FARNHAM CASTLE KEEP

Audrey Graham looks down the shaft from the new viewing platform
BACKGROUND
Many people will be surprised to hear that the shell keep we see today at Farnham Castle is not the first to have been built on the site, but is actually a later 12th century replacement for an earlier tower keep. One of the problems facing the second generation of Norman castle masons in England was how to replace timber defences with stone ones, given the problems of putting heavy stone structures on relatively unconsolidated earthen mottes (the name given to the earth mounds of early Norman castles). While there is no evidence that there were ever timber defences at Farnham, the earliest tower keep shows one approach to solving the problem of providing a stable foundation, while at the same time protecting the base of the building from attack.

THE ARCHAEOLOGY
The castle is generally considered to be one of the finest examples of a motte and bailey castle in southern England and was owned for virtually the whole of its existence by the bishops of Winchester. Unsurprisingly, therefore, the castle has a long and complex history. That history became even more complicated when excavations on the keep under Dr Michael Thompson in the late 1950s produced dramatic evidence for the survival of the massive lower section of a square stone tower buried within the soil of the motte. Dating from the early 12th century this tower/keep must have originally risen high above the top of the earth motte to dominate the little settlement of Farnham below. From later documentary evidence, the above ground section of the tower seems to have been demolished at the end of the Anarchy period on the orders of Henry II. The surviving buried 14.5m deep shaft was then brought back into use as a well, following the construction of the walls of the still extant shell keep towards the end of the 12th century.

All memory of the original tower was lost after the 16th century, when the shaft was filled in, and following the Civil War the abandoned shell keep became the site of a pleasure garden.

Following various changes of ownership the keep came under the control of the Ministry of Works after the Second World War, and this was the body which commissioned the excavations that rediscovered the buried section of the original early 12th century tower. At the end of the excavations the shaft and its surrounding masonry flange were protected by a covering of concrete, though a viewing platform was hung in the upper part of the shaft to allow visitors to look down into the black and uninviting hole beneath them.

Basically resembling a cross between a helicopter landing pad and the entrance to a Second World War bunker, the Ministry of Works ‘improvements’, if anything, detracted from the visitor ‘experience’, and combined with a lack of much in the way of explanatory panels it is doubtful whether any visitors to the keep over the last fifty years or so, have come away with any idea of the complex and exciting early history of the site.

It was to remedy this situation that the current occupiers of the castle, the Centre for International Briefing, applied last year for a Heritage Lottery Fund grant to replace the 1960’s concrete slab with a timber pavilion to hopefully resemble the 13th century well house mentioned in the account rolls, and to improve the interpretation of the site for visitors. As part of the Scheduled Monument Consent for this work, English Heritage required a preliminary examination of the site to determine whether the concrete slab could be broken up without damage to the underlying medieval stonework, and that any subsequent works should be monitored and archaeologically recorded. Both the preliminary examination and the recording work was carried out by Audrey and David Graham with the considerable help of Andrew Norris.
The buried structure that Dr Thompson had discovered, consisted of a square tower, with walls 3m thick and an internal dimension of just over 3m at the base, widening slightly further up the building. At the highest level an external flange had been added around the tower walls to form a square base with sides of 15.6m - probably to underpin buttresses supporting the above ground structure. Particularly interesting was the fact that the external face of the, now buried, walls had been plastered, which must mean that the tower had originally been free standing and that the earth motte had been added around it - probably in stages as building rose. There were certainly no signs of windows or doors within the shaft to give any indication that the intention had ever been other than to bury the structure within the motte. There are very few parallels for this type of construction - the closest in size being Goltho castle in Lincolnshire - though Farnham is the largest example of this type of military architecture. Elsewhere the problem of constructing stone buildings on unstable earth mottes was overcome in various ways, eg. as at Guildford, by the rather unsatisfactory expedient of inserting the tower into the side of the motte. While achieving a stable base for the footings, this, of course, left the stonework of the tower exposed and vulnerable to attack. At Farnham, the foundations of the tower are not only firmly set on the underlying chalk, but the base of the tower is well protected by the surrounding earth of the motte. Farnham was therefore at the forefront of Norman castle design in the early 12th century, as befitted a property of the bishops of Winchester - amongst the richest aristocrats in England.

While the recent recording work has done nothing to change the basic interpretation of the site put forward by Thompson, a number of details have been added to our knowledge of the buried structure. A photographic record has been made of the internal walls of the shaft, making use of the temporary scaffolding put in place while the pavilion was being constructed - making the descent a somewhat dark and hair-raising experience for those of us who suffer from vertigo!

At the very base of the shaft, below the original ground surface, we recorded previously unnoticed relieving arches in the north west and south east walls as well as a series of putlog or joist holes that perhaps had supported a floor about 3.3m above the lowest level of the tower. There were ashlar quoins in the two northern corners and the walls were constructed of chalk blocks, including reused stones from some earlier building, all set in a sandy mortar. The walls, which had had a
supporting concrete ring-beam inserted in 1960, rested on the natural stiff decayed chalk layer that lies just above the solid chalk that underlies the ridge on which the castle is built. There was no sign of the filled in well found by Thompson, that no doubt continues many metres downwards to the water table, nor of the earlier ditch that he also found running under the base of the tower. Both were hidden under the 50 years of detritus that had accumulated since the shaft was emptied.

Some 2m above the possible joist holes a crumbling single band of stonework projects into the shaft on all sides. This was interpreted by Thompson as marking the original ground surface and being the main footings for the tower - below this level being a later insert, possibly intended to stabilise the wellhead. From the projecting stonework upwards, the quality of the surviving ashlar improved greatly and indeed the quoins were very finely carved and neatly fitted together. It seems quite possible that another floor level had existed at this point and a further one higher up where the walls of the shaft expanded slightly leaving a narrow platform on all sides. There was presumably a fourth floor, level with the surface of the motte and an unknown number of rooms higher up the tower. In any event so far as the shaft is concerned, it is possible that there were at least two buried rooms in the original tower, with a possible third one at the base, if Thompson is right in assuming that the lowest level was added after the main construction work had been completed.

Quite how the whole structure functioned in its later incarnation as a well shaft is uncertain. References in the medieval account rolls to boys being paid to descend into the shaft to recover lost well ropes, implies that the shaft was open during that period and that therefore any flooring had been wholly or partially removed. Quite how the boys reached the bottom and then got out again is anyone’s guess - but they certainly earned their halfpennies.

Photographs and accompanying notes, taken by Andrew Norris, will be deposited with the Society’s archives at Guildford Museum as a permanent record of the internal stonework of the shaft. In addition, samples were taken of the mortar from various points and will hopefully be analysed by English Heritage to see whether there is any chance of linking the phases of the various parts of the structure. To give one example, there was a band of pinkish mortar surrounding the head of the shaft, and this might possibly be the work undertaken in 1264 at a cost of over £3 to repair the top of the well.

In an article of this length it is impossible to explain in detail the complex history of the keep at Farnham, but anyone interested in finding out more should read Thompson’s account of his excavations in *Medieval Archaeology* Vol 4, 1960. There is a certain amount of controversy over his suggestion that the flange surrounding the square shaft could have supported the weight of a high stone tower. Only the upper third of the flange was integral with the main walls, the lower part being butted to them and the whole rested on what must, at the time, have been the very recently deposited marl of the motte. Perhaps the flange merely supported buttresses for the tower with the main weight being taken by the 3m thick walls of the shaft or, as suggested at Goltho, perhaps the tower was built of wood and was therefore considerably lighter. We shall probably never know.
At least from now on a trip to the castle will leave the visitor with a better idea of the layers of history that lie buried within the keep. The keep itself is now open from 1st February until 24th December each year and entrance is free of charge - so there is nothing stopping you.

**RECENT EXCAVATIONS AT FLEXFORD  
David Calow**

Members of the Roman Studies Group excavated the Romano-British settlement site at Flexford for the second time in April 2010. The first eight trenches were dug in 2009 and found ditches filled with significant quantities of second and third century pottery and evidence for iron working.

Alan Hall supervised Trench 9 and found a spread of flints overlying three north-south gullies. The trench was immediately east of what appeared to be the remains of an iron working furnace with three placed and almost complete pots found last year. This year we extended our knowledge of the furnace area. We found a second gulley with highly magnetic material and what should be datable pottery. Samples from this gulley contained hammer scale, solidified droplets of molten metal, metal fragments, slag, magnetic and non-magnetic furnace debris and reasonable quantities of charcoal. Samples have also been taken from the middle gulley for pollen analysis. This may help understand the plough soil and whether there was a break between Romano-British and subsequent occupation. We were unable to explain the flint spread which could be the remains of a floor or perhaps a rough track.

Emma Corke supervised Trench 10 which uncovered a funnel-shaped and very wet and silty Romano-British ditch 2m wide and cut at least 1.2m below the Romano-British ground surface. There was a surprising quantity of pottery, some of which was unusual for Surrey, and this should allow us to date the infill. Samples have been taken for pollen analysis to help understand the vegetation at the time the ditch filled.

Audrey Graham, with help from David Graham and Kathlyn French, kindly undertook resistivity over the north end of the site. Trench 11, supervised by Nikki Cowlard, was chosen at a point of high resistance and uncovered perhaps the most interesting results so far. We have found signs of structures in several trenches – daub, roof and floor tile fragments and nails - but no foundations. Trench 11 provided the first evidence for the location of a structure with the discovery of a closely packed platform of flints with rectangular sides and seven possible post holes. A coin, so far unidentified, may help dating.

Margaret Broomfield and Isabel Ellis arranged finds processing so that everything was washed, counted, weighed and recorded before it left the site.

The site is being examined in accordance with the Surrey Research Framework to better understand Romano-British rural settlements and we hope to continue the project at Easter 2011.
In his groundbreaking 2009 monograph *Anglo-Saxon Deviant Burial Customs*, Andrew Reynolds drew together many years of research and thinking on what, despite its temporal and thematic depth, previously had been an under-studied subject. One particularly notable achievement of the book is its inclusion of a national corpus of excavated sites where skeletal remains exhibiting signs of distinctive treatment at odds with “standard” contemporary burial practices have been found. Such unorthodox characteristics have meant interpretations of their age and background have often been of a tentative nature, or else avoided altogether. In response to this Reynolds has collected together a substantial array of documentary references with which to substantiate the notion that most, if not all, of these burials represent the remains of individuals put to death as the consequence of the actions of the Anglo-Saxon criminal justice system. Surrey’s relative abundance of such sites had already been been explored by Reynolds and Graham Hayman in the discussion of the context of an execution cemetery at London Road, Staines (Hayman & Reynolds 2005, 242-49).

Of the eight Surrey sites identified, perhaps the most mysterious is that roughly midway along the Hog’s Back ridge between Farnham and Guildford, just under 150 metres AOD at approximately OS grid reference SU911483. Human remains were discovered during trenching associated with the laying of a new water pipe in 1935, and a subsequent archaeological evaluation by Major A. J. Wade identified parts of at least six skeletons. Most of what is known about his findings derives from an article printed not long after in the Surrey and Hants News, but a proper appraisal was not published until several decades later as a brief note in the Surrey Archaeological Collections (English & Dyer 1999). This amended a number of Wade’s opinions, in particular rejecting his interpretation that he had found the remains of individuals killed by the collapse of a Neolithic flint mine (and likewise a later suggestion that it was a plague pit). However, the authors stopped short of advancing a single interpretation of their own, electing instead to ascribe the skeletons to ‘either criminal or military activity’ (English & Dyer 1999, 215). A history of nearby Seale and The Sands published the following year seems to ascribe the skeletons to the passage of Danish raiders through the area in AD 893, the year in which the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles record they suffered a heavy defeat at Farnham (Wheate et al 2000, 15).

It was Reynolds who, a few years later, was the first to interpret the skeletal remains as those of executed criminals (Hayman & Reynolds 2005, 247-48). He based his judgement on the prone nature of one of the burials and the possibility that another had been bound or trussed; a third was buried on a different orientation to the rest, pointing to the bodies having been interred not at the same time, but over an extended period. The account of the site given in his recent monograph adds little in the way of fresh information, aside from noting that the spacing between the burials again suggests they were made on more than one occasion (Reynolds 2009, 143). Like English and Dyer before him, Reynolds also drew attention to a number of important aspects of the site’s topography. Among these is the position of the burials next to a roadside - one of Wade’s sketch-plans shows the skeletons were found less than a metre from the northern edge of the road along the Hog’s Back ridge, equivalent to the present-day westbound carriageway of the A31. This route was certainly a *via regia* (“king’s highway”) by the late twelfth century (Gover et al 1934, 8), but despite its supposed prehistoric origins as the so-called Old Way or Harrow Way, its earlier status is moot (as summarised with assiduous objectivity by Turner 1980).

Perhaps the most remarkable topographical characteristic of the site is its position near the meeting point of the parishes of Wanborough, Seale (originally Farnham) and Puttenham. Each parish belonged to a different Hundred: Woking,
Farnham and Godalming respectively. Such liminal locations at the junctions of parochial and hundredal boundaries are increasingly acknowledged to have been of particular significance as sites of occasional assembly, in spite of their remoteness, and in many cases elevated sites; to quote one authority, ‘rather than being no-man’s land they were “every-man’s land”’ (Pantos 2003, 47). So what might have drawn people to this particular location and not other, more central points in the locality at which estate boundaries met? While it has been recognised previously that the burials were located on the probable boundary of the sixty-hide estate granted to the monasterium at Farnham in a charter of Caedwalla, King of Wessex (Sawyer 235, of AD 685x87), none of the published appraisals have taken any account of the greater relevance of a later charter to the site. On the face of it this charter (Sawyer 382) is a confirmation of the Farnham estate to Frithestan, the new Bishop of Winchester, by King Edward the Elder, of circa AD 909. However, scholarly opinion has repeatedly cast doubt upon its authenticity, and it is more likely to constitute a later document drawn up in the second half of the tenth century (if not later still). It is written in Latin, save for an Old English boundary clause delimiting the Farnham estate and the ten hides at Bentley in Hampshire appended to it (Gover et al 1934, 165-67; Forsberg 1950, 203). Without doubt this describes a boundary that passes through the site under discussion, but might it actually give the name of the site itself?

The boundary clause begins and ends at vii dican, “seven ditches”, which the authors of The Place-Names of Surrey - accepting the earlier conclusion of Rev. H. R. Hubbard in a contribution to the second volume of Farnham Records - believed was equivalent to ‘a belt of seven mounds, just above Shoelands Farm on the southward slope of the Hogs Back, now almost obscured from sight by an overgrowth of trees and bushes’ (Gover et al 1934, 165). This description is misleading, for the overgrown ‘mounds’ are in fact a series of copses (all stands of ancient woodland) broadly coincident with the exposure of Upper Greensand midway down the southern slope of the Hog’s Back. More fundamental is the inappropriateness of Old English dic (of which dican is a plural form) as a term for identifying mounds, and the orientation of the ‘belt’ perpendicular to the boundary detailed in the charter-bounds. This being the case, the traditional identification of vii dican has to be rejected. The ditches must have lain at a point on a line between the boundary marks recorded either side of it: hlos wuda midde weardne to its north (lost, but most likely in the vicinity of grid reference SU912493 at the edge of Grubground Copse) and ottan forda to the south (undoubtedly Totford at the north-west corner of Puttenham Common, grid reference SU911473). Working on the basis that vii dican is no longer extant as a landscape feature, by far and away the most credible site between the aforementioned two marks is on top of the Hog’s Back in more or less the same location as the interments found in 1935. This would also go a long way towards confirming Reynolds’ belief that they may have been associated with an earthwork, despite there being ‘no evidence for pre-existing features at the site’ (Hayman & Reynolds 2005, 248).

In view of its disappearance, interpreting the nature of “seven ditches” is anything but straightforward. A multivallate hillfort or settlement would seem an appropriate explanation of the name’s implication, but arguably does not suit the location midway along the ridge. It is perhaps easier to conceive of the ditches being those of a cross dyke, common on the South Downs, and perhaps paralleled in Surrey by the scarp-foot embankment on the Kent border (Clark 1960) and the ‘great ditch crossing the way from Guildford’ Aubrey noted at Albury (1980, 274-75). A series of seven ditches sounds like a remarkably complex earthwork, but the name may not be a literal reflection of their number. Old English seofon (i.e. seven) has been suggested to have had legal and/or scriptural significance (Smith 1956, 119), and its religious significance has been explored in greater depth by Keith Briggs in his discussion of
the recurrent name “seven wells” (2007). The notion that the name may not be numerically accurate finds further support in the only other known Old English pairing of seofon and dic, found in the bounds of Sixpenny Handley contained in a not wholly reliable charter of AD 956 (Sawyer 630). The spelling of this reference ("?at get at seuen diche suð ende anlag diche = “the gate/gap at seven ditch south end, along the ditch..."") provides no evidence of a plural form, although Mills equates it with an earthwork named ‘the Dykes’ on older OS maps, situated very close to a Romano-British settlement site (Mills 1989, 123).

The appropriation of earlier monuments as places for burials is an important phenomenon in the Anglo-Saxon period. However, whereas they were initially sites for ordinary or even elite graves, they subsequently became places of negative, “pagan” notoriety - a change excellently demonstrated in the reuse of the richly-furnished primary barrow burial at Gally Hills, Banstead for the site of a gallows and execution cemetery (although the date of the five execution burials are not definitely of Anglo-Saxon date: Barfoot & Williams 1976; Hayman & Reynolds 2005, 248). A similar proposition has been made in regard to the large execution cemetery at Guildown at the eastern end of the Hog’s Back (Reynolds 2009, 139). Recently John Blair has proposed ‘liminal places such as barrows and earthworks’ were often congruent with the hæðenan byrgels (‘heathen burials’) which occur as marks in many sets of pre-Conquest charter-bounds. Moreover he believes there was a polarity in burial practice which grew more defined during the later Anglo-Saxon period: ‘safe’ and ‘pure’ interment in churchyards on the one hand, and ‘unclean’ burials in unconsecrated peripheral sites on the other (Blair 2009, 551-53). One should not necessarily assume that because the burials were not at a site named “heathen burials” they must hence post-date the composition of the Farnham charter-bounds; it is reasonable to assume “seven ditches” had been a site of local significance for more than just the conduct of criminal punishment (especially if the first half of the name had pre-Christian significance: see Briggs 2007).

The name “seven ditches” appears in another boundary clause, this time delimiting the Shoelands estate in the north-west of Puttenham parish, within a feoffment containing internal evidence suggestive of a date in the first decade of the thirteenth century (SHC 2609/11/5/35). The southern estate boundary is said to follow the King’s highway running from Puttenham ‘ad vadum de Otteforde. et ex inde usque ad Sevendic’ = ‘to the ford of Totford and hence also to Seven Ditches’ (a published partial translation of the document erroneously gives the name as ‘Senedic’: Currie 2003, 274). At first this is hard to square with the topography of the present-day locality, but it would seem to imply the existence of a lost route picking a circuitous route north from Totford to the top of the Hog’s Back. What is more, there may have been an equivalent route on the northern slope of the Hog’s Back, as a track is shown on several pre-OS maps (e.g. 1828 estate map of Wanborough: O’Connell & Bird 1994, 11). Thus not only was “seven ditches” a focus for estate boundaries, but lay at a crossroads as well. Blair cites crossroads as places where “unclean” burials were typically made, in no small measure influenced by the words of the late-Saxon homilist Ælfric written around the turn of the eleventh century (‘witches still go to the crossroads and heathen burials with their delusive magic, and call to the devil, and he comes to them in the likeness of the man who is buried there’: Pope 1968, 796; Blair 2009, 548, 553).

The second post-Conquest occurrence of “seven ditches” is in the plea rolls of the 1263 Surrey Eyre. Among the entries relating to Woking Hundred is one recording that ‘Robertus de la Felde de Sande suspendus fuit [apud] Seinedik’ per sectam cuiusdam Willelm’ (“Robert de la Felde of Send was hanged at Seven Ditch(es) by suit of a certain William”: Stewart 2006, 335). The name was translated as ‘Sendike’ by Susan Stewart, who posited it might have been ‘the boundary ditch of the parish
of Send’ (2006, 336). Clearly she was of this opinion because of the information given about where Robert was from, but its spelling differs from all instances of Send in both the Eyre rolls and other records (Gover et al 1934, 146). While it must be conceded that there is no exact parallel in the forms of the “seven-names” collected by Briggs (the nearest being the Cumbrian field-name Sinewelle close, but this dates from 1539: Briggs 2007, 33), the archaeological and topographical context means its equation with “seven ditches” is all but assured. But just as this reference answers several questions, so it raises several more.

What is most remarkable about this final reference to “seven ditches” is that it links the site with Woking Hundred. The precise location of Wade’s 1935 excavation is unknown (the newspaper article from which much of what is known about his work opaque reports they were found ‘near the old boundary of the manors of Farnham and Wanborough’: English & Dyer 1999, 215) so there is no reason why its status as the start and end point of the Old English bounds of Farnham should mean it at the time had a particular connection with the coterminous Hundred of the same name. It may be significant that circa 1200 there is record of ‘les forches de Weleye’ - “the gallows of Willey” - belonging to the Bishops of Winchester (as lords of Farnham) and located at a place with an explicitly “pagan” name (Gover et al 1934, 175; Manning 1970, 31). Might this have taken over the capital punishment functions of “seven ditches” for Farnham Hundred? What is certain is that in the second half of the thirteenth century “seven ditches” was still of sufficient repute (or ill-repute) to warrant a man being brought here from the other side of Woking Hundred to be hanged.

The use of the site for an execution as late as 1263 naturally prompts questions as to how old the skeletons found in 1935 might have been. Were they Anglo-Saxon, like those at Eashing (Reynolds 2009, 136-37) and many of the skeletons at Guildown? Or could they have been later, post-Conquest interments? The only means of answering this (and resolving the matter of what “seven ditches” might have been) would be through archaeological investigation and subsequent scientific analysis, but there is scant prospect of this as the site is now on a narrow grass verge sandwiched between the two carriageways of the A31 (whose dualling in the 1960s may have caused damage to any still-undiscovered archaeology hereabouts). Consultation with Thames Water, the owner of a nearby covered reservoir, may at least help to pinpoint the line of the pipe which gave a new osteoarchaeological dimension to what would otherwise have been a much narrower debate about a lost earthwork. With archaeology being of limited use, a more realistic long-term goal would be the discovery of additional forms of the place-name, and the unedited and unpublished plea rolls of the Surrey Eyre offer the most likely source of these. It is hard to believe that there is not more that can still be discovered about a site of prolonged importance, and of a type that can surely be recognised elsewhere in Surrey.
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COUNCIL NEWS

INTERNET NEWS

You can now follow Surrey Archaeological Society on Facebook and Twitter and get all the latest news including events, excavation updates, latest photos and news. All updates will be added to our website onto our new ‘Latest News’ page so you can keep up to date there too.

If you have a Facebook account simply search for ‘Surrey Archaeological Society’ and click the ‘Like’ button. You will then automatically receive the latest news to your account. If you have a Twitter account simply search for ‘@surreyarch’ and click ‘Follow’. You will then automatically receive the latest news to your account.

If you would like to sign up to Facebook at www.facebook.com or Twitter at www.twitter.com, all you need is an email address and follow the simple online steps. However, you will be able to see all the latest news on our website, so you will not be missing out if you do not sign up.

We have trialled using Facebook to upload daily updates and images from the recent Ashtead Roman Villa Archaeological Excavations and this has proved really popular. We aim to provide at least a weekly update of news, so if you have some ‘Latest News’ you would like published online please forward them to Emma Coburn by emailing info@surreyarchaeology.org.uk or by telephoning 01483 532454.

CORRECTION

Emma Coburn

In the copy I supplied to the last Bulletin about the pothouse in Thames Ditton, I inadvertently mis-spelt the name of the contributor. Many apologies to Mr Readhead for my mistake.
I would like to welcome the following new members who have joined the Society. I have included principal interests, where they have been given on the membership application form. If you have any questions, queries or comments, please do not hesitate to get in contact with me on 01483 532454 or info@surreyarchaeology.org.uk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal Archaeological and Local History Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr R J Cadwallader</td>
<td>7 Camellia Court West End Woking Surrey GU24 9XQ</td>
<td>General interest; student specialising in the Reformation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Jennifer Drapans</td>
<td>45 Subrosa Drive Merstham Surrey RH1 3LY</td>
<td>Ashstead Common Dig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Amelia Gall</td>
<td>7 Nightingale Road Godalming Surrey GU7 3AG</td>
<td>Churches, Chobham, Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms P Gerrard</td>
<td>17 Bowling Green Road Chobham Surrey GU24 8LJ</td>
<td>History and Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Michael Hartley</td>
<td>The Lea 14 New Road Esher Surrey KT10 9PG</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr William Hartley</td>
<td>The Lea 14 New Road Esher Surrey KT10 9PG</td>
<td>Woking Palace, History, Archaeology and IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr S D Haslett</td>
<td>28 Grindstone Crescent Knaphill Woking Surrey GU21 2RY</td>
<td>Classical Civilisation (Romans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Hannah Maisey</td>
<td>2 Anne Boleyn’s Walk Kingston upon Thames Surrey KT2 5NS</td>
<td>Roman and Greek Archaeological Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Sue O’Regan</td>
<td>19 Beech Walk Epsom KT17 1PU</td>
<td>Roman and Greek Archaeological Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Fin O’Regan</td>
<td>19 Beech Walk Epsom KT17 1PU</td>
<td>Digging, Pottery, Flints, Prehistory, Roman, Geophysics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs L Page</td>
<td>Willow Bank Hawkley Hants GU33 6NF</td>
<td>Geophysics, GIS Mapping, Roman, Medieval, Artefacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Peter Page</td>
<td>Willow Bank Hawkley Hants GU33 6NF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH COMMITTEE

EXCAVATION RECORDING STANDARDS

The Research Committee wishes to encourage use of a common method of site recording in Surrey. A copy of the standards currently used by the Roman Studies Group has been incorporated into a manual lodged with the library at Castle Arch and is available on the Society’s website. It would be of assistance to current and future researchers if these standards were commonly used by all Society members when undertaking excavations in the county.

Excavation so often destroys that which it seeks to understand. We see this most clearly when examining archaeological remains that were unearthed in times gone by when there was an emphasis on ‘wall chasing’ and a concentration on Roman and medieval period relics to the exclusion of those of other periods. For these reasons we have seen a desire to preserve unexcavated sites for the future - when techniques might be expected to improve. Preservation in situ is not always possible and in such cases ‘preservation by record’ is the best that can be managed. Research excavations can only be justified if the best possible approach to recording is achieved.

If the information from a site is to be ‘preserved’, then a comprehensive recording system is implied. Similarly, as the object of a record system is that data contained therein should be easily retrievable, the design of the system should promote a logical approach.

The Society is keen that our members should follow high standards of recording and therefore wishes to encourage all to follow a standard system which will achieve the desired standards. There are many suites of documents in use but most follow a similar approach which is based on the identification, recording and ordering of the stratigraphic relationship of ‘contexts’. A manual has been compiled with reference to a number of sources including the manuals published by MOLAS and the ECC Field Archaeology Unit and tested over a number of years by Society members. It is now available together with downloadable forms from the Society’s website where the documentation will be found under the ‘Research’ tab.
ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM 2011

Saturday 26th February
Peace Memorial Hall, Ashstead

The Research Committee’s programme will, as usual, report on recent work, mainly in Surrey. Nick Branch from Reading University will talk on environmental archaeology with special reference to Surrey, Joe Flatman will talk on the new PPS and its implementation in Surrey, and Sally Jenkins of the Surrey History Centre, will describe the tithe map digitisation project. There will also be reports on recent work by the Surrey County Archaeological Unit, the industries of Ashtead, research on Chiddingfold, Woking, and the Romano-British settlement at Flexford, and recent finds in Surrey.

Tickets will be £8 in advance from Castle Arch and £10 at the door. Exhibitions for the Margary Award are welcomed and will be on display.

For further information, contact Alison Gaitonde on 01737 812646, 7gaitonde@googlemail.com

PREHISTORIC GROUP

AGM LECTURE

The Prehistoric Group AGM will be held on October 26th this year at the Dorking Christian Centre at 7.30. It will be followed by a lecture by Jane Sidell of English Heritage on *Later Prehistory in the central London Thames* at 8pm. This will include recent environmental work and finds from those parts of historic Surrey adjacent to the Thames. All are welcome. There will be a small charge of £2 at the door.

ROMAN STUDIES GROUP

VISIT TO FARNHAM POTTERY

On 8th July the Roman Studies Group paid a visit to the Farnham Pottery in Wrecclesham, kindly arranged by David Graham. The main aim was for members of the Group to gain a better understanding of the practical business of making pottery with specific reference to techniques in use in the Roman period. We were hosted by the West Street Potters in what proved to be a very enjoyable and informative afternoon.

The Group was first given a tour of the Farnham Pottery by David Graham, who as well as being the Society’s president is chairman of the Farnham (Buildings Preservation) Trust. This body was responsible for saving the Pottery in 1998 and since then has been engaged in a major restoration project (which boasts a SIHG plaque). The buildings now host a café and craft workshops which are well worth a visit. The Pottery itself was is the finest example of a Victorian country pottery left in England and retains what is now a unique surviving kiln. The Pottery was founded in 1872 and produced a wide range of specialist architectural, garden and domestic wares, thus continuing the tradition of pottery production in this area represented also by the Alice Holt/Farnham Roman pottery industry and the medieval and later Surrey border industries. In the case of the latter the continuity was deliberate with copies of green-glazed Tudor pottery being made.
The West Street Potters, an adult education group, then treated the Group to a workshop session. Julia Quigley explained about different clays and tempering and provided examples for handling. Decorative techniques were discussed and illustrated and members were then provided with leather-hard vessels with which to experiment, using burnishing, slip coating, barbotine decoration and moulded appliqués for example. Braver souls also attempted to throw their own vessels. It was generally agreed that this had provided a very real understanding of what was involved in the day-to-day business of producing pots for firing, and that it had also been great fun – a perfect combination.

MEDIEVAL STUDIES FORUM

MEDIEVAL AGRICULTURE AND THE RURAL ECONOMY
Saturday 6th November
St Catherine’s Village Hall, Guildford.

Full details of this next meeting of the Forum will be sent to all members.
The development of agriculture in the South East from 410AD to c1500
Richard Savage
Medieval agriculture in Surrey Heath
Phil Stevens
Making sense of Agriculture in a poorly documented Surrey parish: Puttenham
Rob Briggs
Agricultural tithes and the geography of agricultural output in easy Surrey in
1535
Peter Balmer

We would be grateful if those wishing to attend the meeting could notify Peter Balmer: email surreymedieval@googlemail.com or telephone 01428 658213.

MEDIEVAL ROADS, BRIDGES AND CAUSEWAYS

At the latest meeting of the Forum on 12th June, Professor John Blair (Queen’s College, Oxford) started by providing a broad overview of medieval river and road routes. Beginning with the canalisation of rivers in late Anglo-Saxon England, transport by water was of far greater importance than that by roads, especially around the major river confluences: the Thames, the Wash, the Humber, and the Severn. Roads initially linked the waterways, but increased bridge building from the late eleventh century gradually impeded river transport. After the Norman Conquest, causeways punctuated by stone arches were constructed across river valleys, forcing rivers into single channels, often subject to alluviation at bridging points. By about 1300, the balance had changed in favour of road transport. Professor Blair illustrated these changes with examples from the upper Thames, in particular the mile long causeway of Grandpont in Oxford, and the complex causeway and bridge at Radcot, Oxfordshire, where understanding had been assisted by a *Time Team* investigation. Radcot’s long eleventh century causeway proceeds on a perfectly straight alignment based on Faringdon church, with its course offset to cross the flood plain at its narrowest point, but later diverted to a fourteenth century bridge when the castle by the crossing was expanded.

The presentation by Richard Savage (Chair, Medieval Studies Forum) on the Wey below Guildford (the “Fens of Surrey”) demonstrated some interesting parallels with Professor Blair’s findings on the Thames. The causeway at Old Woking is exactly in line with the church, but diverts through a kink where it crosses the river. The causeway at Pyrford also partly lines up on the church, which is unique among those on the lower Wey as standing on an elevated site rather than on the first river terrace.
The many channels of the Wey in this area have been subject to considerable change, not least by the canons of Newark Priory from the late twelfth century. The present course of the road from the Pyrford causeway to Ripley dates from after Norden's map of 1594. Both the Old Woking and Pyrford causeways probably date from between c950 and c1150, although they may well be of different dates.

By contrast, Hugh Turrall-Clarke (SyAS) took the meeting on a tour of some of the hollow ways of south-west Surrey, especially those on Witley and Thursley Commons and on Hydon Heath. Older alignments of roads were often constrained by environmental factors, such as the boggy area north-east of Thursley. Some routes were only passable seasonally or in drier weather, and some routes that were satisfactory for packhorses were too steep for wheeled traffic. Clusters of gullies in the landscape are the product of seeking different courses in varying weather, but none developed into true roads, and those on Witley Common, for example, were all redundant by c 1600. Hollow ways only came into existence because the route was useful before the hollowing out occurred. Detailed examination of older routes in the landscape should avoid being blinkered by modern road courses.

Returning to flood plain environments, Phil Jones (SCAU) examined medieval routes in the area between Staines and Chertsey, much of which is subject to flooding. The Egham causeway (westwards from the south side of Staines Bridge) is of unknown date, but was in disrepair in the thirteenth century, when the Abbot of Chertsey tried to avoid his responsibility for maintenance. The Monks Walk causeway, from Thorpe to Chertsey, was possibly in existence in the fourteenth century but may not have been passable in all seasons. In Thorpe, the route of the medieval road can be demonstrated from property evidence. Excavations in January 2009 showed metalling of three successive medieval surfaces lying over occupation soil. The lowest had carefully graded tightly packed pebbles from St Ann’s Hill. Because of its undisturbed state, the excavated part must have been from the road’s margin. Finds in the occupation levels would date the road to the late twelfth or early thirteenth century.

Mary Alexander (SyAS) located Guildford’s origins to the “golden ford” where sand accumulated on the river bed, but speculated that the reason that no Roman road crossed the river here was because the ford was not present at that time. Settlement in the Quarry Street area in the seventh or eighth century may have been associated with the development of the ford, which in any event is likely to predate the laying out of Guildford as a planned town about 950. The existence of an enclosed area west of the Wey, clearly visible in Guildford’s first town map of 1739, may suggest that the first bridge on the site immediately north of the ford could have been built around the time of the town’s first being laid out. The stone bridge that survived until the flood of 1900 fitted the pattern of other Wey bridges of c1200.

John Wettern (SyAC) drew attention to the many medieval ways that did not develop into later roads, tracing examples from Cobham to Great Bookham, Walton on the Hill to Epsom, Polesden to Leatherhead, and the course of Stane Street between Ockley and Dorking. He suggested four reasons for roads’ disappearance: topography (e.g. steepness) making roads unsuitable for developments in transport; powerful landowners blocking courses (most notably the diversion at Nonsuch, between Cheam and Ewell); settlements diminishing in significance (such as at Polesden); and turnpikes demoting older routes (such as the lower road from Leatherhead to Guildford).

Finally, Rob Briggs (SyAS) delivered a short impromptu presentation on roads in Puttenham parish. The route along the Hog’s Back was certainly in existence by the thirteenth century, but barrow burials that have disappeared suggest it could have been much earlier. The parallel route to the south (now the North Downs Way) could
from place name evidence (Totford) be early to mid Saxon. There are a numerous hollow ways in the parish but, as elsewhere, they are difficult to date. A possible early causeway across the Cutmill Stream is now obscured by eighteenth century ponds. The day clearly showed that this was a popular and interesting topic, and one which has considerable potential for further local research.

SURREY INDUSTRIAL HISTORY GROUP

CHILWORTH GUNPOWDER MILLS GROUP RECEIVES CONSERVATION AWARD

![Image of two people shaking hands]

The 2010 Conservation Award of the Surrey Industrial History Group was presented to the Chilworth Gunpowder Mills Group and Guildford Borough Council on Saturday 10th July 2010 in recognition of their work over many years in recording, researching and restoration of the site of the former gunpowder works at Chilworth on the Tillingbourne. The award was commemorated by the presentation of a plaque by Mr Robert Bryson (Chairman, Surrey Industrial History Group) to Mr Andrew Norris, representing the Group and its constituent members the Guildford Borough Council and St Martha’s Parish Council. The Guildford Borough Council was represented by Councillors Jenny Powell, Roy Hogben and David Wright. See attached photograph of the presentation: L to R Andrew Norris, Robert Bryson.

The award is the 28th in the series of annual awards made by the Surrey Industrial History Group.

MISCELLANY

ANCIENT EARTHWORKS by DOWNMAN

In Bulletin 169 in 1980, David Field and Pat Nicolaysen noted that a collection of survey drawings of Surrey monuments published in 1904 by the Revd. Downman was located in the Kingston Museum archive. This information with an accession number is to be found on both the HER and NMR websites, but is now out of date. The Kingston drawings were transferred to the Bourne Hall Museum some time ago and can be accessed there. However, the Society also possesses a collection of the drawings at Castle Arch: Acc.No. M12/30/1-17.

The Revd Downman was an Anglican clergyman and antiquary who was educated at Southwark College and ordained in 1885. In the early years of the 20th century the Earthworks Committee of the Society of Antiquaries encouraged Downman and others to record monuments thought to be at risk (Field 2004). Surrey was not the only area where Downman chose to work; he also planned monuments in Derbyshire, Somerset, Wiltshire, Shropshire, Dorset and Hertfordshire, and possibly more elsewhere between the years 1899 - 1915. These drawings are well worth inspecting prior to any future work on the earthworks now listed:
During the winter of 2009-2010 a topographical survey of the barrow cemetery on Reigate Heath commenced. This area is centred at TQ 237504, and there are eight scheduled mounds. None can be certainly identified as Bronze Age barrows, although in the early 19th century a number of mounds were used to plant conifer clumps, and finds in two of these suggested that they were burial mounds (Glover 1814). It is also possible that natural dunes and ridges of harder rock were used and the monuments cannot now be identified by above ground evidence alone.

All scheduled barrows and possible barrows are being surveyed in detail at a scale of 1/200. The results so far are available as an interim report by contacting the authors. There are two more mounds which remain to be examined and possibly surveyed, after which a survey of the heathland surrounding all mounds will take place in order to set them within their landscape context. Barrow studies now recognise the importance of the relationship of mounds with both natural and man-made landscapes.

Reigate Heath lies on the Folkestone Beds of the Lower Greensand which supported only open heathland and decorative conifer clumps until the early 20th century, after which scrub woodland has encroached. The soil state and vegetation before barrow construction is unknown and such information would be useful for understanding both the previous land use and for sight lines related to the monuments once built.
Most of the mounds on Reigate Heath form a linear cemetery which runs along the south-west facing edge of a ridge that forms the watershed between two streams, both of which feed into the river Mole. Linearity here is a reflection of the topography, but an association between linearity and lineage in such barrow groups has been considered (Garwood, 2007, 43). In general, these cemeteries are seen as being late within the Bronze Age period, with most dated to c1850-1500BC (ibid, 2007).

The topographic position of prehistoric barrows in the south-east has recently been assessed (Field 1998). In the western end of the Weald many cemeteries occur on the Greensand but in Surrey and Sussex there is an increasing emphasis on the chalk as the Greensand ridge narrows. The small cemeteries on Reigate Heath and Redhill Common are the only two recognised east of Dorking. Situations on false crests of raised ridges is common and the sight lines related to those on Reigate Heath could work both north or south, so understanding the vegetation during and prior to the period of construction is crucial to these considerations.

Some round barrows cluster close to water, especially lakes and meres (Tomalin 1996, 15-19), or can be set around valley heads overlooking springs (McOmish et al 2002). Modern drainage and water extraction makes it difficult to reconstruct the prehistoric environment, but peat deposits around the headwaters of the Wallace Brook suggests that the linear cemetery may have overlooked marshland, and several ponds survived on Reigate Heath into the early twentieth century.

The structure of the barrows and any evidence of rituals pre-dating or accompanying their construction, and the presence or absence of secondary burials in the mounds or flat graves around them are all unknown, but the open spaces around the barrows on their ridge, with water or marshland to the south and a backdrop of the North Downs towering behind them, could have provided a suitable setting for such rituals.

Any greater understanding of this cemetery would be assisted both by positive identification as prehistoric of each mound, and by some knowledge of the environment during their construction. There is also an issue of protection since all are to varying extents being damaged, however inadvertently, by heavy leisure use. This fieldwork is taking place in accordance with a Research Design approved by Ann Clark (English Heritage) and has been facilitated by the Ranger, Ian Wright (Reigate and Banstead District Council). The surveys have been undertaken by Nigel Bateman, Jan Blatchford, Michael Edwards, Pauline Hulse, John Jennings, Jen Newell (who has completed much of the field drawing), Mike Rubra and Geoff Stonehouse, and we are most grateful for their time and skills. Access to papers in the Holmesdale Museum, Reigate has been arranged by Roger Ellaby whom we also thank.

REFERENCES:
Garwood, P 2007 Before the hills in order stood: chronology, time and history in the interpretation of Early Bronze Age round barrows, in Last, J (ed) Beyond the grave: new perspectives on barrows, Oxbow Books 30-52
The Ewell Hinterland Project was set up by Surrey Archaeological Society in conjunction with Epsom and Ewell History and Archaeology Society to examine and investigate the archaeological evidence for Iron Age and Romano-British sites around Ewell, a known Romano-British settlement. Over the last two years members have participated in a number of field walking days to ascertain evidence for past occupation. It was decided to include in the project all fields that became available regardless of whether or not there is archaeological evidence already known for past activity. This ensures that new sites are more likely to be identified and that fields currently ploughed are investigated whilst field walking is possible, as they may be returned to pasture in the future.

In March 2009 volunteers carried out two days of field walking at Langley Bottom Farm on the chalk of the North Downs. Three fields were walked: Langley Vale Field, (centred NGR 520210, 157305), Nutshambles (centred NGR 520096, 157208) and Headley Road Field (centred NGR 520202, 156946). The fields had all been slit cultivated, that is the soil is not turned over but is slit to a depth of about 5cm. This obviously reduces the turn-over of artefacts in the soil and as a result surprisingly little was found. One of the highest numbers of finds was of golf balls, the area being used by golf enthusiasts from Langley Vale as a practice ground! We were joined by two metal detectorists, Bill Meads and John Cole, who found a Tudor clothes fastener and an unidentifiable coin, approximately 1.5cm in diameter, from Langley Vale Field. This field also produced an orange sandy ware handle with stabbed decoration and a green glaze, of 12th-13th century date. All fields produced amounts of undiagnostic brick and tile, butchered and unbutchered bone, bottle and window glass, domestic pottery (including sherd s of china and glazed red earthenware), and a number of post-medieval metal objects.

A cursory inspection was made of Trial Course Field (centred NGR 520862,157507) which borders the south side of the current Langley Vale settlement, and Tadworth Meadows (centred NGR 522513, 157095), but very little was noted apart from domestic/ agricultural detritus. Tadworth Meadows is the site of an Iron Age banjo enclosure (SHER 3194) and slit-ploughing is deliberately carried out here to protect any remaining archaeology. Three fields in the centre of the Langley Bottom Farm estate, close to Downs View, were also checked briefly (centre NGR 521810,156284/521780,156354/521665, 156509). These fields were traditionally ploughed but nothing of interest was noted.

In May 2009 two fields were field walked at Northey Fields (centre NGR 523743,162008 and 523300, 161710). Romano-British pottery and tiles had previously been found in the Northey Avenue area (SHER 1104) and metal detectorists are known to have found a number of metal Romano-British objects, albeit acting without permission. The fields had been ploughed the week previously, harrowed and sown with a rape seed crop. Field 1, immediately to the south of Northey Avenue produced the body sherd of a Bartmann jar with part of what
appeared to be a Tudor rose on a coat of arms. These stoneware bottles have a moulded bearded mask on or just below the neck, and are known to have been copied in England c.1675 by a Fulham pottery. A green glazed sherd of Border Ware pot was also found dating from the 16th-17th century. Our metal detectorist colleagues found two small copper alloy coins in Field 2 (just off the Banstead Road) which may possibly be of Roman date, and a small sherd of greyware, possibly of Romano-British date, was found in the south-east corner of Field 2.

At the end of November a further two field were field walked, this time at North Looe, Ewell. This area lies between the late Iron Age/early Romano-British farmstead at The Looe (SHER 1101) and the Early Iron Age site near Epsom College (SHER 929). Again, the fields had been ploughed, harrowed and seeded. No finds of interest were noted.

Full details of the field walking and relevant artefacts will be lodged at Bourne Hall Museum. My thanks to all those who participated and to Michael Jelley, farm manager of Langley Bottom Farm and Eric Wise, farmer of Northey Fields and North Looe, for access and continuing support.

NEW TRUSTEES FOR GUILDFORD INSTITUTE

The Guildford Institute is looking for one or two new members to join its Board of Trustees. If you are interested in this opportunity, please contact the Manager, Liz Markwell, in the first instance on 01483 562142 or email info@guildfordinstitute.org.uk

GUILDFORD GRAMMAR SCHOOL AND SOUTHWARK  Graham Dawson

Guildford Grammar School was founded from a bequest by Robert Beckingham in 1509 (PRO PROB 11/ Bennet f165) though it would not have come to the school till after the death of Elizabeth his wife who died in 1510 (PRO PROB 11/ Bennet f259); he lived in St Olave’s Southwark but must have had some connection with Guildford. The Grammar School was not his first wish for his bequest because he left the properties, which lay in Bromley, Kent and Newington, Surrey (now part of the borough of Southwark), to the Fraternity of St Mary in St Olave’s if they acquired a corporation (ie so that they could own property as an institution). The Bromley land certainly went to the school (Victoria County History of Surrey Vol 2 p164-5), but there is no trace in their records of their owning the Newington property and the VCH says Our Lady Brotherhood in St Olave’s took Beckington’s Newington lands.

There is a reference in the Corporation Book of Guildford to rents being collected in Bromley in 1518/9 and an account in a rental of 1545 only mentions rent from Bromley, which is why the VCH thought the Grammar School never acquired the Newington lands though it quotes George Austen, who wrote a history of the school in 1596, saying that ‘it should be enquired of who took the Newington lands from the School’, but VCH still says they never had them.

However, this was not so, and Austen was right that the school did acquire this land and then somehow lost it. The property lay on the east side of Borough High Street just north of Trinity Street and in 1544 (Letters and Papers Vol 19 part 2 340), 1555 (PRO C54/517) and 1560 (Guild Lib Ms 13387/3) the property to the south abutted north on the land of the Literary School at Guildford. In Hillary term 1538 John Osborn and George Parkhurst, wardens of the new school at Guildford, sued Ralph Copwood of Southwark as, with others, the executor of Walter Kellet for 77s because they had leased to him on 28th September 1528 four messuages and four gardens in St George’s Newington (this should be St Mary’s) from Michaelmas 1528 at 22s per year for one year and then from year to year as pleased the parties and he held it for
three and a half years (1528-32) none of which he had paid to which Copwood put up a technical defence (PRO CP40/1096 f344).

Thus the school certainly held the property till 1532 (the abuttal evidence does not show that they had held it later because abuttals in deeds are often anachronistic, probably because they copied earlier deeds). I do not know who owned the property later, but Austen was right in believing that the school lost it sometime in the middle of the 16th century. Oddly, there is a survey of the manor of Walworth, in which the property lay, of 1504, but it contains no mention of Beckingham (Cant Rec Off MA31 f36-39).

A letter from member Ron Shettle:

In Bulletin 422 there appeared an item contributed by Rose Hooker and Keith Winser on the Grinling-Collins lithic collection. It included a family photograph of archaeologist Pat Collins, with his mother, father and sister.

As mention was not made of it, I wonder if those associated with the article and its subject were aware that the father of Pat Collins was Peter Collins, who for a long period of years, including the Second World War period, was the art master at Guildford’s Royal Grammar School. Peter Collins is in the left-hand corner of the photograph and would have been instantly recognised by hundreds of former grammar school students.

Peter Collins was an extremely gifted artist who specialised in illustrating flora and fauna, but particularly bird illustrations. He provided the art work for a number of books on the subject. He was a quiet and gentle man who found it difficult to maintain discipline amongst precocious and unruly schoolboys, whom regrettably ragged him unmercifully. However, some later regretted their behaviour and recognised what their art master was able to teach because of his particular artistic skills.

LECTURE MEETINGS

16th October
“Excavations at Woking Palace” An afternoon talk by Rob Poulton of the Surrey County Archaeological Unit at Surrey History Centre, 3.15-4.45pm. Tickets: £5 to include refreshments. To book please Tel: 01483 518737

16th October
“Liberty’s at Merton” by David Luff to Merton Historical Society at Christchurch Hall, Colliers Wood at 2.30 pm.

16th October
“Before the Motor Car- Travel on Horseback 1500-1900” by Peter Edwards to the Walton & Weybridge Local History Society at Elm Grove Hall, Hersham Road, Walton-on-Thames at 3pm

20th October
“The Surrey Swing Riots” by Judith Hill to Send and Ripley History Society in the Annexe of Ripley Village Hall at 8 pm. Visitors welcome £2.

20th October
AGM and President’s Lecture “Surrey’s Spas and Holy Waters” to Holmesdale Natural History Club in The Museum, 14 Croydon Road, Reigate at 8 pm.

20th October
‘Loseley Park - the first 500 years and the Albury connection’ by Jennifer Nicholas to the Albury History Society in the Albury Village Hall at 8.30 pm. Visitors welcome £2.
20th October
“Godalming’s Shipwrecks” by John Young for Godalming Museum at The Octgon at 7.30 for 8 pm. Tickets £5 from Godalming Museum.

23rd October
“The Queen’s and the Surrey’s: their path to war with the British Expeditionary Force, 1940” A talk by Ian Chatfield, curator of the Queen’s Royal Surrey Regimental Museum, Clandon Park at Surrey History Centre, 2pm - 3pm. Ian will trace the Surrey Regiments’ journeys from part-time soldiering in Surrey in 1939, to meeting the might of the German Army and their “Blitzkrieg” of 1940. Tickets £3.50. To book please call 01483 518737

26th October
“Replicating British Army Aircraft No. 1” by David Wilson to Surrey Industrial History Group in Lecture Theatre F, University of Surrey, Guildford, 7.30-9.30 pm. Part of 35th Series of Industrial Archaeology Lecture Series. Single lectures £5, payable on the night. Enquiries to Programme Co-ordinator Bob Bryson, tel. 01483 577809.

28th October
“Aviation at Brooklands” by Mike Goodall to Egham-by-Runnymede Historical Society in the Main Hall, Literary Institute, High Street, Egham at 8 pm. Visitors welcome £2.

29th October
“Iron Age finds in Wandsworth” by Pamela Greenwood and Bob Wells to Wandsworth Historical Society at the Friends’ Meeting House, Wandsworth High Street, SW18 (opposite Wandsworth Town Hall) at 8 pm.

29th October
“Gatton Park” by Glyn Sherratt to Walton on the Hill & District Local History Society at Riddell Hall, Deans Lane, Walton at 8 pm. Visitors welcome £2.

1st November
“Arts and Crafts houses of the Surrey Hills” by Nigel Barker to Woking History Society at Mayford Village Hall, Saunders Lane, Mayford at 7.45 for 8 pm. Visitors welcome £2.

2nd November
“The meadow at Runnymede” by Richard Williams to Addlestone Historical Society at the Community Centre, Garfield Road, Addlestone at 8 pm. Visitors welcome £2.

3rd November
“Divorce, Slander and Inheritance. How the Church Courts changed in the 19th century and what the Clergy had to say about it” by Russell Dewhurst to Epsom & Ewell History & Archaeology Society at St Mary’s Church Hall, London Road, Ewell at 7.45 for 8 pm.

4th November
“Two local artists - Mary Stella Edwards and Judith Ackland” by Alice Eden to Spelthorne Archaeology and Local History Group in the large (downstairs) hall at Staines Methodist Church at 8 pm. Visitors welcome £1.

6th November
AGM of Merton Historical Society, followed by a quiz at Raynes Park Library Hall at 2.30 pm.

8th November
“Medieval Farnham” by David Graham to Guildford Archaeology and Local History Group in the Meeting Room, United Reformed Church (side entrance), Portsmouth Road, Guildford at 7.30 pm. Visitors welcome £2.
8th November
“The Secret History of Kensington Palace” by Lucy Worsley to Richmond Local History Society in the Baptist Church, Duke Street, Richmond at 7.30. NB This month’s meeting is by ticket only, even for members. Applications by 26 October to membership Secretary Johanna Coombes.

9th November

9th November
“A History of Glassmaking on the Thames Southbank” by David Watts in the New Cut Housing Co-operative Hall at 7 for 7.30 pm. Visitors welcome £1. Enquiries 020 8764 8314/

9th November
“Ockley Mill” by Peter James to Westcott Local History Group in the Westcott Reading Room, Institute Road at 7.45 for 8 pm. Visitors welcome £1.

11th November
“Begging for Mercy - tales from the National Archive” by Brenda Mortimer to Farnham & District Museum Society in the hall of the United Reformed Church, South Street, Farnham at 7.30 for 7.45 pm.

11th November
“The Work of Surrey Archaeological Society” by David Calow to Kingston upon Thames Archaeological Society in the United Reformed Church at the corner of Union Street and Eden Street at 7.30 for 8 pm. Visitors welcome £1.50.

12th November
“Neanderthals in Sussex” by Matthew Pope to Richmond Archaeological Society at the Vestry Rooms, Paradise Road, Richmond at 8 pm. Visitors welcome by donation.

13th November
“Emile Zola in Weybridge” by Odile Hughson to Walton and Weybridge Local History Society at Elm Grove Meeting Hall, Hersham Road, Walton-on-Thames at 3 pm.

17th November

17th November
“Redhill at the Crossroads” by John Capon to Holmesdale Natural History Club in The Museum, 14 Croydon Road, Reigate at 8 pm.

17th November

18th November
“Lutyens and the Great War” by Tim Skelton for Godalming Museum at The Octgon at 7.30 for 8 pm. Tickets £5 from Godalming Museum.

19th November
“Searching for Stane Street from Mickleham to Ewell” by Alan Hall to Leatherhead & District Local History Society at The Institute, 67 High Street, Leatherhead at 8 pm. Visitors welcome £1. Coffee served from 7.30 pm.
20th November

27th November
Surrey Heritage Annual Lecture: “From The Battle of France to the Battle of Britain – May to August 1940”, by Andy Robertshaw of the Royal Logistics Corps Museum, at the Surrey History Centre between 2 and 3pm. Tickets £10, including refreshments. To book Tel: 01483 518737.

DATES FOR BULLETIN CONTRIBUTIONS

There will be one further issue of the Bulletin this year, for which the copy date is 12th November for publication on 11th December.

Copy dates for 2011 will be listed in the December Bulletin.
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