first-floor gallery or chapel. The circular structure F230 was surely a font or the platform on which a font stood. There would, presumably, have been a stone or plaster surface above the rubble packing, which must have been destroyed when the structure was robbed. The font was ultimately replaced by a much smaller font further to the west (see Period 13). Period 7 seems, on finds evidence, to belong to the late 11th century.

The site for the Period 3, 5th-century, mausoleum may have been chosen because it was part of an urban estate or had a religious tradition (a pagan temple or a bath house adapted to religious use), or just because it was a long-deserted space surrounded by ruined Roman walls. There was continuity, betrayed by the persistence of alignment, between the mausoleum and the later structural sequence. From Period 4 onwards, the buildings were associated with burials outside the west wall. These buildings surely represent a sequence of churches that culminates in the medieval church of St. Mary de Lode.
Medieval and Post-Medieval Structures

Period 8 (Fig. 17)
The north wall of the nave was represented by a wall foundation, F133 (Figs. 18 and 19). A foundation of similar width, F32, extensively robbed by F40 in Period 11, was found on the south side of the nave. F133 sealed the robbing trench F193 of the Period 6 wall F228 and was butt-jointed against the Period 7 western annex wall F197. It was 1.5 m wide, built of coursed stones in sandy mortar, and became deeper towards the east, reaching nearly 1 m (Fig. 19). The southern wall foundation F32 also became deeper towards the east, although it was shallower than F133 because for much of its length it rested partly on the remains of the Period 6 south wall F33/F35.

Immediately to the south of wall F32/F30 lay a burial B17 (a child) and a cut filled with dark brown/black loam that may be a second grave, II (75). Areas of orange mortar ‘floor’ skimmed with white mortar, III (10), and fragments of floor make-up, IV (115) and (139), survive.

Continuous foundations of such depth and breadth as F133 and F32 were presumably built to carry solid walls which were only later, in Period 9, pierced by arcades. The reason for the greater depth of the eastern sections of the foundations is unknown, but it may be an indication of
Fig. 18. Trench IV looking west, with the top layer of foundation F133 in the foreground.
Fig. 19. Foundation F133 (partly excavated) looking west and showing the ‘compartmentalised’ lower foundations.
unstable ground. The eastern part of the nearby minster of St. Oswald was built on a deposit of sand (Heighway and Bryant 1999, 48): excavations under St. Mary’s Gate in 1916 encountered ‘a bed of running sand 5 ft deep’ (Heighway 1999, record no. 4).

The Period 8 church thus seems to have consisted of an aisleless nave which continued apparently without internal division into the retained Period 7 western annex. This church probably had a small chancel, about the same size in plan as the later tower. None of the finds recovered from the period offer close dating. Since it follows the 11th-century Period 7, an early 12th-century date seems likely.

**Period 9** (Fig. 20)

From Period 9 onwards, elements of the developing medieval church survive in the standing fabric of the chancel, crossing and tower. However, at no point was it possible to link physically the excavated detail in the nave with the surviving medieval fabric. The evidence for Period 9 suggests a 12th-century church with nave, north and south aisles, and tower-chancel in chevron-decorated Romanesque style. The tower probably fell shortly after it was constructed and was quickly rebuilt.

---

Fig. 20. Period 9. The north wall of the north aisle, F242, was recorded under the present north wall during excavations in Trench I. Evidence for the strip buttresses and doorway at the west end is taken from a medal of 1797 (see below, Fig. 21). There is no specific evidence for the corner buttresses at the west end, but they were a common feature of buildings in this period. The Period 9 tower of St. Mary’s is heavily buttressed, and the chancel probably also had corner buttresses.
The west door

The west door was described in the early 19th century as ‘decorated with zigzag and billeted mouldings’ (Appendix, no. 2); it is also illustrated on a medal of 1797 (Fig. 21). The excavations indicated that the Period 7 annex was still in existence in Period 8, so this 12th-century door must have been inserted into the pre-existing west annex wall. Two strip buttresses are also shown in 1797.

The tower and chancel

A tower was built between the nave and chancel. The arch in the west wall of the tower (Fig. 22) has chevron-decorated voussoirs and scalloped respond capitals (much restored in the 19th and 20th centuries). The outer order was originally carried on angle shafts, which are now missing. The north and west walls of the tower are built of coursed, well-cut, large ashlars up to first-floor level. In the north wall is what appears to be a cut-back string course, 2.1 m from the present ground level, at the level of the arch abacus, as well as the east jamb and two voussoirs of a 12th-century window.

The east and south walls of the tower are markedly different. They are much more irregular both in coursing and in the type of stone used; they appear to be contemporary with the chancel arch. This arch is decorated with a single, heavy roll moulding and the capitals of the respond shafts are typical of Romanesque work of the last quarter of the 12th century (Richard Gem pers. comm.). A reasonable explanation for the difference between the east/south and the west/north walls is that the tower fell and was rebuilt, with the north and west walls of the old tower.
Fig. 22. Elevation of east wall of nave and west face of tower. The chancel arch was drawn by Richard Bryant in 1979, together with its relationship to the present ceiling. The tower is drawn from a measured sketch made by Richard Bryant in 1979 with some details added from a drawing by Astam Design partnership of July 1968. The main features from the excavation and the profiles of the pew-cavity walls have been projected onto the elevation to relate the above and below ground evidence.
incorporated into the new structure up to first-floor level. It is likely that the chancel would have been badly damaged by the falling tower, and the Romanesque work that remains in the first bay of the chancel is presumably contemporary with the rebuilt tower.

The external elevations of the tower
The tower has shallow clasping buttresses on each corner. A single 12th-century window survives, with later fenestration, in the north face at ground-floor level (this window also survives on the inner face of this wall, see above). At first-stage level, a small 12th-century lancet survives in the north face and a larger 12th-century window in the south face. There are 12th-century belfry windows, infilled with later louvered lancets, in each face of the top stage. Very large buttresses support the lower stage of the north-east and south-east corners. A smaller buttress in the north-west corner is now partly encased by the east wall of the 1826 north aisle. There is a staircase turret in the south-west corner.

The north and south elevations, as with the internal ones, are different from one another. The north face rises without offsets to parapet height, while the south face is set on a chamfered plinth (c. 1.00 m high and 120 mm deep) and has two 150-mm offsets (one at c. 7.00 m and the other at c. 10.00 m above present ground level). The west elevation bears the scar of the Period 9 nave roofline above the present roof (Fig. 22). The tower carries an open-work parapet with pinnacles at each corner. These are probably late 14th century or 15th century in date.

The excavated evidence
The north aisle wall (F242) was excavated in Trench I under the 1826 wall.

Two large pits, F178 and F179, were cut into the top of the continuous foundation F133 in the north-east of Trench IV and a dense scatter of stakeholes and postholes was cut into the mortar floors of Period 8 further west. These are probably the result of scaffolding and building work associated with the insertion of the new arcade.

The postholes and stakeholes were sealed by fine grey-brown layers, IV (92), (96) and (148), which are probably floors and which contained pottery and finds of the 12th to 13th centuries. The finds included a coin of 1247–79, which presumably derives from the latest floor use. The surface of the ‘floors’ was heavily burned.

The arcades
Descriptions before 1826 show that the nave was, for most of its length, flanked by a Romanesque arcade on both the north and south sides. A description of the early 1800s suggests a north arcade with semicircular arches and a south arcade with pointed arches (Appendix, no. 2); an accompanying sketch (Fig. 23) shows a two- or three-ordered arch set on a scalloped capital on a circular pier. The voussoirs of the arch are chevron ornamented, and the hood-moulding is decorated with billet carving. A water-colour drawing of 1806 of the nave from inside the chancel arch shows a row of three round columns with arches decorated with chevron (Fig. 24). During the excavations chevron voussoirs and sections of plain hood-moulding were recovered from the 1826 pew-cavity walls, together with segments of circular piers (Figs. 39 and 40). Large disturbed areas around the 1826 pier bases indicate the robbed position of the 12th-century piers. Those piers were c. 0.8 m in diameter (based upon the circumference of the recovered pier stones and the Period 10 capital: Fig. 41, no. 29) and spaced at 4.2 m centre to centre. An arch reconstructed from the recovered voussoirs would fit these dimensions, while the voussoirs themselves came from two- or three-ordered arches with hood-moulding.
Period 10 (Fig. 25)
On both the north and south sides of the nave, immediately to the west of the ends of the Period 8 foundations, were large square foundations of coursed stones in mortar and rammed earth, F36 and F134. The mortar of both was deep orange in colour. It was not possible to excavate below F36 because one of the present piers (F1) stands upon it, but F134 was set on top of the
Fig. 24. View of the nave of St. Mary de Lode church looking north-west through the chancel arch, in James Ross, *Ecclesiastical and Monumental Antiquities of Gloucester and of Tewksbury Abbey* (1806): a bound volume of sepia drawings of Gloucester and Tewkesbury, in Gloucester Library.
foundation for the western annex of Periods 7 and 8. This suggests that at least part of the annex was demolished. Re-used in the foundation of the 1826 pier F1 was a complete, circular capital for a pier of 0.8 m diameter (Fig. 41, no. 29). The capital had a simple 13th-century moulding and was presumably carved to fit a pier of the same dimensions as the Period 9 piers in the rest of the arcade.

Early 19th-century accounts of the church, although conflicting as to their position, all agree in describing pointed arches in the nave arcade as well as semicircular ones (Appendix, nos. 1 and 2: Rudge, pointed arches at east end of north aisle; George May, pointed arches in the south aisle). It seems likely, therefore, that the foundations F36 and F134 were the pier bases of a single western bay added to the arcade in the 13th century, when the north and south aisles were extended to the west. The walls of the old west annex would have been cut back to accommodate the new arches. This hypothesis is not borne out by the 1806 painting (Fig. 24) which shows four arches, all semicircular. However, other aspects of this illustration are known to be incorrect, such as the floor levels and the detailing of the chevron decoration on the arches.

At about the same time the chancel was extended east by one bay with quadripartite vault ribs supported by foliate capitals on clustered wall shafts. Two corbels support the vaulting ribs where they meet the east wall, but these are obviously re-used from another context and may even date to the extensive restorations of the 19th and 20th centuries.

A dense scatter of post and stake holes probably derives from the alterations to the nave arcade. Immediately to the east and south of F134 lie F138, F143, F150–8, F160–75 and further east lie F142, F144–6, F148. The more westerly group of features is sealed by make-up and patching lay-
ers that also seal foundation F134: IV (83), (231) and (232). These layers are in turn cut by post-holes F139, F141, F176, F177. The last two may be for centring scaffolding. Occupation layers were also found in Trench III (6–9), (11) and (34) (Fig. 29, Section 5).

The Period 10 layers cover floors of Period 9, one of which contained a coin of 1247–79, indicating that the ‘orange mortar foundations’ of Period 10 date to the late 13th century.

**Period 11**

Period 11 was assigned to activity observed on the south side of the nave, associated with the robbing of the Period 8 foundations between the piers of the southern arcade and the possible rebuilding of the arcade.

Period 8 foundation F32 was completely robbed out from a point c. 1 m to the west of the east end of Trenches II and III. The robber trench, F 40, was backfilled with alternate layers of mortar and crushed stone and compacted loam (36–8). Various postholes and two possible graves, F34 and F46, were assigned to this period. A large pit, F50, is probably a western extension of the robber trench. In it were eight architectural fragments including two fragments of volutes (Fig. 41, nos. 19 and 21) and painted and plastered pieces (nos. 22, 24, and 25). A third volute

---

**Fig. 26.** Later development. The small, Period 13 font soakaway is shown near the west door. The plan of the rebuilt south aisle south wall is based on Bonner’s illustration of 1796 (see below, Fig. 27), which shows a shallow staircase ‘turret’ built presumably to give access to a gallery over the south aisle.
with grape clusters (no. 20) belongs to this group, although unstratified. Fourteenth-century floor tiles were recovered from various contexts.

**Period 12**
The nave area yielded many late medieval and post-medieval finds from a sequence of thin deposits of fine grey-black silt, interleaved with mortar spreads. Since this area of the town was subject to serious flooding until comparatively recently, these silts may represent flooding deposits. Part at least of this sequence seals the Period 11 robbing of the Period 8 foundations.

**Period 13** (Fig. 26)
One of the last floors, IV (101), in a sequence which continues from Period 12 contains a coin of 1636–44. The group of layers containing this coin seals the robbing-pit F140 of the font F230. Just to the north of the central axis of the nave, c. 4 m from the west door, was a drystone font soakaway, F94. It appears that the old font was demolished c. 1644 and a new one constructed. In the north half of the nave were three brick cists, probably of 18th-century date.

The pictorial evidence (Figs. 21, 27 and 28) shows that the south wall of the south aisle had been rebuilt by 1797 with what appears to be a stair turret and a flat roof. The rain water from the flat roof exited through a parapet on the west façade into a down-pipe. The building of the stair turret and the raising of the roof were presumably to accommodate and provide access to a gallery in the south aisle. A gallery is recorded in the early 19th century (Herbert 1988, 304–5).

**Period 14**
By 1825 the nave of the church was in a state of serious disrepair and the decision was taken to demolish and rebuild it. The tower and chancel were not affected by this scheme. The present nave was completed in 1826. Its centre is 0.7 m to the south of the centre of the chancel arch (cf. Fig. 22). This can be explained if the new nave utilised the line of the foundations of the pre-1826 aisles. On the north side these foundations would have been those of the 12th century, on the south those of the Period 13 alterations. The result was a shift of the axis of the new structure to the south. The present spindly octagonal piers appear to respect almost exactly the spacing of the medieval piers so that one can visualise the internal dimensions of the medieval church.

**Period 15**
Some building levels and occupation levels can be associated with the post-1826 church.

*Discussion*
The excavation had very little to add to the known history of the late medieval and post-medieval church, and because the medieval nave has been demolished, heavy reliance has had to be placed on illustrations which may not always be reliable. The evidence from the standing building cannot easily be related to the buried evidence. The archaeology includes a sequence of deposits, of pale mortar interleaved with black, which represent an unknown period of time and are impossible to date. It is not easy to establish in this sequence where the late medieval/post-medieval divide might come. This is evident for instance in the pottery report, see Table 3. It is possible that some of the layers result from flooding deposits. One incident which might have left traces in the archaeology was the billeting of Royalist prisoners in 1643 and 1646. It is interesting to notice among the clay tobacco pipes from 19th-century contexts a group of nine dating to 1640–60, which might have got into the church during the Civil War episode.
Fig. 27. Thomas Bonnor’s view of the church from the south-east, in *Perspective Itinerary of England*, part 1 (London 1796). The plate was reproduced in *Gentlemen’s Magazine* 1826, ii, facing p. 513.

Fig. 28. Print from Thomas Rudge, *History and Antiquities of Gloucester* (1811), p. 327.
Fig. 31. Sections 7, 8, 8A, 16, 17 (Trenches II and III).
Fig. 32. Sections 24, 25, 26 (Trench IV).
Fig. 33. Sections 22, 27, 30 (Trench IV).
Fig. 34. Sections 23, 25A, 28A and 28B (Trench IV), 3 (Trench I)
### Roman Coins by John F. Rhodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date A.D.</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>268–70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2b</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350s?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2b</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350s?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379–95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2a</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Residual; missing 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388–95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>In context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388–95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>Worn, therefore possibly in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395–402</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2b</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>Residual; missing 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th century</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th century</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th century</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2b</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>Residual; missing 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th century</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2b</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Residual; missing 1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Medieval and Post-Medieval Coins by John F. Rhodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Context date</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1205–47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>late medieval</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Current in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247–79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>late 12th–13th century</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>In context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248–50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>late medieval</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Current in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279–84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>late medieval</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Current in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307–27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>late medieval</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Current in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344–51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>late medieval</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Current in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272–</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>late 17th century onwards</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625–34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>mid 17th century onwards</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Possibly in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636–44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>mid 17th century onwards</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>In context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695–98</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Intrusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The medieval coins are potentially in context. The older coins in phase 13.6 could still be current — the parishioners may have preferred to pass old coins as oblations.
**POST-MEDIEVAL TOKENS**

**Jeton of Hans Schultes I, Nuremberg (Mitchiner 1351)**
- **Date Period Phase Context date SF Comments**
  - 1553–84 13 14.2 floors, mid 17th century onwards Current in context

**Ditto (Mitchiner 1375 var.)**
- 1553–84 13 14.2 floors, mid 17th century onwards Current in context

**Ditto (Mitchiner 1344 var.)**
- 1553–84 14 15 building of 1826 nave Residual

**Jeton of Wolf Lauffer II, Nuremberg (Mitchiner 1709 var.)**
- 1612–51 14 15 building of 1826 nave Residual

**Bristol farthing token (Williamson and Boyne 19)**
- 1662 13 14.12 17th to late 18th century In context

The 16th-century jetons SF14 and SF25 in phase 14.2 were probably still in use in the 17th century.

**LEAD/TIN TOKENS** (Fig. 35) by Geoff Egan

Note: in descriptions // = other face; diameters given for irregular items are the greatest ones.

1. Irregular flan, incomplete, diameter 17 mm; five circle-and-pellet motifs (doublestruck in part) // double stranded cross (cf. long cross of coinage) with further radial lines in three of the angles (doubled in one instance). SF294, IV (128), Period 7, 11th-century context.

2. Blank, sub-round flan, diameter c. 13 mm, with irregular outline and of uneven thickness (holed at thin point); slight, parallel ridging transversely suggests this was made by rolling flat a waste droplet or other fragment. SF336, IV (128), Period 7, 11th-century context.

3. Irregular flan, diameter 17 mm; devices weakly registered: cross potent with pellets in angles, all in (?) circle of heading // (?) two circles with extensions flanking lanceolate form — together possibly a crude animal’s head (cf. leopard) with the tongue out, having a legend around. SF250, IV (119), Period 7, 11th-century context.

This could perhaps, to an unobservant contemporary, have passed as a worn medieval penny or a base foreign coin (legends are most unusual on tokens until the very end of the medieval period), but it is more likely to have been simply a locally-produced token that has no ready parallel.

These three tokens, all assigned to the late 11th-century Period 7, are very early examples of their type. Although superficially similar, they seem to be quite diverse in their methods of production. No. 3 was apparently cast, like the great majority of such objects recorded from the medieval period (Mitchiner and Skinner 1983). By contrast nos. 1 and 2 (both from the same context) seem to have been produced by the labour-intensive and low-technological method of rolling a small roundel, which in the case of no. 1 was then apparently struck with the devices noted.

The site stratigraphy aside, confirmatory dating for these tokens is difficult because none is from widely-known, readily-defined series. No. 3 might, if found out of context, be assigned tentatively from its broad border to the late medieval period, though the inspiration of its design could be among somewhat earlier coinage. No precise parallel has been traced. So far, the only items noted that come at all close to nos. 1 and 2 are among a series of broadly similar roundels recovered from a couple of sites in the City of London (BUF90 and GYE92). These London finds begin to give a broader context for all three present items. At both London sites tens of similarly rough roundels, of about the same size as nos. 1 and 2 and mainly lacking obvious devices (a minority bear the imprints of textiles of different grades), came from deposits assigned to a span
from the 11th century to the mid 12th century and possibly even earlier (Egan forthcoming; over 90 of these finds are from deposits that appear to predate 1150). An isolated find such as no. 2 may be subcircular simply by chance. However, the large numbers of such items now evident from the (?) late Saxon/early Norman Period in London cumulatively point to a specific
phenomenon. At present they are most easily interpreted as the earliest known form of base-
metal tokens (it is possible that, if differentiation was required, the roundels lacking relief devices
may originally have been coloured with pigments). If this is accepted, the present small group is
more readily taken to show that, outside the capital also, lead/tin tokens go back at least into the
century before the one in which they were previously thought to begin — whatever their specific
purpose at this early date. The ecclesiastical context of the present three finds perhaps provides

THE POTTERY by Caroline Ireland

The quantity of pottery recovered from the site was small (246 sherds) and is summarized in
Tables 2–4. Each sherd was allocated a Type Fabric (TF) number, using the pottery classification
system of the Gloucester Museum Excavation Unit, to which reference should be made for full
details (Ireland 1983, 113; Vince 1983, 141). The fabrics are arranged in a broad chronological
sequence, based on the evidence for the date-ranges of fabric types from other sites in the city.
When sherd counts for each fabric are plotted against the site phasing the pattern of pottery
supply becomes visible despite the small quantities involved; residual and intrusive material can
be identified. The majority of intrusive sherds derives from the Period 6 levels, which were
sieved, and mostly consists of very tiny sherds of 11th- to 12th-century date (TF 41B, TF 131).

The Roman pottery (Table 2)

Roman pottery formed just over 35% of the total assemblage (based on sherd counts) and about
half was stratified. Types current in the late 1st to early 2nd centuries formed just over 15% of
the Roman assemblage. Relatively little material can be attributed to the 2nd and 3rd centuries,
and by far the largest group of pottery belongs to the late Roman period. Only a small propor-
tion of this late Roman material was stratified. The table presents the pottery fabrics in order of
use-date; for some fabrics additional information on the site assemblage is given below.

TF 4 (BB1) Dorset Black-burnished ware
Most of the 13 sherds probably belong to the late 3rd to mid 4th century. A single dish or bowl sherd came
from the destruction of the Period 2 building; it is probably 2nd century in date.

TF 5 Late micaceous grey ware
This fabric is present in Gloucester from the 3rd century, but is a common component of assemblages in
the 4th century. Most of the 14 sherds belonged to jars or flagons with zones of burnished decoration.

TF 9X Oxfordshire red colour-coated mortarium
A rim of Young (1977) form C97 was found.

TF 11B Severn Valley wares
These products are present in Gloucester from the early 2nd century and continue to be common until the
late 4th. Most of the eighteen sherds were undiagnostic body sherds which could belong anywhere between
these dates.

TF 12A Oxfordshire colour-coated wares
Six of the eight sherds belonged to rouletted beakers. It is possible that some of these are a local colour-
coated ware (TF 12D), but the small size of the sherds makes identification difficult. Of two bowl fragments,
one, from Period 6, is probably Young (1977) form C78, the other from Period 3 is probably form C79 and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type fabric</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>11A</th>
<th>11B</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>12A</th>
<th>9X</th>
<th>9W</th>
<th>12B</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>212</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White-slipped wares (Rawes 1972)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micaceous grey wares (Rawes 1972)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Severn Valley wares (Webster 1976)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal-tempered ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1st-century coarse ware (Goudge 1982)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samian ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset BB1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late micaceous grey ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire white ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire white slip mortaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire red colour-coated mortaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire white colour-coated mortaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late micaceous grey ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire parchment ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell-tempered ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nene Valley colour-coated ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire red colour-coated mortaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous sandy wares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Roman pottery.
can be compared to the bowls from the Horizon 14 group excavated at Gloucester's new market hall in 1966–7 (Hassall and Rhodes 1974, 86–9).

**TF 12B Nene Valley colour-coated ware**
There was one rim with grooved lip from a tall jar in a white fabric with metallic brown slip (Howe, Perrin and Mackreth 1980, fig. 6, 70).

**TF 1 Oxfordshire Parchment ware**
There was a base of a form P24 from Period 7.

**TF 22 East Midland shell-tempered ware**
Fourteen sherds came mainly from hook-rim jars; there was a single plain-rim bowl. These products were reaching Gloucester by the mid 4th century, and are a common feature of late 4th- and early 5th-century groups.

**TF 212 Alice Holt ware**
The excavation produced a burnished jar sherd possibly in this fabric from Period 3.

**TF 20 Miscellaneous sand-tempered wares**
From Period 3:

a) a sherd of a wheel-thrown jar with reduced inner surface and oxidised brownish red burnished exterior. The fabric is sandy in texture with scattered white sandstone or limestone inclusions.

b) a sherd from a handmade jar, reduced dark brown to black, with a slight burnish on the exterior. The fabric is fine and slightly ‘soapy’, tempered with grains of polished clear and milky quartz, sub-angular sandstone up to 1 mm and scattered quartz sand grains with some black iron ore and occasional organic inclusion.

c) a base fragment from a handmade cooking vessel with ill-defined basal area. The fabric is reduced in places to dark brown and is fine textured with white mica. It is tempered with a sand of angular and sub-angular grains of quartz and sandstone mainly up to 1 mm, but with a large sandstone inclusion 5 mm in diameter. The interior of the vessel shows some burnish. There is a possibility that this sherd represents a post-Roman or ‘sub-Roman’ vessel.

From Period 4:

a small sherd from a black sandy vessel, possibly TF 4; similar sherds from Periods 5 and 6.

From Period 6:

a) rim from a wheel-thrown jar in an oxidised sandy orange fabric tempered with coarse angular fragments of milky and clear quartz.

b) sherd from a wheel-thrown jar in a reduced sandy fabric, possibly TF 39.

c) two neck sherds from the same wheel-thrown vessel in a reduced sand-tempered fabric with scattered black iron-ore inclusions up to 2 mm long.

**The medieval pottery** (Table 3)
Almost all the pottery from the post-Roman Period 3 and 4 buildings and the Period 6 building comprised late Roman types. It is possible that some of the sherds from these levels classified above as miscellaneous (TF 20) may be post-Roman, since they cannot be paralleled with other late Roman material with any certainty.

Evidence from sites in the city, particularly street sequences, suggests that Gloucester Late Saxon ware (TF 41A) is superseded by Gloucester Early Medieval ware (TF 41B) in the mid 11th century (Vince 1983). TF 41A is present from the late 10th century and is generally indicative of late Anglo-Saxon occupation in the city. Occurrences of small sherds of TF 41B in Periods 5 and 6 are probably intrusive, but the fabric is common from Periods 7 to 9. There are few fabrics
which are characteristically 12th to 13th century in date. In Period 10, types characteristic of the period between the late 13th and late 15th century are present. These types continue until the end of Period 12, when a single sherd of a brown glazed cup (TF 60) may indicate an early 16th-century date, although such a tiny sherd may be intrusive.

Table 3. Medieval pottery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period Phase</th>
<th>Type fabric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Burning layers (5.3)</td>
<td>41A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Occupation (6.2a)</td>
<td>41A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burials (6.3)</td>
<td>41A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Western annex (7.1)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation (7.2a)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation, font (7.2b)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F195 (7.3)</td>
<td>52TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbing of W wall (7.5)</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Burials (8.2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition (8.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 N arcade (9.1a)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation (9.2)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Occupation (11.2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postholes (11.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postholes (11.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial (11.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Robbing of S wall (12.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Floors (13.5a)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floors (13.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 onwards</td>
<td>2 1 1 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 33 2 3 1 1 1 2 2 6 1 1 53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = intrusive
TF 41B Gloucester Early Medieval ware
The majority of the sherds were very small and were probably from cooking pots. A few vessels may be wheel-thrown, but most are handmade and include a single club-rim vessel from Period 7. A possible spouted pitcher sherd with wavy combed decoration occurred in Period 9. A wheel-finished club-rim vessel was present in the Period 6 burials, but is probably intrusive.

TF 43 Sand and limestone-tempered ware
Two sherds from handmade cooking pots.

TF 131 Hereford fabric A2
A sherd of a lead-glazed pitcher.

TF 40 Malvernian cooking pots
These occur from the early 12th century. Only three handmade cooking pot sherds were recovered.

TF 52TP Malvernian tripod pitchers
A 12th-century rim with wavy line decoration on the rim top came from Period 13.

TF 90 Worcester jugs
These are present in Gloucester from the early 13th century. Two vessels, a jug and a cooking pot, occurred as residual material.

TF 44 Minety wares
Two sherds of wheel-thrown jugs, which occur from the late 13th to late 15th centuries, came from Periods 10 and 13.

TF 52 Malvernian glazed wares
These products were present from Period 12, but it is clear from the types of jugs represented that some of the material could be residual late 13th century. Most of the sherds recovered were from jugs. A rim from an internally glazed wheel-thrown cooking pot was present in Period 12 and a small bowl rim came from Period 13.

The post-medieval pottery (Table 4)
Period 13 produced a group of sherds which represent pottery types datable from the early 17th century. From the brick-lined graves and subsequent contexts fabrics of 18th- to 19th-century date are present, with a high proportion of Staffordshire wares and/or Bristol wares.

TF 52 Malvernian glazed wares
A rim from a bowl came from Period 13.

TF 54 Herefordshire border wares
Seven sherds came from internally glazed bowls.

TF 55 Buff-bodied ware
There were two bowl rims.

TF 58 Buff-bodied hollow wares
A single sherd from an enclosed vessel had white slip decoration on the exterior.

TF 61 Staffordshire black glazed ware
A cup sherd came from Period 14.
Table 4. Post-medieval pottery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Fabric</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fabrics</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Robbing of Norman wall (3.4)</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassett ware</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Floors (3.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave alterations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Floors (3.10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction levels</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Floors (4.2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick lined graves</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(4.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction spreads</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(4.9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826 rebuilding</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Floors (4.12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th–20th century</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1826 rebuilding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th–20th century</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1826 rebuilding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1826 rebuilding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 21711112235213132 2 9 56129 9 0 |
**TF 62 Tin-glazed ware**
A footring base of a decorative plate had a hole for ornamental suspension.

**TF 66 Porcelain**
A probable Chinese import came from Period 13 and two plain cup sherds from Periods 14 and 15.

**TF 67 Staffordshire white salt-glazed stoneware**
A thin bowl or cup rim was from Period 13, a bowl rim from Period 14 and a base from Period 15.

**TF 68A Raeren stoneware**
A handle was from a globular drinking pot.

**TF 69 Cream wares**
The 29 sherds were mainly from plates.

**TF 70 North Devon gravel-tempered ware**
The two sherds were from bowls, one with an underglaze white slip.

---

**MEDIEVAL FLOOR TILES by Alan Vince**

The excavations produced floor tiles of two types, summarized in Table 5.

*Printed sand-tempered ‘Droitwich-type’ tiles (TF 86)*  
Twenty-two pieces or fragments were found. They came from tiles between c. 12.0 and 15.6 cm square, although three were from tiles that had been scored into smaller pieces for use as borders; one was divided into four making a square tile of side 6.0 cm, one into six making a rectangular tile 6.0 by 4.0 cm and one into 18 triangular tiles made from squares of side 4.0 cm. The tiles varied in thickness between 22 and 35 mm. Most were extremely worn but five could be seen to have been plain lead-glazed tiles, one of the small border tiles was covered with white slip and five had inlaid or printed slip patterns. In all but two instances the designs were indecipherable. In the two where the designs could be seen they were tiles with the Beauchamp Arms, a common design. An example from a different stamp came from St. Oswalds Priory (Vince 1999, p. 115, no. 27).

*Thornbury Castle type tiles (TF 87)*  
Two fragments came from very large tiles, one c. 20 cm square and both 26 mm thick. Both were inlaid although only one stamp was well-preserved. This design, based on a coat of arms, is possibly the same as one found at Blackfriars, Gloucester, and dated by Dr. L. Keen to 1510 A.D. or later. Another example of the same stamp came from the excavations at 13–17 Berkeley Street in 1969–70 (unpublished). Despite the similarity of the tile fabric neither tile could be from the Thornbury Castle tile series, which is composed of smaller tiles. The tiles are, however, similar in their method of manufacture and in the poor quality of the stamp design.

*Date*
The small border tiles are probably 14th century since their use seems to have been eclipsed by the use of alternating plain and decorated tiles of full size during the late 14th to 15th century. A 14th- to 15th-century date is likely for most of the remainder of the TF 86 tiles. The 15.6 cm square tiles are unusual in this fabric although this is the standard size for Malvern Chase and...
Bredon-type (TF 115) tiles in the 14th century. The TF 87 tiles are presumably early 16th century in date.

CLAY TOBACCO PIPES (Fig. 36) by Allan Peacey

The excavation yielded 133 fragments of clay tobacco pipe. Of these there are 110 stem fragments, 4 mouthpiece fragments, 7 bowl fragments and 12 bowls. As both bowl mouth and heel/spur are required to accurately type a bowl, anything less has been counted as a fragment. No contexts produced sufficient material to warrant any statistical analysis; stem bore data has not been recorded. It has been noted however that whereas the pipe bowls without exception date before 1730 much of the stem material is from a later period.

Four of the stem fragments are marked. No. 13 with two lines ending RD and WS is probably the work of Richard Mathews of Gloucester who died in 1800. A similar partial stamp beginning RI and MA has been recorded from Stroud (Peacey 1979, 54). Three examples have a quatrefoil stamp on the stem (no. 9). The stamps are in the form of a quartered diamond with each quarter having three lobes. They were recovered from floor levels of the post-medieval, pre-1826 church, with two from contexts associated with the 1826 church. One has a part of a round heel which

---

**Table 5. Medieval floor tiles.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Context date</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Border tiles</th>
<th>12.0–13.5 cm</th>
<th>15.5 cm</th>
<th>Fragments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.5a</td>
<td>Late medieval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15th to 16th</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>17th to 18th</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17th to 18th</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 1826</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>modern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>17th to 18th</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bredon-type (TF 115) tiles in the 14th century. The TF 87 tiles are presumably early 16th century in date.

appears to have borne an impressed mark. This type of mark has been recorded from a number of sites in combination with the impressed initial heel marks TI and TM (Peacey 1979, 73). They date to the mid 17th century and have a distribution which favours Gloucester, or somewhere near by, as their origin.

Only one of the bowls, no. 4 from a 20th-century context, has a mark. The stamp, impressed on the heel, is roughly circular and made up of four depressed areas with two raised circular pellets. It is set out in a manner suggesting a debased heraldic design. This stamp has not previously been recorded. The pipe is dated by its bowl form to the period 1630–60.

One other bowl, no. 10, is worthy of special mention. It came from a brick-lined grave of the post medieval, pre-1826, church. It is of a form not commonly recorded in Gloucester. There is no reflex on either the forward profile or the backward profile as they close into the bowl mouth. This is a feature of Hereford Types E, F and G (Peacey 1985, M8.A8) and may point towards the pipe’s origin. The bowl, dated 1650–80, is unusually upright for its period. This is possibly accidental rather than typical; variations of this kind have been found among kiln groups where pipes clearly from the same mould exhibit various anomalies including bowl angle deflection (Peacey 1996, 243).

The largest group of pipe material is from a layer associated with the post-1826 church. The 42 fragments all show clean, sharp, unabrasied breaks; all are consistently late in date and certainly later than 1750. A single fragment of blue transfer printed white-bodied china ware accompanied the group and it is quite possible that the pipes are of similar date, post 1800. All of the fragments are consistent with a long-stemmed form which remained in vogue into the 20th century.

Of the twelve pipe bowls recovered nine are of forms current in the period of civil unrest between 1640 and 60: three of the four marked stems also fit this period. It is possible that this reflects increased secular use of the building. It is known, for instance, that Royalist Welsh prisoners were locked up in the church for ten days in 1643. This alone could account for some of the material. The occurrence of unusual bowl forms and stamps would also be expected under these conditions.

MISCELLANEOUS SMALL FINDS

The small objects found total several hundred but very few of these are significant for the site history. The site archive (under accession code 5/78) includes a catalogue of all finds. They are held at Gloucester Museum, except for a few on display at St. Mary de Lode church. This report summarises the evidence, and catalogues and illustrates only items of significance (Fig. 37)

Bone
1. Decorated bone draught piece, diameter 34 mm, thickness 9 mm; probably of 17th- or 18th-century date. The design has a central recess, diameter 5 mm, surrounded by a six-petalled flower with a band of ring-and-dot decoration around the circumference. The published drawing is based on a measured sketch used on a poster advertising the Local History Symposium in 1978; the object is missing. SF27, phase 14.2, Period 13.

Copper alloy
A number (161) of spiral headed pins were found in layers of Periods 12, 13 and 14. They vary in diameter and in length from 19 to 375 mm.

2. Fragment of hemispherical hollow bead or stud, similar to SF242, diameter 6 mm, with hole pierced through centre of hemisphere. SF243, phase 8.1, Period 8.
Fig. 37. Small finds: (1) bone, (2–3, 6–10) copper alloy, (4) stone, (5) fired clay, (11) glass, (12) lead, and (13–14) iron.
3. Two small spherical studs, diameter c. 5.5 mm and 4.5 mm. The studs are made in two halves and seem to be designed to appear as half spheres on either side of a piece of cloth or leather. SF254, phase 7.2b, Period 7.
4. Bead in polished stone, diameter c. 7 mm. SF270, phase 7.2b, Period 7.
6. Small sub-rectangular hooked tag, maximum length 27 mm, pierced by two holes. SF293, phase 7.2b, Period 7.
7. Small tube of rolled bronze sheet, length 11.5 mm, decorated with three raised lozenges. Probably a lace tag. SF28, phase 7.1, Period 7.

Glass
Three glass beads are all from post-medieval contexts. There is one fragment of a lens from a pair of spectacles, SF42. There are also 26 fragments of window glass, some coloured: one fragment is illustrated here. Eighteen small fragments of vessel glass include several Roman pieces.

11. Fragment of circular or semicircular painted glass. The painting is in dark red-brown paint. The back of the glass is also painted, except for a narrow circular line, in a discoloured green-grey opaque paint. The glass is not quite flat, and has a pronounced texture on the ‘crown’ side. SF87, phase 15, Period 14.

Lead
This includes a collection of window lead and several scrap fragments. Lead tokens are dealt with above. The following report on a lead seal is provided by Geoff Egan.

12. Cast, damaged disc, diameter c. 37 mm; coronet over ‘A’, partially legible inscription around // ligature of letters PADV. Parallels show that this seal originally had a small loop for attachment at the top and that the full legend would have read HOLSTEINESCHES DRAT — i.e. ‘Holstein wire’. It is a trade seal for copper-alloy wire produced at a mill in Holstein (in today’s Northern Germany) and imported into England. The crowned ‘A’ presumably refers to the local potentate, who, like the significance of the ligature on the other side, remains obscure (enquiries to Schleswig Archaologische Landesamt have failed to elucidate these points). SF11, from building of 1826 church.

Holstein seals such as the present one are the commonest of this form among finds in this country (e.g. Museum of London ABO92 site acc. no. 1225 with finds mainly from the late 17th century onwards, Guildhall Museum Catalogue 1908, 320, no. 13; Bristol Museum acc. no. T1394). None has definitive close dating. See Egan 1995, 122–3 and fig. 46, nos. 351–2 for other German wire seals from Hamburg.

Iron
The iron objects are nearly all nails. Since each small-find number covers several objects, quantification is difficult, but 11 such grouped items are in Roman contexts and many of the further 30 items in Periods 3–6 are likely to be Roman in origin. The rest of the nails are likely to be from medieval and post-medieval coffins: these have not been studied in detail and a small selection only ‘X’-rayed.

Two early coffin fittings were found in burials. Similar fittings at St. Oswalds Priory dated to
the 10th–11th century (Heighway and Bryant 1999, 208–14). No. 13, from a burial of the 10th to 11th century, was probably in situ: no 14, found in a medieval burial, was probably residual.

13. Iron coffin fitting found beside Burial 12. The fitting is of the corner-bracket type. One arm is complete, 90 mm long, with circular or oval terminal. SF442, Period 6.

The later periods of the site produced post-medieval coffin fittings which have again not been studied in detail. In general there is not a great variety of material, and what there is is very similar to that at nearby St. Oswald’s Priory (Heighway and Boore 1999). Two brick cists, F70 and F80 (Fig. 25, Sections 24 and 25) containing burials B1 and B2/B3 of Period 13, contained loose (?) coffin handles of ‘fixed’ type (Heighway and Boore 1999, fig 5.37, no. 1). There are also plain loop handles of various sizes.

*Tile*

A collection of Roman tile from the destruction of the Period 2 Roman building and the leveling-up of Period 3 produced six tiles stamped RPG (*Rei Publicae Glevensium*). These were published along with an account of the Roman tilery nearby at St. Oswald’s Priory (Heighway and Parker 1982). These are listed here (Table 6) along with their reference in *RIB* ii, fascicule 5.

**Table 6.** Roman stamped tiles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stamp type</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>RIB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>IV 173</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2487.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>IV 200</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2487.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>IV 63</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2487.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>346, 362, IV 200, IV 215</td>
<td>3.1, 2.4</td>
<td>2486.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35</td>
<td>315, 337, IV 173</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2486.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C38</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>IV 216</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2486.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*STONE SCULPTURE* (Fig. 38) by Richard Bryant

1. Two joining fragments of an Anglo-Saxon cross shaft, with the remains of a carved beast head snout pointing down across a narrow, plain, horizontal border which divided this panel from a lower one. The beast head is very similar to the ‘salamanders’ on Face B of cross shaft 33 from St. Oswald’s Priory, although the pupils of the eyes are drilled (Heighway and Bryant, 1999, 160). The fragment is edged with a broad cable moulding. Mid 9th century. Fine-grained oolite. IV (109), SF233, Period 9.

2. Fragment of Anglo-Saxon cross shaft, with plain border. The broader surviving face carries irregular, median-incised interlace. There is a sharp, rather awkward angle in the interlace, below what is probably a horizontal border which divides this panel from one above. Too little of the other face survives to interpret the deeply carved, curving forms with confidence, but they could be parts of plant tendrils and spirals. Late 9th century? Fine-grained oolite. III (30), SF399, Period 9.

3. Lower part of a lion’s head carving, with evidence of burning. The tongue of the creature protrudes between rounded lips, drawn back into a rather vapid, toothless smile. The nostrils are lightly incised and set wide apart. A mane of coarse hair runs back from the lower lip and down across the chin. This is probably part of a corbel from the 12th-century church. Fine-grained oolite. IV (68), SF174, Period 13.
Fig. 38. Carved stone: (1) mid 9th-century cross shaft fragment; (2) late 9th-century cross shaft fragment; (3) part of a 12th-century lion-head corbel.
Fig. 39. Worked stone: (1–6) fragments of large Roman column or columns; (7–13) 12th-century voussoirs, drum column sections, hood-mouldings and scalloped capital fragments.
WORKED STONE (Figs. 39–42) by Richard Bryant

All the stone is oolitic limestone.

1. Large fragment of a Roman column found lying on the Roman floor, II (86), and against the face of wall F17, under Period 2 destruction debris and Period 3 make-up layers, II (42). Radius 470 mm, height 430 mm. SF420, Period 2.

2. Fragment of a Roman column. Radius 470 mm, height 140 mm. SF353, Period 4.

3. Small fragment of a Roman column. Radius 470 mm, height 190 mm. SF351, Period 4.

4. Two small joining fragments of a Roman column. Radius c. 470 mm, height 117 mm. SF316 and 317, Period 7.

5. Large fragment of a Roman column found in the bottom of the Period 8 foundation F133 where this cuts deeply into the Roman destruction layers. Radius 470 mm, height 130 mm. SF423, Period 8.


The fragments are all from a large column or columns that would have been between 7.5 and 9.5 m high. The scale is the same as columns from the town’s basilica and the possible temple north of Westgate Street (Hurst 1999b, 155–9; Heighway and Garrod 1980, 85, fig. 8). Four of the pieces retain evidence of at least one tooled jointing face, as well as fine-tooling on the curved surface. No. 4 has a finely-tooled jointing face, no. 3 has coarse-tooling on the jointing faces, and nos. 2 and 6 have course-tooling on the jointing face, with a finely-tooled circumference band 17 mm wide acting as a fine jointing surface between blocks.

7. Part of a scalloped capital. Surface burned and subsequently covered in whitewash or white plaster. 12th century. SF73, Period 14.

8. Part of a scalloped capital. Surface burned and subsequently covered in whitewash or white plaster. 12th century. SF72, Period 14.

9. 12th-century voussoir from the outer order of an arch. The face is decorated with chevron in the form of a heavy roll below a scalloped border. SF492, still in north wall of north aisle, framed for display.

10. Two stones from a 12th-century hood-moulding with concave chamfer below a narrow groove. The surface is burned. SF438 (420 mm wide, 360 mm deep), SF439 (450 mm wide, 290 mm deep), Period 14.

11. Section of drum column. The surface is burned and subsequently covered with whitewash or white plaster. There is a drilled hole in the curving surface of the stone. Radius 405 mm, height 250 mm. 12th century. SF431, Period 14.


13. 12th-century voussoir from the outer order of an arch. The face is decorated with chevron in the form of a heavy roll. Above the chevron is a scalloped border. The front half of the soffit face is burned and covered with whitewash or white plaster, as is the face of the stone. The rest of the soffit face is neither burned nor whitewashed/white plastered. This must indicate the degree by which the outer order projected from the inner order of the arch. SF491, Period 14.


17. 12th-century voussoir decorated with chevron in three heavy rolls separated by angled mouldings. The front of the soffit face is burned and covered with whitewash/white plaster, as is the face of the stone. The rest of the soffit face is neither burned nor whitewashed/white plastered. This must indicate the degree by which this order projected from the inner order of the arch. SF377, Period 14.

18. 12th-century voussoir decorated with chevron in three heavy rolls separated by angled mouldings. The
Fig. 40. Worked stone: (14–18) 12th-century voussoirs.
Fig. 41. Worked stone: (19–28) 13th-century fragments; (29) 13th-century capital re-used upside down in Period 14 pier foundation; (30) part of a 13th-century statue niche, a tomb or a reredos which still bears traces of brown paint; (31–4) sections of 13th–14th-century string course.
The voussoirs 9, 13, 14–18 almost certainly come from the Period 9 nave arcade that was demolished in 1825. No. 10 shows the profile of two sections of hood-moulding probably from the same arcade. Nos. 7 and 8 are fragments of scalloped capitals, while nos. 11 and 12 are sections of drum columns. Most of these stones were re-used in the 1826 pew-cavity walls.

20. Fragment from the corner of a small ‘crocket’ capital with two volutes above a cluster of grapes. Late 13th or 14th century. SF422, unstratified.
22. Fragment of a volute below a chamfered abacus moulding. Whitewashed or plastered white. SF400, Period 11.
23. Fragment of a curved capital with a deep ‘V’-shaped groove above what is probably the position of a volute that has been smashed off, leaving a circular scar. Whitewashed or plastered white. SF4, Period 14.
24. Fragment of ribbed, curved capital. Whitewashed or plastered white. SF398, Period 11.
25. Small fragment of chamfered moulding similar to that of the abacus on no. 22 (above). Whitewashed or plastered white. SF401, Period 11.
26. Two joining fragments from the base of a large, ribbed circular capital. The ribs have alternate semicircular and triangular profiles. SF274 and 275, Period 13.
27. Fragment of a 13th-century moulding. Probably part of same stone as no. 29 (below). SF381, Period 14.
29. 13th-century circular capital with a shallow, inverted-bell profile above a simple roll. This would fit a column of c. 400 mm radius (0.80 m diameter) which is similar to two drum column stones from the site (nos. 11 and 12 above). The capital was re-used as part of the foundations for the Period 14 pier F1. SF487, Period 14.

Numbers 19, 21, 22, 24 and 25, together with other fragments of dressed stone, were all recovered from a large pit, F50, which is probably part of the Period 11 (14th-century) robbing of the 12th- and 13th-century foundations of the south side of the nave. No. 20, although unstratified, clearly belongs with this group. No. 23, recovered from a Period 14 context in Trench I, should probably be included, and the capital fragment no. 26, which is similar in scale to no. 24, may also be part of the group. Together with nos. 27 and 29, they constitute a significant late 13th- or 14th-century collection, and may be elements from a side chapel in the south aisle or from the late 13th-century remodelling of the west end of the nave.

30. Part of the springing for a small 13th-century arch, possibly from a niche, a tomb or reredos. There is a ‘mouchette’ moulding on the innermost rib, and the remains of brown ‘paint’ in the panels between the ribs. SF379, Period 14.
31. Engaged simple roll moulding, 220 mm long. SF406, unstratified.
33. Engaged simple roll moulding, 240 mm long. SF390, Period 14.
34. Engaged simple roll moulding. Whitewashed or plastered white. SF404 (220 mm long) joins SF408 (220 mm long), unstratified.
Fig. 42. Worked stone: (35) section of 14th-century moulding from blind panelling; (36) part of the abacus from a 14th-century engaged shaft; (37) 14th–15th-century canopy from a statue niche, with blue paint surviving on some of the recessed panels.
Stones 31–4 have the same profile and are probably from 13th- or 14th-century string courses, although such simple mouldings may be found in later periods as well.

35. Straight section of moulding, possibly a mullion from blind panelling. The central arris carries a three-quarter round moulding flanked on each side by a hollow chamfer and a half roll with frontal fillet. 14th century. SF489, Period 14.

36. Part of a four-sided (half octagonal) abacus from the capital for an engaged shaft. Setting-out lines survive on the upper surface of the stone. The decoration consists of three half-rolls with frontal fillets, with a roll and angled moulding separating the upper half-roll from the lower two. 14th century. SF437, Period 14.

37. Damaged canopy, probably from a statue niche in the perpendicular style. The top of the canopy is carried up into a vertical moulding, flanked by two further, chamfered vertical mouldings that subdivide the backing panel. The central portion of the inner surface of the canopy carries a pair of roundels, each of which is quartered with narrow, half-round tracery bars that meet in hollow-centred bosses. Three of the quadrant panels still carry dark blue paint. Above the roundels is a square-centred node from which a fan of half-round tracery springs. Below the roundels the lower edge of the canopy is outlined with a curving half-round moulding. The remains of further panels flank the central roundels. Late 14th or 15th century. SF375, Period 14.

ROMAN WALL PLASTER by Richard Bryant

Large quantities of painted wall plaster were recovered from excavated layers in Trenches II, III and IV, within the areas defined as Rooms A, B and C (see p. 108 above).

**Period 1** (Fig. 43)

Almost all the Period 1 wall plaster was recovered from the make-up levels IV (192 and 184) for the Period 2 floor of Room A. Some residual fragments were recovered from later destruction levels IV (63), above disturbances caused by the robbing of the threshold in the Period 2 wall F135. The plaster is of fine quality and most comes from a scheme of large black panels surrounded by red borders, probably above a dado of blue/white ‘false marble’ flecked with red, black and yellow ochre. Most (86%) of the plaster recovered from IV (192) is plain black or black overpainted with turquoise and white plants with three-lobed leaves and flowers and wheat heads in yellow ochre highlighted in white. This scheme is later overpainted with broad white bands outlined with fine red lines. Several of the white bands and red outlines are curved, and these may have formed part of an arcade against the original black. As well as the black scheme described above, there are also panels of terracotta-red and yellow ochre, overpainted with fine white lines. Late 1st- or early 2nd-century pottery was found with the Period 1 plaster.

**Period 2** (Figs. 44 and 45)

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

The first phase of wall plaster in Room A is of very good quality; it consists of panels of red and cream, with small areas of plain white and salmon-pink edged with fine red lines and white borders. In the second phase the colour scheme changes. Above what is probably a dado of speckled lilac outlined in dark purple are panels of light and dark terracotta. Some of the earlier white is retained and partly overpainted with dark terracotta. The dark purple seems to be used not only above the dado, but also in borders immediately below the ceiling and in broad borders overpainted with white lines: see example from IV (63). Dark yellow enters the scheme, overpainted
Fig. 43. Roman wall plaster, Period 1, from contexts IV 184 and 192 unless otherwise indicated (scale 1:4). The scheme was predominantly black with turquoise and white flowers and wheat heads in yellow ochre and white. None of the structure associated with this plaster was found.
Fig. 44. Roman wall plaster, Period 2, phase 2, from Room A, IV (63, 75); Room B, IV (215, 212); and Room C, III (66) (scale 1:4).
with fine white lines. There are also areas of lighter red with broad white borders. Turquoise and dark red panels are divided by white or fine yellow ochre lines: see examples from IV (75). Light and dark lilac is used in conjunction with pale green and yellow.

In rooms B and C, in IV (212, 215) and III (66), there is a bold scheme of diamonds, triangles and slashed borders in a range of earth colours, associated with the use of red, white, dark-grey, and dribbled and speckled green over khaki. It is suggested that this scheme was contemporary with the second scheme in Room A because the red in Room C is an exact match for one of the reds in room A, and the surface of the plaster is treated in a similar way. The other reds are all very different. The plaster of one of the triangle panels from Room B, IV (215), is not only painted in red, khaki and white but also moulded on two edges, and a second panel from the same context, painted in red, white, pink-red and yellow ochre, carries an edge moulding. A border panel in earth colours from Room C, III (66), is also moulded at one end.

The third phase consists of white and dull pink backgrounds overpainted with dark red-maroon decorations consisting of curving lines, wavy lines, circles, circles with radiating lines, and border panels. There are also an almost fluorescent pink-orange and panels of white with grey borders. Plaster was recovered from the western end of room A, from II (42) and IV (216) near walls F17 and F135. The quality is very poor and the paint has cracked and peeled, presumably because there was not enough binding agent in the tempera to bond it firmly to the dry face of the previous phase. The fragments with the dull pink background overpainted with circles and wavy lines seem to be the exception in that they seem to have been applied as fresco on to wet plaster.

All the Period 2 painted wall plaster was recovered from phase 2.3b and 2.4 destruction levels, which also contained a few sherds of 2nd–4th-century pottery but nothing else that was useful for dating purposes. The construction of the building is dated to mid 2nd century.

GRAVESTONES

Fosbrooke (1819, 173–5) lists over 200 names on monuments in the church and churchyard. An unfinished survey of the churchyard c. 1845 includes a map with 86 graves and the detailed epitaphs of 49 of these.20 The churchyard tombstones were all cleared in 1957.21
A complete gravestone found in the excavation was re-used as make-up for the 1826 floor. Its inscription was as follows:

WILLIAM FLETCHER Gent / who departed this life / Sept. 17th 1814 aged 82 years / and also of WILLIAM FLETCHER Gent / of Barton Street, Son of the / late RALPH FLETCHER / of this city / who departed this life / Dec. 8th 1819 aged 57 years / ELIZABETH FLETCHER / wife of Wllm. FLETCHER / This exemplary and faithful woman / also departed this life the 12th day / of February 1834 Aged 88 years / in the sweet hope of joining / her beloved Husband

ENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE AND TECHNICAL REPORTS

HUMAN SKELETAL MATERIAL by Juliet Rogers

Twelve burials were examined. Details of age and sex were noted and measurements taken where possible. There was no major pathology. The burial remains were too few and fragmentary for a detailed study to be worthwhile. The archive may be consulted at Gloucester Museum excavation unit, where it is filed with site 41/75 (St. Oswald’s Priory). The following table summarizes the information obtained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Burial</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Date of burial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10th–11th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10th–11th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10th–11th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10th–11th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10th–11th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10th–11th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10th–11th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10th–11th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>?8th–9th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>?8th–9th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>early post-Roman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANT REMAINS by Frank Green

Five soil samples of 500 ml were examined. A full description and tabulated results will be found in the site archive. Although initial examination of the site had suggested some potential for the survival of organic material, the plant remains were extremely sparse. There were fragments of wood from Period 10, IV (175), but no other plant remains. A single carbonised hazel-nut fragment was recovered from Period 7, IV (119). This species is ubiquitous on early medieval sites and cannot be meaningfully interpreted nor can the single grain of barley recovered from Period 6, IV (126). Seeds of elderberry from Period 6, IV (126), and Period 7, IV (178), may well have
originated as constituents of floor coverings. However, this species is also ubiquitous from sites of all periods due to the durable and woody nature of the seed. Period 7, IV (177), produced a concentration of hazel-nut fragments preserved by carbonisation. These may have originated from a domestic context (perhaps they were even eaten in the church), whereas the rest of the evidence such as Ranunculaceae, Cyperaceae, Polygonaceae, and Gramineae species might have originated from rushes and grasses used as floor coverings and subsequently burnt. These species are also frequently recorded from waterlogged deposits on medieval sites.

Evidence from Period 6, IV (179), and Period 7, IV (178), included a single grain of wheat, possibly bread wheat, and also a rye-like grain. These also probably originated from nearby domestic activity.

Fig. 46. Radiocarbon dates.
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The calibrated ranges for the samples are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab number</th>
<th>Sample reference</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Radiocarbon age (BP)</th>
<th>Calibrated date range (1σ)</th>
<th>Calibrated date range (2σ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAR-4895</td>
<td>GL578545</td>
<td>IV 180 phase 5.3 destruction of Period 5</td>
<td>1050 ± 80</td>
<td>cal A.D. 890–1030</td>
<td>cal A.D. 790–1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAR-4896</td>
<td>GL578552</td>
<td>IV 220 phase 2.4 destruction of Period 2 Roman building</td>
<td>1930 ± 70</td>
<td>cal B.C. 10–130 cal A.D.</td>
<td>cal B.C. 100–230 cal A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one and two sigma ranges refer to 68% and 95% confidence ranges respectively. The calibrated date ranges listed in the table have been calculated using the maximum intercept method of Stuiver and Reimer (1986), and they are quoted in the form recommended by Mook (1986) with the end points rounded outwards to 10 years.

The probability distributions (Fig. 46) have been calculated using OxCal (v.2.0) (Bronk Ramsey 1994), and the usual probability method (Stuiver and Reimer 1993). The calibrations have been calculated using the data published by Stuiver and Pearson (1986).

**CONCLUSIONS**

Excavations at St. Mary de Lode Gloucester have shown that the church had its origins in a 5th-century timber mausoleum containing a group of three burials. The mausoleum had been built in the ruins of a Roman building. Two of the graves were emptied of their occupants and the head of the third was removed; the mausoleum was destroyed by fire. A sequence of buildings on the site thereafter, preserving the alignment of the mausoleum, is interpreted as a series of churches (Fig. 47).

A church displaying such origins would always be of interest, but the church of St. Mary de Lode has other claims to antiquity. Steven Bassett compares it to St. Helen’s at Worcester, which he plausibly argues was a British church (perhaps even a bishopric) predating the foundation of the Anglo-Saxon see c. 680 (Bassett 1992, 20–6). St. Mary de Lode, like St. Helen’s, had a large extra-mural parish; moreover, though subservient to St. Peter’s Abbey, St. Mary’s was outside the medieval abbey precinct. This might suggest that it was not built by St. Peter’s as a parish church but was taken over by it. Finally, the putative foundation charter of St. Peter’s Abbey seems to indicate that the land was given to ‘the holy virgin Mary’. The archaeological evidence adds conviction to the hypothesis of an origin for the church before 679 (ibid. 26–9).

There can be no evidence that the bodies in the mausoleum were Christian. The removal of the bodies, with an implied translation to another building, could mark the transition to a Christian church or oratory.

In Britain the establishment of early churches often involved the re-use for ecclesiastical purposes of Roman structures (Blair 1992, 235–46). Equally important were the Roman cemeteries, which included the burial places of influential Christians who came to be regarded as martyrs and saints (Morris 1989, 13). In Gloucester the late Roman cemeteries included one on the site of St. Oswald’s Priory, about 150 m north of St. Mary de Lode (Fig. 2). However, there is no evidence...
that this had any use after the 4th century; the significant late Roman cemetery, also with an early 5th-century mausoleum, is at Kingsholm. The presence of the mausoleum at St. Mary's in the 5th century or perhaps later suggests that the Roman rules which prohibited burial within towns no longer applied. People of importance might well bury and be buried near their
dwellings: one might recall the later situation at Winchester where there was a settlement within the walls in the mid 7th to 8th century accompanied by a cemetery (Kjølbye-Biddle 1992, 219–22).

The mausoleum was laid out in a large room in a ruined Roman building. The building apparently had a long life. It includes three phases of wall paintings, a mosaic of the mid 2nd century and a hypocaust; the building continued in use (no doubt with many modifications not within range of the excavations) for an unknown time — it may have been in ruins for some time when the mausoleum was built. The area of Roman deposits reached by the excavations was very small, but the discovery of fragments of one or more very large columns suggests this was a public building, perhaps part of a bath-house. The ruined Roman walls were initially visible when the site for the mausoleum was being prepared, but they were covered over during the final stage of the levelling process. This is perhaps an example of deliberate re-use of the architectural framework provided by Roman walls (Blair 1992, 245–6; Bell 1998, 7–8); there is no evidence that the Roman building had any Christian use.

A satisfactory history of the topography of post-Roman Gloucester cannot be gained without establishing the location of the first minster of St. Peter, but this is not achievable at present. Walled Romano-British towns were commonly chosen, however empty, as a suitable location for the new Anglo-Saxon minsters (Blair 1992, 235–46). At Gloucester it is usually assumed that the minster of 679 was placed in the north-west corner of the walled but virtually deserted town, occupying a block defined by Roman streets (Heighway 1983, 12–13). This would explain why the present precinct includes some of the walled area. It is claimed that it was only in the late 11th century that the precinct would have extended over the walls to achieve its present form (Hurst 1986, 131). However, although the date of the extension to the north is well documented to 1110, that to the west is unrecorded. The discovery of an 11th-century cemetery outside the Roman wall line near the present cloister and under the 12th-century west claustral buildings (Garrod and Heighway 1984, 53–5) suggests that part of the precinct outside the Roman wall line was already in ecclesiastical use (Fig. 2).

John Blair has suggested that when St. Mary de Lode was taken over by the minster, St. Peter’s might have been sited in relation to St. Mary’s (Blair 1992, 242). Anglo-Saxon minsters often consisted of groups or alignments of churches, often with a St. Peter’s church to the east and an older St. Mary to the west (ibid. 250–1). It is possible to suggest a site for the c. 679 minster under the building known in the 17th century as ‘Parliament House’,22 in alignment with St. Mary de Lode but outside the Roman wall. However, the same precise alignment could not accommodate a church within the Roman wall. Since Anglo-Saxon minsters often comprised a complex of churches, there may even have been three churches, including St. Mary’s, with two outside and one inside the walls.

Great changes occurred at Gloucester in the late 9th/early 10th century. In 877–8 the Danish army spent half the winter in the town; in the last years of the century a new defended burh was founded to counteract the Danish threat. St. Mary’s church burnt down at about that time (Period 5) — not a remarkable event, since the timber towns of early medieval times were always going up in flames. However, the presence of a fragment of a new cross shaft in the debris (Fig. 38, no. 2) could hint at something more deliberate. At St. Oswald’s also there were damaged cross shafts, the latest of which was of mid 9th-century date built into the fabric of c. 900. It has been suggested that the site of St. Oswald’s, with its ‘D’-shaped enclosure against the river, was the Danish camp established in 877–8 (Heighway and Hare 1999, 8; Baker and Holt forthcoming); one might further attribute the burning of St. Mary’s church to Danish activity. The founding of the new town and new minster c. 900, and a rebuilding after fire at St. Mary’s, could all be part of the process of reviving and cleansing the town after the occupation of the Viking army.
At the foundation of St. Oswald’s c. 900 St. Mary’s huge parish was divided to provide endowment for the new minster, and another major constituent was added to the western suburb. The relationship between the two churches was not close, in spite of their proximity, for St. Oswald’s was always the dependent of the king and looked to the royal residence at Kingsholm, c. 500 m to the north, and St. Mary’s, the possession of the abbey, looked towards the east and the former Roman city. The importance of St. Mary’s to the abbey and to the town is reflected in the fact that in the 11th century a font was placed centrally in the nave. In England at this time, the administration of baptism was still controlled by the older minster churches (Foot 1992, 181–2; Blair 1988, 50–1). St. Mary’s was presumably granted the privilege by St. Peter’s Abbey — or had it retained it from a much earlier period?

The two important churches in the western suburb should have been a focus for settlement in the late Saxon period. In spite of this, considerations of effective defence would probably have placed the Saxon burh of c. 900 in the Roman walled area (Hurst 1986, 129–32; Heighway 2003). Much more investigation is needed to elucidate this point, and to amplify knowledge of the western suburb, which was clearly a crucial element in the topography of early medieval Gloucester.
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APPENDIX

Descriptions of St. Mary de Lode church before 1826

1. Thomas Rudge, *History and Antiquities of Gloucester* (Gloucester 1811), pp. 327–8. Rudge’s history includes an engraving (see above, Fig. 28) showing the church from the east. Rudge’s description was followed word for word in an article by G.W. Counsel, a local antiquary, in *Gloucester Journal* 4 November 1826; the same description was reproduced in Gentleman’s *Magazine* 1826, part ii, p. 505 where it was accompanied by the print by Thomas Bonnor (see above, Fig. 27).

   This church retains more marks of antiquity than any other ecclesiastical building in the city, the Cathedral excepted. The west door, the circular arches of the south and part of the north side, with the pillars that support them are of the Period prior to the conquest. The two pointed arches at the east end of the north range, are the alteration of a much more modern date….. In the chancel on the north side, is a cumbent figure of considerable antiquity but certainly not of King Lucius, who is said, in Colliers Historical Dictionary, to have been buried here. The honour is claimed with some more shew of probability by the church of Winchester. The costume of this effigy does not correspond with so early a Period.

2. Notes on St. Mary de Lode church, included in a letter by George May, dating c. 1800–20: Gloucester City Library, Gloucestershire Collection, NQ 5.3. For the accompanying sketch, see above Fig. 23.

   The exterior is greatly disfigured by the tom-foolery of modern glaziers placed within the pointed window soffits, and the dandified appearance of a new coat of plaster. The western doorway is circular arched and surrounded with zig-zag and billetted mouldings ([note at bottom of page] I forget whether there are any others, and if so, what they are); over it extends a fascia of balls, and above, a long and narrow pointed window divested, like the rest, of its mullions and tracery, surmounted by an extensive line [?], continued intermittently from the walls of the aisles ([note at bottom of page] I do not clearly recollect if this be correct).

   The interior is particularly striking. On the north side of the Nave, the Pillars are short cylinders, with very neat reeded capitals (thus [a sketch]) — sustaining — ([note at bottom of page] Do you remember how many?) well-turned circular arches adorned with indented mouldings of varying designs. The North Aisle retains its original flat wooden ceiling unmolested, even by the hands of the whitewasher (who has carefully bedaubed every other part of the building). Against its East wall are evident remains of an altar-screen; the roof at this one part is a stone vault, strengthened by two circular ribs crossing each other: it is not improbable but this portion of the aisle might formerly have been screened in as a Chapel. The original raftered roof of the Nave is now covered with a plastered ceiling. On the South the arches are pointed, and rest on plain circular columns: these appear to have been originally the same as those opposite, but at a later Period, altered to their present form. There are some slight vestiges of canopied niches against the East wall of this aisle. The cieling here is plastered. At the termination of the nave stands the tower, which is of the same breadth as the Chancel: its East and West walls are supported by two bold semicircular arches, decorated in the same style as the others. Against the side walls of the Chancel are some large paneled pointed arcades and pilasters. On the North wall within a pointed recess of later date (the foliated embellishments of which are destroyed) lies an ancient looking male effigy, clothed in a loose garment, the arms crossed on the breast. Tradition assigns this to the celebrated Lucius who makes such a figure in monkish annals. It looks more like an ecclesiastic than a King…


   A few days since, as the foundations for the New Church intended to be erected in St. Mary’s square, in this city, were being dug out, the workmen came to part of a beautiful tesselated pavement, on the north side,
about five feet below the surface, extending from east to west 16 feet 6 inches, and from north to south 7 feet 6 inches. This pavement was also divided into compartments, enriched with a variety of scrolls, frets, and other ornaments, having a wreathed border inclosing figures of fish, and surrounded by a guilloche. The colours of the tesserae are white, red, and bluish grey; the sizes varying from one-half to three-quarters of an inch, some triangular, and of various other shapes, They were laid in a bed of cement, composed of sand, pulverized brick, and lime; the interstices are filled up with cement so hard that it is extremely difficult to break it. The white tesserae appear to be of a hard calcareous stone, and bear a good polish. The red are of a fine sort of brick; the bluish grey are of a hard argillacious stone, found in many parts of Gloucestershire, and called blue lyas. As this is the largest pavement, it was probably the floor of the Triclinium, or eating-hall. Mr Jas. Cooke, the architect employed in building the Church, endeavoured to have the whole pavement taken up, in order that so fine a specimen (which has probably existed for upwards of seventeen centuries), should have been preserved entire; but it was found impossible. A very accurate drawing, however, has been made of the pavement, by Mr Cooke, a copy of which is intended for the Antiquarian Society.

It has not yet been discovered how far this pavement extends, but it appears that the walls of the Old Church of St. Mary de Lode are built upon it, and that it has been considerably depressed with their weight.

A tesselated pavement has also been found, at a small distance from the preceding one, composed of tesserae of blue and white stones, and varying from one and a half to two inches in diameter. This was evidently the floor of an inferior apartment, as the interstices between the tesserae are wider, and the workmanship less elaborate than the other. A fine specimen of the tesselated pavement, also a brick-tile 16 inches square and 1 1/8 thick, used in the roof of the building, likewise the two snail-shells mentioned below, have been carefully preserved.

On the south side of the Church, another pavement has been discovered, with a fire-place, and underneath a flue composed of brick tiles, eight by seven inches, and one and a half inches thick for the purpose of conveying heated air. This was evidently a Laconicum, or sweating-room, adjoining which was, in all probability, an Apodyterium, or dressing-room. It is a very singular circumstance, that in one of the flues two snail-shells were found, in a perfect state of preservation!
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Notes


3. We are grateful to Michael Hare for provision of references and discussion of the issue.

4. J.N. Langston, ‘St. Mary de Lode’ (1957) (in vol. ii of ‘Old Gloucester Churches’: typescript in Gloucester Library, Gloucestershire Collection), note 1, concluded ‘Lucius must be relegated to the
realms of mythology’. However, Lucius continues to raise interest from time to time: see A. Dodd, ‘King Lucius’, *Gleveenis* 30, 1997.

7. GRO, D 936/M 11.
9. An initial proposal in April 1825 to rebuild only the west end and south aisle wall was superseded by the rebuilding after September 1825 of the whole nave: GRO, D 3117 (20–1).
12. It is not clear why the post was not discovered when the monument was constructed: perhaps the monument was too small to disturb the ground.
15. Gloucester Library, Gloucestershire Collection, microfiche 47958.
20. GRO, P 154/12/CW 3/2.