

Surrey Archaeological Society

Medieval Studies Forum Newsletter

No.13 March 2017

Welcome to the latest edition of the Forum Newsletter. Many months have passed since the last edition, a delay that has weighed on the minds of all those involved in producing it. As the old saying goes, life has a habit of getting in the way!

One positive result of the long delay in producing this edition is that there is a bumper crop of content and annexes by a number of contributors. The newsletter proper begins with a run-through of the most appropriate name or names by which to refer to the period 410–1066, drawing upon some lively debate that has taken place in both archaeological and historical circles in recent years, but with a particular focus on how the various possibilities fit with the circumstances of Surrey. There follow a few notes, and notices of new publications, forthcoming Forum meetings and a day conference.

There are three annexes to this edition of the Newsletter, by Peter Balmer (on medieval churches in the landscape), Derek Renn (on tower-naves and *burh-geats*), and Stephen Humphrey (on the many names connecting Southwark and environs with Surrey). Sadly, as many readers will already be aware, Stephen Humphrey passed away recently. His contribution to this Newsletter stands as testament to his great skills as a local historian.

Lastly, I would like to pay tribute to the marvellous job Peter Balmer has done in editing the Newsletter for several years. In taking over the reins as editor, he has left me with a tough act to follow, and I have been grateful for his guidance (as well as that from other Forum committee members) in putting together this edition. Going forward, the intention is to return to producing two Newsletters a year. To do this of course requires content, and I extend the invitation to all readers to offer written contributions —long or short, research or review— on any medieval topic for inclusion in future editions.

Contents

410–1066: What should we call this period?	2
Notebook	8
New publications	10
Forthcoming Medieval Studies Forum events	11

410–1066: What should we call this period?

Rob Briggs

What label—or labels—should we use to refer to the period between the traditional end-date of Roman imperial control of Britain in 410 CE (i.e. Common Era, a useful and here rather apt alternative to AD/Anno Domini) and the Norman victory at the Battle of Hastings and subsequent Christmas Day coronation of William I in 1066 CE? Every reader will probably have one or more phrases spring immediately to mind, but how appropriate are they when you stop to consider what they actually mean? This note will discuss the most commonly-encountered terms, both old and new, not only in terms of the ever-growing body of scholarly discourse on the topic, but also in terms of how additional care must be taken when considering using some in relation to Surrey.

As someone whose research interests span multiple disciplines, for convenience and simplicity's sake I have taken to describing myself as an “early medievalist”, thereby acknowledging that I am interested in the middle ages but with an overwhelming preference for the earlier rather than later centuries. In general, I find my interest starting to wane beyond the middle of the 13th century—in other words, the best part of two centuries after the end of the timespan under discussion—yet my current PhD research goes the other way by considering archaeological data of the period *circa* 300–900 CE. *Early Medieval Surrey*, John Blair's seminal study that was itself based on a doctoral thesis, stretches its titular period as late as 1300 CE; which could be seen to leave relatively little chronological space for a hypothetical counterpart volume on Late Medieval Surrey!

A commonly-encountered international paradigm is for a three-way division into the Early, High and Late Medieval or Middle Ages. These are usually understood to represent respectively the periods *circa* 500–1000, 1000–1300, and 1300–1500. However, the period of the **Early Middle Ages** is extended for the purposes of an important thematic essay collection, *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages: Britain and Ireland c.500-c.1100*, first published in 2009. Its editor, Pauline Stafford, is candid in her introduction that ‘The date limits of this volume [...] are to a degree arbitrary’, but goes on to note that they ‘correspond roughly to the end of Roman Britain and the arrival and first impact of the Normans’ (Stafford 2009, 6). Significantly, clear explanation is offered for why the end-date is not 1066; it does not have direct relevance for the entirety of the British Isles. It does, on the other hand, have clear significance for Surrey in South-East England. Here a crucial point emerges about the contexts in which period labels are applied: a profound political change like William's seizure of the English throne, which will be reflected in historical data, does not necessarily bring about immediate material cultural change, as would show up in archaeology (coins and perhaps some imported items aside).

So far as the England (and Surrey) is concerned, the Early and High Middle Ages cut across the traditional conception of an **Anglo-Saxon** period between 410 and 1066 CE, although it must be added both of these terminal years are not without issues: imperial authorities in Rome did not simply turn off a military-political tap that had been flowing freely up until 410 CE, and nor did 1066 mark the establishment of Norman rule over the entirety of the English state. This was the label used by John Morris in his landmark 1959 archaeological gazetteer ‘Anglo-Saxon Surrey’. Despite its title, Morris was explicit in stating ‘Only objects of the pagan period, between about A.D. 400 and 650, have been included’, and the concluding archaeo-historical discussion headed ‘The Anglo-Saxons in Surrey’ keeps to the same approximate limits (Morris 1959, 132, 148–58). By widely-accepted current convention, the Anglo-Saxon period is split into three sub-periods: Early (*circa* 450–650 CE), Mid or Middle (*circa* 650–

850 CE), and Late (*circa* 850–1066). The choices of years are not just for symmetry; they correspond to certain political or cultural changes, although it must be said that other, more meaningful approximate terminal dates could be advanced in their stead. Note too that the earliest date of *circa* 450 CE excludes the four decades after 410 CE: a not-insignificant period of time, albeit one of immense historical and archaeological inscrutability. The title of Morris' gazetteer, therefore, would make more sense if it is re-read as 'Early Anglo-Saxon Surrey', with "Anglo-Saxon" serving as a useful, though not unproblematic, catch-all term for the whole period through to 1066.

Anglo-Saxon is a portmanteau name that reflects the melding of Anglian and Saxon cultural identities. Bede's famous reference to the three immigrant "tribes" of Angles, Saxons and Jutes has long dominated analyses of the archaeology of the period, with much discussion of **Anglian**, **Saxon**, and **Jutish** cultures. In 1933, J. E. A. Jolliffe noted a number of affinities between the medieval institutions of Kent and East Surrey in the context of his proposition of a 'Jutish South-East' (Kent being traditionally understood to be the heartland of Jutish settlement) but later scholarship has cast doubt upon his thesis, and any notion of "Jutish Surrey" is spurious in the extreme. Very little about the early medieval archaeology of Surrey could be described as Anglian, in the sense that it includes sites and artefact-types analogous to those from East Anglia and further north along the East Coast (and by extension Angeln/Anglia in Northern Germany). By contrast, supplanting Anglo-Saxon with Saxon—in the manner of Rob Poulton's chapter 'Saxon Surrey' in *The Archaeology of Surrey to 1540*—would seem to be warranted for reasons beyond mere alliterative convenience. Various identifications of artefacts of Saxon style from sites (particularly early inhumation cemeteries) have been proposed over the years, perhaps most recently for the part-excavated 5th- to 7th/8th-century CE cemetery at Park Lane, Croydon, about which Jacqueline McKinley (2003, 109) wrote the following:

'Croydon and the contemporaneous cemeteries in Surrey lay at, or close to, the interface between different cultural groups of Germanic settlers. Most of the artefacts suggest southern Saxon influences, with limited Kentish connections indicated by some of the weaponry and textiles. Indications of links with the Anglian region are confined to some textile evidence and the presence of the horse cremation burial, though other aspects of the latter (relatively profuse pyre debris) are not characteristic of burials from that area.'

Surrey may have abutted the kingdoms of the West Saxons and South Saxons, plus the province of the Middle Saxons, but speaking in terms of "Saxon Surrey" as a period or even sub-period is misleading. It has strong echoes of Culture History: a 20th-century school of thought that held the distributions of particular artefact types reveal the geographical extent of historically-attested ethnic groups such as Saxons, Angles, Jutes, etc. But the back-projection of early historical "ethnic" identities into a pre-historical past (i.e. the time of the 5th- and 6th-century interments at Croydon) using the presence/absence or specific forms of particular types of grave goods is now considered to be an exercise in speculation. We do not know that the people buried in the cemetery at Croydon, for example, identified themselves as Saxons. They might have done, but they may have constructed their identity in different ways: at the family or community level, or in terms of **Supra-gē*, the "southern district" from which Surrey is descended. The fact the Croydon cemetery is not alone in yielding evidence of supposed Kentish/Jutish and even Anglian cultural inputs suggests that a much more complex and nuanced situation prevailed in Surrey than an overarching Saxon identity (something its abuttal of Kent would likewise imply).

One other small point of order coming off this is the necessity to avoid referring to “Middle Saxon Surrey”. The label Middle Saxon should pertain solely to the territory and inhabitants of Middlesex. Surrey was long considered to be the “southern district” of a pre-historical Middle Saxon kingdom on either side of the Thames. This was fatally undermined by John Hines in 2004, who demonstrated that the bulk of the earliest “Anglo-Saxon” archaeology has been found to the south of the river. It also fits with earlier work by Keith Bailey and David Dumville that sees Middlesex as a polity below the level of a kingdom limited to the north side of the Thames and closely tied to the proto-urban trading settlement of Lundenwic; both it and Middlesex were perhaps Mercian creations of the late 7th century. Even if Surrey and Middlesex were two halves of an earlier whole, they had ceased to cohere as a single polity by the dawn of documentary testimony in the 670s. Therefore, references Middle or Mid Anglo-Saxon Surrey are acceptable; Middle Saxon Surrey is not, because it is fundamentally contradictory.

I can go no further without addressing the elephant in the room; the **Dark Age** or **Dark Ages**. It has long been used to refer to some or all of what came between Antiquity and the Renaissance, as well as entering common parlance to negatively characterise a period of time. In 2016, English Heritage sparked a storm of controversy among early medievalists by producing material that referred to the period after the ‘Romans’ as ‘Dark Ages’ using a little-known piece by archaeologist Ken Dark as the academic justification for its decision, thereby ignoring a vast body of scholarship that argued for and/or used alternative terminology. (So far as I am aware, the subsequent periods, ‘Medieval part 1’ (1066–1348) and ‘Medieval part 2’ (1348–1485), did not elicit an equivalent hostile response despite the astoundingly clumsy phrasing of their names.) A series of articles and blog posts —many of which can be read on the website of *History Today* magazine, such as [this initial salvo by Kate Wiles](#)— took English Heritage to task for reviving or perpetuating ‘Dark Ages’ as a period label, but differed in their opinions as to what may or may not permissibly be described as Dark Age, and the extent to which the other available alternatives are viable at different spatial scales or points in time (for instance, Early Anglo-Saxon would be wholly inappropriate as a characterisation of the 5th—7th-century CE archaeology of Cornwall, despite the county later being part of Anglo-Saxon England).

(The) Dark Ages undoubtedly have popular name recognition, and help to override some of the complexities of finding a single periodisation that accommodates the very different contexts of, say, the contemporaneous high-status settlements at [Tintagel in Cornwall](#) and [Rendlesham in Suffolk](#). But the term, if it must be used at all, should be employed with the utmost care in a limited range of circumstances. Thus, “Dark Age Surrey” might be used in the title of a research project or paper, but only if the purpose of that work was to shed light on the period and improve understanding of it, as much in the eyes of those who might not be aware that it is not the optimal label for the period in question as for those who know this already. On the other hand, it would be highly inadvisable to make repeated references to Dark Age settlements/artefacts/personages within an article or presentation, especially given there is no shortage of alternatives with greater degrees of credibility.

Considerably less baggage is attached to the terms put forward by Mark Gardiner in a short discussion of the topic in hand at the start of a chapter concerning Sussex. He argues for the years between 450–1175 CE to warrant subdivision into two periods or phases: the **Post-Roman** (450–900 CE) and **Early Medieval** (900–1175; concomitant with this is the insinuation of a Late Medieval period after 1175). Gardiner brings an impressive array of archaeological and historical evidence to bear, but not all of it is so defensible 10+ years down the line (for instance, the contention that there is ‘little evidence for significant trade levels until about 900’ —Gardiner 2003, 152— needs revision in view of the volume of late 7th- and early 8th-century *sceattas* or silver proto-pennies subsequently recorded through the [Por-](#)

table Antiquities Scheme and Corpus of Early Medieval Coin Finds). While the basic reasoning behind his bipartite paradigm remains sound, so far as the Post-Roman period is concerned such an overarching label runs the risk of suggesting that there was only very incremental change across the space of four-and-a-half centuries. Were Aelle, reputedly the first South Saxon king who besieged the former Saxon Shore fort at Pevensey and slaughtered all of its occupants in the year 491, and Alfred, the “Great” king of Wessex who revitalised Chichester as a stronghold in the late 9th century, really sufficiently alike as to merit both being called Post-Roman kings? I would argue the single descriptor has limitations, and these will grow as archaeological and historical thinking advances.

Elsewhere, the label Post-Roman has tended to be more narrowly applied. In a blog discussing the pros and cons of the various terms for the the 5th and 6th centuries CE with regard to the evidence from Lincolnshire, Caitlin Green concludes that ‘post-Roman’ is perhaps the most suitable periodic appellation, despite its ‘dry’ and inherently ‘factual’ nature. This comes after consideration of the evidence for the city of Lincoln and its hinterland presenting multiple reasons for believing they continued as some form of Romano-British polity into the 7th century CE; interestingly, she writes favourably about Brittonic (developing a suggestion by Chris Snyder) in reference to this polity, and ‘Anglo-Brittonic’ (Anglian + British) as an overall descriptor of the Lincolnshire area in the 5th to 7th centuries. Guy Halsall, meanwhile, has posited the inverted ‘Brito-Roman’ as a way of articulating the evolution of what he dubs ‘Roman-ness’ within some regions of Britain (Halsall 2013, 262, part of an avant-garde reassessment of the material culture and related identities of the time that is tangential to the purposes of this piece but well worth a read).

But Surrey is Surrey, not Lincolnshire or any other distant part of lowland Britain. The main Roman urban centre within the bounds of historic Surrey —Southwark— gives almost no such signs of continuity beyond the second decade of the 5th century. There is only a very limited body of archaeological and place-name evidence, too meagre to sustain the idea of “Brittonic Surrey”. Large parts of the historic county have produced no 5th- to 7th-century archaeological evidence whatsoever. However, using an absence of artefacts diagnostic of “Early Anglo-Saxon” material culture to postulate the continued survival of distinctively (Romano-)British population relies on negative evidence and an essentially-invisible “Brittonic” material culture, standpoints that are hugely problematic and open to criticism. Similarly blanks on archaeological distribution maps in the parts of the Upper Thames Valley have been characterised as denoting ‘communities with different ways of doing things’ to a supposed “Early Anglo-Saxon” norm (Hamerow, Ferguson and Naylor 2013, 61); a nuanced way of thinking about the issue, but one that does nothing to help ascertain the correct way of referring to the period of time in question!

Post-Roman has largely superseded **sub-Roman**, a somewhat pejorative label inasmuch as it infers that everything that happened after 410 CE was in some way inferior to what went before. While mass-production of pottery such as those from the Alice Holt industry may have ended, and coins may have ceased to circulate in large numbers (there is an ever-growing body of numismatic evidence suggesting that small numbers of Roman coins continued to be imported into Britain, albeit not necessarily as part of a monetary economy of the type that existed before large-volume coin imports ceased in the early years of the 5th century), other aspects of life —such as predominantly-pastoral farming regimes— may have been relatively unaffected (see Rippon, Smart and Pears 2015, 125–29). It might not be inaccurate to posit that the economy of the Surrey countryside in the late 4th-century CE after the abandonment of many villa settlements was in the main more like that of the late 5th century than the late 3rd century. In such conditions, applying sub-Roman to the years after 410 CE feels misleading.

The new kid on the block at the start of our period is **Late Antiquity**, a concept usually attributed to the late Peter Brown, historian and author of *The World in Late Antiquity*, published in 1971. The term is counterposed with the Middle Ages in the title of at least one important essay collection (Bintliff and Hamerow 1995). Definitions tend to vary so far as the approximate limits of Late Antiquity are concerned. Brown favoured it to span the 3rd through 8th centuries CE, which tallies with the [Oxford Centre for Late Antiquity's definition of its period running from circa 250–750 CE](#). One important characteristic of Late Antiquity as a periodisation is its geographical extent, taking in more or less the entirety of Europe, the Middle East and North Africa. This does not render it unsuitable to be used at the level of a county or below, but does encourage circumspection that it may not be the most appropriate term to use in “granular”, local contexts; Late Antique may not be the best descriptor for a 7th-century inhumation burial, for example. That said, it could be usefully employed in ways that affiliate Surrey evidence with cognates from elsewhere in Europe and beyond. At present I am not aware of any published references to “Late Antique Surrey”, but the day cannot be far off when one appears in print!

There is definitely a greater range of possible terms to describe the earliest part of the period 410–1066 CE than the latter portions. **Viking Age** might be applied in certain capacities to contextualise Surrey in the later 9th century CE, when the likes of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and several coin hoards attest to the presence or threat from Scandinavian marauders. In fact, these witnesses come towards the end of what is often referred to as the First Viking Age that began with the earliest recorded Scandinavian attacks on Britain and Western Europe towards the end of the 8th century; a Second Viking Age is associated with the emergence of Denmark under Harald Bluetooth that culminated in the seizure of the English throne by Cnut in 1016. At the very end of the time period (after *circa* 1050), **Saxo-Norman** has been applied to characterise elements of church buildings that could be said to “overlap” the Norman Conquest insofar as they exhibit pre-Norman design idioms but may well have been built after 1066; from personal experience, I can attest that the west towers of East Horsley and Wotton are excellent cases in point. Outside of non-architectural contexts, however, this label is rarely if ever apt.

Taking everything into account, I would like to conclude by offering the following comments and suggestions:

- The best way of referring to the years 410–1066 in relation to Surrey is as the Early Medieval period or the Early Middle Ages. Corollary to this is the necessity that the period after 1066 is not simply called the Medieval or Middle Ages, but the Late Medieval, etc. There should be no value judgement explicit or implicit in such nomenclature; if we are to distinguish the two periods from one another using 1066 as the dividing line, then we must bear in mind that there are at least as many commonalities between them as there are significant differences.
- Anglo-Saxon is an acceptable broad-brush periodic/chronological label, and to an extent a cultural one as well, especially so far as Surrey is concerned given its largely invisible post-Roman “Brittonic” culture. Much the same applies to the three-way subdivision into the Early, Mid(dle) and Late Anglo-Saxon. Its rather prescriptive ethnic implication, however, does raise issues, ones that do not attend Medieval/Middle Ages.
- The standalone descriptor Saxon should not be used other than in very specific stylistic discussions, because it embodies an outmoded Culture History perspective on ethnic identities for which Surrey provides conflicting evidence. References to a Middle Saxon sub-period likewise should be avoided, this time for political-cum-geographical reasons.

- At more temporally-restricted levels, sub-period names like Post-Roman, Late Antique/Antiquity, and Viking Age each have applicability at different times and to varying extents and contexts.
- Despite impassioned recent pleas to the contrary, Dark Age(s) is not entirely without its uses. The term might be used in certain scenarios with exceedingly great care, but there are so many better alternatives so far as Surrey is concerned that in reality it is hard to envisage a situation in which it would be either the only or the optimal choice available.

References

- Bailey, K., 1989 'The Middle Saxons', in S. Bassett, ed., *The Origins of Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms* (London and New York: Leicester University Press), 108–122
- Bintliff, J., and Hamerow, H., 1995 *Europe Between Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Recent archaeological and historical research in Western and Southern Europe*, BAR International Series, **617** (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports)
- Blair, J., 1991 *Early Medieval Surrey: Landholding, Church and Settlement before 1300* (Stroud and Guildford: Alan Sutton Publishing and Surrey Archaeological Society)
- Brown, P., 1971 *The World of Late Antiquity: From Marcus Aurelius to Muhammed* (London: Thames and Hudson)
- Gardiner, M., 2003 'Economy and landscape change in Post-Roman and Early Medieval Sussex, 450-1175' in D. Rudling, ed., *The Archaeology of Sussex to AD2000* (Great Dunham: Heritage Marketing and Publications), 151–60
- Green, C. R., 2015 'Anglo-Saxon or sub-Roman: what should we call Lincolnshire in the fifth and sixth centuries?' Dr Caitlin R. Green <<http://www.caitlingreen.org/2015/01/lincolnshire-anglo-saxon-or-sub-roman.html>>
- Halsall, G., 2013 *Worlds of Arthur: Facts and Fictions of the Dark Ages* (Oxford: University Press)
- Hamerow, H., Ferguson, C., and Naylor, J., 2013 'The Origins of Wessex Pilot Project', *Oxoniensia*, **78**, 49–69
- Harland, J., 2017 "'Race" In The Trenches: Anglo-Saxons, Ethnicity And The Misuse Of The Medieval Past', *The Public Medievalist* <<http://www.publicmedievalist.com/race-in-the-trenches/>>
- Hines, J., 2004 'Supre-gē — the Foundations of Surrey', in J. Cotton, G. Crocker and A. Graham, eds., *Aspects of Archaeology and History in Surrey: towards a Research Framework for the County*, ed. by (Guildford: Surrey Archaeological Society), 92–102
- Joliffe, J. E. A., 1933 *Pre-Feudal England: The Jutes* (Oxford: University Press)
- Morris, J., 1959 'Anglo-Saxon Surrey', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, **56**, 132–58
- Poulton, R., 1987 'Saxon Surrey', in J. Bird and D. G. Bird, eds., *The Archaeology of Surrey to 1540* (Guildford: Surrey Archeological Society), 197–222
- Rippon, S., Smart, C. and Pears, B., 2015 *The Fields of Britannia: Continuity and Change in the Late Roman and Early Medieval Landscape* (Oxford: University Press)
- Stafford, P., 2009 'Introduction', in P. Stafford, ed., *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages: Britain and Ireland c.500-c.1100* (Chichester: Blackwell Publishing), 3–8
- Wiles, K., 2016 'Back to the Dark Ages', *History Today* <<http://www.historytoday.com/kate-wiles/back-dark-ages>>

Notebook

Church orientation in the Welsh landscape. At the Forum's March 2015 meeting, Dr Anne Sassin Allen gave a presentation about church orientations in Wales in the session on churches in the landscape. Last year saw the publication of her research article on the same topic in the prestigious *Archaeological Journal*. The article is an extraordinary piece of research, amassing and analysing data from 630 medieval churches across Wales. Her conclusion that medieval Welsh church orientation was often influenced by prominent features of local natural or artificial topography is a striking one. Might their Surrey counterparts exhibit a similar correlation with surrounding landscape features? Dr Sassin Allen's article can be read in hard copy in the Society's library at Abinger, or online by those with RAI membership or institutional access.

Sassin Allen, A. 2016 'Church orientation in the landscape: a perspective from medieval Wales', *Archaeological Journal*, **173(1)**, 154–187

Tanning, Tawing and Tuesley. One of the recurrent themes of last year's Forum study day in Godalming was the importance of the town's medieval and early modern tanning industry. Not long after, it dawned on me that there is a further piece of evidence for the local significance of this industry of a very different nature.

For place-name specialists, early spellings of the name Tuesley, located at what is nowadays the southern edge of the town, have long caused confusion. It looks at first sight like a combination of *Tiw*, the Old English form of the Germanic pagan deity name *Tīwaz*, and the generic element *leah*, 'clearing, open woodland/wood-pasture'. However, trisyllabic spellings like *Tiverlei* 1220, *Tewersle* 1313–14, *Tyweresle* 1344, etc. are incompatible with such an etymology. As a result, Margaret Gelling sought to explain Tuesley as having nothing directly to do with a pagan god, preferring the first half of the name to stand for an unrecorded (but formally credible) personal name, **Timhere*. This was overturned by John Insley, another leading light in Old English place-name studies, in a 2001 chapter on pagan place-names. Insley did this by hypothesizing that the first two syllables of the attestations cited above represent the product of a popular etymology with the Middle English noun *teuer(e)*, 'one who taws animal skins' (tawing being the process by which animal skins —normally those of pigs and goats— is turned into white/very light-coloured leather). Insley makes no mention of any recorded tawing taking place in the Tuesley locality, but the body of evidence for tanning being conducted in Godalming —almost certainly with tawing as an associated activity— serves to render his interpretation of the name even more convincing.

Insley, J. 2001 'Kultische Namen: II. England', in R. Müller, ed., *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, **17** (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter), 425–37 [Tuesley is discussed on pp. 429–30]

A piece of medieval Bramley rediscovered in Boston, MA. In late May 2016, the medievalist community on social media was abuzz with news of the unanticipated discovery of an original medieval document in the collection of the Massachusetts Historical Society. A blog post written by an assistant reference librarian of the Society was picked up by the *Boston Globe* newspaper and turned into an article that was shared many times. From later endorsements added to the document, it was already known to date from the first half of the 14th century, and was believed to be written in Middle English. Sub-

sequent contributions ascertained that it was a charter (and a very well preserved one at that) with a dating clause indicating it was composed in the year 1337, that was in reality written in Medieval Latin and concerned a quitclaim to 16 acres of land — specifically land that lay in Surrey. The byname of the grantor, 'William, son of Agatha de Bromlegh', suggest a connection with Bramley. That of the grantee, 'John de Bylingehurst', may seem like it derives from Billingshurst further south in the Weald in Sussex, but it has a little-known near-namesake in High Billingham, a farm situated just north of Dunsfold Aerodrome. Fieldwork I undertook a few years ago confirmed that it sits upon a hill that is compatible with the first half of the name (excluding the later affix High) to come from Old English **billing*, "a bill- or sword-shaped hill".

Whether the 16 acres lay in the vicinity of High Billingham or elsewhere in Bramley (a massive manor in the medieval period) is unclear, but their situation in the Dunsfold area arguably is hinted at by the bynames of two of the witnesses to the charter —Richard de Brunyngfolde and Richard de Rykhurst — being identical to the local minor place-names Burningfold and Old Rickhurst. The charter itself would be largely unremarkable were it to be preserved in an archive such as the Surrey History Centre, but its passage across the Atlantic (by means still unknown) marks it out as special. If any Forum member should happen to be in Boston and have a couple of hours to spare, perhaps you might consider going to view the charter and bring it up to speed on more recent events in its home county.

Hinchen, D. 'Pondering Paleography and Soliciting Transcriptions', *The Beehive*, 27th May 2016 <<http://www.-masshist.org/blog/1361>>

Further discussion of aspects of the charter can be found at <<https://surreymedieval.wordpress.com/2016/06/01/a-piece-of-medieval-bramley-rediscovered-in-boston-ma/>>

Bones of Croydon. An exhibition entitled Bones of Croydon opened in the Riesco Gallery of the Museum of Croydon at Croydon Clocktower on 4th March 2017. It gathers together a range of archaeological finds of the Anglo-Saxon period from the Borough of Croydon, chief among which is a skeleton on public display for the first time, with an interesting story to tell.

A flurry of reports in national and local media accompanying the opening of the exhibition provided details of the discovery and analysis of a near-complete adult skeleton, uncovered (along with the thigh bone of a young child) in 2014 during construction work in the driveway of a house on Riddlesdown Road, Purley. There were no artefacts found alongside these remains, but subsequent radiocarbon dating of bones from the adult skeleton in a laboratory in Florida returned a date range of 670–775 CE (at unspecified confidence level), making the burial of Mid-Anglo-Saxon date. Conclusively dated burials of this date are exceedingly rare for Surrey, and the Riddlesdown inhumation was made at a time when the historic county area had at least nominally been converted to Christianity (a minster at nearby Croydon is first recorded in 808 CE). In 2016, a human bone report was commissioned, authored by Dr Rebecca Redfern of the Museum of London's Centre for Human Bioarchaeology. This study revealed that in life the adult had residual rickets, a benign tumour on their skull, a leg infection, and osteoarthritis; the last of these ailments is suggested to be the result of 'repetitive work'. Unfortunately, the age and sex of the deceased could not be determined.

Entry to Bones of Croydon is free. The exhibition is scheduled to run until January 2018.

Morris, D. 'The extraordinary 1,300-year-old skeleton found beneath a Croydon driveway', *Croydon Advertiser*, 9th March 2017 <<http://www.croydonadvertiser.co.uk/here-8217-s-where-you-can-see-the-anglo-saxon-skeleton-found-beneath-a-croydon-driveway/story-30190364-detail/story.html#Ifqwfr5VCaJwGpXd.99>>

For further details about Bones of Croydon, see <<http://www.museumofcroydon.com/ixbin/indexplus?record=ART9105>>

New publications

David Wynn Williams, *50 Finds From Surrey: Objects from the Portable Antiquities Scheme* (Amberley Publishing, 2016). ISBN 978 1 4456 5873 5. Price £14.99

This book is part of a series of county or multi-county volumes in a popular series highlighting the work of the Portable Antiquities Scheme and some of the most significant finds reported through it. Fittingly, the Surrey volume is written by the county's Finds Liaison Officer, David Williams. *50 Finds...* is in fact something of a misnomer; while there are 50 entries, there are many more finds illustrated and discussed. There are no fewer than 19 entries date from the period covered by the Forum (*circa* 410–1600 CE): six from the 'Saxon' period, 12 from the 'Medieval' period, and one —part of an inscribed purse bar— that falls within the book's post-1500 'Later' period. Together, this represents a wealth of new material (none of the objects was found earlier than 2005) now known to us and that has been subject to expert identification and description. It would be unfair to highlight certain artefacts as being of greater significance than the rest as, medieval or not, everyone will find something of particular interest among the small finds here. Common to all is the fact they shed light on various aspects of life in medieval Surrey that have previously received little attention, and for this the book and its author are to be congratulated.

The book can be bought in good bookshops, museum shops, and from online retailers.

Peter Hopkins, *Moated Sites in Merton, Mitcham and Morden* (Merton Historical Society, 2016). ISBN 978 1 9038 9972 4. Price £1.90 (MHS members £1.60)

Following Peter Hopkins' contribution during the Forum's 'Moated Sites and Churches in the Landscape' meeting in March 2015, he has now updated the material he presented in consultation with other members of the Merton Historical Society. The resulting 48 page booklet recording the documentary research into no fewer than nine suggested moated sites was published by the Merton Historical Society in December 2016. It is well illustrated with maps, historical pictures and photographs, as well as a wealth of footnotes with details of the sources consulted. In a county with no shortage of moated sites, the booklet could act as something of a template for similar local studies elsewhere.

The booklet can be ordered from the Merton Historical Society: see <http://www.mertonhistoricalsociety.org.uk/publications/moats>, or write to the Publications Secretary at 57 Templecombe Way, Morden, Surrey SM4 4JF.

Forthcoming Medieval Studies Forum events

Study Day — Kingston: Saturday, 3rd June 2017, 10.00–16.30

Venue: Kingston upon Thames, meeting place TBC

A study day is being arranged to Kingston upon Thames. The day will include a visit to the Lovekyn Chapel, a talk on Anglo-Saxon Kingston, a tour of All Saints Church, viewing the remains of Kingston's medieval bridge and a guided town walk. Further details will be circulated to members of the Forum in due course and then posted on the website.

Meeting — Medieval Industries: Saturday, 14th October 2017, 10:30–16:00

Venue: The Octagon, St Peter & St Paul Church, Borough Road, Godalming GU7 1ET

A meeting on the topic of Medieval Industries will take place at The Octagon in Godalming. Speakers will include Dr David Dungworth from Historic England, Doug Irvine and Ian West. Further details will be circulated to members of the Forum and posted on the website in due course. **Please note: the meeting will also include the Medieval Studies Forum AGM.**