ALDERSHOT FIRING RANGES
2700 hectares of heathland along the Surrey/Hampshire borders around Aldershot have been in the ownership of the MOD since 1854. This land has proved to be a valuable military training ground for more than 160 years, and it is still in use today. With access restricted until recent years, the MOD occupancy has protected the site from development and consequently no comprehensive archaeological assessment of the immediate area has been completed to date.

The early Victorian era saw rapid advances in engineering technology that allowed the development of the first rifles which, at the time of the early 19th century, were specialised weapons only available in small numbers due to the expense of production over the traditional ball and musket. The British Army’s experiences in the North American War of Independence (1775-1783) initiated the slow realisation and recognition of the superiority and tactical advantages afforded by the rifle, and after the Napoleonic War, this led to the formation of the famous Rifle Brigade, highly trained in rifle sharp shooting and skirmishing.

The subsequent and very gradual introduction of the rifle to the British Army necessitated the adoption of new practices and drills. Specialist firing ranges were constructed across the country and regular rifle shooting competitions between army regiments focused the training in contexts other than the battlefield. The 3rd Battalion Worcestershire Regiment, for example, raised in 1900 and initially based at Aldershot, won many rifle shooting competitions in the early part of the 20th century, including what was at the time, the blue ribbon competition for rifle shooting - the Queen Victoria Cup for Marksmanship - four times.

The construction and presence of rifle ranges over the Aldershot training area is therefore of no surprise, and the main study area covered in this article is bounded to the north by Bourley Rd, and to the south-west by the Iron Age hillfort of Caesar’s Camp. Map regression work on OS maps dated 1873 through to 1978 show there have been a total of 18 firing ranges in use at various times across this area.

Surveying was carried out using tapes and off-setting, and local datums were established and recorded using a hand held GPS. Grid references obtained from the GPS were matched against aerial photographs and geo-referenced historic maps for accuracy.

What follows is a brief description of the extant sections of firing range.

The largest number of ranges in use on any single map was the first edition of 1873, with twelve shown, but surveying of the area has revealed little in the way of visibly preserved remains. A well-preserved 55m long butt is centred around SU8398 5045, with possible vestiges of related earthworks at the southern end of Cheese Hill. A much larger butt of the same period is also still extant centred around SU8398 5045, and stretches for a length of c150m, with a ditch cut in front.

At SU8437 5017 is a 140m earthwork butt. This is shown just identified as ‘earthworks’ on the 1893 OS map, and can not have been present in 1873 as it would have obstructed other firing ranges in place at that time. The size, shape and form of the earthworks clearly suggest they are a butt, and the fact they are not on 1873 maps and listed only as earthworks in 1893 suggest they were constructed and then fell into disuse between the two map editions.

Two ranges stretch on a north-east alignment from SU8396 5054 and SU8405 5044. The eastern ranges dates to the 1912 map, the western one to the 1938 map. Both consist of a line of earthwork firing lines, mostly well preserved. The target butts are no longer present, but for brickwork visible at ground level. The slopes of the western
edges of Caesar’s Camp form a backstop behind the butts. Four .303 shells were found on the western firing range, and in excess of forty .303 bullets were found at the location of the target butts, 80% of these bullets show signs of high velocity impacts. The age of the ranges, coupled with the ordnance found would indicate that their main usage was most likely with the Lee Enfield .303 rifle.

A further range is still visible centred around SU8418 5033. Maps indicate that this was developed in two phases. The first consists of a forty metre range with earthwork butt, topped by a brick wall backstop. This phase was first shown on the 1961 map and labelled as a miniature range. By the 1978 map a further section of range had been added, consisting of a ramped brickwork butt, with earthwork backstop approximately forty metres behind. In 1978 this range was overlooked by an observation post on the flanks of skirmishing hill. Ordnance found in the vicinity of these ranges suggests either hand gun or machine gun usage.

A number of the earthworks surveyed had drainage features around them, and this is in line with contemporary construction manuals.
A brickwork firing range with a T shaped profile was first identified on mapping in 1961 is still present, now obscured in heavy woodland to the north of the Bourley Road at SU8448 5106. A further two machine gun ranges dating to the 1930s were identified in the Claycart area, and near to Potters International Hotel.

Of the ten sets of ranges identified and surveyed, only five are shown on current OS mapping, none are listed within the relevant HERs. This reaffirms our opening comments regarding lack of survey and analysis of the archaeological landscape within the area. The underlying studies these surveys have formed part of, coupled with our previous studies of practice trenches, and ongoing work on other aspects of military occupation of the area will be published more fully and comprehensively later this year.

This article has been written jointly as a result of Blatchford’s MSc in Landscape Archaeology at Oxford University and Alexander’s MA in 20th Century Conflict Archaeology at Bristol University; it also builds on the ongoing investigations for the Caesar’s Camp and Environs multi-period archaeology project.
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Like many members of the Society and readers of this publication, I was saddened to learn of the passing of Dennis Turner at the start of this year. Though it was only in recent years that we first met and talked, our exchanges left a lasting impression and still inform elements of my research today (though I fear I will never be able to live up to his advice that, when speaking in public, one should emulate the slow, measured delivery of a Catholic priest he once saw officiate). Moreover, his published works have had and will continue to have a scholarly influence extending far beyond Surrey. A number act as cornerstones for study of the medieval period in the county (e.g. Turner 1987; 2001; 2004) and illustrate both the necessity and the rewards of multi-disciplinary thinking. I have sought to adopt this approach during my own investigations over the last ten years into pre-historical and early historical land use and settlement patterns in my home parish, Puttenham (summarised in Briggs 2013), and in return offer the following piece as a tribute to Dennis and what cannot fail to be his lasting influence on landscape archaeology in Surrey - my only regret is that I did not write it sooner so that he could have read and no doubt critiqued it with his customary sagacity and insight.

I wish to focus here on the origins of the manor, church and village of Puttenham, a choice made in part because Dennis named the parish as one where a ‘properly designed research project’ focused on village origins, development and context would be desirable (Turner 2004, 143). The following is not the fruit of such a project, but does appraise a topic that has synergies with the studies produced under the aegis of the Surrey Villages Project, Dennis’ brainchild and an enterprise which has turned rural settlement studies in the county into one of its most vibrant areas of historical and archaeological research. Those familiar with the reports published to date will appreciate that this note differs from them in emphasis as well as format, but I hope it will encourage deeper contemplation of the reasons behind the inception of the constituent elements of medieval villages, as I feel such things too often have been taken for granted owing to their perceived temporal ‘remoteness’. With diligence and circumspection, many new observations can be proffered, though definitive proof inevitably remains out of reach in most cases.

The village of Puttenham is situated at the foot of the southern slope of the Hog’s Back ridge, roughly midway between Guildford and Farnham. The underlying bedrock is the Folkestone Formation of the Lower Greensand, though consultation of the local geological map shows that much of the village stands on drift deposits of ‘silt, sand and clay with variable gravel’ (British Geological Survey 2001). This has remarkable echoes of John Aubrey’s description of Puttenham as lying ‘upon a fine Gravel’ (4, 22), part of a detailed contextualisation of the post-medieval village that at times strays into effusiveness (it is the source of the first half of the title of this note) but which nonetheless encapsulates the advantages of its site. The pre-medieval archaeological background can be dealt with briefly. Some have suggested Bury Hill due east of the church in the grounds of Puttenham Priory may be capped by the remnants of a Bronze Age round barrow, though the supposition remains untested. More convincing is the claim of the modest assemblage of early Romano-British pottery and quern fragments recovered from the churchyard in the course of nineteenth-century grave digging to represent the vestiges of a settlement (perhaps linked with a 1st century AD cremation burial found at The Manor House to the south-east in 1908 - Elsley 1909). A different sort of funerary evidence - inhumation burials - was found towards the top of Puttenham Hill in the early 19th century. Although there is no record of any grave goods, the circumstances recommend them being
Early Anglo-Saxon in date. If true, then they may have been contemporary with the place-name Puttenham, interpreted by philologists as containing the supposedly early Old English habitative place-name element *ham*, in combination with Putta, a male personal name (*PNS*, 209). However, as will be argued in the coming paragraphs, the reality may be considerably different.

Blair (1991, 60) described Puttenham village as ‘a simple double-row with irregular house-plots’ and Turner characterised it in much the same terms a decade later (Turner 2001, 9). In more general morphological terms Puttenham village is a nucleated cluster (Lewis, Mitchell-Fox & Dyer 2001, 50-51), an agglomeration of habitation exhibiting precious little regularity in the layout of its property boundaries today and more importantly when it was first mapped accurately in 1765 (of which a copy of 1816 is available for study; SHC 5143/1). Lacking detailed medieval manorial records, we catch only occasional glimpses of the early village through documents. A charter of *circa* 1210 includes an oblique reference that is capable of interpretation in a number of ways (as will be shown below), including being the earliest specific reference to a village-like settlement at Puttenham. Much less equivocal are two indentures of 1402 and 1442 (transcribed by Woods, 17, 247-48) which together allow the reconstruction of no fewer than five contiguous tenements in the eastern half of the historic village (that is, the village in its mid to late 19th century form, excluding the later developments along Seale Lane/Dark Lane, Suffield Lane and Puttenham Hill) sandwiched between the “king’s highway” (equivalent to The Street) on the north and “the common field called le Hyde” on the south; the successors to these properties were swept away in the latter half of the 18th century to extend the grounds of Puttenham Priory (Dugmore 1972, 68).

The search for Puttenham’s origins as a village begins with the parish church. Though heavily restored at various points during the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries at the expense of much medieval fabric, enough survives intact or on reliable record as to indicate it was a substantial edifice by the end of the 12th century. Some have claimed it was built as an aisled structure *circa* 1160 (Hussey 1852, 339; Blair 1991, 133) but others have chosen to interpret the round-headed window in the south-western extremity of the nave as evidence of an earlier 12th century date (e.g. McDowall 1968, 106). An early 19th century depiction of the exterior of that part of the church fails to show the window, suggesting it was at best a faithful restoration of a blocked aperture found during 19th century restoration work and cannot be used as authoritative dating evidence. An early 12th century date can, on the other hand, be posited on the strength of the long and proportionally narrow ground-plan of the nave. This identifies the original church as a single-celled structure of a type not uncommon along the dip-slope of the North Downs, including Ashtead, an identically-dimensioned building of the period 1107-29 (Blair 1991, 124-25). This early 12th century would correlate with the limited ceramic evidence known from the vicinity of the church (Jackson, Maloney & Saich 1997, 199; Watson 2011, 15 - to these the author can now add a further sherd of a poly-tempered ware of *circa* 1050 x1150 picked up from ground at the east end of the church).

The next - and arguably the most important - piece in the Puttenham puzzle is the manor. It escapes direct record until the 1240s though must lie behind at least one of the earliest mentions of Puttenham of 1199 (*VCH*, 3, 53). Unlike many Surrey manors-cum-villages, Puttenham is not named in Domesday Book, and its inception as a manor must be seen in the context of the Domesday entry for Redessolham/Reddesolham (from which Rodsall in the south-west of the parish is descended). This contains indices - the lack of any lordship plough-team, static valuation across the Conquest-Domesday period - which suggest it was being run down as a demesne enterprise, perhaps under the auspices of the major manor of Bramley to which it was annexed *circa* 1082 (Morris 1975, note 5,3). If this was the
case, then it sets the scene for the creation of a new, more advantageously-sited manorial centre at Puttenham. Research projects like Wharram Percy and Whittlewood have demonstrated the instability of seigneurial sites (Jones & Page 2006, 180-83) but the historic morphology of Puttenham accommodates few possible manorial sites other than adjoining the church to the west. Now occupied by Home Farm, in the 18th century it was the site of Bury Farm (VCH, 3, 54), whose name contains Middle English *bury*, a common demesne identifier in Surrey minor place-names and field-names (cf. PNS, 209).

The juxtaposition of church and manor is very common; their foundation at the same time less so. Furthermore, in the case of Puttenham, there is a scrap of evidence that opens up the possibility the two were established on or close to the site of an existing settlement or one that had been in existence in the Anglo-Saxon period - but which was not known as Puttenham. The aforementioned 1442 reference to the field named ‘le Hyde’ can be interpreted in non-agricultural terms, as testimony of the former existence of what Ros Faith terms a ‘hide farm’, a well-demarcated holding of obscure but presumed early formation (Faith 1998). If a ‘hide farm’ existed at Puttenham, it may well have been in existence at the time of the Domesday Book (perhaps being the home of one of the three villains enumerated under Red sessolham) and hence could have acted as a ‘pre-village nucleus’, in the parlance of the Whittlewood project (Jones & Page 2006, 87-89).

The ‘hide farm’ hypothesis implies the coexistence of two names for a single place, or else the succession of one (“Hyde”) by the other (Puttenham). The supposedly early coinage of the name Puttenham has been noted already, but the scholarly assessments are superficial and not rooted in the specific local circumstances. One possible mechanism for the putative name-change, taking account of Puttenham’s remarkably late debut on written record, would be if the place-name were to stem from the family name of a man acting on behalf of the lords of Bramley as a *locator*, that is to say an official who oversaw the creation of the new manor-church complex (and attendant village and field systems, but this is to pre-empt the discussion below; on *locators*, see Rippon 2008, 242-43). A (de) Puttenham family took its name from the Hertfordshire manor of the same name first recorded in 1086 (Graham 1957; the earliest individual so-named is found on record in 1154x84) and the expansion of its landed interests during the 14th century explains Putnam Place at Penn in Buckinghamshire (PNB, 230). A much earlier transfer in Surrey clearly requires special pleading, but it is not without local precedent in the south-west of the county, for example Burgate in Hambledon, Polsted in Compton and, closest to home, Frollebury/Frowsbury in Puttenham (the second occurred before 1200, the third *circa* 1235 - see Meekings & Crook 1979 for detailed histories of the personages behind these names). This line of thought necessitates the eponymous individual and/or their immediate heirs to have had a tenurial association with the new manor in order to cement the connection, most likely as mesne-tenants, and its early history does seem to show it was not always in the same hands as Bramley.

With so many uncertainties and possibilities already in our minds, we turn to perhaps the thorniest questions of all - when the earliest peasant tenements were created and in which part of the historic village? Central to this is the early 13th century charter mentioned in passing above, which concerns in part the grant of a virgate ‘*ubi masagia sedent in exitu de Puteham scilicet a sinistra parte...*’ (SHC 2609/11/5/35; Currie 2003, 273-74, gives a partial translation of this document). This phrase can be interpreted in a number of ways. Blair (1991, 60) assumed “Puttenham” here meant the parish, and was an acknowledgement of the village’s position very close to its eastern limit. This is dubious, as the ‘Parochia de Puteham’ is referred to at the start of the charter, making the use of the place-name to refer to the parish hard to credit. Since the messuages can be placed in the vicinity of modern-day Winters Farm at
the heart of the village, the crux of the issue is what was meant by “Puttenham”. Was it a cluster of tenant houses, to which the peripheral messuages were an adjunct? Or did the latter abut a reserved area, devoid of habitation save for the manorial complex until some time after the charter was drawn up?

New perspectives have come from recent appraisal of a collection of medieval pottery derived from the surfaces of flowerbeds in a number of the gardens in the western half of the historic village and the adjacent hop field (I am deeply grateful to Steve Nelson and David Hartley for giving of their time and expertise in provisionally identifying the fabric types). Using the Surrey type series developed by Phil Jones (Jones 1998), it is clear that the assemblage contains an abundance of grey/brown sandy wares (Q1, Q2, and especially IQ) and whitewares. This mix of types, alongside the absence of Late Saxon Shelly Ware, is consistent with the suggested date of the manor and church, though the equivalent post-Conquest ware (S2) is surprisingly under-represented in the present sample. Intriguingly, small numbers of sherds of Saxo-Norman Chalky (SNC) and handmade poly-tempered wares hint at activity nearer the time of the Norman Conquest. What is more, all sherds are small and some are heavily abraded/eroded, as if broken by sustained cultivation rather than deposition in the context of contemporary occupation hereabouts (though this could be a product of the shallowness of their provenance).

One way of explaining the apparent Saxo-Norman element to Puttenham’s ceramic profile is to ascribe those sherds to arable farming conducted by the inhabitants of the putative ‘hide farm’. Alternatively, it could be postulated that a cluster of peasant farms in fact pre-dated the church/manor, as in the case of a number of Whittlewood villages (Jones & Page 2006, 187). Unless the Redessolham estate’s four cottars were (newly) settled hereabouts at the time of Domesday, the timescales are exceedingly tight, to the point where even if it were true, the cluster of peasant habitation was joined by a proximate manor-church pairing so soon after as to make the chronological distinction more or less immaterial. Important indications to the contrary, implying that manor, church and village were established together, come from the layout of the surrounding field systems. Although there is no detailed material descriptive of the arrangement and operation of these subdivided fields until well into the post-medieval period, it is likely (but by no means certain) that their basic arrangement is medieval in origin. Especially noteworthy is the fact that the demesne bloc lay further away from Puttenham village beyond the communally-cultivated South Field on soils of superior fecundity (Tuckwell [?]1981, 2), as if the land had been deliberately reserved for manorial use. Likewise, a ten-acre field within the demesne known as Church Croft (a name now attached to a larger area of woodland east of Puttenham Common) was surely commensurate with the glebe up until its replacement by a smaller endowment of land at the start of the 16th century (VCH, 3, 58). Allowing for the possibility of the historically-perceptible pattern being a “redesign” of an earlier system or systems, that the open fields, demesne and glebe show signs of interrelationship in ways not dissimilar to the respective institutions suggests they came into being as part of a single unified process.

So what conclusions can be drawn from the above regarding the origins of Puttenham as a village? Although much hangs on negative evidence, from synthesis of the available topographical, historical and archaeological evidence, the balance of probabilities at present favours an inception post-dating the Domesday Survey and in the latter stages of the ‘village moment’ (Lewis, Mitchell-Fox & Dyer 2001, 181-82), thereby contradicting Ruth Dugmore’s (1972, 9) evocative claim that ‘it seems permissible to read “Puttenham for “Redessolham” and to imagine the little cruck houses...in the village street’. The establishment of an agglomeration of peasant tenements, the essential constituent for a nucleated village, is harder to date than the foundation of the related church and manorial caput. All that can be said with
certainty is that Puttenham was a nucleated village by the middle of the 15th century, a manor by the middle of the 13th, and the site of a church or chapel built at some point before the final third of the 12th century. Hereafter, ambiguity and uncertainty reign. However optimistic I remain about the chance a hitherto-unknown documentary reference may surface to shed new light on early Puttenham, conclusive answers to the many questions posed in the previous paragraphs will come ultimately from different forms of evidence. Without a shadow of a doubt it is archaeology - be it field-walking, test pitting or larger-scale excavation - which offers the best opportunity to provide the answers, not least in the eastern half of the village between the church and what is known nowadays as School Lane, logically but by no means inevitably the earliest non-manorial portion of Puttenham. As Dennis once observed, ‘the search for the longer-standing villages seems to plough itself into deeply difficult territory’ (Turner 2001, 10). Having reached a point where I feel able to summarise what I have discovered to date, it may now be time to dig deep in order to seek answers to the many questions that remain.
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WHAT IS HAPPENING?

If you want to know what is happening in the Society go to the website www.surreyarchaeology.org.uk and click on Events on the left hand side. You will find one or more pages of upcoming events. If you think something is missing please tell us.

PLANNING AND PUBLICISING SOCIETY EVENTS

Please put details of your events on the Society’s website as soon as you can.
If you are not sure how to do this email your details to info@surreyarchaeology.org.uk or Tel: 01483 532454 and we will do this for you. If you want the website to show your event runs for several days the best way is to make sure that you enter the start and end dates (with the correct times).
Office staff members are there to help groups and committees to register their events on the website so do make use of them if necessary.
The Society’s equipment is used regularly, so if you need any, or the meeting room at Abinger, please email us so that we can check no one has reserved these for the same dates and they can be reserved for you. Some members book a year ahead so please don’t leave it to chance.

NON-SOCIETY EVENTS OF POSSIBLE INTEREST

Send details to info@surreyarchaeology.org.uk so that we can put the details on our website and include them in the list of events in the Bulletin

NEW MEMBERS

Welcome to 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>Town</th>
<th>Principal Archaeological and Local History Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr M Allen</td>
<td>Wrecclesham</td>
<td>Iron Age, Roman, Britain; Zooarchaeology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emma Coburn
MEDIEVAL STUDIES FORUM

SOUTHWARK STUDY VISIT
Saturday 7th September, 10.30 to 4pm

Guided walks led by Stephen Humphries round historic Southwark and the Cathedral will bracket talks from Graham Dawson and Alistair Douglas of Pre-Construct Archaeology at the John Harvard Library.

Graham Dawson will be providing the meeting with An overview of medieval Southwark, while Alistair Douglas will give a presentation on The Archaeology of Bermondsey Abbey: from Saxon minster to Tudor mansion.

The meeting place for this visit is Southwark Cathedral. The charge, which includes all admissions, presentations and guided tours, is £12.50 per person. To obtain tickets please send a cheque payable to Surrey Archaeological Society together with a self addressed stamped envelope to:

Medieval Studies Forum – 070913
Surrey Archaeological Society,
Castle Arch,
GUILDFORD,
GU1 3SX
WOKING PALACE OPEN DAY  
Sunday 6th October

A chance to see the results of the fifth season of excavations at Woking Palace. The site will be open for guided tours from 11am with the last tour of the day leaving at 4pm. In addition a number of heritage organisations will be attending and mounting displays. There is no parking at the site but free public parking is available in Old Woking and the walking/cycling route to the site will be sign-posted. For further details, including disabled access, see www.woking-palace.org or Tel: 07722 299026

FUTURE MEETINGS

St Catherine’s Village Hall  
AGM and Members Day  
Saturday 28th November

As well as a presentation on Place names by John Baker this meeting will provide an opportunity for members to update the group on their researches as well as attend the AGM of the group. This should prove to be a busy and interesting day, and an opportunity to catch up with the many and varied activities of members.

Further contributions are invited from members who should contact Brian Creese.

Cobham Village Hall  
Saturday 15th March 2014  
GUILDS AND INDUSTRIES

This meeting will explore Rural and Urban Industries and Occupations in medieval Surrey. Speakers will include Stephanie Hovland, Raphaelle Schwarzberg and Paul Sowan.

Further details of these meetings will be notified to members and will be posted on the Society’s website in due course.

EVENTS COMMITTEE

THE MARC MELTONVILLE LECTURE

The excellent Menuhin Hall at Stoke D’Abernon has been chosen by the Society’s Events Committee for a series of top quality lectures over the past six years. The latest, on June 7th, a beautiful Friday evening, was given by Marc Meltonville. These events are much more of an evening out than a typical Society lecture. On a sunny summer evening the grounds are ideal for a picnic. Clean shirts, best frocks and scrubbed nails are the norm with a free glass of wine, at least for those not driving.

Marc, an experienced archaeologist who has specialized as a food historian, gave a fascinating talk on the remarkable discovery, conservation and renovation of the eighteenth century Royal kitchens of the White House, the long gone Royal Palace at Kew. The German Kitchens, as they were called at the time, not because they were made in Germany or even because they used German methods but because they were built for our German monarchs, supplied King George III while he lived in Kew. How could substantial kitchens become lost right next to Kew Gardens? It seems Queen Victoria disliked the White House and its memories and so it was demolished. The kitchen buildings, however, were separate, their doors and shutters...
were locked and, with few exceptions, so they stayed until a few years ago when someone asked what the ivy-covered building was and why it looked just like the well-known eighteenth century German Kitchen at Hampton Court.

So it was that largely untouched and rather dusty royal 18th century kitchens were rediscovered with original documents to help explain how they were run, the meals they prepared, how much it all cost and the traditions they observed. Marc showed us how the ovens were lit, how the equipment worked and how the meals were prepared and served. We learned how the tables were arranged so that guests’ preferred delicacies were close by, how food and plates were colour co-ordinated and how the many left-overs were allocated between the staff.

Marc explained the meticulous way the renovation had been done. Everything was to be as it was on February 6th, 1789. Why that day? Because that was the happy day that King George’s first bout of madness lifted and it was thought safe for him to be allowed to use his own knife and fork once again.

Marc’s detailed knowledge of kitchen processes before electricity and gas helped think about other periods. He described the regular deliveries, how spices were kept under lock and key, the many large jars of pickles, the trivets over charcoal burners, the hooks and other devices to help the kitchen run well.

Marc has worked on many other food history projects including the recent TV series about Tudor life. During a lively question time he spoke of his work recreating a banquet in the kitchen at Haddon Hall and his knowledge of Roman and Medieval food. After the lecture he joined Richard and Pamela Savage who had prepared a display about the medieval and Tudor kitchens at Woking Palace, Hampton Court and Castle Rising and Jean Follett, Treasurer and Open Day organizer of the Friends of Woking Palace who had brought her exhibits of replica medieval dishes and foods.
WHY SOME TABLES HAD BLUE LEGS  

Peter Youngs

About seventy friends and members of the Society gathered in a modern concert hall on a fine early summer evening in the grounds of the world-renowned Menuhin music school to hear Marc Meltonville, by his own account a ‘food historian’, explain how and what we eat today has its roots, so to speak, in the diet and habits of our ancestors.

An entertaining, as well as highly knowledgeable speaker Marc focussed on his work at Kew Palace. Kew Gardens were the favoured place to which King George III (r. 1760-1820) went to recover from bouts of mental illness. Dissatisfied with the then Kew Palace, a 17th century building which is still there and otherwise known as ‘The Dutch House’, the King commissioned a new Palace which became known as ‘The White House’.

The White House had a chequered history and was demolished after William’s death but a few years ago Marc discovered, to his enthusiastic delight, that the contemporary Great Kitchen, located in a separate building, was still there. After the death of Queen Charlotte in 1818 it had been left unused and largely unoccupied; which meant that unlike, almost uniquely, the kitchens of the surviving great houses of the period, it had not been modernised.

Marc took his audience on a virtual tour through the Kitchen explaining the functions of the different rooms and the role of various archaic features and pieces of equipment. We learnt, for example, that there was a ‘Wet Room’ in which fresh meat was stored; this was an innovation because, until relatively recently, meat had arrived ‘on the hoof’. We were shown a typically elaborate menu. Except for a formal banquet food was served buffet style; no doubt servants helped royalty to their portion. Afterwards the servants, depending on their position in the ‘downstairs’ hierarchy, would get a share of the leftovers. The lecture covered a great deal more but, for anyone who is interested, the kitchens are now open to the public and there are demonstrations of early cookery.

Pam and Richard Savage and Jean Follett mounted a display of food known to have been served in the Tudor period, which admirably complemented the lecture.

Altogether the evening fulfilled the purpose of these annual lectures, given by distinguished archaeologists and historians to audiences that have attracted members of the public as well as Society Members.

And why did some tables have blue legs? The blue paint was believed to stop insects from climbing up onto the table.

ROMAN STUDIES GROUP

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Notice is given that the Roman Studies Group AGM will be held on Tuesday 1st October 2013 at 7.30pm at the Letherhead Institute. The meeting will receive and consider the Chairman’s and Treasurer’s reports and elect officers together with up to three committee members. Nominations may be made to the Secretary, Alan Hall, c/o Castle Arch.

PLEASE NOTE THE CHANGE OF LOCATION FOR THIS SEASON OF THE GROUP’S MEETINGS. The Committee decided that the Letherhead Institute offered a better room for our talks and at a lower price. The Institute is at the eastern end of the historic centre of Leatherhead. There is a nearby multi-storey car park.
WINTER PROGRAMME OF TALKS

Our first meeting will be on 1st October following the AGM, when Jon Cotton will present The Isle of Thanet: gateway to Britain. Jon's talk will deal with the excavation by MOLA of a prehistoric and Roman site at Tothill Street, Minster on Thanet, and attempt to set the site within its topographical and chronological context. The Tothill Street site was notable for producing a number of Roman sunken-floored buildings, which have become increasingly well known through recent excavations on Thanet.

The full programme is as follows:

1st October: The Isle of Thanet: Gateway to Britain Jon Cotton
5th November: Report-back session on recent work
3rd December: The Culver project Rob Wallace and David Millum. The study of a recently discovered settlement close to the villa site at Barcombe, well-known to many Group members.
7th January: Report-back session on recent work
4th February: Maryport Tony Wilmott. Excavations near the western end of Hadrian's Wall have provided important new evidence concerning the well-known collection of altars buried at the site.
4th March: The Highgate pottery Harvey Sheldon. Post-excavation work on the excavations at the Highgate pottery site is nearing completion. The pottery is known from sites in Surrey and the excavations are also of interest as a production site offering something of a parallel for Ashtead.

All talks will as usual start at about 7.30pm.

FLEXFORD EXCAVATIONS

The Roman Studies Group arranged a 6th season of excavations at the Romano-British rural settlement site at Flexford in May.

The first trench, supervised by Nikki Cowlard, was 12m x 7m and designed to establish the northern end of the aisled structure found in April 2012 and show whether this had been one structure with four rows of timber posts. The line of a probable beam supporting the northern wall and an additional post hole were found and showed the aisled structure did not extend beyond the northern end found in 2012. It appeared to have been a six bay structure about 14m long and 8m wide with four rows of seven posts so twenty eight posts in all. There were very few finds of building materials or pottery suggesting the structure was either demolished with great care or that the walls and roof left no trace. C14 analysis of charcoal from a fire burnt after the structure had been cleared suggested demolition took place AD 260-410.

The excavation also revealed what appeared to be the foundations of the northern wall of an earlier building under the aisled structure on a different alignment. The earlier building was in line with four postholes 15m south found in 2011 and at right-angles to a magnetometer response running NE which appeared to be at the junction between a ploughed field and an area of unploughed clay.

The interpretation was that there were earlier buildings on the site of the aisled structure but with a 30 degree difference in alignment. More work will be needed in this area.
The second trench, supervised by Emma Corke, was 20m x 8m and designed to explore an area of disturbance shown by magnetometry around a known enclosure ditch and about 30m from the aisled structure.

This trench revealed another large flint surface covering almost the whole of the trench and extending into the sections. This appeared to be on top of and in part making use of a natural flint and pebble lens but the majority of the surface was man-made, up to 30cm thick, in two to three levels and with considerable quantities of Roman pottery. The excavation showed the area had been reused several times.

The earliest feature was a roughly straight gully probably lined with flints. To the north and partially overlying the straight gully was a roughly circular gully about 6m in diameter. A second straight gully had been cut alongside the first. Postholes in the flint surface suggested a small structure within the circle. The circular feature was later cut by the substantial enclosure ditch investigated in previous excavations and thought to have been first cut in the second century.

The enclosure ditch was then deliberately filled in this area and rectilinear features built on top. Relatively large quantities of tegula, imbrex and burnt floor tile fragments, shaped building stone with some daub, a probable stone doorstep, nails, broken quernstone, grey silty soil and considerable quantities of pottery were found but no foundations. This suggested a rectangular timber frame building with a tile roof and at least a door and a hearth which appeared to be on the same alignment as the aisled structure discussed above.

To the north was a conical pit about 2.4m in diameter at the top, narrowing to about 1.6m with 1.3m of black silty fill. This may have been cut for a well but augering showed clay continued below the silt to at least 2m and was too deep for further excavation. Rectilinear gullies had been formed in the area of the rectangular building. One was cut across the top of the earlier enclosure ditch and three appeared to have drained into the circular pit.

The rectangular building was abandoned and the site was cleared. A plough was used to drag flints from the building area across the top of the enclosure ditch. Small pits were dug into the top of the ditch at this time, two of which were carefully filled with sherds from three or four large pots. C14 analysis of charcoal from one of the pits gave an identical result to charcoal from the fire after the aisled structure was cleared suggesting the entire site was cleared at the same time.

The interpretation is that settlement started in this area of the site. A large enclosure ditch was excavated in the second century but this in turn was at least partially filled and new buildings constructed on a different alignment from the earlier structures perhaps in the later second century when the site was most active. These went out of use and the site was cleared in the late third or early fourth century.

Whereas the first trench produced almost no finds the second produced over 5000 sherds of Roman pottery in addition to many other finds. I would like to thank Isabel Ellis and the AARG team for the efficient and painstaking way that they processed the finds on site, Nikki Colward and Emma Corke for supervising the trenches and the metal detectorists and members of the Roman Studies Group for their hard work.

---

**PREHISTORIC GROUP**

**AUTUMN LECTURE**

The Prehistoric Group Autumn Lecture will be held on October 26th this year at the Dorking Christian Centre at 2pm. Dr Paula Levick of Oxford University will be talking
about the Hillforts Atlas Project which is being jointly managed by both Oxford and Edinburgh Universities. It aims to list all known sites in Britain with all information relating to them so that future research can be both informed and targeted. All are welcome and there will be a charge of £2 to cover expenses.

MISCELLANY

ULTIMOGENITURE IN SOUTHWARK

Graham Dawson

Some years ago I wrote a note in the Bulletin about ultimogeniture (the system in which the youngest, not the eldest son, inherited) and a number of members were kind enough to supply me with evidence from various parts of the county, which showed it was widespread in Surrey.

I have now recognized a case of ultimogeniture in Southwark. In October 1484, it was reported to the manor court in Paris Garden that Joanne Austen, who held a plot of vacant land in Paris Garden, had died and her heir was her son John, who was 13. He died between October 1489 and June 1490, and the next heir was his brother William, who was 21 in 1491, so he would have been 14 in 1484 and thus older than John (Minet Library 6. 1f11d & 6.2 f1). This is interesting for two reasons. Firstly, Paris Garden was part of the medieval borough of Southwark; ultimogeniture is sometimes called Borough English, but it does not occur in boroughs since it is associated with tenure by copyhold, whereas property in boroughs was held by burgage tenure, a form of freehold. Paris Garden is unique in Southwark, since it is the only place where copyhold does exist.

Secondly, these copyholds seem to have been created in the mid 15th century on manorial waste and demesne, which seems rather late, but it shows that ultimogeniture was so associated with copyhold that even in the 15th century new copyholds were created with it.

SCHERINGE

Graham Dawson

In the Common Plea Rolls for Hillary 1288 (TNA CP40/70 f20d) Adam de Stretton sued Bermondsey Priory about a tenement in Stheringe. Since this is listed under Surrey it is most likely within the county, especially as Stretton was complaining that Warenne had exacted service from him for it for which Bermondsey was responsible: however, cases concerning places outside the county do occasionally occur under Surrey.

I had thought that there had to be a vowel missing from between the initial ‘S’ and the ‘t’ (though I could not see one), and ‘I’ was the most likely since that is most easily obscured by other letters, but when I came across the same case in a later roll (TNA CP40/75 f3d of Michaelmas 1288), it was clear that the ‘t’ was in fact a ‘c’ (they are very similar in medieval texts) so no vowel is needed. When I looked in Bartholomew’s Gazeteer I could not find such a place and I wondered if any member had come across the name anywhere in Surrey. Originally, it had a passing resemblance to part of the earliest form for Southwark (Suthringa geweorch), but as Schering this is not relevant.

Stretton (more usually Stratton) was a notorious royal official who was found guilty of corruption in 1289 and was accused of driving Bermondsey Priory into debt.
CASTLE STUDIES TRUST

The Castle Studies Trust, a charity set up last year to fund research work to advance the understanding of castles, is open to receive applications for grants to fund research in September 2013. The Trust will be awarding grants of up to £5,000 to fund or co-fund new discrete pieces of research on castles and is open to both individuals and groups/societies.

The trust’s patrons are Edward Impey and John Goodall, and grant assessors include Jeremy Ashbee, Richard Oram, Tom McNeil and Stuart Prior.

Key types of work the Trust would fund:

* Site-based survey work (eg geophysical, architectural, topographical, LiDAR)
* Scientific tests on objects/materials from a castle site (eg radiocarbon dating)
* Review of historical sources (as part of a project)
* Pieces of work, such as reconstruction drawings, which would help the public understanding of a castle site.

Focus will be on sites not managed by statutory bodies. Exceptions can be made for exceptionally interesting projects on statutory protected sites. Project funding of up to £5,000 can be considered. Funding is open to both individuals and groups/organisations. Individuals will have to provide details of a non-personal bank account to transfer funds (eg. a sponsoring organisation).

The Castle Studies Trust is willing to fund and co-fund projects. Funding for a project is for the set piece of work as laid out in the application form and signed contract, regardless of the number of hours/length of time it takes within a maximum time period (see below). No extra funds will be provided for completion of work. All projects funded by the Castle Studies Trust to start within 10 weeks of the first tranche of funding being received. Any permissions required to carry out the work (eg from the landowner) must have been obtained within the 10 week time frame. The first tranche of funding is up to a maximum of 75% of grant awarded, with rest being paid on the delivery of the results of the research to a satisfactory standard (as deemed by expert assessor) i.e. ready for publication for publications such as peer-reviewed journals. Projects awarded grants will be monitored by one of the expert assessors in a form to be agreed.

All projects should be finished and written up to satisfactory standard ready for publication within nine months of first tranche of funds received. This can be extended in exceptional circumstances. All results/reports on research to be freely available on the CST website. All applicants must be in a position to give permission to the Castle Studies Trust to be able to use the results of the research in any format.

All applicants must complete the application form (available at www.castlestudiestrust.org) and return it to the CST with two references. Costs only specific to the carrying out the specific task can be included in the grant (e.g. travelling to and from site in question). All successful applications will be required to account for the expenditure of the grant. Receipts and invoices to be provided as requested.

Deadline for applications is 15th December each year (or Friday before if date is on a weekend).

Registered Charity Number: 1148165
NEW BOOKS

A History of Ockham to 1900
by Gillian Lachelin and Robert Primrose
Published May 2013. A4 90 pages. Price £10 (p&p £1.50p) Enquires to historyofockham@gmail.com

This book gives an account of a small Surrey community, drawing on a considerable body of primary sources. Ockham has consisted of a scatter of hamlets spread over some 2000 acres, for hundreds of years. It emerged as a recognised political and social entity at an early period and has remained relatively unchanged despite a surprisingly colourful history due to its involvement with a range of influential men and women. The book aims to engage with readers interested in local history as well as providing a useful reference source for students and researchers. It contains a wide range of illustrations (many coloured), maps and detailed appendices.

CONFERENCES

LANDSCAPES OF SOUTH EAST BRITAIN DURING THE ROMAN PERIOD

COUNCIL FOR BRITISH ARCHAEOLOGY – SOUTH EAST ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING AND CONFERENCE
Queen Elizabeth School, Abbey Place, Faversham, Kent 9.30am to 4.30pm

The Landscape of Iron Production in the Roman Weald Jeremy Hodgkinson
A newly discovered Roman villa in Bourne Park, Canterbury Lacey Wallace
The Sussex Roman Road network David Staveley
The Upper Medway during the Roman occupation. Industry, agriculture and elites. Simon Elliott
Roman period settlement and land use in the Sussex Ouse Valley David Rudling.
Landscapes of Roman Surrey. David Bird
Villa landscapes in Roman Kent. Paul Wilkinson
Emporium to villa: 500 years at East Wear Bay, Folkestone. Andrew Richardson

Tickets available in advance from www.kafs.co.uk ‘news page’ at £8 for members of CBA SE and KAFS and £10 for non-members and on the day. This conference has been organised by KAFS in association with CBA SE.

THE IMPACT OF ROME ON THE BRITISH COUNTRYSIDE

THE ROYAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE in association with the UNIVERSITY OF CHESTER
University of Chester, Riverside Campus 11th-13th October 2013
Friday 11th October
Chairman Professor David Breeze
7.30-8.30pm Re-assessing the transformation of rural society in the Roman Rhineland, Public lecture by Professor Nico Roymans (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

Saturday 12th October
Chairman Dr John Creighton
9.30-10.15 The Wroxeter environs project Dr Roger White.
10.15-11 Survey and excavations in the Vale of Pickering, East Yorkshire Professor Dominic Powlesland.
11-11.30 Coffee
11.30-12.15 The complexity of impact on a local scale: studies from Yorkshire Professor Martin Millett.
12.15-12.45 Discussion
12.45-2pm Lunch
Chairman Professor David Hinton
2pm Rome on the British frontier Dr Nick Hodgson.
2.45 From community to civitas: the impact of Rome on the southern Cotswolds Dr Tom Moore.
3.30 Tea
4pm The contribution of the Portable Antiquities Scheme to understanding the countryside, Sally Worrell
4.45-5.30 Discussion

Sunday 13 October
Chairman Professor David Breeze
10.15 A view from the east: the impact of Rome on Romania and Britain compared Dr Ioana Oltean.
11 Coffee
11.30 Looking at the countryside Professor Brian Roberts.
12.15-1pm Discussion
2.30 Visit to the Grosvenor Museum and tour of Chester

Monday 14 October
Tour led by Fiona Gale, Denbighshire County Archaeologist

From Chester, the coach will travel to Prestatyn to see the Roman bath-house, and then on to the recently restored Cornish engine house and to St Winifred’s, Holywell. We shall then travel on to Denbigh for the town walls, the castle and lunch (not provided). In the afternoon, we will go on to Ruthin, and a cruck-framed medieval town house. We shall return to Chester via Moel y Gaer hillfort on Halkyn Mountain, but we will not have time to climb it. The coach will drop off at the station, no later than 5pm.

Fee for 2 days (includes tea/coffee and lunch on the 12th): £95
Additional guided visit to North Wales on the 14th October: £20
www.royalarchinst.org; admin@royalarchinst.org; Registered Charity No. 226222
ARCHAEOLOGY ABROAD
Saturday 19th October 2013
Rutherford College, University of Kent, Canterbury

JOINT STUDY DAY organised by THE UNIVERSITY OF KENT and the COUNCIL FOR KENTISH ARCHAEOLOGY and the KENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

ROMAN OSTIA: URBAN LIFE IN AD 387, AS SEEN BY ST AUGUSTINE
Dr Mike Mulryan or Dr Luke Lavan

MADEIRA - GATEWAY TO THE WORLD: ORIGINS AND DISCOVERY (MEN OF KENT AND PORTUGAL
Dr Brian Philp

Third Speaker to be announced

Tickets: Free for Friends of the CKA, subscribers and members of KAS. Available on first come first served basis. Non-members £5, cheques payable to CKA. Please send SAE to CKA, 7 Sandy Ridge, Borough Green, Kent TN15 8HP.

Further information can be found on the CKA website, www.the-cka.fsnet.co.uk or 0208 777 7872 or email davru58-arch@yahoo.co.uk

COURSES

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INSTITUTE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION
2013/14 programme of part-time University courses in Archaeology, Historic Environment and Local History

The following part-time courses are offered at undergraduate level:

*Archaeology: Certificate, Diploma and Advanced Diploma
*Historic Environment (landscape archaeology and garden history): Certificates and Advanced Diploma
*Local History: Diploma and Advanced Diploma.

Certificate courses are open to all, and you don't need any special qualifications to apply. Diplomas offer the opportunity to study the subject in greater depth, while Advanced Diplomas are research-based courses of supervised independent study, so are accessible to students from across the UK and beyond. All courses lead to full University of Cambridge awards.

The Certificate and Diploma courses in Archaeology and Local History are taught through weekly evening classes, while the two Certificates in Historic Environment are taught over six weekends throughout the year, with online support, making them suitable if you want to study from a distance.

Teaching takes place at Madingley Hall, an historic 16th-century country house on the outskirts of Cambridge.

See www.ice.cam.ac.uk/awards for course specifications, fees and information on how to apply.
Bursaries and student loans
As in previous years, we are offering a number of bursaries to self-financing students. Applicants who are new to higher education, new to ICE, or who are state-funded teachers will be eligible to apply for a bursary. Those who are studying for their first university qualification may also have access to part-time student loans. The deadline for applications to both courses is 9th September 2013.
Please don’t hesitate to contact me at enquiries@ice.cam.ac.uk if you have any questions, or if you would prefer not to receive email from us in future.

LECTURE MEETINGS

2nd September
“Lilly Bell II: the plane that crashed at Jacobs Well” by David Rose to Woking History Society at Mayford Village Hall, Saunders Lane, Mayford at 7.45 for 8pm. Visitors welcome £3.

3rd September
“Sir Edward Colebrooke of Ottershaw Park and the rift with Addlestone” by Sheila Binns to Addlestone Historical Society in Addlestone Community Centre, Garfield Road, Addlestone at 8pm. Visitors welcome £2.

3rd September
“The Degenhardt family” by Susan Hoad to Dorking Local History Group in the Friends’ Meeting House, Butter Hill, South Street, Dorking at 7.30pm. Visitors welcome £2.

4th September
“These sherds belong to you and me: an account of the Time Cheam Project 2010-2012” by Clive Orton to Epsom & Ewell History and Archaeology Society at St Mary’s Church Hall, London Road, Ewell at 7.45 for 8pm. Visitors welcome £4.

7th September

10th September
History AGM followed by “Votes for Women - Suffragettes in Surrey” by Kathy Atherton to Westcott Local Group in the Westcott Reading Room at 7.45 for 8pm. Visitors welcome £1.

13th September
“Archaeological Science” by Sophie Beckett to Richmond Archaeological Society in the Vestry Rooms, Paradise Road, Richmond at 8pm. Visitors welcome by donation.

17th September
“Roman Guildford” by Rebecca Lambert to Send & Ripley History Society in Ripley Village Hall at 8pm. Visitors welcome £2.

17th September
“The stormy life and loves of the 5th Viscount Midleton” by Mike Page to the Albury History Society at the Village Hall at 8pm. Visitors welcome £2.

20th September
“The Folklore of Surrey” by Matthew Alexander to Leatherhead &District Local History Society at Leatherhead Institute, High Street, Leatherhead at 7.30 for 8pm Visitors welcome £2.
26th September
“The Folklore of Hampshire Archaeological sites” by Alex Godden to Farnham & District Museum Society in the United Reformed Church Hall, South Street, Farnham at 7.30 for 7.45pm.

26th September
“History and restoration of Westminster Abbey” by Geoff Roberts to Egham-by-Runnymede Historical Society in the Main Hall, Literary Institute, Egham High Street at 8pm.

27th September
A History Talk tba to Wandsworth Historical Society in the Friends’ Meeting House, Wandsworth High Street at 8pm. Visitors welcome.

1st October
“Guildford Railway Station” by Roger Nicholas to Surrey Industrial History Group in the Education Centre, The Cathedral, Guildford, 7.30-9.30 pm. Part of 38th Series of Industrial Archaeology Lecture Series. Single lectures £5, payable on the night and open to all. Enquiries to Programme Co-ordinator Bob Bryson, Tel: 01483 577809, meetings@sohg.org.uk

1st October
“Landscapes and lives, 5000 years of Addlestone’s story” by David Barker to Addlestone Historical Society in Addlestone Community Centre, Garfield Road, Addlestone at 8pm. Visitors welcome £2.

1st October
“The Broom family” by High Broom to Dorking Local History Group in the Friends’ Meeting House, Butter Hill, South Street, Dorking at 7.30pm. Visitors welcome £2.

2nd October
“Rudyard Kipling [his life and remarkable story” by Gary Endstone to Epsom & Ewell History and Archaeology Society at St Mary’s Church Hall, London Road, Ewell at 7.45 for 8pm. Visitors welcome £4.

7th October
“Riches and poverty in Restoration Woking” by Catherine Ferguson to Woking History Society at Mayford Village Hall, Saunders Lane, Mayford at 7.45 for 8pm. Visitors welcome £3.

10th October
“History and anecdotes of the Castle Theatre” by David Wylde to Farnham & District Museum Society in the United Reformed Church Hall, South Street, Farnham at 7.30 for 7.45pm.

11th October
“Britain’s Western Vikings” by David Griffiths to Richmond Archaeological Society in the Vestry Rooms, Paradise Road, Richmond at 8pm. Visitors welcome by donation.

12th October

15th October
“Iron Age hillforts in Surrey” by Judie English to Send & Ripley History Society in Ripley Village Hall at 8pm. Visitors welcome £2.
15th October
“Monorails of the 19th Century” by Adrian Garner to Surrey Industrial History Group in the Education Centre, The Cathedral, Guildford, 7.30-9.30 pm. Part of 38th Series of Industrial Archaeology Lecture Series. Single lectures £5 payable on the night and open to all. Enquiries to Programme Co-ordinator Bob Bryson, Tel: 01483 577809, meetings@sohg.org.uk

15th October
“The Churches of Sir George Gilbert Scott” an illustrated talk by Dr Geoff Brandwood to the Albury History Society at the Village Hall at 8pm. Visitors welcome £2.

18th October
“Local War Memorials” by Frank Haslam to Leatherhead & District Local History Society at Letherhead Institute, High Street, Leatherhead at 7.30 for 8pm. Visitors welcome £2.

21st October
“Shrovetide football” by Christopher May to Richmond Local History Society in the Duke Street Baptist Church, Duke Street, Richmond at 7.30 for 8pm. Visitors welcome £2.

24th October
“George Sturt” by Hilary Underwood to Farnham & District Museum Society in the United Reformed Church Hall, South Street, Farnham at 7.30 for 7.45pm.

25th October
“Recent archaeological work in Southwark” by Chris Constable to Wandsworth Historical Society in the Friends’ Meeting House, Wandsworth High Street at 8 pm. Visitors welcome.

19th November
“Milling in Albury” an illustrated talk on Bottings Mill by Mick Ede to the Albury History Society at the Village Hall at 8pm. Visitors welcome £2.

DATES FOR BULLETIN CONTRIBUTIONS

There will be two further issues of the Bulletin this year. To assist contributors relevant dates are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copy date:</th>
<th>Approx. delivery:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>441  20th September</td>
<td>21st October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442  15th November</td>
<td>16th December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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