ASHTEAD VILLA: The Pleasure of Archaeology

Gillian Lachelin in a very wet Trench 3
MAGNETOMETER SURVEY OF THE ROMAN BUILDINGS AT CHIDDINGFOLD

David and Audrey Graham

Introduction
The Roman buildings at Whitebeech, Chiddingfold (SU 9785 3610; Scheduled Monument no SU 135) are sited on a slight east-facing artificial terrace just below the top of a prominent hill and within a field known as The Riddings. The countryside surrounding the hill is Weald Clay but the hill itself is capped by loam. The site was discovered in 1883 during agricultural works and was subsequently excavated, but the results were not finally published until 1984 (Cooper et al 1984). The report, including a plan of the buildings, while of a good standard for the period, fails to note phasing, stratigraphy or even to give the exact location of the buildings within the field.

In 2002 Surrey Archaeological Society, with Scheduled Monument Consent, carried out a gridded survey of the field recording all surface material within each 10m square – the material being returned to the square of origin after on-site recording. This exercise clearly showed the likely position of the Roman buildings and allowed a ‘best fit’ to be made relating the 19th century plan to the distribution of finds noted during the fieldwalking (Howe et al 2002).

In 2005 a team from the Society excavated six small trenches over an isolated scatter of tesserae in the plough-soil about 30m east of the presumed site of the main range of Roman buildings (see location plan). Further tesserae were recovered from the plough-soil level in all the trenches, but only two produced definite evidence for underlying archaeology. One trench (3) contained a stone-packed post pit c 0.8m in diameter and partially backfilled with tesserae, while a second (6) – that closest to the previously excavated Roman buildings – exposed a layer of building rubble.

In 2008 the authors, again with consent from English Heritage, carried out a magnetometer survey on the presumed site of the Roman buildings, in an attempt to confirm their exact location. The survey, when taken with the results of the gridded fieldwalking, now allows a fair degree of certainty as to the location of the buildings. Clear evidence was also found for a, presumably earlier, D-shaped enclosure, together with subsidiary rectangular enclosures and an apparent entrance trackway.

Method
In 2002 a grid, linked to the Ordnance Survey grid, was laid out across the field using a Topcon 211 total station. All subsequent work including the geophysical survey has been linked to this grid, making the results spatially comparable.

For the purposes of the geophysical survey, a grid of 30m squares was laid out and surveyed using the Society’s Geoscan FM256 fluxgate gradiometer at 1m traverse intervals with a 0.25m sampling interval and zig-zag traverses. The survey data were processed using Geoplot 3.0 software. The area was generally magnetically quiet; however the exposed nature of the site and the strong gusting winds and rain during the survey affected the quality of the results. This meant that the data had to be rectified using zero mean traverse and a low pass filter and the results were then interpolated to 0.25m resolution across the traverses and printed as a compressed shade plot.

Results
The site is unusual in that, in this case, excavation (in the 19th century) preceded the geophysical survey rather than the usual order of events. This has allowed elements of the survey to be interpreted in the light of the excavation plan and report.
The results of the survey are shown on the accompanying printout and an interpretation/location plan has been overlaid with the ‘best fit’ for the Roman buildings (the 19th century excavation plan).

As can be seen, the main feature revealed by the survey is the c 70 x 70m D-shaped enclosure, which partially surrounds and underlies the Roman buildings. The latter assumption is because the Rev Cooper, the original excavator, makes no mention of a destruction line through the buildings and it therefore seems probable that the buildings post-date and overlie the enclosure.

Curving south-west from the D-shaped enclosure and turning west is a second linear feature, which appears to be paralleled to the south-east for part of its length by a second linear. Though rather wide, this may be a trackway leading to the enclosure with at least two rectangular enclosures lying immediately to the south-east.

Within the D-shaped enclosure are two straight linear features forming a right angle, the longer side more or less lining up with the long axis of the main Roman building. It is uncertain whether this relates to the building or to some other feature. On the computer screen, it is possible to discern a number of other potential lines in this general area but none is clear enough for there to be any certainty as to their meaning or even their true existence.

A stretch of ditch marked A (see location plan) shows a high response indicative of heating and it is interesting that this appears to lie close to ‘circular structure Q’ (Cooper et al 1984, 71), a feature found in the 19th century excavations and which the excavator thought to ‘have been a furnace’. He went on to say ‘The earth here was very black, and for a distance of upwards of 12 feet on the west side’. Equally, the area of high magnetic response marked B on the location plan lies close to an area of the buildings identified as having a furnace and hypocaust. The shape of the response, having a central ‘spine’ with four cross ‘bars’, may possibly be the result of the physical layout of such a heating system, although it would seem rather large. The highest magnetic responses came from either end of the northernmost cross ‘bar’ and may possibly represent the original fireboxes. Only
excavation will resolve this question.

The separate and differently aligned suite of rooms to the south of the main Roman building, labelled 44 – 48 on Cooper’s plan, appears to lie neatly within one of the rectangular enclosures and it may be that rather than being a coincidence it is the earliest Roman building on the site and utilises a pre-existing enclosure.

To the west of the main features the survey recorded three sides of a straight-sided feature, the longest recorded side of which was c 40m in length. As it was not possible to continue the survey to the west in the time available the nature and extent of this feature remains unknown.

A public footpath runs along the southern edge of the field and has cut a deep groove into this section of the slope of the hill. It has often been claimed that this path is of great antiquity, and it may be worth noting that since it appears to cut through the southernmost rectangular enclosure, it would seem likely to post-date that enclosure – giving some idea of an earliest possible date for the path.

**Conclusions**

While the survey failed conclusively to show the walls of the Roman buildings, it nevertheless confirmed the position because of the close correlation of the high magnetic anomalies with features on the 19th century plan and mentioned in the accompanying report. This suggestion is further strengthened by the terracing that is still visible on the surface of the field and confirmed by the results of the 2002 fieldwalking programme.

The D-shaped enclosure is probably Iron Age in date and there is some indication that at least one of the Roman buildings utilised part of the existing Iron Age enclosure system. It is possible therefore that there was continuity of occupation on the site between the two periods and indeed that, as seems probable, the Roman buildings are of more than one phase. Only excavation is likely to resolve these and other points on this most unusual site.
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COBHAM PARK: CONTINUING WORK  
David Taylor
As part of the continuing work of investigating the historic landscape and archaeology within the Cobham Park estate, a survey of earthworks within a section of the park, immediately to the south of the mansion, was undertaken between January and November 2007 by a team under the direction of Judie English.

The section of the park surveyed had been emparked during the 18th and 19th centuries. The area in question lay between the mansion house and the former
common field known as Down Field. It is currently grazed grassland with a scatter of specimen trees and mature oaks.

Analysis of the results of the survey indicates that the boundaries of at least two phases of field systems and a series of gravel quarries have been preserved. Whilst no dating evidence has been recovered it is considered that a medieval or post-medieval genesis is likely. Excavation across the putative line of a road predating the emparkment proved inconclusive but a test pit located in the area of a post-medieval dwelling that formerly stood adjoining the site indicated activity dating from the late 14th or early 15th centuries to the early 19th century.

A full report on the survey by Judie English and David Taylor, which also contains the historical background and appendices giving documentary evidence for landholdings within or adjoining Cobham Park both prior to and in the 18th century, has been lodged with the Society and can be seen at Castle Arch.

Thanks are due to the Society’s Honorary Vice President Dominic Combe for his enthusiastic encouragement of the continuing programme of exploratory work on the Cobham Park estate and for generously allowing access to this and other neighbouring sites.

**ASHTEAD VILLA AND TILEWORKS**

David Bird

A third season of fieldwork was undertaken by the Society’s Roman Studies Group on Ashtead Common between 27th August and 15th September. This year we were much less lucky with the weather, and at times it rained so much that it was not possible to work at all. Of course this affected site cleaning and photography, but in compensation it undoubtedly made digging easier, both physically (the clay was not rock hard) and visually (colour differences were much more apparent). It was surprising how much work was possible, a great tribute to the skill and dedication of the diggers; we also now have a greater appreciation of what A W G Lowther and a few helpers achieved at the site.

As a result of the work this year, we are in a much better position to begin to identify at least basic phases on the villa site, with stratified pottery and other finds to provide dating. We can also begin to understand more clearly information gleaned from Lowther’s reports (1927; 1929; 1930; 1959). The main aims this year were to complete the excavation of a 2m wide section of Trench 3 across the area interpreted as a porch by Lowther, to cut a section out from room 8 across the postulated line of a ditch running along the north side of the villa (Trench 5) and to relocate the corner of the enclosure wall found by John Hampton (Trench 6: for location see Bird 2004, 122-3, figs 54-5). These trenches were supervised by, respectively, David Calow, Nikki Cowland and Frank Pemberton; site recording was under the control of Alan Hall. Anyone referring to the earlier reports should note that our site north is in fact roughly north-west.

Trench 3 was reopened and extended to the east in order to answer some of the questions raised. The general sequence outside the building was seen most clearly at the west end of the trench, starting with a greyish sandy clay above the natural yellow, with some finds suggesting activity perhaps in the later 1st century, presumably to be associated with the construction of the first building. In this area it precedes a spread of smallish flints perhaps forming the base for a yard or road surface (probably as a continuation of the approach road), with a yellow sandy layer above it and a top dressing of small pebbles. There was a layer of debris over this, mostly a layer of mortar and plaster with tiles, below a more general spread of tile, earth and some flint rubble. The front wall of the villa was found at foundation level, along the front of, but well below, the surface of the corridor floor found in 2007. It
consisted of flints packed into a trench that narrowed as it went down (rather like the walls around room 11, also examined in 2007).

The wall went through two 90° turns more or less on the line of Lowther’s porch but much less deep north to south. On the south side of this reduced ‘porch’ were found two tile-built stub walls on flint foundations, one set somewhat lower than the other apparently in an earlier shallow pit (which produced finds including pottery, some smashed in situ and certainly earlier than the front wall foundation). The tiles in these stub walls had been badly affected by heat, adding weight to a possible explanation, that they were related to a furnace. The ground surface sloped away to the south and was notably rich in charcoal. This area was later covered by two layers of broken tiles of all types sandwiching a spread of large fragments of *opus signinum*, including shaped pieces.

Beyond the ‘porch’ to the east a rammed chalk floor was found, as previously recognised by Lowther (1930, plan opposite 148); its extent was tested by augering and found to be approximately 5 x 4m. It was noticeable that the general debris layer was absent over the chalk floor; it was covered only by dark earth bounded by a line of flints apparently forming a rough wall set along the western edge of the chalk. This was a very unconvincing ‘wall’, with little sign of proper edging, only dark earth between the flints and no foundation, and it may have been no more than a flint heap created in Lowther’s day. It is likely that this area was thoroughly dug over at that time as it falls within an area of broken pottery and refuse ‘explored’ in 1928 and found to be productive of small finds (1929, 5). The chalk floor was probably earlier than the front wall, and must have been inside a structure although no evidence for this was
found. It may have been related in some way to the construction period, but that can only be established by future work.

In the angle of the wall return on the western side of the ‘porch’, the foundations of part of a small apse were found, seemingly a later addition. Unfortunately all trace of the inner junction of the front wall, the western side of the ‘porch’ and the apse had been removed, probably by robbing. Two tiles of the base of the gutter found by Lowther were discovered still in situ (confirmed by their prepared base of yellow sand) making clear that it post-dated the apse. It was also later than the yard or road base and must relate to a later version of the front wall, probably when the corridor was made in the form in which it was found last year. The latter’s floor of crushed brick was laid over a substantial make-up deposit, mostly of yellow clay. This raising of levels was probably carried out over much of the site, and may have included the spreading of debris in front of the building, perhaps at the same time as the filling of the U-shaped ditch to the north (see below). A major period of refurbishment is implied.

Trench 5 was dug to cut the ditch recorded by Lowther so as to obtain a proper section and hopefully provide a stratigraphic link back to the villa, with some associated dating evidence. It was also hoped to obtain environmental evidence from the ditch with the assistance of Professor Martyn Waller of Kingston University, who kindly took a sample of the fill. The trench was set out with some difficulty to avoid tree stump problems and immediately located the line of the wall between rooms 8 and 10 where it joined the outer (northern) villa wall. As in Trench 4 last year the lines of the walls were clearly marked almost at the surface by orangey-brown sandy material with some tile and tesserae, but only a small part of the outer wall survived and the rest of this and the inter-room wall otherwise only existed at foundation level. The material left above the walls was therefore the remnants of the robber trenches, left undug by Lowther. The tessellated floor they enclosed survived more or less as his plan indicated, but at an unexpectedly high level. Where it was damaged it could be seen to be laid over a crushed tile base. Not far to the north a modern ditch cut across the line of the trench; part of a United Dairy milk bottle of 1920s pattern was found and may indicate that the ditch was one of those dug for drainage purposes in the 1927 digging season, which was very wet (Anon 1929, xix). Its dark fill was found to overlie in places a black, charcoal-rich layer with tile that is probably to be

The tessellated floor in Trench 5.
associated with the furnace pit recorded by Lowther to the east of the attached bath-house at the north-west corner of the villa. The modern ditch had cut along the southernmost side of the Roman-period ditch. The latter was not immediately apparent after the removal of topsoil except that north of what proved to be the line of the ditch the surface was covered in a thick layer of broken tile. In due course it was found that the original ditch was roughly V-shaped and had at some stage been recut to a U-shape; this shape remained very crisp and must therefore have been quickly backfilled with the building material found in it. The tile layer north of the ditch was probably laid at this time, perhaps intentionally as a rough surface. According to Lowther’s plan, the gutter round the attached bath annexe of the villa discharged into the ditch, and it may be suggested therefore that the recut backfilled with building material was intended to serve as a linear soakaway. Similar features are known for example at Rapsley (Hanworth 1968, 15-16) and Ashtead itself, south of the isolated bath-house (Lowther 1927, 149).

Trench 6 was intended to relocate the enclosure corner so as to make possible further testing of the wall line and the possibility that there was a building there, especially in view of its proximity to the tileworks. The corner was found, with two related tile-built features that perhaps suggest a building, but there were no associated finds and only a clean sandy surface above the natural clay. If it was a structure then perhaps this could be explained by a use such as a drying shed. The walls were only two or three courses high, with broken tegulae used for binding. There was no sign of loose flint so robbing is perhaps unlikely and the walls must be seen as the base for a timber structure of some sort. More work is needed.

Further magnetometer and topographical survey was carried out by Archaeology South East in the spring in the area west of the clay pits and this hinted at features crossing the area tested by Trench 6, but nothing was found that seemed to be related to them. More convincing anomalies were noted nearer the pits and they suggest the possible location of tile kilns that we hope to test in the future. Professor Martyn Waller has produced details of analysis of the material that had accumulated in the main clay pit after it ceased to be used and has been able to obtain a radiocarbon date giving a range of AD 60-240 for the initial silt, which fits very well with the other dating evidence for the Roman-period tile-ery. Pollen evidence suggests that oak was predominant in the area at the time (Martyn Waller, pers. comm.). This is being subjected to further dating and the range of samples is being extended. Scientific research on the tiles has begun, arranged by the Estate under the direction of Dr Ian Betts; study of the ceramic building material from all of the excavations continues in parallel, run by the Society’s Artefacts and Archives Research Group. Finds work on site is also carried out by AARG, led by Margaret Broomfield; notable finds this year included a small bronze cockerel, pottery vessels smashed in situ, fragments of Cologne colour coat pottery and other fine wares, part of an open lamp from Trench 5 and a samian stamp (SERVI.M), part of a pipeclay figurine and a large lump of lead, partly worked. Recovery of metal finds gained considerably from the expert assistance of John Cole and Bill Meades with their metal detectors. The finds have yet to be properly assessed but the general impression as before is that most are of the second century, with some pottery perhaps a little earlier and occasional sherds that could be prehistoric.

Thanks are due to all who took part, especially those who endured the worst of the weather. As before, key roles were played by Alan Hall and Margaret Broomfield both on and off site, and the assistance of the Estate keepers (especially Sean O’Kelly and Lizzie Bruce) and their nature conservation volunteers was vital; they not only cleared and fenced the site but also provided a compound, delivered tools, water and other necessities and removed the finds when required. Dr Richard Massey of English Heritage and Dr Ralph Hobbs of Natural England were again supportive. This year
the site was ‘open’ for one of the Heritage Open Days; tours were led by a Roman tunic-clad Sean O’Kelly and displays were arranged by Margaret Broomfield and AARG. Over 200 people visited the site (with probably another 100 on other days) and more than 500 saw the displays in the Estate Office.

This the third year of the Project and the results were more than expected. Many other parts of the site require attention and it is time for us to step back and consider what else can be achieved in a reasonable timescale. The Project Design will be revised following consultation.
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COUNCIL NEWS

ANNUAL LECTURE

Friday 5th June 2009

Ptolemy Dean, architect and artist, perhaps best known for presentation of the BBC series “Restoration”, will present the Society’s Annual Lecture next year.

Ptolemy Dean specializes in historic preservation, as well as designing new buildings in keeping with their surroundings. He also appeared in the seven-episode series *The Perfect Village* on Radio Four, in which he discussed the qualities which make the “perfect village”.

He has written ‘The more people who can read and enjoy historic architecture, the more importance architecture will be given in our society. We live in an increasingly fast and distracted age when people have less and less time to look and see, and consequently to understand the rich heritage of the past that surrounds us.’

Further details and application forms will follow in the New Year.

CHANGE TO WORKING HOURS  Susan Janaway

At the end of November I changed my working days at Castle Arch. You will now find me here on Thursdays from 10am to 4.15pm and Fridays from 10am to 2.45pm. I no longer work on a Wednesday but Hannah Jeffrey will continue to do so.

This means that there will be a voice at the end of the phone on a Friday and the library door will be open. However, if you wish to look at research material, please ring a day or so before, so that the material can be found for you before you arrive.

NEWS FROM THE TOOLS  Geoff Stonehouse

Following comments from recent digs that our drawing frame is very heavy, I have made a lighter one with an aluminium frame. It weighs under 2lbs, about 12lbs lighter than the old iron framed one. It is, however, less robust and needs more careful
Handling. Both new and old frames are now available from the stores.
I would appreciate comments from users of the new frame, and from users of any of
our equipment.

SURREY ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH FRAMEWORK
(SARF)

2008 CONFERENCE

Nikki Cowlard and Lesley Hays

Surrey Archaeological Society held its annual SARF Conference on Saturday 4th
October 2008 at The Letherhed Institute. The Surrey Archaeological Research
Framework was launched in 2006 and has been used as a basis for the development
of further research in the county. The annual conference is a chance to assess how
the Framework is being used and how it is evolving, and this year was ably organized
by the Prehistoric Group.

Surrey County Council’s support has been instrumental to the set up and continuing
development of SARF and so it was fitting that the Chairman for the morning session
was Joe Flatman, the Surrey Heritage Conservation Team Manager. The first
speaker to be introduced was David Field of English Heritage who started by
suggesting that we need to look beyond the Channel and put aside boundaries to
gain a wider view of prehistoric activity. The relationship between evidence for
prehistoric activity (in the form of round barrows, banjo enclosures and artefacts,
such as flint and BA axes) and geology, topography and rivers was examined. For
Surrey, the convergence of geologies such as the Wey and Mole Gaps are likely sites
for prehistoric activity, and wooded areas that remain removed from agricultural
activity may shield archaeology that could be highlighted by the use of LIDAR (Light
detection and Ranging). David Field concluded by discussing the hypothetical
landscape of Doggerland which, until the Mesolithic period, joined England to
Continental Europe.

Next, Becky Lambert from the Surrey County Archaeological Unit (SCAU) spoke on
the use of SARF within a commercial framework. She argued that, rather than a
divide between research and commercial archaeology, all archaeology should be
developmental. The Research Framework does have relevance in commercial
archaeology where activity has expanded dramatically in contrast to the decline in
university-based research. Becky used examples of recent SCAU activity at
Christchurch School, Guildford, and Sandhill Lane, Thorpe, to highlight the benefits
of using the Research Framework.

The final speaker of the morning was Peter Harp, of the Plateau Group, discussing
work the group had undertaken over a period of two years at Nork allotments. Field
walking had uncovered upwards of 10,000 flint tools, Romano-British pottery sherds,
medieval shell-tempered ware and roof tile. Peter concluded that the site had been
useful for training purposes and allotments can be good sites to field walk as they are
usually indicative of fertile soils and settlement. Discussion following the morning
session concentrated on the potential benefits of LIDAR in Surrey and how it would
require a grant or joint project with other counties/ societies to make it viable due to
its expense.

After lunch the afternoon’s Chairman, David Calow (SyAS’s Honorary Secretary)
introduced three diverse talks based on Farming and Farmsteads. Judie English
discussed the latest on Bronze Age field systems: why they might have developed,
how they are recognized, the difficulties in dating them, how they were aligned and
current locations being researched in Wiltshire and East Sussex.
David Bird (Vice President and Chair of Roman Studies Group) then tackled the subject of Roman-period farmsteads in Surrey and the lack of good evidence for this important aspect of Roman Britain. Evidence for rural settlement is scant with little evidence for buildings, crops or animals; buildings associated with villas, such as at Beddington and Rapsley, may have been used for agricultural purposes. SARF highlights this dearth of evidence, as does the South-East Framework, but Surrey is well placed to produce nationally important evidence and the Roman Studies Group plan to use its recently developed database as a basis for future work.

Dennis Turner was the final speaker of the day delivering a paper on behalf of Peter Youngs on medieval farmsteads. Little evidence is known from Surrey thus a more national perspective was employed. Temperatures in the medieval period are known to have dropped after a late Roman high, population levels are thought to have declined and urbanisation was a thing of the past. Evidence for early churches and barns in Essex, the ability to build complex wooden structures, and the use of timber-framed wattle and daub were discussed as was animal husbandry. What little evidence there is suggests that Surrey settlements are more dispersed than other parts of the country and it was concluded that social change seemed to take place more rapidly than farming methods in this period.

After the final panel discussion David Calow succinctly summed up the day’s events and thanked the speakers and David Graham, President of the Society concluded proceedings with comments on Taking Forward the SARF Process.

SURREY INDUSTRIAL HISTORY GROUP

“25 YEARS OF CONSERVATION AWARDS 1983-2007”
Launch party
Angela Fraser DL, Chairman of Surrey County Council, gave a welcoming address to an audience of about fifty, including SIHG Members, many of the Award Winners and members and staff of the County Council. She referred to the Surrey History Centre as a splendid and very appropriate venue for the launch of the publication: SCC had been presented with a plaque in 1990 for the conservation of Chatley Heath semaphore tower. She was particularly pleased to welcome Heather Stimson, a member of the family of the late Stuart Chrystall, whose substantial bequest to SIHG made publication of the book possible. Sarah Goad, Lord Lieutenant of Surrey, had planned to attend the evening but had to take over family commitments at short notice. She has written an excellent, enthusiastic foreword to the book.

Alan Crocker then gave an illustrated talk about the book, which he and his wife Glenys edited. The presentation included illustrations which are not in the book. Alan explained briefly why each award was deserved and how awards had inspired further investigations.

Angela Fraser of SCC
Bob Bryson, Chairman of SIHG, later presented the 26th plaque, for 2008 to John Redpath of The Spike, Guildford. John remarked that the winning of an award can provide welcome recognition and boost interest in a conservation project. (A temporary plaque had already been presented after the AGM, when John gave a talk and his team showed SIHG members round the conserved building.)

Refreshments were organized by Jan Spencer and Margaret Levett, Christopher Mann set up a bookstall and Glenys Crocker mounted a display about the Conservation Awards.

Thanks are due to the staff of the Surrey History Centre for their hospitality.

Nominations are now being sought for the 2009 plaque.

### MEDIEVAL STUDIES FORUM

**SAXON SURREY**

*St Mary’s Church, Quarry Street, Guildford*

*Saturday 28th March 2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>Tea and Coffee available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>Welcome and Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td><strong>The Roman-Saxon Transition</strong> <em>David Bird</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45</td>
<td><strong>Anglo Saxon Kingdoms in the South East</strong> <em>Martin Welch</em> of the Institute of Archaeology UCL project “Beyond the Tribal Hidage: Using Portable Antiquities to explore early Anglo-Saxon kingdoms in southern England”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Lunch – bring your own sandwiches or lunch in the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td><strong>Surrey’s Saxon Estate Holdings from Domesday</strong> <em>Patrick Molineux</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td><strong>Place name Studies in Surrey</strong> <em>Rob Briggs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45</td>
<td><strong>Saxon Guildford</strong> <em>Mary Alexander</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Open Forum discussion on research themes to be identified in the 2009 SARF review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>Walk across to Guildford Museum to view selected Saxon artefacts including some from the reserve collections not normally on show</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost: £6 per person payable on the day.

### MEDIEVAL POTTERY IDENTIFICATION DAY

*Steve Nelson*

On 18th October nineteen members of the Medieval Studies Forum attended a full-day seminar to hear Phil Jones of the Surrey County Archaeological Unit outline his approach to the study of late Saxon and medieval pottery from excavations and the classification of a type series for the county.

The quantitative assessment, by sherd count, weight, MNVs and EVEs, of groups complements the analysis, using binocular microscope, of differing fabric types. The current SCAU classification is based on this analysis of relative tempering constituents and an objective, coded type series, rather than the area/kiln site type descriptions many of us have been used to.

It is not always easy to relate Surrey’s coded series to the, slightly simpler, MOLAS fabric codes, which may be more relevant to the north east of the county. However, there has always been a problem of the relationship of the City, largely a consumer site, to the surrounding areas that variably supplied it. Another problem remains with dating. Although there are a great number of apparently distinct fabric types, their date ranges are often still quite wide with few securely, independently dated groups in the county. In broad terms they are dependent on the various dendro- and coin-
dated City waterfront groups. Dating is a difficulty particularly with the varied quartz/sandy tempered fabrics of the early medieval period. The material associated with the move of settlement in Reigate from the Cherchefelle area to the “new town” is helpful, as are the large groups from Staines. Although some pottery types, particularly the more decorated wares, Earlswood type etc, are more readily recognised, their date ranges seem to have widened rather than having been closer defined. The apparent longevity of shelly type wares is also problematic. However, it is encouraging note that the span of Kingston-type Surrey whitewares of c1240-1380 seems to hold good, although there is still some debate over its end. In the City it is a very small percentage of groups of 1360/80 but its demise in the county is unclear and complicated by its affinity to Coarse Border Ware.

Phil finished with a brief look at the late medieval/post-medieval transitional period. While there are clearly a number of significant changes in some fabrics and vessel forms, there are as ever overlapping traditions. The date of change from medieval to the post-medieval still means different things to different people, not the least to pottery studies – but that’s for another day!

Our thanks are due to Phil Jones and SCAU for presenting the day and for such a huge sample of the material on display.

VILLAGES STUDY GROUP

MAPPING AND HEARTH TAX RECORDS WORKSHOP
Surrey History Centre, Goldsworth Road, Woking
Saturday 31st January 2009

10.00am  Tea and Coffee available
10.30   Welcome & Introduction
10.35   The Development of Maps and Estate Plans  Carole Garrard, the Local Studies Librarian at Surrey History Centre, will talk on the historical development of mapping, illustrated by examples from Surrey; she will also demonstrate the use of the Centre’s search facilities for maps and plans
11.30   Rectifying and Manipulating Maps of Different Periods  A workshop led by Richard Savage on theory and practice, with examples by Ken Bewsey and Richard Christophers from their study of Old Woking
12.30pm  Lunch – bring your own sandwiches or lunch in the town – tea and coffee available. During this period Carole Garrard will conduct smaller groups into the Research Room of the History Centre to see a display of ‘Historic maps from Surrey’
2.00   The interpretation of Hearth Tax returns  Roehampton University Research Team. We are very fortunate to be able to have a presentation by members of this team
3.00   Open discussion
3.30   Close (building shuts at 4pm)

Cost: £5 per person payable on the day.

ROMAN STUDIES GROUP

FORTHCOMING TALKS PROGRAMME
6th January  Ashtead Excavations
3rd February Hatch Furlong Excavations  Jon Cotton
3rd March  Roman Glass  Denise Allen
OBITUARY

ELIZABETH EAMES, MBE, FSA. 24th June 1918-20th September 2008

Elizabeth Eames was a redoubtable scholar with a strong, not to say stentorian personality who, following a Newnham degree, wartime ATS service and an MLitt, found her perfect working environment in the British Museum. Since the 1950s, her ‘special subject’, of which she became the doyenne, was decorated medieval floor tiles. The museum has a vast collection of these including a long-held three thousand plus from Chertsey, augmented when the museum acquired the Rutland collection in April 1947. In the early 1970s Mrs Eames created an attractive new gallery to display tiles, tile pavements and kiln remains from a variety of sites. Most of the pavements came to the museum as part of the Rutland collection.

Mrs Eames worked in the field on a number of excavations, particularly of kiln sites, as well as in the museum. Working on the Chertsey material, she analysed the relationship between the remarkable panels of the king, queen, and archbishop with the kiln found there, and published her results in the *Tile kiln at Chertsey Abbey* (1954).

She lectured widely and her remarkable publication record reached its peak in 1980 with the two-volume *Catalogue* of the BM’s collection – a catalogue that had been under compilation for thirty years. The work lists almost fourteen thousand tiles and illustrates over three thousand designs. In it is the most complete publication of the Tristran and Isolde romance tiles from Chertsey.

Her contribution to medieval studies was not confined to floor tiles. Mrs Eames was energetic in encouraging others, especially those in the voluntary sector (she had begun her career at the BM as a virtual volunteer). A natural and exuberant teacher, she worked assiduously for the City Literary Institute, the WEA and the London University Department of Extra Mural Studies. Her extra-mural activities reached Guildford and she recruited ‘Jac’ Cowie of the Society’s Guildford Group to her team of volunteer illustrators (who all had to maintain the high standards set by Mrs Eames). In 1980, despite a busy life, she became, with her solicitor husband, Herbert, the first of a series of joint honorary secretaries of the Society. Elizabeth and Herbert had been married since 1949. Sadly, their term of office was brought to an untimely end when her husband became terminally ill.

She was President of Kingston upon Thames Archaeological Society from 1978 to 1980 and President of Southwark and Lambeth Archaeological Society from 1978 to 1980.

Elizabeth Eames has been memorialized by obituaries in the *Guardian*, *Independent*, *Times* and elsewhere. The newspaper obituaries were rather longer than is usual for specialists in the archaeological field but Elizabeth was a notable scholar of highly deserved reputation and exceptional personality. Perhaps the Society should honour her by reviving work on the county contribution to the Census of Medieval Tiles in Britain.

*Dennis Turner*

MISCELLANY

OTHER WORK AT DOWNSIDE MILL IN 2008

A preliminary report by Tony Howe of the training excavation at Downside Mill appeared in *Bulletin 411* (November 2008). While we were on site, Roman Golicz, assisted by Andrew Norris, carried out a survey of a partially-filled brick-built outfall culvert that drained the former southern millrace of the mill The arched roof of this brick-built culvert, built on the original millrace walls, was approx 1.5m wide and 5.5m...
long with possibly over 2m from the floor to the top of the arched roof. The millrace was still open at the time of the 1798 map of the site and it is not clear whether it was roofed over before the mill was demolished in c1814 or thereafter (a map of 1839 indicates that it was roofed over by that time). The culvert was subsequently blocked by an inserted wall of later bricks, incorporating a pillar of a bridge into the mill that had been shown on the 1798 map.

Roman has completed a report on the construction and present state of this culvert and this is to be retained as part of the full site archive. His report contains the following about bricks in general which may be of interest:

“These 9-inch blockage bricks (some were found to be 1/16th to 2/16ths longer even than that) are themselves of historical interest. Although dating bricks by size alone is notoriously unreliable, 9-inch units are generally a feature of the period 1571 to 1776, when brick sizes were finally standardised throughout England to 8.5 x 4 x 2.25 inches [17 Geo.3 c.42 Bricks and Tiles Act]. However, when the first brick tax was introduced in 1784 [24 Geo.3 sess.2 c.24 Duties on Bricks and Tiles Act], the 1776 standardisation was blatantly ignored as larger bricks made for fewer units which meant a lower taxation. The standard-size law became impossible to enforce, fell into abeyance, and was repealed in 1856 [19&20 Vict. c.64 Repeal of Obsolete Statutes]. The taxation was revised (and reduced) in 1839 [2&3 Vict. c.24 Duties on Bricks Act], and finally repealed in 1850 [13&14 Vict. c.9 Brick Duties Repeal Act]. Thus the essentially late-Elizabethan 9-inch (and over) brick experienced its mini-renaissance during the period 1784 to 1850. When steam-powered machining and mass production was introduced (1839), dutiful industrial companies adhered to the 1784 Act, which had not yet been repealed although barely acknowledged by small firms and individual brickmakers. As these were either driven out of business or converted to the new standard practice, so the Georgian standard was effectively reintroduced. Thus the modern British standard brick length of 8.5 inches.”

A GOLD RING FROM COBHAM

David Taylor

A gold mourning ring recently discovered by metal detectorists working with permission on the Cobham Park estate carries the initials FV and the date “16 May 70”. This clearly relates to Sir Francis Vincent of Stoke D’Abernon.

The Stoke D’Abernon parish registers record the following:

Sr Francis Vincent Kt & Baronett, & patron of this Church, dyed May 16, 1670, between 7 & eight of ye clocke in ye morning, and was buried on Friday night following, being ye 20th day of ye same month

In his will made in 1669 Sir Francis made the following bequests:

To my loving sister Mrs Katherine Vane the sum of Ten Pounds wherewith to buy her a Ring
To my said cousin Matthew Carleton three pounds & to his wife forty shillings to buy them rings
To my loving brother and friends Sir Walter Vane, Sir William Harward & Arthur Onslow the sum of Ten pounds a peece to buy them rings

(NB Sir William Harward (or Hayward) of Tandridge and Arthur Onslow of West Clandon)

Sir Francis Vincent of Stoke D’Abernon was the second husband of Mary Bigley (nee Archer). Mary was the granddaughter of George Bigley who had married Elizabeth the widow of Richard Sutton. The Suttons had been bailiffs of the manor of Cobham for Chertsey Abbey and, after the dissolution in 1537 the Suttons purchased the manor from the Crown.

The manor of Cobham was ultimately owned by Mary Bigley’s sister Dorothy who
married Robert Gavell who died in 1595. He was succeeded by his son Francis who married Mary Archer and it was their son, also called Francis, who married Margaret, eldest daughter of an earlier Sir Francis Vincent of Stoke D’Abernon in 1619. That Francis died in 1633 and left his eldest son, Vincent Gavell aged 15, his heir. This boy was placed in the charge of his relative Sir Francis Vincent of Stoke D’Abernon who, in 1638, was reproved by the Courts of Wards and Liveries for helping himself to young Gavell’s fish and timber. It was this Sir Francis who was commemorated by the ring.

The Matthew Carleton who received £3 for a ring was also related by marriage to the Suttons and the Bigleys, Mary the daughter of George Bigley having married Edward Carleton.

Although the Vincents primarily owned the manor of Stoke D’Abernon they also owned land in Cobham some of which now forms part of the Cobham Park estate. In particular Francis Vincent owned a property called Frages which appears to have been somewhere in the vicinity of Down Place (now Down Farm). Another property owned by Vincent was Bottells which stood on the site of the present Cobham Lodge. It seems likely that the ring is one of those purchased directly as a result of the bequests in the Will of Sir Francis. It is unlikely to have been that of his “loving sister” Katherine or Sir Walter Vane, Sir William Harward and Arthur Onslow as they were left ten pounds for their rings and presumably would have purchased something far more elaborate than that purchased for three pounds or less. This leaves the possibility that the ring was the property of Matthew Carleton or his wife. The fact that the Carletons owned various lands in Cobham and other members of their family lived here adds support to this case. A cousin of Matthew Carleton was Sir Dudley Carleton, 1st Viscount Dorchester who owned Ember Court, near Esher. Sir Dudley was Charles I’s Ambassador to The Hague and Venice and helped the monarch to acquire a number of important works of art for the royal collection. More on Sir Dudley can be found in Jerry Brotton’s book The Sale of the Late King’s Goods, Macmillan (2006).

The ring is currently at the British Museum awaiting a decision under the treasure trove legislation.

For more on the Carleton family see Chapter 3 of An Estate for All Seasons. A history of Cobham Park, Surrey and its owners and occupier by David Taylor, Phillimore & Co. (2006).

**REBURIAL OF HUMAN REMAINS AT AVEBURY**

**English Heritage Consultation**

The Reburial Officer of the Council of British Druid Orders has requested that human remains from Windmill Hill and the West Kennett Avenue presently held at the Alexander Keiller Museum at Avebury should be reburied. Part of the joint response from English Heritage and the National Trust is a consultation exercise which takes the form of a short online questionnaire. There are, of course, varied opinions on this sensitive subject but at the recent Bronze Age Forum a unanimous vote enabled our objections to such reburial to be recorded.
If any members of the Society wish to add their views the consultation site is:  
http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/ConWebDoc.14782  
A draft report is available on the site and provides further information.  

Rose Hooker and Judie English

COLLECTIONS
A new home and owner for a complete set of the Surrey Archaeological Collections is needed. If interested please make an offer to Chris Hasler on christopherhasler@btinternet.com

TEBBUTT RESEARCH FUND
The Wealden Iron Research Group is inviting applications for grants from this fund towards research, including associated expenses, into any aspect of the Wealden iron industry. Grants will be around £100. Applicants should write a letter giving details of themselves, together with relevant information concerning the research envisaged.

Letters of application should be sent before 31st March 2009, to David Brown, Honorary Secretary Wealden Iron Research Group, 2 West Street Farm Cottages, Maynards Green, Heathfield, Sussex TN21 0DG

ERRATUM
Hambledon Limekiln, which appeared in Bulletin 411 should have listed the following amongst the References at the end of the article:
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LECTURE MEETINGS

19th December
"John Evelyn’s Gardens in pictures" by Beryl Saich to Leatherhead & District Local History Society at Letherhed Institute (top of High Street) at 7.30 for 8 pm. Followed by Christmas Social event. Visitors welcome £2.

6th January
"Banknote Papermaking at Laverstoke and St Petersburg" by Alan Crocker to Surrey Industrial History Group (33rd Series of Industrial History Lectures) in Lecture Theatre F, University of Surrey, Guildford, 7.30-9.30 pm. Fee for single lecture £5 payable on the night.

6th January
"A Brief History of Holmwood" by Kathy Atherton to the Dorking Local History Group at the Friends’ Meeting House, Butter Hill, Dorking at 7.30 pm. Visitors £1.

7th January
"Surrey’s Mental Hospitals" by Julian Pooley to Epsom & Ewell History and Archaeology Society at St Mary’s Church Hall, London Road, Ewell at 7.45 for 8 pm.
7th January
“The miracles of St Dunstan: hagiography and history in fourteenth-century art” by Dr Alixe Bovey and followed by Twelfth Night Party of the British Archaeological Association in the rooms of the Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, Piccadilly at 5 pm. Non-members are welcome but asked to make themselves known to the Hon Director on arrival and to sign the visitors’ book.

8th January
‘Hands-on’ session and finds recognition with finds from Butser, by Steve Dyer to Kingston upon Thames Archaeological Society in the Mayo Hall, United Reformed Church at the corner of Union Street and Eden Street, Kingston at 7.30 for 8 pm. Visitors £1.50.

10th January
“The Lumley Chapel, Cheam” by Andrew Skelton to Carshalton & District History and Archaeology Society in Milton Hall, Cooper Crescent, off Nightingale Road, Carshalton at 3 pm. Guests welcome £1.

12th January
“Little known byways of Guildford history” by Matthew Alexander to Guildford Archaeology and Local History Group in the Jubilee Room, United Reformed Church, Guildford at 7.30 pm. Non-members welcome £2.

12th January
‘Richmond Hill, a place in art: visions of perfect harmony’ by Richard Thomas to the Richmond Local History Society in the Duke Street Baptist Church, Richmond at 8 pm. Visitors welcome £1.

13th January
“The Dorking Underground” by Richard Selley to Westcott Local History Group in the Reading Room, Institute Road, Westcott at 8 pm.

13th January
“Excavations at Drapers Gardens” by Neil Hawkins to the Southwark and Lambeth Archaeological Society at The Housing Co-op Hall, 106 The Cut, almost opposite the Old Vic Theatre at 7 for 7.30 pm. Visitors welcome £1.

17th January

19th January
“Fireworks: The History and Science of their Manufacture” by Gerry Moss to the Croydon Natural History & Scientific Society in the Small Hall of the United Reformed Church Hall, Addiscombe Grove, East Croydon at 7.45 pm.

20th January
“Channel Islands Concrete from WW2 to Today” by Chris Shaw to Surrey Industrial History Group (33rd Series of Industrial History Lectures) in Lecture Theatre F, University of Surrey, Guildford, 7.30-9.30 pm. Fee for single lecture £5 payable on the night.

21st January
“Surrey Spas” by Judy Goodman to the Wimbledon Society at Drake House, St George’s Road, Wimbledon at 8 for 8.15 pm.

21st January
“Old Plum n’Apple: Plumer – Every Inch a Soldier’s General” by Ian Passingham to the Surrey Branch, Western Front Association at The Day Centre, Lushington Drive, Cobham (behind Waitrose) 7.45 p.m. Visitors very welcome. Voluntary donation of £3 is suggested.

26th January
“The Byrons of Coulsdon” by Ian Scales to the Croydon Natural History & Scientific Society in the Small Hall of the United Reformed Church Hall, Addiscombe Grove, East Croydon at 7.45 pm.
29th January
“W F Rankine” by Colin Brash to Farnham & District Museum Society in the Hall of the United Reformed Church, South Street, Farnham at 7.30 for 7.45 pm.

29th January
“A Victorian Bobby’s Notebook” by Christine Weightman to the Egham-by-Runnymede Historical Society in the Main Hall, Literary Institute, High Street, Egham at 8 pm.

2nd February
“Brunel” by Brian Thorne to Woking History Society at Mayford Village Hall, Saunders Lane at 7.45 pm. Visitors welcome £2.

3rd February
“Watches in England: the First Hundred Years (1580-1680)” by David Thompson to Surrey Industrial History Group (33rd Series of Industrial History Lectures) in Lecture Theatre F, University of Surrey, Guildford, 7.30-9.30 pm. Fee for single lecture £5 payable on the night.

3rd February
“The Dorking Emigration Scheme of 1831-2” by Judy Hill to the Dorking Local History Group at the Friends’ Meeting House, Butter Hill, Dorking at 7.30 pm. Visitors £1.

4th February
“The Classic Post Office: The GPO from 1900-1969” by Paul Wood to Epsom & Ewell History and Archaeology Society at St Mary’s Church Hall, London Road, Ewell at 7.45 for 8 pm.

4th February
“Social transformations around the North Sea and western Baltic AD 600-1100: perspectives from Flixborough and Stavnsager” by Dr Chris Loveluck to the British Archaeological Association in the rooms of the Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House. Piccadilly at 5 pm. Non-members are welcome but asked to make themselves known to the Hon Director on arrival and to sign the visitors’ book.

12th February
“Archaeology of the Bee Garden and Chobham Common” by Isobel Ellis to Kingston upon Thames Archaeological Society in the Mayo Hall, United Reformed Church at the corner of Union Street and Eden Street, Kingston at 7.30 for 8 pm. Visitors £1.50.

16th February
“Coinage in England from the Conquest to the Reformation” by Richard Kelleher of the British Museum to the Croydon Natural History & Scientific Society in the Small Hall of the United Reformed Church Hall, Addiscombe Grove, East Croydon at 7.45 pm.

18th February
“Der Tag: Ludendorf’s offensive against the British Third and Fifth Armies in Picardy” by Clive Harris to the Surrey Branch, Western Front Association at The Day Centre, Lushington Drive, Cobham (behind Waitrose) 7.45 p.m. Visitors very welcome. Voluntary donation of £3 is suggested.
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