

# The Church of St Michael and all Angels

## Moccas

### HEREFORDSHIRE

### (NGR SO 35710 43280)

*A Report on an Archaeological Trial Excavation.*

---

#### **1. Summary.**

---

*The project was undertaken in response to proposals by Moccas PCC to extend the existing cemetery to the west (planning application ref NW2000/0799/F and a brief from Herefordshire Archaeology dated 25/05/2000 apply).*

*Under PPG16 (1991) the development proposal was judged to have significant archaeological implications. The Local Planning Authority was advised that a program of archaeological work was necessary to mitigate the archaeologically damaging effect of the development.*

*The extent to which archaeology had been preserved on site was not previously known and no archaeological work had been carried out there before.*

*The aim of the project was to establish the presence and significance of archaeological deposits within the proposed area. In particular the project aimed to identify the pre Norman evidence with regard to occupation and burials.*

*Six burials were discovered within two of the trial trenches (T1 and T4) excavated to the north of the churchyard and a seventh burial was found in ploughed soil at the edge of the field to the west of the present churchyard.*

*A large circular pit containing nine separate layers of fill was discovered in a third trial trench (T3), there were no finds associated with this feature.*

*No pottery or other datable artefacts were present within any of the trial trenches, some human bone was retained from two burials for radio carbon 14 dating, the dates came back as (SK1) mid 12<sup>th</sup> -mid 13<sup>th</sup> century and (SK6) late 11<sup>th</sup> -mid 12<sup>th</sup> century.*

---

---

## **2. Introduction .**

---

Archaeological Investigations Ltd was commissioned by Mr John Entwistle acting on behalf of Moccas PCC to evaluate an area proposed for the extension to the cemetery, with the fieldwork taking place between the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 22<sup>nd</sup> of October 2002.

Under PPG16 (1991) the development proposal was judged to have significant archaeological implications. The Local Planning Authority was advised that a program of archaeological work was necessary to mitigate the archaeologically damaging effect of the development.

The proposal was contained within a planning application (NW2000/0799/F, validated 20/03/2000) and the archaeological work defined by a brief from Herefordshire Archaeology dated 25/05/2000.

The village of Moccas is located at NGR SO 35710 43280 in the south west of Herefordshire (Fig 1).

The site (HSM 1080) is adjacent to the north-west boundary of St Michael's Churchyard at around 76m O.D and occupies an area of 488m square.

The church (HSM 1775) is on raised ground (Fig 2), possibly within a larger and earlier enclosure that backs onto land presently being used for grazing livestock.

---

---

## **3. Historical Background, (Dr John Eisel).**

---

*Moccas lies within the area bounded by the Wye, the Monnow, and the Black Mountains. This area was known in post-Roman times as Erging (in Welsh) or Archenfield (in English), both names being derived from the Latin Ariconium, the name of the Roman mining town two miles east of Ross-on-Wye, the implication being that this was once part of the Archenfield.*

In the twelfth century this area was claimed by the diocese of Llandaff, although by then it was mostly in the Diocese of Hereford, with some parishes in the Diocese of St. David's. The claim to ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the area was made by Urban, Bishop of Llandaff, and in pursuit of this the Liber Llandavensis - Book of Llandaff - was compiled, consisting of supporting evidence in the form of copies of charters, lives of saints, etc. Urban died in 1133 on his way to see the Pope about the claim, which was thus never tested. This compilation gives the story of St. Dyfrig (in Welsh, Dubricius in Latin, or Devereux in Norman-French) and although the outline may be basically true, the detail is likely to be inaccurate, as all the evidence was presented in the best form to give support to the claim of Bishop Urban. Modern interpretation suggests that St. Dyfrig was born c.440-450 or perhaps slightly later, and it is said he was born in Madley (another account says Moccas). His earlier religious life was spent as a missionary and teacher, being centred at Hentland, which became a religious centre to rival Llaniltud Fawr. His pupils included St. Teilo and St. Samson, and at least four bishops. Ariconium being not too far away he could make use of the remains of the Roman road system converging on Ariconium to help him in the conversion of Erging and Gwent. After a few years St. Dyfrig moved his school to Mochros (identified as Moccas), and subsequently was created Bishop of Llandaff, and then Archbishop of Caeleon. Eventually he retired to Bardsey Island where he died in the middle of the sixth century.

Although it was called a school, St. Dyfrig's establishment at Mochros would have been an organised monastic or semi-monastic church and a community or 'clas' (SMR 1080), members of which were called canons, and headed by an abbot. Any church would have been small and probably made of wood or wattle. As several other monastic schools were growing up Mochros gradually lost its status, and one of S. Dyfrig's successors, Bishop Comereg, was the last known abbot of Mochros *c.*590 and it is assumed to have closed after this. Thereafter, apart from an odd mention of the church in a charter, nothing further is known until Domesday book in 1086.

By the time of Domesday the area had been taken over by the invading English, although Welsh customs still pertained in Archenfield and are carefully recorded in Domesday. The manor of 'Mochre' – Moccas - was divided into two parts, the major part being part of the endowment of St. Guthlac's in Hereford, was valued at 30s. The adjoining parishes of Tyberton and Preston-on-Wye were said to have been laid waste in the time of King Edward (no doubt because of Welsh incursions), but no comment about the earlier status of Moccas was made and a possible inference is that there was nothing at Moccas before the Conquest and a new community (SMR 25781) was settled at Moccas after the Conquest. The smaller part of the parish, valued at 15s., was held by Nigel the Doctor.

In about 1156 the land formerly held by Nigel the Doctor was in the hands of Walter of Moccas, whose family name was del Fresne or de Frene, and he held the rest of the manor as well. He also held land in Sutton St. Nicholas and Maund. In 1294 Hugh de Frene had licence to fortify his manor house at Moccas. The manor of Moccas remained in the possession of the de Frene family until 1375 when Sir Richard de Frene died, his lands being divided between his three daughters. The Moccas estate then passed into the Vaughan family of Bredwardine in whose hands it remained until the seventeenth century. Two sons having died without issue, the Moccas estate reverted to their mother who married Edward Cornewall. He had previously bought the Bredwardine estate and so these estates were reunited. In 1771 Catherine Cornewall, daughter and heiress of Velters Cornewall, married Sir George Amyand and he took the name Cornewall. He enlarged it from an estate of 2907 acres in 1772 to nearly 7000 acres in 1818 (SMR 7599). The Moccas estate still remains in the hands of his descendants.

Little is known of the history of the present church (SMR 1775), most being deduced from the fabric of the church. It stands on a mound and was built of tufa in one phase in the second quarter of the twelfth century (Fig 3). The nave is in the form of a double cube, with a chancel and apse. In the middle of the chancel is a table tomb, on top of which is an effigy dating from *c.*1330, thought to represent one of the de Frene family. There are north and south doorways, each with a tympanum of the Herefordshire School (Fig /plate ??). The north doorway is blocked. Subsequent alterations include windows of *c.*1300 in the chancel and fourteenth century windows in the nave.

In the middle of the seventeenth century the church was visited by Silas Taylor, the Parliamentarian antiquary, who wrote:

'In the churchyard at Mockes are to be seen the foundations of a very large church to which this now standing was but a chapple, of which the inhabitants say that the ornaments and painted glass was carried to madley in the north window of that church now standing is this coate.'

There is then a gap in the record until the eighteenth century. After Sir George Cornewall took over the estate on his marriage he caused to be drawn up a book of maps of the various manors and farms on the estate (Fig 4). The survey was carried out by John Lambe Davis in 1772 and the church is clearly depicted on the map showing the Moccas estate. The churchyard was to the south of the church, and the apportionment shows that the total extent of the church and churchyard was 21 perches or 635¼ square yards, just under an eighth of an acre. It was situated in the middle of field, called ChurchYard Meadow, rented out to the rector of Moccas. Access to the church must have been by footpath, not marked on the map. There is a larger map of the estate, undated but of the same period, which also shows this, but this is very indistinct.

Within a few years the situation had changed. Sir George Cornewall built a new house at Moccas (SMR 8995) from 1775 onwards, and in 1778 commissioned Lancelot Brown to plan improvements to the landscape. He also rebuilt the Home Farmhouse, Stable Court and Farmyard. As part of all this the access to Moccas Court (SMR 8995) was altered and a new private road made, passing close to the church, one of a number of new access roads. A drawing of the new Moccas Court was made by James Wathen, the final version being dated 1788, and this shows the house and church from Brobury Scar, the church surrounded by trees while the house is rather bare.

In 1787 a drawing was made of the south elevation of the church, and also a plan. This shows that at that time the church had a west bell turret, and that the window in the south side of the apse was what was described in 1891 as ‘an ordinary cottage window.’ Early in the nineteenth century repairs were carried out to the church by a Mr. Westmacott. A drawing for proposed new windows in the chancel was made in 1805 (and initialled RW) and there is also an undated drawing for a double bell cote which is of the same period. The windows were seemingly not rebuilt until later in the century, but the present bell cote may have been built at this time, and it is possible that the west wall itself was rebuilt.

At this period there was a proposal to extend the churchyard, and the necessary legal papers were drawn up in 1812 by the attorney to Sir George Cornewall, but not executed. The extension to the churchyard was to be ‘...bounded by the churchyard on the east by the private road leading to the stable and ffarm (*sic*) ground of Moccas Court on the south and by a sunk ffence on the North and West parts or sides thereof’. This was an L-shaped extension on the west and south sides of the existing churchyard. Sir George changed his mind about the proposal and the legal work had not been executed before his death in 1819. On 2 June 1820 his attorney wrote to the executors of Sir George’s estate, submitting his account for the legal work carried out.

‘The business was not completed owing to some change in Sir Geo’s mind, but the Instruments charged for were ingrossed & all the Stamps spoiled. The business has remained in this state for some years tho’ I have more than once or twice spoke to the late Sir Geo on the Subject.’

After this something obviously happened, as when the tithe map as drawn up (undated, but the apportionment was dated 1838) the parcel of ground described above was included in the churchyard.

*The repairs carried out by Mr. Westmacott only delayed an inevitable restoration, and a pencil sketch of the church from the north-east, made on 2 August 1867 shows that the west gable of the church and the other gables covered in ivy. No graves are evident to the north of*

*the church. Extensive work on the church was carried out in 1870-1 under the supervision of Mr. George Gilbert Scott jun., including rebuilding the chancel arches which were badly cracked. The effigy on the table tomb was moved from the corner of the chancel to the position where it now is. Finally, the churchyard was extended to the north and east of the church, and this extension was dedicated on 25 April 1871, using a standard form of consecration as used in the diocese of Hereford. This extension is shown on the 1:2500 OS maps.*

### ***Extent of churchyard***

*The evidence of a school or monastic establishment at 'Mochros', founded by St. Dygfrig, is good, and no reason has as yet been found to doubt the identification of Mochros with Moccas. The remains of such an establishment are not likely to be substantial, with buildings probably of wood, and the most obvious record is likely to be an enclosure ditch (SMR 4034).*

*Even if the church lapsed, such a spot would be considered holy, and if a new church was built – as happened in the twelfth century – it would not be surprising if it were re-established at the same place. The evidence of Silas Taylor in the 1650s suggests that the churchyard was then very much larger, and there is the surprising assertion that the foundations of a much larger church were then visible. It is not clear whether Taylor actually visited Moccas himself.*

*Certainly by the eighteenth century the churchyard was very much reduced in area and hardly big enough to serve even such a small community as Moccas. The fact that there was then no churchyard on the north side suggests that this had been thrown into the surrounding field as part of a landscaping exercise that took place before 'Capability' Brown's work from 1778.*

---

---

## **4. Aims and Objectives.**

---

The project was considered likely to produce results of local/regional archaeological importance.

The main aim of the project was to establish the presence and significance of archaeological deposits, artefacts and ecofacts beneath the areas of the proposals. In particular the projects aim was to identify pre Norman burial and occupation.

The main objectives of the work were to:

- a. Identify the date and nature of features being investigated.
- b. Assess the survival, quality, condition and relative significance of any archaeological features, deposits and structures within the study area.
- c. Produce a record of the features present on the site.
- d. Analyse and publish the findings where appropriate.

---

---

## **5. Methodology.**

---

The brief required that 10% of the 488m square site should be excavated. This was achieved with 5 trenches each 5m x 1.6m wide. The trenches were oriented at 45 degrees to the church to maximise the chance of identifying associated burials. It was not expected that any burials found would be lifted (Fig 5).

Specialist analysis on skeletal remains was undertaken in situ and samples were taken for carbon dating, a home office licence was obtained to facilitate these measures. General biological samples were retained from archaeologically interesting features for further analysis.

The areas of ground disturbance were tied into features shown on the Ordnance Survey 1:2500 mapping using electronic survey. Plans and sections were drawn at 1:20 or 1:10 scale as appropriate.

After cleaning the sections, photographs were taken using colour and black and white 35mm film, to record the presence or absence of archaeological deposits.

Recording was in accordance with Archaeological Investigations Ltd's site manual. Registers were kept for context sheets, photographs, samples and drawings.

---

---

## **6. Results.**

---

Five trenches, all measuring 5m long x 1.60m wide were excavated within the site of the proposed cemetery extension (Fig 5), they were laid out as described in the methodology. The results from each trench are recorded below.

---

### **6.1 Trench 1. (Figs 5 and 6)**

---

Trench 1 was aligned east-west, located near the middle of and close to the north boundary of the cemetery, at the south side of the excavation area. The total depth of Trench 1 was a little over 0.80m.

The topsoil (layer 1001, same as 2001, 3000, 4000 and 5001) was 0.21m deep within trench 1, consisting of dark blackish-brown silty sand and some rounded stones. Within the deposit were bits of plaster and mortar that may have come from the church during Victorian restoration work. No other finds were present within 1001 other than a few modern animal bones.

Sealed by 1001 was 1002, a layer of pinkish-light brown, silty mixed subsoil. Within it were a variety of rounded stones some as large as cobbles. The total depth of the deposit was 0.41m and it was the same as 2002, 3003, 4001 and 5002. Occasional bits of the same kind of mortar/plaster mentioned in 1001 were present in this deposit. No other finds were present within 1002. The layer below 1002 (1003) consisted of natural red-brown silt and gravel. The excavation of the trench cut 0.36m into this layer. This layer is the same as 2003, 3004, 4002 and 5003.

A lens of pinkish-orange silty sand mixed with mortar was present at the interface of 1002 and 1003. The lense was 1.90m long x 0.18m deep. No finds other than mortar were present in the deposit. Sealed below the lense and cut into the gravel layer was a pit (1006/1005). The pit was 0.82m wide x 0.18m deep. The sides of the cut (1006) were sloped at around 45 degrees to a flat bottom. The fill (1005) was dark grey-brown silty sand and some rounded stones. There were no finds present within the fill.

Also cutting the natural gravel layer and sealed by 1002 were the graves of two adults and a juvenile. The grave cuts and fills were at first poorly defined against the silt/gravel base and as a result the adult skeletons suffered some damage to the skulls when caught by the digger bucket. The first of the skeletons exposed in the west end of Trench 1 was SK1 within grave cut 1008 (fill 1009-dark silty sand). The burial was lying in an east-west, supine, articulated, extended position with arms crossed over the chest to the neck. The burial was complete but the bones were in a brittle condition. The body (as with all the others discovered on the site) was examined in situ by a specialist and identified as a male adult. A femur was retained for C14 dating. The date range came back as mid 12<sup>th</sup> - mid 13<sup>th</sup> century (See Appendix 2).

There were no objects or grave goods buried with the body and no evidence to suggest that it had been buried in anything more than a shroud. A partial juvenile skull was found in the fill of 1008 and may belong to the infant buried next to it, SK2.

The second burial, lying to the left of and apparently cut by SK1 was SK2. SK2 was buried in cut 1010 and fill 1011 (both ill-defined), also lying in an east-west, supine, articulated, extended position with arms crossed over the chest. The burial was complete except that the skull was missing from the grave. The bones appeared to be better preserved than those of SK1. No finds or grave goods were present with this burial and again there was no evidence of a coffin.

A third burial (SK3) was located at the east end of trench 1 with its lower legs and feet just beyond the end of the trench. The burial was lying in an east-west, supine, articulated, extended position with arms crossed over the chest. The burial was complete except for some damage to the skull and legs. Again the bones were in a fairly brittle condition. The body was that of an adult male with very worn teeth. The body was buried within a well defined, linear cut (1012) and dark silty sand fill 1013. No finds or grave goods were present with this burial and again there was no evidence of a coffin.

---

## 6.2 Trench 2. (Fig 5)

---

Trench 2 was positioned 3m north and 2m west of Trench 1. It was aligned north-south and nearest the west edge of the excavation area. The trench extended slightly beyond the north edge of the site.

The topsoil (2001, same as 1001) was on average 0.50m deep. A few bones were present within it but there were no other finds at all.

Below the topsoil was 2002, very similar silty red-brown, stony subsoil to 1002. The depth of the deposit was 0.35m and no finds were present within it.

The natural gravel and silt layers (2003) lay below 2002. The only signs of disturbance within the trench and within this layer were from tree roots. No finds or features were present within Trench 2.

---

### **6.2.1 Ground water test pipe within Trench 2.**

---

When the excavation and recording of trench 2 was completed, a pipe was inserted for the occasional testing of the quality of ground water.

A plastic pipe was inserted vertically into a hole dug for it at the north end of Trench 2. The base of the trench was excavated to accommodate it with a small, toothed bucket to over 3.20m below ground level. No water was apparent during the excavation of this hole.

---

### **6.3 Trench 3. (Figs 5 and 7)**

---

Trench 3 was located 4.50m to the east of Trench 2. This trench was also aligned north-south and partly lay over the edge of the site area.

The topsoil (3000) was as already described. The depth of the deposit within trench 3 varied from 0.30m to 0.50m as it sloped slightly from north to south. A small amount of animal bone and plaster or mortar was present within the topsoil but there were no other finds.

Over the north half of the trench, were the remains of a truncated layer, 3001. The layer was 0.18m deep at the north end sloping down and disappearing near the middle of the trench. The layer appeared to be made up of a mixture of the topsoil and subsoil. There were animal bones and charcoal flecks present within it

Sealed by both the topsoil and the truncated layer at around 0.40m below the surface was a cobbled/pebble spread (3002) that may represent a surface or track, certainly the spread was not present in the other trenches excavated. The layer was not more than 0.08m deep at any point along its length and although patchy in places it appeared to be continuous right across the trench. There were no finds associated with the spread.

Below 3002 was the pinkish subsoil 3003 (described above). The depth of the deposit averaged 0.25-0.30m, there were no finds present within the layer.

Cutting 3003 and the layers of natural gravel below (3004) was a circular or ovoid pit (3014) that was 2.30m wide x 0.80m deep and bowl shaped, within it were nine fills. The uppermost fill (3005) was 0.36m deep and consisted of brown silty clay and various abundant stones. Mixed with the fill were flecks of charcoal and occasional pieces of mortar and plaster.

Sealed by 3005 was a 0.10m deep deposit (3006) of dark soil and lime mortar, a general biological sample (sample 1) was taken from this deposit. Below the mortar deposit was a 0.10m deep deposit of blackish silt (3007) that contained charcoal flecks and ash. A number of cobbles and pebbles were also present along the base of the deposit. A biological sample was also taken from this deposit (sample 2).

Below deposit 3007 the width of the cut reduced to about 1.40m. Possibly the upper part of the feature (from the base of 3007 up) represented a re-cut of an older pit. Below 3007 were six separate fills 3008, 3009, 3010, 3011, 3012 and 3013, all very similar in nature. The deposits showed in section as alternating thin stripes of pinkish brown silty clay (3008, 3010,

3012 averaging a depth of 0.02m) and dark blackish silt (3009, 3011, 3013 averaging depths of 0.04m-0.08m). No finds were present from within any of these deposits.

---

#### **6.4 Trench 4. (Figs 5 and 8)**

---

Trench 4 was located 4m to the east of Trench 3 and was aligned north-south.

The topsoil (4000) (as described) was 0.47m deep on this part of the site. Within the layer were flecks of charcoal, mortar, animal bone and lots of stones.

Sealed by the topsoil was layer 4001, this was the same stony subsoil as previously described. Within Trench 4 the layer was on average 0.30m deep. No finds were present within the layer.

Cutting layer 4001 and the natural gravel (4005) below were three graves 4004, 4006 and 4008. The graves were only partly exposed in Trench 4 due to its alignment being north-south. Grave cut 4004 was 0.70m wide x 0.50m deep, rectilinear with a rounded off end for the feet. The sides were vertical and the bottom part of the grave was stepped in, probably because the gravel was difficult to dig through. The grave was filled by a blackish brown stony soil (4003) which contained burial SK6. The skeleton was exposed from just below the knees to the feet lying in a supine, articulated and extended burial position. The condition was poor and some of the foot bones only appeared as stains in the soil making cleaning and recording very difficult.

The skeleton SK6 was badly eroded by the acidity of the background soils and gravel leaving parts of them not much thicker than paper. The burial was examined in situ and part of one femur was retained for C14 dating. The date range came back as late 11<sup>th</sup> - mid 12<sup>th</sup> century (See Appendix 2).

There were no nails present in the fill to indicate a possible coffin burial and no finds were present in the grave.

Grave cut 4006 was 0.46m wide x 0.50m deep. The cut and fill (4005) were difficult to distinguish in plan due to soil leaching but the section showed the feature more clearly, the fill was much the same as 4003. In section it could be seen that the sides of the cut were vertical and the base was slightly rounded. The skeleton (SK4) contained within fill 4005 was a juvenile in a similar condition to SK6, the burial was supine articulated and extended. The skull was fragmentary the upper arms and shoulders were little more than stains and the rib cage was entirely gone. No nails or other finds were present within the grave.

One more burial was present in Trench 4. Grave cut 4008 filled by 4007 contained skeleton SK5. The cut was poorly preserved in plan but again showed up in the section quite well, it was 0.46m wide x 0.40m deep with vertical sides and a flat bottom. The fill was similar again to 4005 and 4003. This skeleton was also in a poor state although slightly better than SK6 and SK4. The skull was quite badly damaged and the arms, ribs and shoulders were all but stains, the spine however was at least partially intact. Burial SK5 was also supine, articulated and extended. No finds were present in the excavated portions of any of the graves.

On the east section just to the south of SK4 there was a feature. The feature appeared as a narrow (0.04m wide) vertical line of dark soil, stretching from the base of the topsoil down

into the gravel. The feature looked like a possible animal burrow or root hole, alternatively it could have been a stake or post hole, the evidence was inconclusive.

---

### **6.5 Trench 5. (Fig 5)**

---

Trench 5 was located 3m to the east and 1m north of Trench 4. This trench was aligned east west and was positioned on the line of the north boundary of the extended area.

The topsoil (5001) was as described above. The depth of the layer in this area was on average 0.50m deep with some undulation of the base of the deposit. Sealed below layer 5001 was the stony red-brown subsoil (5002) also described above, within trench 5 the depth of the subsoil averaged between 0.40m and 0.60m. No finds or features were present within the layer.

Underlying 5002 was the top of the natural gravel layer 5003. There were no features or finds related to any of the deposits within Trench 5.

---

---

## **7. Discussion.**

---

Within the excavation area a total of six burials were located within two trenches, skeletons 1-3 were located in Trench 1, skeletons 4-6 were located within Trench 4. A seventh burial was identified at the edge of the adjacent field to the west in recently ploughed soil.

The condition of the burials varied depending on where they were found. Within trench 1 the preservation of the bones was much better than it had been in Trench 4 and the burial ploughed up in the field appeared (except for plough damage) in better condition than the skeletons within Trench 1.

There were only limited signs of inter-cutting between burials, SK1 must have been buried later than SK2 and appeared to have cut the right side of SK2's grave. Parts of the skull of a juvenile, which are most reasonably likely to be from SK2 were found in the fill with SK1. No further examples of inter-cut graves were present in the excavated areas. This could suggest that the population of Moccas has never been large enough to fill this part of the cemetery to capacity.

The layout and extent of the earliest churchyard is not presently known, there are possible earthworks enclosing the churchyard visible to the north and west of the present cemetery. If the observed feature is an earthwork it may relate to the Celtic church.

The extent of the churchyard on the estate map dated 1772 and the apportionment map (probably from 1838) shows it as a small area of land confined to the south side of the church. A tythe apportionment map undated but probably from the later 19<sup>th</sup> century shows a dotted line coincidental with the present perimeter fence suggesting that this part of the cemetery was being enclosed at that time. The iron estate boundary fence still enclosing this part of the cemetery appears to confirm this possibility.

Part of the boundary fence (north-west) appears to have been moved back towards the church since it was erected in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. If the original line of the fence was followed, as drawn on the later tythe apportionment map then all the burials discovered by the evaluation would

be within the boundary as it was in the later 19<sup>th</sup> century. This may suggest that the burials located were interred before the boundary was moved, probably in the late 19<sup>th</sup> or early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Alternatively if the cemetery of the Celtic church was in the same area of the site, at least some of the burials could belong to that early period.

The results of the carbon 14 dates and the specialist analysis of the skeletons puts the burials between the mid 11<sup>th</sup> and mid 13<sup>th</sup> centuries. samps 1+2?

---

---

## 8. Conclusion.

---

In conclusion it can be said that the aims of the project were satisfied and that the methods employed were appropriate to this site.

---

---

## 9. Bibliography.

---

### *Sources*

- Bowen, Prof. E.G. 1953 *The Settlements of the Celtic Saints in Wales*.  
Burgoyne, Rev. G. 1979 *Church Guide*.  
RCHM 1931 Vol. 1 South West.  
Robinson, Rev. C.J. 1872 Mansions and Manors of Herefordshire.  
Thorn, F. and C. 1983 Domesday Book. Herefordshire.  
Transactions of the Woolhope Naturalists' Field Club, in particular  
1891 221  
1914 159, 211  
1924 viii  
1968 334, 338  
Whitehead, David. 2001 *A survey of Historic Parks & Gardens in Herefordshire*.  
Whitehead and Shoesmith 1994 *James Wathen's Herefordshire 1770-1820*.

### **Hereford Record Office**

- Deeds and letters relating to the extension of the churchyard AF57/3/2-4, F10/B/1-6  
Eighteenth century estate map C62/1  
Tithe map MX 20  
Papers relating to enclosure J56/III 85

### **Hereford Reference Library**

- Folder of drawings and plans relating to Moccas church  
Form of service for dedication of extension to churchyard 25 April 1871  
MSS collections on Moccas (c.1785)

### **Woolhope Club Library**

- Estate plans surveyed in 1772.

---

---

### **Appendix 1. Site Archive. Aquisition No 2002-49.**

---

- |     |  |     |                      |
|-----|--|-----|----------------------|
| 1.  | 1 Drawing register.                            | 11. | The finds,           |
| 2.  | 1 Trench location plan at 1:100.               | 12. | 1 Sample register.   |
| 3.  | 6 Sheets of plan and section drawings at 1:20. | 13. | 2 Enviro samples.    |
| 4.  | 2 Context registers.                           | 14. | 6 Skeleton sheets.   |
| 5.  | 42 Context sheets.                             | 15. | 3 skeletons.         |
| 6.  | 4 Photographic registers.                      | 16. | Correspondence file. |
| 7.  | 2 Colour films x 36 exp.                       | 17. | Carbon 14 samples.   |
| 8.  | 2 B & W films x 36 exp.                        | 18. | This report.         |
| 9.  | 3 Site notebook pages.                         | 19. | Inked drawings.      |
| 10. | 4 Finds registers.                             |     |                      |

---

---

**Appendix 2, The Carbon 14 dates.**

---

---

---

**Appendix 3, The Skeletal Remains by Dr Megan Brickley.**

---