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A small (0.07ha) univallate oval-shaped earthwork sits at the end of a promontory on the north-east flank of Crooksbury Hill a few miles south-east of Farnham (centred SU 8802 4620). Known locally as Soldier's Ring, it is probably associated with a similar earthwork at Botany Hill, approximately 500m to the west. Both monuments are generally considered to be Iron Age in date, but could just as well be early medieval ringworks.

Soldier's Ring is on publicly accessible land and is in a reasonable state of preservation though in places now being eroded by walkers and horse riders. The ditches are on average about 1.5m deep and there are the slight remains of an internal bank which, no doubt, was once surmounted by a palisade. There is no obvious entrance, but presumably access was along the ridge and therefore would have crossed the ditch on the southern side.

In 2000, the authors undertook a survey, with the help of Liz Whitbourn, to establish the state of the site in advance of proposals to fell the pine trees which currently cover the area. The oblique view printed here shows the earthwork looking from the south along the promontory, with the ground falling away steeply to the west and north and slightly less so to the east. Copies of the full survey have been supplied to the rangers at Waverley Borough Council who manage the land and to the County Sites and Monuments Record.

Surrey Historic Landscape Characterisation Project

Over recent years there has been increasing interest shown by archaeologists in the historic landscape as a whole rather than just individual sites (usually of a particular period). W G Hoskins (1955) is widely regarded as a pioneer in this field, although earlier work by the likes of O G S Crawford might be noted. More recently the work of C C Taylor has been particularly important (eg Taylor 1974). Rackham's *History of the countryside* (1986) attempts to show how the landscape has developed through time and draws attention to the historic importance of the living elements in the countryside, while stressing the landscape change that has occurred since 1945.

All of this work has contributed to a higher profile for the historic landscape and a growing understanding of the need to find ways to offer it protection. The white paper: *This Common Inheritance* (1990) invited English Heritage to produce a register of landscapes of historic importance. As a result, English Heritage commissioned various studies, the main result of which was to highlight that all landscape is historic and that it is difficult to separate out special areas. An alternative approach was therefore developed, leading to the assessment of the character of the whole of the historic landscape, the methods being pioneered in Cornwall (Herring 1998). This overall approach was in keeping with other approaches being developed with the Countryside Commission and English Nature, and was reflected in PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment (1994). The method is being used and further refined in a number of English counties (Fairclough 1999).

A report was prepared for Hampshire in 1999 and it was decided that work should be commissioned for Surrey, building on the results of the Hampshire project. As well as being worthwhile in its own right, it was felt that the project would provide a good basis for the work in progress on Areas of Special Historic Landscape Value (ASHLVs). This work has had to proceed without the benefit of an overall survey of the county's historic landscape. It is intended that the characterisation project will provide a basis against which to judge the overall selection of ASHLVs (ie are all historic landscape types adequately represented) and the merits of individual proposals (ie does this particular area best represent a particular type or types). It is anticipated that current proposals for ASHLVs will not be affected but that the
characterisation report will provide a more reasoned basis for their designation and help to highlight gaps.

The Surrey survey was a joint project between Surrey County Council, English Heritage and the Countryside Agency. The aim of the project was to define the landscape of Surrey in terms of the attributes that characterise the human interventions that have created it as it is today, so as to provide a sound basis for land-use planning, conservation and management decisions. It involved a rapid survey based on the modern map base and the use of recent aerial photographs. Categories were defined by modern boundaries but taking account of readily available historic data especially early editions of OS maps and Rocque’s map surveyed about 1762. The results were plotted onto a GIS (Geographical Information System) package so that many different combinations of the material can be examined with the aid of a computer.

The work was commissioned from Dr Nicola Bannister, known particularly in Surrey for her book on woodland archaeology (1996), and had support from Patrick Wills, head of the County Council’s GIS team. The final report was delivered at the beginning of May. A project for Kent, following a similar model to that for Hampshire and Surrey, has also recently been completed, and by kind permission the overall maps for the two adjoining counties have been included in the Surrey report. Wide circulation of the report is not possible but a copy has been supplied to the Society’s library. The project’s main value, however, is when used with a GIS package. It is anticipated that the results will be available on the County Council’s GIS system in the near future (and therefore with the Sites & Monuments Record) and that it will soon be made available on the internet.

The completed study will be of value in many different ways, for example it will:

- raise interest in and widen knowledge of the history of Surrey’s landscape
- serve as a basis for interpretation
- provide a sound basis for further ASHLV work
- provide a basis for more detailed historic landscape work by showing what is required as against what is known
- assist with analysis of the effects of development proposals
- assist with preparation of future Structure Plan and Local Plan Policies and related issues such as the choice of sites for future housing
- assist with AONB-related work, in interpretation, management and the development of more detailed projects
- highlight issues in need of attention and help to raise and target resources, for example through Countryside Stewardship
- encourage those undertaking land management to take account of historic landscape issues
- assist with management through greater understanding of the different historic landscape types and what characterises them
- help the public to understand the process of change and how none of the landscape is ‘natural’ as such, thus providing better understanding of the need for continual management

The Countryside Agency was involved with the project particularly because of its value for the Surrey Hills AONB and a follow-up project is already in preparation to develop the use of the results in the AONB area. It is also hoped that the project will provide the basis for a more considered approach to the study of the historic landscape in Surrey, providing a framework for existing studies and encouraging other research, for example on soils and former vegetation cover, on heathland history and in particular on field systems, a much neglected topic in the county.
A Multi-Period site at Woodbines Avenue, Kingston

Barry Bishop

Introduction

In advance of redevelopment, an archaeological evaluation and subsequent excavation was carried out during October and November 2000 at 15-23 Woodbines Avenue, Kingston upon Thames (TO 179 686). The project was funded by Laing Homes Ltd, commissioned by CgMs Consulting and conducted by Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd.

The site lies 100m east of the River Thames and c750m upstream of Kingston Bridge on a sandy ridge thought to have formed an island during the prehistoric and early historic periods, c400m long (N-S) by 40m wide (E-W). This Kingston South Island would have been located along the eastern side of the River Thames, surrounded by rich and varied habitats, with the River Hogsmill forming its western and northern limits and with low-lying areas to the south (Hawkins, 1996 and 1998).

The fieldwork revealed evidence of intermittent and low levels of activity from the Mesolithic to the present, principally in the form of flint and pottery scatters recovered from a re-worked sub-soil up to 0.85m thick. At its base were 67 stakeholes and two postholes clustered in several distinct areas, although the levels from which they were driven could not be ascertained. The stakeholes may be of a domestic structure, similar to Saxon examples recorded from South and East Lanes in Kingston (Hawkins et al forthcoming), but the lack of discernible structure plans or any indications of domestic activity - with the exception of a few burnt daub fragments - is more suggestive of ancillary structures, such as fencelines, storage areas or even animal pens.

The struck flints are, on consideration of the raw material, typology and technology, characteristic of knapping traditions that span the Mesolithic to the Middle or Late Bronze Age. The most notable piece is a single-ended Mesolithic tranchet axe. Numerous similar examples are known from the Kingston area, although most are from the Thames, with few recovered from dry sites. It is 180mm long by 55mm wide, and weighs 504g, typical for those analysed by Field (1989): and its shape would suggest it was used more like an adze or mattock than an axe. The only other truly diagnostic implement is a narrow obliquely truncated microlith, also of Mesolithic date. Other probable Mesolithic implements principally consist of cutting tools, including utilised blades, edge trimmed blades and a finely serrated blade segment which is probably from a composite hafted tool. The rest of the retouched component consists mostly of scraping and piercing tools including a small circular ‘thumbnail’ scraper, normally regarded as Early Bronze Age in date, while other more crudely produced items are more characteristic of flintworking traditions of the Middle Bronze Age or later.

Likewise, the pottery recovered represented vessels manufactured over a long period. The earliest examples included a possible undecorated Peterborough ware form from the Later Neolithic, but it was mostly characterised by undecorated wares produced throughout the Bronze Age up to the Late Iron Age/Roman transition. (J Cotton pers comm). Several sherds of Roman pottery were recovered, including
greywares, colour-coated wares and a sherd from a flagon, along with a few sherds of early Saxon chaff tempered ware dated to the 5th - 8th centuries, a few sherds of 13th - 15th century Kingston ware and post-medieval wares dateable to the 16th - 20th centuries (C Jarrett pers comm).

The lithic and pottery assemblages thus suggest activity occurring at the site periodically from the Mesolithic to the present. The size of the assemblages, however, would suggest that such activity was low scale, and probably peripheral to any main settlement areas.
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COUNCIL NEWS


SyAS has just staged its first major conference on the archaeology of the county in nearly eighteen years. This post-conference piece briefly addresses three questions: Why was it needed? What did it seek to achieve? Where do we go from here? (A review of the conference itself will appear in a future Bulletin.)

Why was the conference needed?

The last such conference was held at the University of Surrey in October 1983 and the proceedings were published as Archaeology of Surrey to 1540 in 1987. With the Sites & Monuments Record, this volume forms the basis for all archaeological decision-making within the County.

Since its publication, however, there have been a number of advances, political, philosophical and practical, that have begun to re-shape our view of the past. In particular the promulgation of PPG16 (Department of the Environment Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning, 1990) has brought about a seismic shift in the way that archaeology is perceived, both by those responsible for initiating and controlling development programmes, and by those charged with mitigating their effects. The upshot is that we now have more professional contract archaeologists recovering more archaeology from more places across the county than ever before, as even the most cursory glance at recent round-ups in the Collections will demonstrate.

The pace has been no less frenetic in the County’s vocational sector either. Here, important research has been undertaken by the Surrey Industrial History Group, the Society sponsored Millennium Project (Bulletin 298 & 347), and the joint SyAS/SCC funded Community Archaeology Project (Bulletin 331, 333 & 345), to name but three. In addition SAS and various affiliated local groups have continued to support and conduct a wide range of other work across the county, which has contributed significantly to the database.
Acknowledging the post-PPG16 data explosion, a slew of discussion documents have been issued by English Heritage over the last few years, designed to stimulate debate regarding the formulation of national, regional and local archaeological research frameworks. While the research framework model proposed by Adrian Olivier (Frameworks for Our Past, English Heritage, 1996) has not commanded universal acceptance, it is clear that his approach has already been (or is in process of being) widely adopted across the country. Summarised by David Bird (Bulletin 308) Olivier's model Research Framework comprises three elements:

- A resource assessment (a 'statement of the current state of knowledge and a description of the archaeological resource')
- A research agenda (a 'list of gaps in knowledge, of work which could be done, and of the potential for the research to answer the questions')
- A research strategy (a 'statement setting out priorities and method')

Not only has this model been adopted across the Eastern Counties and in London, for example, it has been enshrined within SCC’s newly revised Heritage Strategy 2001. In Olivier’s terms therefore the recent conference constituted a staging post along the road to an up-dated resource assessment.

What did the conference seek to achieve?
The conference provided first and foremost an opportunity to hear about aspects of the historic County presented in a deliberately more thematic, inclusive and 'cross-curricular' fashion. The intention was not to attempt a complete chronological overview of the County’s past (or even necessarily to update the 1987 volume) but, as the conference title made clear, to work towards the formulation of a research agenda. This approach represented something of a radical departure from that adopted at the 1983 meeting, as did the decision to include papers dealing with the period after 1540.

Discussions prior to the conference identified four themes worthy of closer examination: landscape, settlement/habitation, buildings and industry. All four were represented to a greater or lesser degree in the final conference programme. However, the arrangement of the programme reflected our firm intention that no one theme should dominate proceedings, or be viewed in isolation, but that all should be approached in a holistic, 'joined-up' way. We hoped to demolish barriers rather than erect them (there was no set 'end date' as in 1983, for example) and, as far as possible, the papers were arranged to prompt connections as well as contrasts.

We invited our speakers to embrace this vision wherever possible. We sought the presentation of new data and re-evaluation of old; analysis rather than description; the formulation of new questions and the identification of wider perspectives. Furthermore the presence of a number of out-of-county speakers on the programme was quite deliberate. The reason? We wanted to encourage those working within the county to look upwards and outwards, without of course seeking to denigrate or neglect the very necessary minutiae of the local and the specific. This also served as a useful reminder of the need to articulate with other national/regional agendas currently being developed beyond the County's borders.

Inevitably there were omissions: transport and infrastructure, the use and potential of documentary sources and place-names, the environmental setting and the impact of PPG16 (and PPG15) were only the most obvious. But these are matters that we now have an opportunity to address.

Where do we go from here?
The Society decided some time ago to publish the proceedings to coincide with its 150th anniversary, which falls in 2004. This represents a once in a generation opportunity and we are keen to get it right. As a first step, the Publications Committee has invited the speakers to contribute papers based on their presentations. All have
agreed. The proposed publication has two other ingredients, however. Firstly, papers to plug gaps and follow up leads identified during the conference itself, perhaps along the lines of those outlined above. Secondly, updates of the chapters published in the Archaeology of Surrey, including the period beyond 1540. We haven't yet decided how these will be divided: will there be a single chapter synthesising recent developments in early prehistory, for instance? Would it be useful to run the later prehistoric period straight into the Roman? And how are we to treat the post-Roman millennium? These are questions awaiting answers. The bottom line, however, is that we intend the final volume to provide an up-date of Archaeology of Surrey to 1540, which will effectively constitute the initial resource assessment element of Olivier's three-stage research framework.

The next step, the formulation of a research agenda, requires the active engagement of the County's archaeological community, both vocational and professional. Happily, there is a mechanism already in place by which this might be co-ordinated, in the form of SCC's Heritage Strategy working groups. There are five of these: i) Archives and Local History, ii) Archaeology, iii) Historic Countryside, iv) Historic Buildings and v) Museums, and each has been charged with 'selecting priority actions every year and monitoring progress on these actions'. Action AR1.1 within the Archaeology section of the document is quite specific: 'to develop an archaeological research framework for Surrey, including updating Archaeology of Surrey to 1540. We are now seeking comments and/or expressions of support from interested parties across the county. It is anticipated that the formulation of a research agenda will eventually involve seminar-type meetings and the production of topic, theme and period specific discussion documents. If you would like to know more, please either contact the writer at the Museum of London, London Wall, EC2Y 5HN (Tel: 0207 814 5736; email: jcotton@museumoflondon.org.uk) or Dr David Bird, Environment, Surrey County Council, County Hall, Kingston-upon-Thames, KT1 2DY (Tel: 0208 541 8991; email: davidbird@surreycc.gov.uk).
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Villages Study Group - Visit to Bramley

On 5th May a well attended workshop was held at Bramley Village Hall, which was both interesting and enjoyable, and thanks are due to Patricia Pratt, Chairman of the Bramley History Society, and members in making the arrangements.

Pat gave a brief introduction to Bramley pointing out that although the manor was large and important within the hundred of Blackheath, the development and settlement at what is now Bramley village was by no means clear. It was generally accepted that of the three churches referred to in the Domesday Survey, the mother church was at Shalford, and the other two were possibly at Hascombe and Wonersh.

The incongruity of the large village hall in which we met, and which almost successfully concealed its medieval origins and was not shown on the tithe map, was noted. There was some discussion on -ersh endings and the significance of Linersh Wood - now an area of select housing - but shown as a field called Linersh on earlier
maps, sited on a patch of gravel above the Bramley Way - itself the result of river capture from the Arun.

We were then treated to a tour of Bramley - a real eye-opener for those who know it only from the A281. There appears to be a back lane, and numerous cross lanes, apparently developed at different times to meet an economic or social need, but the revelation was the wealth and status of 16th century houses which fronted the village green, now reduced to a tiny patch of grass at the southern end. We were warmly welcomed into two houses, one of which still retains its original external stair turret and stairs, described by Rod Wild as a “real cracker”.

After lunch Peter Finch explained his theory of the relationship of trackways (whether now roads or footpaths) to tenement boundaries and illustrated his talk by maps. A wealth of statistics and analysis from Horley and Nutfield gave everyone food for thought.

Several groups displayed maps and presented the results of their researches to date, and a draft of the Shere publication was available. A few die-hards made their way to Nursecombe Farm, and were well rewarded by a tour of two splendid barns and the farmhouse.

Ably chaired by Dennis Turner, the day was both interesting and enjoyable, and future workshops will be planned.

It is hoped that more members will consider joining the Villages Study Group and exploring the development of their own village settlements - even if they are now in the heart of metropolitan London. Anyone wishing to do so should contact the Honorary Secretary at Castle Arch.

COMMUNITY ARCHAEOLOGY

Documentary Research: An Introduction to the Surrey History Centre
Saturday 5th October 2001 10—3.30 pm

An introductory day to the Surrey History Centre, and how the wealth of information there may be found and accessed. This will be of particular interest to anyone doing research for local history or archaeological projects in Surrey.

A tour of the Centre will proceed at 10.30, and this will be followed at 11.35 by a session giving examples of sources and how to locate them. We will then look at manorial documents.

Lunch: 12.30 - 2 pm. There is a pub nearby and other eating places within walking distance.

In the afternoon we will look at some specialist maps and how to locate them, and we will finish with details of some other sources that are available and that could be useful, but which are not at the History Centre.

Further details available from Castle Arch or Mike Rubra Tel: 01737 843025.

The Surrey History Centre is at 130 Goldsworth Road, Woking, GU21 1ND. (The car park closes at 4.10 on Saturdays, by which time all cars must be removed.)

LIBRARY NEWS

Recent Accessions to the Society’s Library

Excavations and evaluations carried out by units working within the County, which are reported periodically elsewhere in the Bulletin, are omitted here. As before, each entry includes the author, title, publisher and date of publication, followed by the
four-digit accession number, and classification number indicating the shelf location of the book.

GENERAL

Allen, J L Health and Safety in Field Archaeology. Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers 1997 A
Aston, Mick Monasteries in the Landscape. Tempus Publishing Ltd 2000 8664 X53
Bean, Simon The coinage of the Atrebates and Regni. Oxford University School of Archaeology 2000 8745 N5
Bromwich, David The diary and memoirs of John Allen Giles. Somerset Record Society 2000 8741 ZB
Cameron, Esther Sheaths and Scabbards in England AD400-1100. Archaeopress 2000 8686 L2
Cleal, Rosamund Grooved Ware in Britain and Ireland. Oxbow Books 1999 8602 H2
Evans, John Land and archaeology: histories of Human environment in the British Isles. Tempus Publishing Ltd 1999 8744 D4
Fairbairn, Andrew Plants in Neolithic Britain and beyond. Oxbow Books 2000 8746 D2
Foote, David The Viking Achievement. Sidgwick and Jackson 1970 8681 F9
Gelling, Margaret The Landscape of Place-names. Shaun Tyas 2000 8658 Q1
Hanley, Robin Villages in Roman Britain. Shire Publications Ltd 2000 8743 K2
Morriss, Richard The Archaeology of Buildings. Tempus Publishing Ltd 2000 8663 X1
Norrington, Valerie Recording the Present. Phillimore 1989 8655 N1
Pyatt, Edward C Chalkways of South and South-east England. David Y Charles n.d. 8615 V3
Richmond, Andrew Preferred economies: the nature of the subsistence base throughout Mainland Britain during prehistory. Archaeopress 2000 8689 G2
Thompson, K M Short Guides to Records: second series; guides 25-48. The Historical Association 1997 N21
Tyson, Rachel Medieval glass vessels found in England cAD 1200-1500. CBA 2000 8695 MA2

PLACES OTHER THAN SURREY

Butler, Chris Saxon settlement and earlier remains at Friars Oak, Hassocks, West Sussex. Archaeopress 2000 8688 F33
Ellerton, G J Review of non-Metropolitan counties. County of West Sussex and its boundary with Surrey: .... final report and proposals. 1990 8679 P3
McNeil, Robina A guide to the Industrial Archaeology of Greater Manchester. Association for Industrial Archaeology 2000 8617 R7
Whitworth, Alan M Hadrian's Wall: some aspects of its post-Roman influence on the landscape. Archaeopress 2000 8687 F7

SURREY - GENERAL
Anon Retracing Canals to Croydon and Camberwell. Living History Publications 1986 8634
Dann, Chris E Surrey Steam. Becknell Books 1983 8592 V4
Davison, Mark East Surrey then and now. Argus Books 1992 8716 P31
Guilmant, Aylwin Surrey of one hundred years ago. Alan Sutton 1993 8705 P31
Hurley, Alfred Days ... that are gone. Milestones I have passed in South-west London: memories of fifty years of local newspaper work, public and social life. A H Hurley Ltd 1947 8712 P31
Maggs, Ken The Roman Roads of East Surrey and the Kent Border. North Downs Press 1987 8587 K31
Myers, Sam Price London south of the river. Paul Elek 1949 8728 P31
Webb, Cliff The following titles are all by Cliff Webb, published by the West Surrey Family History Society and shelved at O2:
A handlist to some Surrey Cases and Depositions in the Court of Chancery 1714-1758 and in the Court of Exchequer 1497-1603. 1998 2 copies 8603A and 8603B
A list of Surrey Feet of Fines 1558-1602. 1998 2 copies 86004A and 8604B
Handlist and Index to Surrey Cases and Depositions in the Court of Requests c1500-1624. 1999 2 copies 8605A and 8605B
Surrey Administrations in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury 1782-1790. 1999 2 copies 8606A and 8606B
Late Elizabethan and Stuart Lay Subsidies pertaining to Central and South-Eastern Surrey 1593-1641. 1999 2 copies 8607A and 8607B
A Handlist of Surrey Cases in the Court of Star Chamber. 1999 2 copies 8608A and 8608B
Surrey Apprentices III: being an Index of Apprenticeships of Surrey Interest in some London Livery Company Records 1563-1928. 2000 2 copies 8609A and 8609B
Surrey Cases in the Court of Chancery 1391-1714: a guide and handlist. 2000 2 copies 8610A and 8610B
A Guide to Surrey Parish Documents. 1999 2 copies 8612A and 8612B

MISCELLANY

A 14th Century Treasure Trove Prosecution Mary Alexander
Since this Society was instrumental in altering the medieval treasure law to make it more suitable for the present day, it is interesting to note that the law could be applied unsuitably in the Middle Ages. The Calendar of Patent Rolls for the first year of Henry IV (HMSO) has an entry dated Nov 16th 1399, translated from the original Latin.
"Whereas by an inquisition taken by pretext of a commission of oyer and terminer in the county of Surrey in the time of Richard II it was found that Robert atte Mille and
Alice his wife found treasure to the value of 600/. at Gildeford, of which they were in no way guilty, and nevertheless they paid about 500 marks in the Exchequer of the said late king as is alleged by their petition in Parliament, the king pitying their poverty pardons to them the remainder of the said sum."

Unfortunately I cannot add anything to this as there is no evidence of what the couple found or how they found it. All we are left with are questions. Had the couple found treasure or not? Does the entry mean that they had found something but were entitled to keep it, or that they had not found any treasure? £600 was obviously a huge amount in 1399, and 500 marks, worth about £330, was also a lot of money, so Robert and Alice must have been wealthy in the first place to have paid the fine, even though it bankrupted them. Although Henry IV was pardoning them the unpaid fine he appears to be keeping what had been paid, which suggests that the couple had found something. If so, what? The precise sum of £600 might suggest coins, but gold and silver objects could also be valued according to the weight of precious metal. Had the *atte Milles* found gold jewellery from the pagan Saxon cemetery on Guildown, or a hoard of gold or silver coins from Roman, Saxon or earlier medieval times? It must have been a magnificent assemblage if so.

However, there is probably something of a hidden agenda. Henry IV had deposed Richard II and was unlikely to have been reluctant to overturn a ruling by him. The wording "by pretext of a commission of oyer and terminer" suggests some irregularity. (Oyer and terminer meant to hear and determine, a form of enquiry introduced by Henry II.) The case is a fascinating glimpse into the past, which is too brief for us to see the details, unfortunately.

**Hamlet or Village**

Graham Dawson

As its Millennium Project Surrey Archaeological Society organised an investigation into the origins and development of Surrey villages. A meeting was held in November at Leatherhead to report on progress (see Bulletin 344).

The old model for English rural settlement saw the countryside filled with nucleated villages with two or three very large open fields farmed in common by the villagers and that this was introduced by the Anglo-Saxons when they settled in England in the 5th century. It has long been recognised that this picture is based on the pattern in the Midlands, where the early work on field systems was done and an example survives at Laxton in Nottinghamshire, and that different patterns could be seen elsewhere. In the last two or three decades it has also come to be accepted that it was not introduced by the Anglo-Saxons but developed in the Anglo-Saxon period. Surrey is one of the areas where the village pattern never really applied and hamlets or scattered farmhouses were the rule and this was brought out strongly at this conference. This can also be seen to apply to Southwark and Lambeth. Only Lambeth has much claim to be a nucleated village with the medieval settlement stretching along the river from just north of where Lambeth Bridge now is to where Vauxhall Bridge is. In all other parishes we seem to have hamlets. In Camberwell there seem to be three early foci of settlement, the Camberwell Green area, Peckham and Dulwich, while in Newington Parish there seem to be two, one at Newington Butts and one in the Walworth Road. Bermondsey only seems to have one early focus, along Bermondsey Street northwards from the priory later abbey, but this is very small and hardly more than a hamlet. Rotherhithe too has one focus, round St Mary's Church, but this was very small and there is a lawsuit in 1338 where the defendant claims, in the sort of technical objection beloved of lawyers, that Rotherhithe was merely a hamlet of Bermondsey and this was accepted by the jury and the case was dismissed (PRO Just 1/1423 f43).

The other aspect of the old model, the open fields, is more complex. There is certainly plenty of evidence for open fields divided up into strips. In Newington, for
example, Thomas Hill's map of 1681 still shows traces of strips in some of the fields and early deeds show that even some of those which do not were originally divided into narrow strips. Even St George's Fields, which belonged to the Borough of Southwark, show this strip system and here there is also some evidence for common agriculture since in the 16th century part of the field should, it was said, be open after harvest, for commoning of animals, though the manorial court's efforts to impose this do not seem to have been very successful.

But even so, these are very different to the classic Midlands model; for rather than two or three large fields there are large numbers of smaller fields. It is difficult to work out how many or their precise locations because we lack early maps, but from the names mentioned in the documents all the parishes had a number well in excess of three.

*From the March 2001 Newsletter (85) of the Southwark and Lambeth Archaeological Society, with many thanks.*

**Guildford Museum**

Before the opening of an extension to Guildford Museum towards the beginning of the last century, an interesting letter appeared in *The Surrey Advertiser* on 16th January 1909 from Miss Gertrude Jekyll, the garden designer who gave her collection of West Surrey artefacts to Guildford Museum.

*Guildford Gateway House*

*A plea for an old wall*

*To the Editor*

*Sir, There must be many who, with your present correspondent, feel the keenest regret on account of the proposed demolition of the old Castle wall in Quarry Street and must desire to join in the protest expressed in your last issue by Mr Thackery-Turner, speaking for the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings of which he is secretary.*

*Within the recollection of one who has borne it for more than 50 years Quarry Street with its ancient church at one end and the Castle walls near the other and it has for the most part of the 17th and 18th remained perfectly unfronted, a precious heritage to our beautiful town and neighbourhood.*

*It is well known that the Surrey Archaeological Society lodged in Gateway House needs an expansion of building for the housing and display of their ever growing collection and that the garden adjoining the house is the most convenient and obvious site but as Mr Thackery Turner points out, such a building could be erected behind the wall and which, in any case, be most suitably lighted with top lights such as are used in art galleries.*

*The feeling is very strong in my district and I can only suppose it to be equally prevalent not only in the large area to the south and south west whose inhabitants enter Guildford by Quarry Street but by all who live in the neighbourhood and know the beautiful old street which could not be more grievously despoiled by the substitution of any façade, however meritorious in itself, for the old Castle Wall which has stood there for many centuries.*

*With many others and with extreme regret for the expression of any dissent from a conclusion arrived at by so learned and careful as the Surrey Archaeological Society, I venture most earnestly to hope that their present intention may be reconsidered.*

*Gertrude Jekyll*

*Munstead Wood, Godalming*
The architect Ralph Nevill constructed a long reply which included this relevant extract:

"The wall is no part of the ancient gateway building and it is certainly not ancient perhaps 100 years. The description of it as a fine old wall seems to me an exaggeration - it is commonplace brickwork and overlays the road by four feet at one end. In some cases that adds picturesqueness but it is not a nice feature in a wall skirting the footpath up an important highway. Moreover when the ground is removed from inside, the ivy and other growth that covers the wall and has a great deal to do with such beauty as it has, must necessarily be destroyed.

I will however be glad enough to modify the plans so as to retain the greater part of the wall provided that permission is made for the extension of the building in another direction.

R Nevill
Castle House, Guildford

In fact the plans were modified. The contract was carried out by Stanley Ellis and cost £596. The cost was met by Alderman F Ferdinand Smallpiece as a gift to the town. Sadly Ralph Nevill passed away a year after the extension was built, a victim of influenza.

I am grateful to Eric Morgan, editor of the Friends of Guildford Museum Newsletter, for permission to reproduce the above correspondence, which first appeared in issue 11 of December 2000.

**Hare Warrens**

Brian Wilson's article in *Bulletin* 349, 15, mentions that there may have been a hare warren on Merrow Downs. There definitely was a warren there, which was the subject of a short article by Helen Davies in the Guildford Group's Annual Review for 1999.

From a map by John Senex 1729
I made my first visit to the site with Helen last year and was interested to see the warren. It was established by one of the Onslow family. It is marked on John Senex's map of 1729, so is obviously earlier than that. I alerted Guildford Borough Council's Planning Department to it and they tried to have it scheduled by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport, but English Heritage decided against it because the surrounding wall is incomplete. This sounds a rather odd reason, since the majority of the wall is there, complete with meuses - the little holes for the hares to go in and out of. However, Guildford Borough Council intends to list it locally.

Wanborough Evening

About a hundred and thirty people filled Holy Trinity Church, Guildford, on the evening of Friday 4th May, to hear two lectures on the Romano-Celtic temples at Wanborough. The audience first heard a brief description of the history of the Society's involvement in the site from its initial discovery in the 1960s to the most recent excavation in 1999. David Williams, who directed the later excavation, then described the archaeology of both stone temples as well as the ephemeral evidence for earlier activity on the site. He also showed slides of some of the finds, including the ritual regalia and the coins for which Wanborough is (in)famous. After a short break, David Bird, in a masterly talk, took the audience on a whistle stop tour of Roman religion and religious sites and set the temples at Wanborough in their wider context, not only in Surrey but in the Western Empire as a whole.

Alan Crocker, our President, who chaired the meeting, then ran a short question and answer session and closed the meeting just after 9.30pm.

The site at Wanborough has occupied a great deal of the Society's time and effort over the last thirty years or so, and it was particularly pleasing to see, and to be able to thank, many of the people whose hard work has led to our current state of understanding of this unique site. The local landowners have been more than generous with their help, the numerous volunteers, both archaeologists and metal detectorists, worked, much to their credit, under conditions that varied from concrete-like at the beginning of the 1999 dig to 'goopy' at its end; Rosamond Hanworth raised funds at short notice to pay for the emergency extension to the dig that became necessary, and a large number of people and organisations contributed to the fund. The Society is more than grateful to all these and to the numerous other people who have contributed in their various ways, not least to Audrey Monk and her helpers who organised the Wanborough evening itself.

The site has now been scheduled by English Heritage and is a unique example of the transference of power between temples in the Roman period. It is also an example of the very best and the very worst that can happen in relations between archaeologists and metal detectorists. A dramatic site which has had a profound effect on our understanding of the Roman period, but has also led directly to a change in English law of Treasure Trove. One can truly say, a site of national significance in every sense.

Charlwood Boundaries

Following a local history weekend at Oxford on boundaries, my interest in the pre-1974 parish boundary jungle north of Charlwood was stimulated. I would like to air the subject in the hope that readers will come up with answers.

The Facts:

a) Charlwood lies on the Wealden Clay. Most parishes are elongated north/south even on the clay, but Charlwood is roughly the shape of Australia, with an area to the north known as Charlwood Detached. The River Mole runs continuously on the east boundary of both parts, the area between them is only 0.4 km, and is in Horley parish.
b) The River Mole is also a manorial boundary and although Horley contains parts of many manors, none of the manor of Horley is west of the Mole.
c) There is a river crossing at Sidlow Bridge.
d) Newdigate, Leigh, Buckland and Reigate parishes jut into the area.
e) Paludina Limestone Beds form high ground in the north-west of Charlwood parish with a narrow ridge extending into Horley. There are many pits and ponds. (Charlwood has a Norman church c1080, built largely of local stone.)

The Questions:
1) Were the two parts of Charlwood and the intervening land once one longer parish?
2) Was the value of the Paludina Limestone the reason for the jumbled boundaries?
3) Was the area an example of intercommoning or unenclosed pasture on a drove road?
4) Could a lord of the manor change a parish boundary if he owned land adjoining his manor?
5) When were these boundaries formed? Anglo-Saxon times? Norman times? Later?

I would prefer any members responses as letters or notes in the Bulletin, but if you would like to contact Jean Shelley direct, her address is 4, Norwood Hill Road, Charlwood.

Tolworth Court Farm 2001

Unfortunately the excavations proposed for this year at Tolworth Court Farm have had to be postponed until the summer of 2002. This postponement has been caused
by a number of factors including the extremely wet weather during the winter, but it is hoped that by allowing extra time the excavations in 2002 can be programmed more successfully in terms of the archaeological requirements of the site.

However, in order that the impetus started last year is not lost it is planned that the area around the site is looked at as a means of placing the site within its landscape, and commencing a study of the Hogsmill River and its tributaries. This landscape survey, with perhaps some geophysics, is proposed for early August.

All are welcome to participate in this study. Further details will be available when the dates have been finalised.

**Roman Roads**

The Library has recently received an archive of 182 slide photographs of the Roman roads of Surrey from Alex Vincent (NL/RO.RDS). He took them during a study he made of examples in the county, the result of which is a book, *The Roman Roads of Surrey*, just published by Middleton Press.

**Local History Postcards of Ewhurst**

Later this year I am walking the Inca Trail to Macchu Picchu in aid of the Children's Society. It is only 40 km long, but strenuous as it is at an altitude of between 2,200m to 4,000m and with many steep climbs. The trip is being organised by the Children's Society and promoted by Sainsbury's Magazine in support of a school in the village of Zapallal, Peru. Half the funds raised will go to the school and half to the Children's Society for other projects in the UK and abroad. I am a keen local historian and to raise funds I've prepared packs of reproduction postcards of *Bygone Ewhurst*. There are six different views in each pack - Ewhurst Mill, The Windmill Inn, Ewhurst Green, The Village School, The Mount and Deblins Green.

Price £3 per pack. To buy a pack or sponsor my walk Tel: 01483 277342.

**PUBLICATIONS**

"*The Cricket Green*" by E N Montague

144 pp. 27 maps & illustrations


The unique character of Mitcham's Lower Green, the eastern half of which is today known as the Cricket Green, was recognised by its declaration as a Conservation Area by the London Borough of Merton in 1969. The Green was formerly part of the expanse of largely uncultivated heath and woodland - the common 'waste' - which formed a substantial part of the parish throughout the Middle Ages.

By the time of the Norman Conquest, still forming part of an unbroken swathe of rough grazing land extending from today's Church Road eastwards as far as Commonside East, the Lower Green served to separate the two Saxon 'vills' of "Witford" and "Michelham" recorded in the Domesday Survey.

Both sanctioned and unauthorised enclosures of land on the margins of the Green have diminished its extent, but a little over eight acres (3.25ha) survive today as public recreational space. It is conceivable that here, in the Middle Ages, stood the archery butts, close by Mitcham's earliest recorded inn, the White Hart. Skilled bowmen may no longer be needed for the defence of England, but since the late 17th century the Lower Green has been the cradle of another sport whose stalwarts were able during the great days of village cricket to throw down a challenge to all comers, including visiting Australians.
The gradual development of the land peripheral to the Green has left an interesting history of building and rebuilding, as well as a legacy of architectural styles which, although modified in their translation to a village setting, nevertheless reflect trends and fashions throughout the Home Counties.

This, the first volume in a series which, it is intended, will eventually cover the whole of the former Borough of Mitcham, reproduces in extended form three articles (on Mitcham Court, Elm Lodge and the National Primary School) written for the *Merton Borough News* in 1972, and which were published that year in the paper's "Merton Story" series. The choice of illustrations and maps used has been dictated largely by the availability of originals either in my possession or in the Local History Collection at Merton Local Studies Centre. It is hoped they will prove an adequate accompaniment to the text.

ENM

**VISITS**

**HERSTMONCEUX CASTLE, EAST SUSSEX**

Last year a party of intrepid adventurers stayed here for a wonderful weekend, and by popular demand, it's back. Some visits are the same but for those who wish to return there is more to see and do. In fact, in the light of previous comments this year's tours are extended to 3 nights!

**Tour One: 6th-9th August**
- Mon  Herstmonceux Castle grounds and tour
- Tues Bodiam Castle and Batemans
- Weds Lewes town and castle and Michelham Priory
- Thurs 1066 Footpath

**Tour Two: 9th-12th August**
- Thurs Herstmonceux Castle grounds and tour
- Fri  Battle Abbey, site of the battle of Hastings and vineyard
- Sat Hastings, Shipwreck Museum, castle and caves
- Sun Pevensey Castle, Saxon Shore Fort and the Long Man of Wilmington

Herstmonceux Castle is a 15th century brick-built moated castle, set in beautiful parkland and superb Elizabethan gardens, and is a popular conference and wedding venue. It is not generally open to the public and is used during term as an International Study Centre by its Canadian owners, Queen's University. It has a purpose built hall of residence in the grounds of the estate, which provides excellent and high standard accommodation. Breakfast and dinner are taken in the Great Hall and in the evenings we have a private room in the castle for talks, slides and videos, together with the use of ‘The Headless Drummer’, the castle's own personal pub. Also within the grounds lies the former home of the world-famous Greenwich Observatory. This is now open to the public and has been converted into a Science Centre and Discovery Park. In addition, there is an excavation taking place in the grounds and there will be the opportunity to visit it.

**Prices**: from £43 per person per night, inclusive of dinner, bed and breakfast. Transport will be in private cars; lift shares can probably be arranged.

No insurance has been taken out as this is a voluntary field trip.

For more information please ring Elizabeth Whitbourn: 01483-420575, e-mail: liz.whitbourn@binternet.com, mobile: 07790-451110
REIGATE CAVES OPEN DAYS GUIDED TOURS
Wealden Cave and Mine Society
Saturdays 7th July and 8th September
Both Barons Cave, in the Castle Grounds and the East and West Caverns in Tunnel Road will be open for separate guided tours.
Cost for each tour: Adults £1.50, Child/OAP £1, Family £5
For further details contact Malcolm Tadd, Tel: 01737 823456.

LOWFIELD HEATH WINDMILL
Open Days Sundays 26th August and 9th September
The restoration of the mill is progressing well and it has been turned three times since last autumn using the patent sails.
For further details of access Tel: 01293 862374.

PAINSHILL PARK SUMMER EVENING WALKS
Thursdays through July 2001 from 6.30 pm
5th **Pleasure Gardens**: a pleasant walk with tales of how people enjoyed the famous and infamous gardens of the past.
12th **The Grand Tourists**: stroll and hear how the rite of passage tours of the young gentry inspired the art form of the landscape garden.
19th **The American Connection**: follow the footsteps of Thomas Jefferson, who visited Painshill in 1786. See how Hamilton the plantsman used the new range of American exotics to action different effects. An illuminating view of a unique 18th century planting restoration.
Tickets: £8, that includes a glass of wine from the Painshill vineyard.
Advance booking essential Tel: 01932 864674.
I would be very surprised if these were not sold out before this Bulletin appears. There were earlier walks but their flyer came too late. Who could resist such midsummer madness - try and book, but if unsuccessful remember next year.

EXHIBITION

The Bloody Code: Crime and Punishment in Surrey 1700-1850
Surrey History Centre
12th June-1st September 2001
The 18th century is notorious for its glamorous highwaymen and its apparently brutal law code, which imposed the death penalty for around 200 separate and often trivial offences. As an alternative to the noose, thousands of criminals, often guilty of little more than opportunistic petty theft, were shipped in grim conditions to the American colonies and later to Australia.
This exhibition at Surrey History Centre draws on the records of local courts and prisons and uses popular prints and works by artists such as William Hogarth to illustrate the workings of the judicial system and the measures taken to counter crime and disorder. It also explores the enormous shift in attitudes to the punishment of crime with the gradual abandonment of the death penalty and of transportation and the development of rehabilitation through incarceration.
Also on display will be:
- lurid illustrations and accounts of trials and executions
- tales of crime and punishment in popular ballads
- records of voluntary watch associations of the 18th century
- truncheons, leg irons and handcuffs
This illustration from London Labour and the London Poor by Henry Mayhew, 1861, shows a prisoner sentenced to hard labour using a Crank or Labour-Machine. Offenders had to perform a set number of revolutions per day, generally between 10,000 and 15,000. Mayhew criticised the cranks for being “unproductive”, serving no purpose but for “grinding the wind”.

- evidence of life in Surrey houses of correction at Wandsworth and Brixton
- relics of Surrey’s early prisons including the massive lock of the County Gaol at Newington

The exhibition can be visited at Surrey History Centre, 130 Goldsworth Road, Woking, Surrey. For further information ring 01493 594594 or visit our website at http://shs.surreycc.gov.uk

CONFERENCES

RECENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES IN THE SOUTH-EAST
Christ Church University College, Canterbury
Saturday 3rd November 2001. 2-5.30 pm.

The Bronze Age waterlogged landscape at Shinewater Park near Eastbourne.
Andrew Woodcock, County Archaeologist, East Sussex

The Roman circular temple of Wanborough and the special site at Betchworth, Surrey.
David Williams, director of both excavations for SyAS

Current research in Londinium.
Philip Treveil, MoLAS

Tickets: £3 payable to CKA (The Council for Kentish Archaeology who have organised the event) and SAE, please, from 7 Sandy Ridge, Borough Green, Kent TN15 8HP.
COURSES

KENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD SCHOOL
Kent Field Centre, near Faversham
Saturday and Weekend Courses through July to September

21/22nd July Post-Excavation Analysis
28/29th July Anglo-Saxon Weekend: Saturday focus on art and especially the symbolism and production of jewellery, led by Paul Cullen. Sunday tuition on place-names and afternoon tour to put them in context, led by Margaret Gelling.
4/5th August Roman Agricultural Estates. Includes afternoon visits to villa sites along the Swale and Darenth rivers, including Lullingstone (entrance fee included). Course led by Paul Wilkinson.
1/2nd September Landscape Archaeology. Saturday mapwork. Sunday fieldwork.
22/23 September Prehistoric Flints. Identification, recording and fieldwalking.

Fees: £30 per day to include tea/coffee.
Local accommodation on request.
For further information contact the Kent Archaeological Field School, School Farm Oast, Graveney Road, Faversham, Kent, ME13 8UP; Tel: 0208 987 8827 or 0585 700 112.

KENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD SCHOOL
TRAINING EXCAVATION: ROMAN TOWN HOUSE
Watling Street, Syndale, west of Faversham
11th - 26th August 2001

Recent geophysical survey and excavation identified high status stone buildings most likely to belong to the lost Roman town of Durolevum, and we will spend sixteen days excavating and recording them.

Fees: £30 per day to include tea/coffee.
Local accommodation on request.
For further information contact the Kent Archaeological Field School, School Farm Oast, Graveney Road, Faversham, Kent, ME13 8UP; Tel: 0208 987 8827 or 0585 700 112.

LECTURE MEETING

26th July
“The Bayeux Tapestry” by Nick Pollard to the Egham-by-Runnymede Historical Society in the Main Hall at the Literary Institute, Egham High Street, at 8.00 pm.
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