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Introduction

The earlier Deerhurst Lectures comprise a formidable array of scholarship, covering a wide range of topics. Most have been historical in the widest sense, using the evidence from written documents, buildings, and studies in the field. Some provide a European context for Deerhurst, others the regional or local settlement background. They have been about history and art-history, people, lands, institutions, architecture, liturgy and even music; and especially the people who built St Mary’s; who they were, and the resources available to them.

My lecture was principally about the archaeology of St. Mary’s Church. Modern archaeology has, however, an agenda wider than the study of what is visible above the ground, and what is revealed below the ground by excavation. It encompasses the work of several disciplines, as in fig 1. Here we proceed from top to bottom from sources, through analysis to synthesis, culminating in areas of scholarship; these in turn contribute to our wider history of Deerhurst Church, as a building and as an institution (Rahtz 1976a); or we can work upwards, by asking what the history depends on: a series of studies, based on the synthesis and analysis of a variety of sources.

When we began our work at Deerhurst in the 1970s, we had no hope of addressing all these themes; although we were part of a major research project of the Society of Antiquaries, on the English Church (Butler et al. 1975), and three universities were involved, there were limitations of time, money and expertise. To study Deerhurst properly, one needs a full-time research institute, with staff covering all specialisms; a few such exist in America, Germany and Holland. But we had only short seasons, a dozen or so helpers and few thousand pounds.

We can divide our subject in two broad themes, the wider context of the church, in its landscape; and the building itself. The sources for the wider study are maps, fieldwork and air photographs; this has been the province of Mick Aston, now Professor of Landscape History at Bristol (Aston 1997). The written sources have been the special study of my colleague at York, Dr Lawrence Butler.

For this wider context of St Mary’s, we should ideally study the prehistoric settlement pattern and its relationship to topography, water and soil; this would establish the background of the land and its wealth which continued to be the economic basis of Anglo-Saxon society. We must also consider the past expression of religious belief – the barrows, earthworks and shrines of pre-Christian times; and especially that of the Roman background; and the major changes in the landscape, roads, rivers, and structures. Roman buildings nearby could merely have provided a source of ready-prepared building material, such as stone and tile. Alternatively, one or more Roman structures could have been predecessors
of St Mary's: nuclei of religious activity. Such structures may have been pagan, centred on the Greco-Roman pantheon; or even, in the 4th–7th centuries, centres of Christian worship (Morris and Roxan 1980; Bell 1998).

**Fig 1. Deerhurst Research Directions (by Martin Carver)**

But it is Anglo-Saxon architecture and archaeology which was the main subject of the lecture. The architectural and art-historical studies of Anglo-Saxon churches have been pursued for a century and a half, culminating in those of Harold Taylor and his wife Joan. Harold was the third member of our triumvirate, to whom we dedicated our recent book on St Mary's (Rahtz and Watts 1997); his reasons for attempting to elucidate the history of Anglo-Saxon churches were absolutely clear and expressed in the dedications to these magisterial volumes: for the first two (Taylor and Taylor 1965)

‘To the Anglo-Saxon saints who inspired the building of these churches, to the craftsmen who built them, and to all those who recorded their subsequent history’

and (in the final volume) (Taylor 1978)

‘To the glory of the one Eternal and ever-loving God, to whose honour and for whose worship and praise these churches were built by our forefathers, …… not
only as a further contribution to the understanding of the buildings themselves, but also as a confident expression of faith that these ancient churches will endure through the current years of unbelief and indifference until the dawn of those days when the Glory of the Lord will fill the whole land.

– a potent thought to take us into the 3rd millennium.

With Joan, Harold travelled the length and breadth of England with a notebook, surveying tools and camera, studying over 400 churches; they devoted much time to St Mary’s as a building, but their interests did not extend to the wider paraphernalia of research I have outlined.

From the 1960s, Harold was, however, beginning to appreciate how archaeology could elucidate what to him had been essentially a study of the visible parts of the above-ground building. This appreciation culminated in his collaboration with the Biddles at Repton, and with Lawrence Butler and myself at Deerhurst. He did not want to dig himself, but was intrigued by the nature of archaeological evidence, and applied his fine mind to the integration of our findings with what he had learnt from the fabric.

It was a footnote of his (in Taylor 1969) that was the occasion of my interest (in 1971) – a question: “Did Deerhurst have a corridor crypt”? I realised that this was a question which could be easily answered by archaeology at the ruined east end. I took a group of students from Birmingham down here for a week; within a day or two, it was clear that the answer to Harold’s question was “No”; but we recorded much other new evidence in that week and subsequently (Rahtz 1976b), with which Harold was delighted. So we joined forces for more expanded excavations in 1973, with Lawrence Butler, while later Mick Aston joined us in the landscape study; this partnership culminated with our Society of Antiquaries book (Rahtz and Watts 1997).

**Method**

Firstly, something about method. The exterior walls can be seen in their complete present state, with no rendering to obscure stone detail; examination of these needs the best lighting conditions; with oblique sunlight highlighting the stones, to see the junction of several phases of the church’s developments (plate A). Having become familiar with the visible fabric, one must record it photographically in colour; and draw it stone-by-stone at a scale of 1:20 and attempt to interpret it (fig 2).

Where the walling was too high, we had the assistance of photogrammetry (Rahtz and Watts 1997, fig 19); we produced a series of elevations that record the fabric as it was in the 1970s. Inside the church, the study is more difficult; while the remarkable 34 Anglo-Saxon openings are visible, they are surrounded by plaster, left in splendid isolation, divorced from the fabric in which they are set (Porter 1992, plate inside back cover).
Plate A. Exterior east wall face of North a porticus
With any Anglo-Saxon church, we have to see it as a relic – a remarkable survival (and St Mary’s is one of the most remarkable in England). We see it not as it appeared in Anglo-Saxon times, over a millennium ago; but as it has been rebuilt over many generations: a mistreated relic: attacked, altered and repaired. We have to look at it as a three-dimensional palimpsest which, starting with its present state, we have to unpick mentally backwards in order to understand what is Anglo-Saxon, and what has been rebuilt in later works; this is accomplished by the process of archaeology.

Fig 2. South face of southern bay of polygonal apse

The archaeologist is usually thought of by the public as a kind of mole, working below the ground. There is now a total appreciation that there is no magic boundary at the grass level, but all is archaeology, above and below ground; from lightning conductor and roofs down to the footings and the natural soils below. The stratigraphical sequence that archaeology defines in the layers around the church
and under its floors is the same as the structural sequence seen in the building – the one of soil and rubbish, the other stone, timber, metals, glass, mortar and paint.

Plate B. North porticus wall foundations

Below the ground, there are two kinds of evidence. One is (visually) of the buried foundations of the building (plate B); often much clearer than above, where the fabric has been weathered, repaired, repointed and covered in plaster. The second kind is the evidence from the stratification – the layers that lie around the structures; from these we can recover information about the relationship of different parts of the structure to each other; and evidence for dating, from artefacts, and samples for scientific analysis such as radiocarbon dating. In church archaeology, stratigraphic evidence is sadly rare – most of the soil by the
walls and the finds has been jumbled up by burial – a fundamental function of any church and churchyard.

***

With that general preamble, we may now look at St Mary’s Church, and look at the kinds of evidence below and above the ground that we can recover, a vast box of LEGO which we can attempt to put together and construct a storyline about the history of the church. My task in the 2000 Lecture was much easier because the audience knew the building so well – it would be much more difficult to expound St Mary’s to an audience in York, let alone in another country.

***

The Area

We shall start with the local area, and home in on the farm, churchyard and church. I shall illustrate the nature of the data recovery, and the methods used in our investigations; and finally attempt to summarise the sequence of activity and building in this spot, from Roman times through the Anglo-Saxon centuries.

Mick Aston has provided plans of the earthworks in the parish; this is mostly medieval ridge and furrow; he has also mapped prehistoric barrows and other features revealed by air-photographs (Rahtz and Watts 1997, fig 2). In the village area, Aston delineated the pattern of settlement in the area of the farms, Odda’s Chapel and St Mary’s (Rahtz and Watts, 1997, fig 1); the earthworks and crop-marks seen on air photographs, enclosures, properties and buildings which extend over five millennia of human occupation of secular and religious nuclei – enough data visible and buried which could keep archaeologists busy for centuries ahead.

The village has been dominated by water, and the Severn has also been the route by which Deerhurst had contact with the Bristol Channel and the western seaways, but it also periodically floods, and besieges Deerhurst with water – a problem which must have been a factor in Anglo-Saxon times (Butler et al. 1975, plate LXX a).

While Odda’s Chapel and St Mary’s and associated buildings remain the principal nuclei, we must think of the whole complex of the village and its boundaries. We have done very limited excavation in the area near Odda’s Chapel, resulting in the discoveries of Roman timber structures (Rahtz and Watts 1997, 205–7). The outer boundary of the St Mary’s complex has been located on the west side by a long trench, outside the churchyard (Rahtz and Watts 1997, figs 116–17).

There are here a series of ditches of different dates, with a deep drop off down to the Severn flood-plain, with Roman material. In the Anglo-Saxon period, this boundary was the vallium monasterii, the limits of the ‘City of God’; probably
doubling as flood defences; there must be a similar boundary all around the settlement, not yet discovered. The final phase of the western boundary was the present churchyard wall, itself with a complex history (Rahtz and Watts 1997, fig 112). There are also many unexplained earthworks and ponds in the church and Priory Farm area, all probably originating in monastic or earlier times (Rahtz and Watts 1997, fig 109).

The Church

St Mary’s Church was the target of our most extensive investigations, either from the ground, or by clambering into more inaccessible parts of the tower, or on to the roofs. From there one can see the older steeper roof line preceding the present church roof (Rahtz and Watts 1997, figs 83–4); St Mary’s was thus even higher in Anglo-Saxon times than later. We shall return to this later in this paper.

We are here helped by the excellent drawings by Felicity Strickland in 1862 of the interior as it was at that time, before the plaster was applied (fig 3); but knowing that the plaster was Victorian, it was possible to strip it off in areas in the north aisle. Harold Taylor was adept at chipping it off, and climbing around the scaffolding, using his other skills as an experienced mountaineer. The operation was difficult, creating a cloud of dust.

It was then possible to study, photograph and draw the exposed wall faces and see the relationship of various features. For example, before this operation, it was assumed that the upper round-headed opening on the north side of the present chancel was stylistically later than the triangular-headed doorway below it, but it was now clear that it is the opposite way round, the upper opening being built as part of the surrounding masonry (figs 4–5).

Incidentally, although this upper opening and the contemporary one on the south side look like doorways, we think that there were upper floor rooms in what are now the north and south aisles; and from them any person could observe the Mass at the high altar; cf. people apparently in an upper floor in the scene of the bishop blessing the congregation, from the Benedictional of St Æthelwold (Deshman 1995, colour plate 35). This also brings us to another facet of our interpretation, shown by the plaster-stripping in the north aisle and the new evidence for the integrity of this upper opening with the stone masonry around it.

The opening, as we have seen, is for access to an upper room; the west side of this room is long gone; the north wall was the present north aisle wall, and the east wall was the present east end of the aisle. The two surviving walls of this room are both of stone. But, and this is the point, the east wall is not integrated with the wall face seen in figs 4 and 5. We explain this anomaly by suggesting that this upper room was originally of timber, later replaced in stone; we suggest that this may have been true in other parts of the church: a progressive replacement of timber by stone.
Fig 3. 1862 drawing of west face of east end of the present chancel (by Felicity Strickland)

It is easy to build up to great heights in timber (as we see for instance in the tall stave churches of Norway). When resources became available to rebuild in stone, the builders would, we suggest, have been reluctant to lower the height of the church (‘climbing down from heaven’), but took stone to heights which may have been rash; that is why, we believe, Anglo-Saxon churches (including this one) are often remarkably tall for their length and width and wall thickness. Norman minor churches are, by contrast, not so tall, and more squat-looking.
Thus, in our phasing of St Mary's, we postulated a continuous sequence of timber, stone and timber, and finally wholly stone.

****

Elevation
North wall of present chancel
- north face

Fig 4. Elevation of north wall of present chancel, north face
Another discovery made when the plaster was stripped was the surviving parts of wooden poles set in the walls by the Anglo-Saxon builders as part of their scaffolding (two are visible in figs 4 and 5). When the walls were built, the protruding parts were cut off, leaving these parts in the wall; apart from their intrinsic importance in the study of Anglo-Saxon building technology, they have

Fig 5. Interpretation of fig 4
provided radiocarbon dates for the building of the walls at various locations in the north part of the church.

We have also to take into account the evidence from the sculptures (Porter 1992); they have been studied by art-historians, who have dated them by stylistic criteria. Some, like the protruding beast-heads in the western part of the tower (prokrosoi), are likely to be part of the structure in which they are set, and provide some date for this. Others, such as the Virgin in the porch, cannot be shown to be in their original positions, without taking the building to pieces. The font, although a magnificent piece, is essentially loose and does not help in dating any part of the structure. Nor, of course, can the piece of an elaborate cross head that was found in a pit in our excavations (Rahtz 1976b, ST3 in fig 14). It seems likely that the angel at the east end is in its original place as an important feature, possibly one of seven in the outer façade of the polygonal apse.

What I have discussed so far can be examined above the ground; and is mostly visible to anybody visiting St Mary’s today; excavation below the ground extends this understanding to the stratification and finds below present ground level; and to the foundations and subsoil which support this structure.

The Apse Area

Excavation began in 1971 with a re-examination of the ruined apse area. In this area the whole ground had been cut down for farm use after the apse was ruinous; a 19th-century cider-house here was removed by Knowles in 1926 (Knowles 1927), when he consolidated the foundations and restored the area to be part of the church. The area of the apse was, in his words, ‘thoroughly trenched, but nothing of importance was found’; we however found many features of a kind Knowles would not have considered significant (Rahtz 1976b).

The burials in this area had originally been buried deeply, but the truncation of the area for the farm left them so close to the present surface that they had been disturbed in modern times. This truncation is why, in this area, all that is visible now below doorway level is exposed foundation.

The North Aisle

The next excavation was alongside the exterior wall of the north aisle, exposing the foundations of this area down to the natural sandy clay. As is clear in fig 6, above the ground the left-hand side masonry is different from that on the right; they abut each other, but one cannot see which is earlier; but below the ground, we can see that the left one comes first; the right hand part is ‘wrapped around’ the left; the two northern corners of the earlier block of masonry are quite massive. All this is part of the North Porticus, an important component of an earlier
church – a two-storey adjunct to the north – we noted earlier the opening that allowed an occupant of the upper floor to see what was going on at the high altar. The north-eastern corner of this massive foundation is still visible in the old boiler house by the steps leading down into the farmyard on the north side, where it was exposed by the installation of the old heating system.

![Diagram of church elevation](image)

**Fig 6. Elevation of north side of church, east end**

**The West End**

In plate C, the present west doorway and its threshold is at the top left hand corner; below this is an earlier very worn Anglo-Saxon doorsill. Again we see clearly the relationship below ground between the porch foundation and the masonry to the right, now the west end of the south aisle. But further out to the west (foreground in plate C) is a hitherto unknown wall foundation, much mutilated by graves; but parallel to the west end.
Plate C. Excavation of west exterior, with stone sarcophagus, foundation with Roman material, earlier threshold stone of west entrance, and foundations below it

This foundation incorporates a great deal of Roman tile and mortar with crushed brick – a kind of Roman concrete. This wall foundation is obviously made from a destroyed Roman building, probably a substantial villa. Graves had destroyed the relationship between this and the church, so we do not know its date; it could be of latest Roman date (4th century) or of the immediate post-Roman period, the 5th–7th centuries; this could be part of the earliest church or another structure on the site of St Mary’s.

The wall foundation with Roman material in this area was cut and overlaid by a massive sarcophagus of a medieval burial, of some important person, probably a priest (plate C). There were many medieval graves west of the porch area,
including some of medieval priests, with arms crossed over the chest; one priest had a base metal chalice and paten by his hand – a funerary set, the priest raising the Host in death as he had in life (Rahtz and Watts 1997, fig 71).

Finally in these west excavations, fig 7 is a section showing what was left of the stratification between the early wall (on the left) and the porch (on the right); here can be seen the construction trench of the wall with Roman material; and that for the porch with its successive builders' levels.

**Fig 7. Section west-east in west exterior, from foundation with Roman material to the foundations of the porch**

**Function and phasing**

In the 1970s, we had gained much new information about St Mary’s by studying the visible fabric, stripping plaster, and excavating below the ground. How does one put all this together, to work out the many phases of the church’s construction and use? What is the function of the parts? For instance, there is a very high doorway on the west side of the tower. Harold Taylor suggested that from this position, the priest could show holy relics to a crowd below, without compromising their safety (Rahtz and Watts 1997, fig 82); cf. drawing of display of relics from the apse of St Servatius in Maastricht, in den Hartog 1992, fig 78 (I am indebted to Michael Hare for this reference).

We used all our records to make interpretations like fig 8 to name the sequence of features: here the west face of the tower in elevation. Or, in theory, we could
move the tower sequence to the right (fig 9) showing the relationships of its successive stages to those of the west end of the nave, to see how they all fit together, with the floors at different heights.

Fig 8. Interpretation of elevation of west face of porch/tower and adjoining areas
Fig 9. Schematic drawing with porch/tower 'slid sideways' to show relationship to the west end of the basic rectangle
The next stage was to construct rather daunting diagrams to illustrate the stratigraphic sequence from Roman times to the 11th century, such as fig 10. This incorporated all the evidence collated from different parts of the church, such as the incidence of herringbone masonry, and put in the potential dating evidence from sculpture and radiocarbon. This leads (the two columns on the left) to a definition of periods I–VI, and their possible dating.

**Fig 10. Summary of stratigraphic and structural sequence**
A suggested sequence

We may now attempt to summarise the story of the church in a more reader-friendly manner (figs 11–12).

\[\text{Fig 11. Plan of church with names of principal elements}\]

I Roman and later

There are substantial Roman structures in the area; the earliest evidence is of pottery and timber structures in the Odda’s Chapel area, of the earlier Roman centuries, possibly originating in a military site, on this spur above the Severn. Later finds are likely to be associated with a villa somewhere in the vicinity. This could, in the 4th century, have provided a Christian nucleus for the developments in later centuries.

In the church area, the Rev G. Butterworth, a former incumbent of St Mary’s Church, who wrote the first major book on Deerhurst (Butterworth 1890), records ‘two large earthenware vases or cinerary urns under the pavement of the church in 1861’ (ibid. 10, footnote 1), presumably the nave. There was also a coin of Victorinus (AD 265) discovered ‘at the same time and place’. It seems likely that the urns were from cremations, pagan interments earlier than the 4th century. If this is true, then St Mary’s was a sacred place and used for
burial, antecedent any Anglo-Saxon use of the spot as a church by several centuries.

Apart from these, there were many Roman finds from the excavations. In the western cuttings, there was pottery, roof and hypocaust tile, brick-tempered mortar (from the newly-discovered foundation), stone roof slate, tesserae from mosaic, and a 4th-century coin; a similar range was found at the east end, with possible structural features and burials; and more such finds in the north exterior.

Without taking up the floors inside the church we are unlikely to find out more about the Roman origins of St Mary's, or what happened between late Roman times and the Christian structures we may expect to have been built in the later 7th–8th centuries. Except in one place: Arnold Porter, in a question after the lecture, reminded us of the importance of determining the extent of the foundation in the west exterior (see fig 11): whether it returned to the western part of the present church, or was the east wall of some structure to the west of the church, extending into the graveyard, where there is a distinct mound, perhaps a mausoleum. This could be resolved by further excavation, but there are formidable problems here in depth and burials.

II-VI  *The Anglo-Saxon Church*

These are the five phases of the church. Fig 11 is the composite plan of all structural elements. The present nave and central space (the latter now the chancel) is the first definable stone church (shaded in fig 11). This is what Harold Taylor used to call the ‘basic rectangle’, defined by the ornate string course, which can still be seen (see top of fig 4); but the basic rectangle is of more than one phase, and of a timber/stone sequence suggested above.

To this successive additions were added. These comprise firstly the porch, later heightened to become the tower. This is in two cells, as may be seen at present; but may have originally been a single cell (the eastern one), later lengthened to the west, perhaps to support the heightened structure. Secondly, there was an apse, an eastern sanctuary, of changing form, and again originally possibly of timber. Finally, there were a series of side chapels, termed *porticus* (this name can be either single or plural) on the north and south sides of the church, beginning with complex structures at the east end, with components overlapping the apsidal sanctuary; and successively extending to the western end, probably finally to both sides of the porch/tower. In this sequence there are not only successive phases of timber/stone, but several floor levels and heightenings, and changes in building styles, as well as sculptural and other decorations.

We may now deconstruct this sequence into its separate phases, shown here in axonometric projections (fig 12).

II  **7th – 8th century** (fig 12, upper left)

This comprises the basic rectangle, itself of more than one sub-phase; to this we now postulate the addition of a western porch (possibly only its eastern cell);
an apsidal sanctuary to the east, probably of timber; and possibly timber porticus flanking the eastern apse to north and south. A division is shown between nave and central space (see fig 11); the latter may have been a chancel or choir.

---

Fig 12. The suggested sequence of the Anglo-Saxon church, phases II to VI, and section to show the sequence of floor levels.
III  

? 8th century (fig 12, upper right)

In this phase there is good evidence for a semi-circular apse, and flanking porticus on either side of the east end. That on the north side was a triple porticus; the central member of this (originally of timber) was of two storeys; the east member was only of one; and there was an additional small entry porticus to the west (porticus ingressus). The latter does not appear in fig 12, being hidden in this projection behind the central member, but is seen in fig 11. There was a similar arrangement on the south side, though we do not have any evidence for an entry porticus here. There is no herringbone work in this phase.

IV-V  Late 8th – 10th century (fig 12, centre)

The work of these phases is characterised by the inception of herringbone masonry. The whole of the basic rectangle was heightening (possibly replacing an upper part in timber), and capped by a massive string course with an intricate profile. It can be seen at the east end of the north aisle, just below the roof (see its location at the upper right hand corner of fig 4). This structure culminates in the magnificent polygonal apse, with its arcaded panels defined by strip-work. The external angel is in one of these, visible in the one surviving member of the apse (with the stub of the second). This is the apogee of the church; it must have looked impressive from the east, with its decorated apse and the high porticus behind it.

To these phases, probably in its later stages, we would attribute the double triangular-headed window in the west wall of the basic rectangle (using at least one Roman stone with a lewis-hole), lighting the major second-floor chamber in the porch/tower. This stage is also characterised by its sculptural detail, notably the beast-heads at the extremities of the arches at the east and west interior ends of the present church; on the exterior of the western entrance high up on the tower; and above the south doorway in the farm garden. This ‘beast-head’ stage also includes the prokrossoi (singular prokrossos). These are animal sculptures (sadly mutilated), protruding from the masonry above the west doorways in the exterior face of the porch/tower, and above the south entrance in the farm garden.

VI  10th-11th century (fig 12, lower left)

Finally, the series of porticus were extended the whole length of the church, flanking the now high tower on the north side, but probably not to the south. These may have been done in several phases. The porch/tower was raised to its present height in non-herringbone masonry, possibly after the Norman Conquest.

***

A section through the church in its final phase (fig 12, lower right) shows the complexity of the successive floor levels; Harold Taylor believed that they had
different functions in the developed monastery, the upper one being the communal dormitory. We see here that the church interior was not so lofty as we see it now, but subdivided into many levels, platforms and rooms, very different from the widely-spaced elements of later monasteries.

**Conclusion**

In the course of one lecture, it was not possible to progress through all the range of evidence and interpretation. To do this one needs a whole weekend of seminars. But I hope I have indicated some of the work that Harold Taylor, Lawrence Butler, Mick Aston, Lorna Watts and I have been engaged in, and how we dealt with it. But this is only a preliminary investigation; much more could be done in examination of the fabric, and by excavation; and more scientific work on mortars and stone. For instance, we did not have an experienced geologist to identify the origin of the building stones, but a start has been made here by Steve Bagshaw (1999) who suggests various groupings of stone, in various periods which fortunately do not contradict our preliminary phasing. Richard Gem hopes to make further examinations of the coloured paint residues on the sculptures and structural members; there is quite a considerable amount of paint on the triangular-headed slab on the northern side at the east end, recently observed by Michael Hare when St Mary’s was being redecorated. We would all like to see a proper examination of the flat slab high on the west inside wall of the nave; this, it has been suggested, had an inscription (and still may have, under its coating); this would be highly informative!

Readers who need a fuller exposition than this version of the lecture allows should study our book (Rahtz and Watts 1997) in which we set out in detail all that we have learnt. The extent to which it falls short of a definitive account is shown by the severe criticisms in a recent major review of the book (Cramp et al. 1998). These indicate the work which is needed by a younger generation of scholars in the third millennium, with major resources.

* * *

Finally, I would like to thank all the parishioners of Deerhurst who helped us in our endeavours over the last 30 years, and especially the Morris family; the Friends of Deerhurst Church for inviting me to give the 2000 lecture in this most remarkable building; and Michael Hare who has edited this version, and arranged it for publication.

* * *

The lecture, and this version for publication, were based on the 1997 book on Deerhurst (Rahtz and Watts 1997) and were constructed in collaboration with Lorna Watts.
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Carolyn Heighway (abbreviated text of the 1989 Deerhurst Lecture, revised
ed. 2001) £1.00

*The Anglo-Saxon Landscape of North Gloucestershire* by Della Hooke
(Deerhurst Lecture 1990) £1.25

*How do we know so much about Anglo-Saxon Deerhurst?* by Patrick
Wormald (Deerhurst Lecture 1991) £2.50

*The two Anglo-Saxon minsters of Gloucester* by Michael Hare (Deerhurst
Lecture 1992) £2.50

*Land, power and politics: the family and career of Odda of Deerhurst*
by Ann Williams (Deerhurst Lecture 1996) £2.00

*The origins of the parishes of the Deerhurst area* by Steven Bassett
(Deerhurst Lecture 1997) £2.50

*From Anglo-Saxon to Anglo-Norman: North Gloucestershire in Domesday*
*Book* by John Moore (Deerhurst Lecture 1998) £3.00

*Deerhurst above and below ground* by
Philip Rahtz (Deerhurst Lecture 2000) £2.50

*The Priory Church of St Mary at Deerhurst* by Arnold Porter
(Guidebook, lavishly illustrated) £1.50

Publications may be obtained from The Secretary, The Friends of
Deerhurst Church, Daffodil Cottage, Deerhurst, Gloucester GL19 4BX.
Please add 40p for each publication for postage and packing.