A possible pillow mound on Ashtead Common?

David Bird

One result of the detailed survey of the area around the Roman villa on Ashtead Common carried out by John Hampton in the 1960s (Fig 1) was the identification of a well-marked linear earthwork near Flag Pond. This feature is something of a puzzle as it does not seem to fit the pattern of any of the other disturbances in the area. Vegetation cover makes it difficult to understand on the ground (see Fig 3) but more recent LiDAR imagery helps to gain an overall view. It is a tribute to the overall accuracy of Hampton’s survey that while this adds some detail it compares well to what he was able to record in difficult circumstances.

![Fig 1: John Hampton’s plan of the villa and related earthworks on Ashtead Common with north at the top, after Hampton 1977, 30, fig 2, with minor amendments. The linear earthwork is at the top left, a ditch and shorter bank.](image)

The LiDAR imagery (Fig 2) makes clear that the feature is much more marked than other earthworks on the Common apart from what seems to be an adjacent clay pit (and the triangular enclosure now known to be prehistoric in origin which is off Fig 2 to the west). The adjacent pit seems to be a more recent feature. It might perhaps relate to some later activity such as the illicit clay digging that apparently took place for six weeks in 1658 (Smith 1977, 53).

The linear earthwork is a little to the west of one of the main routes across the Common, near the top of the slope down from the roughly east-west central ridge that runs across between it and the villa. The earthwork’s ditch is about 45m long while the main part of the bank is about 17m in length. The LiDAR image suggests that it might originally have been longer, perhaps matching the ditch. The latter makes little sense as a clay pit and in any case the material cut from it had apparently been thrown out on the uphill side making a
kind of rampart. It would also have been quite different in shape from any of the known clay pits. Consideration was given to the possibility that it was a Roman water tank (the nature of the water supply to villa and tiley is still not established) but the uphill bank made this unlikely and survey by David and Audrey Graham showed that the level was not high enough. An early period construction for defensive purposes has no apparent logic.

There is some evidence for later military training activity on the Common. Stuttard (1995, 49) notes recruitment to the Epsom Brigade of the Surrey Volunteer Infantry and Yeomanry of 80 Ashtead men in 1803/4. They might perhaps have trained on the Common although this is not specified. It was certainly used in the two World Wars: ‘When war broke out in 1914 the Common was used extensively for troop encampments and training’, a specific instance being the 21st battalion of the Royal Fusiliers, billeted in Ashtead, undertaking an exercise that involved ‘digging trenches on the Common’ in the first months of the War (Butler and Willis 1995, 8; Stuttard 1995, 118). There was also an
Ashtead platoon of the Surrey Volunteers Regiment which was reported to be in camp at Headley in 1916 (Stuttard 1995, 120); perhaps it also trained sometimes on the Common.

In the Second World War the Common was ‘again used by soldiers, including the local Home Guard’ (Butler and Willis 1995, 11). The latter are said to have trained there (Stuttard 1995, 139); a photograph shows some of them dug in with a ‘sprocket mortar’ (ibid 137, fig 39) and although not specified it seems probable that this was on the Common. Other troops who may have used the Common were ‘a unit of the Royal Norfolk regiment’ stationed in Ashtead for a time early in the war, ‘as well as a fair number of Canadians’ (ibid 136).

The earthwork in question, however, seems to be both too large and of the wrong type for these activities. There is a well-sized tree growing in the ditch which is surely too old to have grown after 19th or 20th-century activity. It also seems most unlikely that the digging of ‘ballast from the Common’ to aid construction of the road to the station, or excursions from London starting in the later 19th century, or the efforts of the Women’s Land Army in the Second World War, or even scout camps, would have resulted in such an earthwork (Davies 1995, 87, 104; Stuttard 1995, 137, 217).

The possibility that the earthwork might be linked to the farming of rabbits had not previously occurred to me but recently I came across references to a medieval rabbit warren on the Common (Blair and Renn 1977, 36; Stuttard 1995, 25). At that time the ‘warren’ would have restricted to the lord the right to take certain animals not necessarily including rabbits, but there are medieval court cases involving the illegal digging out of
rabbits by ferrets on the Common (Stuttard 1995, 25). Rabbits are mentioned in more modern times as well; in the later 19th century it is said that schoolboys caught them on the Common (Healey 1977, 177). The location might seem odd for rabbits but it has been noted that 'Rabbit warrens were present on all landforms in Sussex' (Tittensor and Tittensor 1986, 1).

Blair and Renn (1977, 36) note that 'Newton Wood in the extreme north [of the parish] was a seigneurial preserve, the ‘wood of the lord called Northwood’ where John Cobbe and an accomplice cut thorn-bushes without permission in 1408. It probably represents the warren of the 13th century lords of Ashtead, and the remains of enclosing ditches can still be seen'. Stuttard (citing W J Blair 1986, Medieval deeds of the Leatherhead district, Proc Leatherhead Dist Local Hist Soc 4.10, 268-9) mentions a late 14th century reference to (specifically) the rabbit warren, ‘thought to have been in or near Newton Wood’ (Stuttard 1995, 25).

Warrens needed to be enclosed by some means such as ‘by long perimeter banks of earth or grass sods … or by stone walls’ (Tittensor and Tittensor 1986, 3). The existing Newton Wood ditches are not very marked and there is little sign of any other strong enclosure banks on the Common itself. It is possible that fences were used (see for example ibid, 4, ‘a former empaled coney warren …’; 15, a reference to fencing at the West Dean warren; and 22: at the end of the 18th century ‘the [West Dean] warrener was subject to the same conditions as had existed for over two centuries, involving the maintenance of buildings, fences, hedges and ditches in and on the boundary of the warren …’). As true woodland and rabbits were not very compatible (eg ibid 4: ‘the [rabbit] population remained fairly low due to consistent tree cover in the forest’), and as Newton Wood is described as ‘the wood of the lord’, it may be that at least some aspects of the rabbit warren were placed on the Common. It was possible for the keeping of rabbits to be compatible with common grazing rights (eg ibid 1, 4, 15, 19).

Control of rabbits in the 13th and 14th centuries would presumably have been easier ‘when rabbits were scarce and the establishment of breeding colonies was difficult, slow and costly …’ (ibid 5). At this time ‘Suitable breeding conditions were provided by breeding
hutches or clappers, or by building subterranean hummocks and banks known as pillow mounds...’ (ibid 3). Could the Ashtead linear earthwork be a kind of pillow mound? The location might be acceptable from a rabbit’s point of view as the mound with a downhill ditch positioned across the slope would provide good drainage.

Known examples of pillow mounds seem to be very varied. One of our former Presidents, Eric Wood, suggests (1995, 122) that they were usually 15-27m long by 6-12m across and 0.6-1m high, often with a flat top, but examples around 80m by 7m by 1.5m or around 11m by 6m are noted by the Tittensors (1986, 3) who suggest that small mounds could also be part of the system at West Dean (ibid 11). Possibly therefore other humps and bumps near the Ashtead earthwork could have been related to warren activity.

The Ashtead mound as it survives would thus be on the small side for a pillow mound and it is not very regular as it survives but if it was intended for rabbits their activities might perhaps have caused alterations over time. We have already noted the possibility that there was damage caused by adjacent 17th century clay digging and there seems to be no mention of the warren continuing in existence up to that period.

It is pleasing to consider that if the linear earthwork was for rabbits, then it might have been one of their descendants (a long way down the line!) who famously unearthed and supposedly bit a Roman tile, leading A W G Lowther to discover the Roman villa and tilery. I have to admit that I have always found this story difficult to believe, not least because I had supposed that it was impossible for rabbits to live on the Common. The references already quoted show that this was not the case. It seems only reasonable therefore to accept the story that in the later months of 1924 Lowther ‘found bits of Roman tiles and Roman wall plaster which had been unearthed by rabbits in making a burrow’ (Times 27 August 1925; similar stories in other papers including the Sutton and Epsom Mail of 4 September 1925, claiming to quote Lowther directly). One of those very tiles was supposedly included in an exhibition in Epsom two years later (Epsom Advertiser 22 September 1927) and W J Pickering, who worked on the site, claimed in a talk early in 1927 that Lowther found a tile with rabbit’s teeth marks (Surrey Comet 5 February 1927 and Pickering’s own lecture notes).
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Pottery collected by the late George Inwood in the Godalming area

Judie English

Following on from the lithics reported in the last Bulletin, a number of small collections of pottery retrieved by fieldwalking are described here. Larger assemblages from Whirl Hill, near Rodsall Manor, near Mitchen Hall and from roadworks involving widening of the A3 at the Shackleford/Hurtmore junction will be the subject of a note to be submitted to the Collections.

Upper Eashing

A number of sites in or near Upper Eashing produced pottery.

Stovold’s Fields (SU953443)

The group of fields north-east of Stovold’s Farm lies along the top of the steep cliff above the River Wey and dominates the valley to the north and west. Some of these sherds came from disturbed ground called a landslide, presumably somewhere along that cliff edge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RB</th>
<th>Sherds</th>
<th>Weight g</th>
<th>Medieval</th>
<th>Sherds</th>
<th>Weight g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PORD</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>9 rims</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAND</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1 rim</td>
<td>WW1A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXID</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>WW1B</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHFA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>storage jar</td>
<td>WW2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PMRE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FREC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BORDG</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STSL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upper Eashing (SU947434)

This site was described by George Inwood as lying ‘north of line of public footpath which runs through this field from Eashing Lane and comes out in Eashing Hollow by the side of Style Cottage’.

| RB  | Sherds | Weight g | Storage | Medieval | Sherds | Weight g |
|-----|--------|----------|         |          |        |          |
| SAND | 1      | 51       | jar rim | WW1B     | 2      | 25       |
| COAR | 1      | 28       | Rim     | OQ       | 2      | 44       |
|      |        |          |         | RWW      | 2      | 25       |
|      |        |          |         | BORDG    | 1      | 37       |
|      |        |          |         | BORDY    | 3      | 18       |
Other find spots are Westbrook (no further location given) which produced 20 sherds of RB pottery and 53 Medieval sherds (6 x IQ; 14 x OQ; 25 x WW1A; 13 x PMRE); and Half-way Vineyard (Halfway House is at SU95684385) where he found one sherd of WW3.

**Ridgeway House, Thursley (SU895387)**

This site lies towards the bottom of the north-facing dip-slope of the greensand ridge as it climbs up to Hindhead Common and Gibbet Hill. As well as a single sherd of CFQ Late Iron Age pottery the area produced Romano-British and Medieval pottery:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RB</th>
<th>Sherds</th>
<th>Weight g</th>
<th>Medieval</th>
<th>Sherds</th>
<th>Weight g</th>
<th>Industrial fire bar?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAND</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3 rims</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXID</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>WW1B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>RWW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHFA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>BORDG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BORDO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BORDY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>I handle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Near Attleford, Shackleford (SU919449)**

Attleford lies on head deposits, overlying Sandgate Beds, just north of the River Wey and the site has produced 18 sherds of Romano-British pottery (9 x SAND; 6 x PORD; 2 x AHFA, one of which is a rim with white slip; 1 x AFSU) and a single sherd of Medieval pottery (RWW).

**Near Lascombe Farm, Puttenham (SU9188847443)**

A scatter of Roman pottery was found by Mr P G Inwood in an area running from the edge of the common and continuing into a field. These finds were shown to Audrey and David Graham. They could not be identified in the surviving archive.

**Gore’s Farm, Puttenham (SU92634700)**

The site lies on greensand of the Folkstone Formation on the east-facing slope of Puttenham Common. It has produced 5 sherds of Romano-British pottery (3 x PORD; 1 x OXID and 1 x AHFA).

**Ashtead Lane, Godalming (SU964428)**

The site location is described as ‘field north of Ashtead Lane and north-east of Ashtead Farm’ – Ashtead Farm is south of the road and land to the north has now been developed. The site lies on greensand close to a tributary of the River Wey coming from Milford to the south, on or near the junction between Bargate Sandstone Member and Hythe Formation. The finds comprise 10 sherds of Medieval and post-Medieval pottery, 4 x Q2; 1 x WW1B; 1 x FOQ; 1 x BORDG and 3 x BORDY.

**Godalming Parish Church (SU969440)**

The church lies on head deposits between the River Wey and the same tributary as the Ashtead Lane site. The finds comprise 6 sherds of Romano-British pottery (PORD) from
the churchyard itself and 3 sherds of Medieval pottery (3 x Q2). Other finds are from the Vicarage Nature Reserve; this has not been located but the Vicarage stands in a large garden close to the River Wey between Brook Street and Borough Road, opposite the church, and it may have been that this garden is the site in question. Finds mentioned are 6 sherds of Medieval pottery (3 x SNC; 2 x Q2; 1 x WW1B).

**Mousehill Manor, Milford (SU93854210)**

The site is on head deposits overlying the junction of the Sandgate Formation and Bargate Sandstone Member close to a minor tributary of the River Wey. The find spot is described as ‘from top of bank which formed the boundary between the Mousehill Manor Estate and the common until the construction of the Milford bypass’. The finds comprise 3 sherds of prehistoric pottery, one possibly from an Early Bronze Age collared urn (fabric CG) and the other two probably of Late Bronze Age date (fabric MF).

**The Hart, Farnham (SU835472)**

Fieldwalking by Mr PG Inwood in 1983-5 produced 14 small sherds of flint-gritted coarse greyware. These are probably wheel-thrown given the uniform thickness of the body sherds. Either Late IA or Saxon/early medieval in date; probably IA. Mr Inwood also found two largish lumps of daub. The finds may represent a small occupation site.

The exact find site is uncertain but probably lies between SU 8350 4722 and 8347 4727 (at ca. 100m OD). Mr Inwood described the site as being in the north-east corner of the field at the top of the hill above The Hart and to the west of the public footpath. The site is towards the top of the ridge and lies on the Upper Greensand/Lower Chalk boundary.

Finds deposited in Museum of Farnham.

**Ockley Common, Thursley (area SU916420)**

(Information from Audrey Graham)

A find of two small sherds of coarse gritty pottery and several pieces of fire reddened carstone, made in a rabbithole in the 1950s by George Inwood. He describes the site as being 200 yds south east of a low but once substantial bank that runs straight across the heathland from the parish boundary to the northeast and peters out in the bog to the south-west. It is probably a medieval or post-med field boundary and appears to be aligned with the still extant boundaries to the north-east. He showed the material to A W G Lowther who thought it might be an iron-working site.

ACG & KDG visited Mr Inwood and saw the material (June 1998). The pottery is either Iron Age or Saxon and, given the reddened carstone, may well have been associated with a small forge. Mr Inwood retains the finds.

None of these finds could be identified in the surviving archive but Ockley Common also produced a single sherd of Romano-British AHFA pottery.

**Cosford House, Thursley (SU910388)**

An old lane at the back of Cosford House yielded 3 sherds of AHFA Romano-British pottery.
The prehistoric fabric types and dates are derived from Seager Thomas 2008, those for Romano-British pottery are as used by the Roman Studies Group and for Medieval and post-Medieval pottery by the Medieval Pottery Group and based on Jones 1998.
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Roman Roads in Banstead  
Peter Harp

Further to Gavin Smith's note "Roman 'district' roads and associated activities" (Bulletin 471, 16-17), I should just clarify Gavin's comments about the Banstead area where he references me. I am a little uncomfortable that 'Roman roads' is sometimes used when a better phrase might be 'roads in use in the Romano-British period' which, while inelegant, overcomes the unconscious assumption many would have that all these roads were constructed in the Romano-British period rather than simply be the continued use of existing
prehistoric tracks. With regard to the A217, my belief is that, as this was formerly Potters Lane and a medieval hundred boundary, it was already likely to be very old and probably prehistoric, therefore in use in the RB period. The straightness of the stretch between the Banstead crossroads and the Tadworth crossroads is certainly not evidence of a RB nature as a major dog-leg was only straightened in 1824. However, it does connect two large, probably Bronze Age, burial mounds – the one to the south-west of the Banstead crossroads being shown apparently as being diminished (possibly by farmers robbing top-soil) on the original Ordnance Surveyor's drawings, while the barrow on the heath near Tadworth Court survives. The original course of Potters Lane would have entered Banstead Downs near the (destroyed) barrow and, in my view, would have then split with one track heading north-west to Sandy Lane (Cheam), and, by at least the medieval period, another branch northwards under the current alignment of the A217 from the crossroads to Sutton as this would have used the Tumble Beacon burial mound as a sight-mark on the ridge when heading south.

I do, indeed, believe the Reigate Road in Banstead was likely to have been in use in the RB period, connecting Potters Lane at Burgh Heath with Ewell, and that the hollow-way Church Lane, whose original course can be seen running east-west in the south end of Nork Park, formed part of a prehistoric ridge route along the North Downs, it passing the Tumble Beacon (presumed to be the largest surviving Bronze Age burial mound in Surrey and probable reason for the manorial name “Great Barrow” / Burgh) and seemingly having a 4th-5th century Romano-British farmstead abutting it perpendicularly on one side by Nork Park (implying the track is RB or earlier).

With regard to what most people understand by "Roman road" – i.e. built by the Romans rather than merely used by them, Andy Keay brought to my attention 20 years ago photographs of a crop-mark running over a very long distance from the east end of Banstead village (where E.A. Baxter had found much RB pottery), running through the fields between Croydon Lane and Woodmansterne Lane, towards Woodmansterne (and the large playing-card shaped scheduled enclosure where Andy found some possibly RB but extremely worn coins). There is currently a new major water-main being laid in this area and maybe it will provide more evidence. If this crop-mark between Banstead and Woodmansterne turns out to be a Roman road, it could be part of the missing network connecting Ewell with Rochester.

**Not a one-way street: Roman roads and “Street” place-names in Surrey**

Rob Briggs

One thing missing from the discussions of the Roman road network of Surrey printed in recent Bulletins is any consideration of the possibility that many of the names used as a key plank of evidence for an extensive enduring road network had nothing to do with roads in existence in the Romano-British period. There is a very useful piece of work waiting to be done charting the use of the words for “street” in Surrey from the 1st to the 21st century, for which there would be a sizeable body of material to work with – not least the historic county’s 30 or so place-names containing the term. This note merely highlights some of the issues at hand, and suggests that, rather than seeking to “join the dots” between “Street”-named places to uncover the courses of Roman-era roads in the county, we might do well to consider instead what “street” meant in the millennium or more after the 5th century CE.
Questioning the one-size-fits-all approach

Think of a Surrey village. Chances are, the name of the primary thoroughfare through the settlement will be The Street or a variation upon it. Are we to assume that every one of them had a Roman-era precedent that was recognised as such in language in subsequent centuries? We do not hold that every historic Street-name found in one of Surrey’s historic towns signifies a Roman road (PNS, 169, lists six such names in Farnham on pre-1600 record, for example), so why must this be the only explanation of equivalent names found in rural contexts? Seen in this light, rather than always crediting a direct descent from Latin strāta and/or the Old English (OE) loan-word strǣt, with the attendant implication that the name in question recalled a ‘decent road’ (to borrow a phrase from Smith 2018a, 20) in use in the Romano-British period, perhaps there is more value in working backwards, looking at the dates and contexts of their first known attestations, and seeing what such an approach reveals.

Let us start in the present day. Modern English street has a much wider set of applications than “(former) Roman road” (if indeed that even remains an active sense of the word). Clearly there was a shift (and broadening) in meaning between the end of the Romano-British period and the start of the 20th century, to pick a fairly arbitrary end-point (albeit one that may correspond to a date at which the decline of a local Surrey dialect was far advanced?). In OE place-name studies the current accepted primary translation of OE strǣt is, unsurprisingly, ‘Roman road’, although ‘urban road’ is also admitted as a Late OE development in urban contexts. In addition, a modern dialect sense of ‘straggling village’ is noted, although it seems not to have been explored in any great detail (Smith 1956, 162; Gelling and Cole 2014, 93-94). The last meaning is particularly interesting in this context, and will be appraised in greater depth presently.

Dividing up the name data

In their summaries of the occurrences of various toponymic elements in the county area, the authors of PNS listed 11 place-names and a further six field-names they considered to be descended from OE strǣt, to which can be added Stratford in Ockham and Stratton in Godstone, listed under OE ford and tūn respectively, and the Mortlake field-name Stratturlong (PNS, 343, 348, 365, 372). In reality, however, there are a significant number of other relevant minor place-names that were not counted thus. The earliest attestations and/or etymologies of the majority of these names are to be found in the main text, with the remainder scattered throughout a gazetteer of ‘Field and Minor Names’. In addition, Alexander Rumble reported two further minor names in Merstham parish in a later research article: the lost Wall-Street (le Walestret 1365), and the field-names Little, Middle Streat Field (1840: Rumble 1970-71, 26, 27).

The combined corpus boasts names of major settlements (notably manorial/parochial Streatham) and minor ones (e.g. Pitland Street, Shere), plus field-names (e.g. Hook Street Field, Alfold) and, inevitably, street-names in the truest sense. There is of course a difference between a road-name and a place-name, one that is not always made clear in the way the early forms are reported, although it is also clear that one could become the other. Another way of distinguishing patterns in the name data is by classifying them according to the general significance of their first elements: pre-existing place-names, bynames (family names or occupations), terms descriptive of the physical character of the “street” or its association with a proximate topographical feature, etc. Even listed in this brief fashion, it is not difficult to think of how some of these classifications overlap, and consequently this approach shall not be pursued further here (other than occasional references to certain name-types in the following paragraphs). Nevertheless, the above lays bare the likelihood that grouping all such names together and seeing them as indicative of the same thing is not the correct way of grappling with this data.
OE strǣt can be shown to have been used in Anglo-Saxon-period name formations in Surrey – albeit not necessarily as the end product of a direct “local” loan from Vulgar Latin (i.e. spoken by people of “Romano-British” stock). The least problematic in terms of source authenticity is Stratton in Godstone parish, which lies on the route of the London-Hassocks Roman road (the revised southern terminus is as per Rudling 2017, 91). It is first attested in the will of Brihtric and Ælfswith, perhaps drawn up in the years 980x987 as (on) Strættune [OE], (in) Strættuna [Latin] < OE strǣt + tūn (S 1511; PNS, 348). More intriguing are the uses of OE strǣt in the boundary surveys appended to the main text of the famous endowment charter of subregulus Frithuwald to Chertsey Abbey promulgated in the earlier 670s (S 1165). Thus, part of the boundary of Chobham ran along a route named (to) Ruggestrate “Ridge street”, while those of Chertsey with Thorpe ran on þere ealde herestræt “to the old army-street”. The bounds are of later 11th to early 12th-century date (with a few blatant mid-13th-century interpolations: Kelly 2015), and point not only to the existence of minor “street”-names in Anglo-Saxon-period Surrey, but moreover to the creation and naming of new roads during the OE period.

The first known attestations of many Surrey “Street” place-names date from the Middle English (ME) period, and this invites the supposition that many could be of ME coinage. The Middle English Dictionary, using attestations from the 12th to 16th centuries, proffers two main meanings of ME strẹ̄t(e): ‘A road leading from one city or town to another, an open road; also, a path or way through a field, forest, etc.’ and ‘A street in a town or city; also, a pathway in a battlefield’. Nowhere is it specified that these roads and streets had to be of Roman origin, and hence that post-Roman equivalents were identified by a different word or words (although it should be remembered that no study, however authoritative it may appear, can be the last word on a topic). There can be no doubt that strẹ̄t(e) had an active life in the ME lexicon, i.e. it was used in many more contexts than to identify routes established or otherwise in use in the Roman period. It is surely corollary that this was also true of the ME toponymicon, i.e. the corpus of linguistic items used to form place-names.

I have not looked into the antiquity of many of the village street names of Surrey. Tracing possible origins through written records is complicated by the use of Latin in most medieval documents, meaning words like strata and via are employed instead of the vernacular equivalent. My inkling would be that many had a late medieval or even early post-medieval genesis, and the same is true of minor “Street” place-names, but again it must be stressed that this is an artefact of very limited research and the language of the majority of the relevant textual sources. The true place-names, i.e. those not attached solely to roads, are a mixed bag; strǣt/strẹ̄t(e) occurs a few times as a first element (Stratton, Stratford) and once as an affix (Street Cobham, Stret Coveham 1298: PNS, 87), but by far the largest proportion have it as a second element. Given the well-understood uses and senses of the OE and ME words, it is clear that the common denominator was a “street” running through what was reckoned as the place in question.

With the exception of Streatham, the relevant Surrey place-names are united by attribution to places that were not the primary settlement within a parish (Stratton might also be excluded here, given it was documented as the location of ten hides of land in the 980s). Even names like Purleestret and Thursleystret 1609 (PNS, 211) pertain to secondary settlements that historically fell within Sanderstead and Witley parishes. Shorn of their documentary context, it is impossible to determine if the aforementioned two name-forms referred to the streets or the settlements of which they were part. In origin anyway, the latter presumably referred to The Street that forms the spine of Thursley village. Not so many miles distant, Thorncombe Street near Bramley is Thornecomestrete 1518-29, but occurs on earlier record back to Torcu[m]ba 1206 (PNS, 228). Here, the main route
through the settlement is still named Thorncombe Street. It is arguable that such names say more about the morphology of a late medieval and early modern settlement than situation within (or memories of) antecedent supra-local networks of travel and transport.

In lieu of the necessary detailed historical research, archaeology may offer some instructive perspectives. Although much work remains to be done, the published results of rural settlement archaeology in Surrey, just as in many other parts of lowland Britain (see for instance the annual reports of the English Currently Occupied Rural Settlement project published in the journal *Medieval Settlement Research*), point to most villages and hamlets – the sort of settlements which might lie along a “street” – not having a continuous existence from the Roman period to the medieval and beyond. This is not to reject the idea that the roads alongside which these medieval settlements stood were not of much earlier origin, but it does compel us to look more closely and critically at the nomenclature associated with them.

**Discussion: many names, three different meanings?**

The Surrey name data shows “Street” toponyms could be formed in a number of ways, with the strong likelihood that formation of such names occurred over a lengthy period of time, during which the element gained and lost different connotations. Without deeper, focused study, it is not possible to ascertain the precise implication of each Surrey “Street”-name. It is argued here that *Street* and its precursors/variants would seem to stand for three things in Surrey toponymy (particularly regarding those names in which it occurs as a second element):

- a term referring to a road of either Roman or post-Roman origin (“X Street”)
- a term that could sustain the borrowing of an existing road-name and wholesale attribution to a roadside settlement (“X Street settlement”)
- a Middle and Early Modern English dialect item in Surrey with a topographical implication-cum-application related to a road but independent of any pre-existing road-name, in the same manner as *Green* and *End* (on the latter, see Turner 1987, 243).

However much objective reconsideration of the meanings of the various place-names under discussion may alter previous perceptions of their origins, it cannot be disputed that some do refer to Roman roads. Stane Street (*Stanstrete* 1279; alias *Pybylstret* 1358 > Pebble Lane, Leatherhead: *PNS*, 9, 81) and Stansted in Godstone (earlier *la Stanstrete* 1263: *PNS*, 319), hard by Stratton and the line of the London-Hassocks road, are unequivocal instances of Roman roads remembered by vernacular element + street name formations. In all three names, the first element is readily connectable to the materials that made up the roads. This should invite serious consideration of the possibility that *Stonestret* at Kingswood, on even earlier record (in 1182: *PNS*, 365), denoted another – perhaps the Ewell to Steyning area route hypothesised by Bird (2018, 11). *Wall-Street* in Merstham, if from OE *w(e)ala* “of the Britons”, may signify the same thing, but in a different way (Rumble 1970-71, 26).

At the risk of being seen to contradict much of the previous paragraph, it is worth introducing the caveat that it need not follow that “descriptive” first elements pertained to relict Roman-period fabric because post-Roman roads were unmaintained muddy tracks (a premise usefully challenged at high level by Smith 2018b). Close to the White Horse Stone in Kent, excavations in advance of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link’s construction revealed three successive holloways with metalled surfaces, all of Mid-Anglo-Saxon-period date (Reynolds 2011, 376-78). Similarly, an excavated sequence of gravel surfaces covering the route of the ‘King’s Highway’ through part of Thorpe shows repeated maintenance activity potentially commencing in the Late Anglo-Saxon period (Munnery 2011). It
may be the case, therefore, that ME-recorded “Street”-names incorporating direct references to their main constituent material actually reflected more recent, post-Roman road surfacing and/or foundations.

Turning to the third of the above-mentioned possibilities for what Street etc. signified, what might be the best translation? The established connotation of ‘straggling village’ can be dismissed as overkill in the context of the mostly dispersed settlement pattern of medieval and early modern Surrey. It might be posited that a better etymology for a name of this type would be “settlement of X (characterised by its situation) along a ?significant road”, with X being either an extant place-name (like Thorncombe Street), a notable characteristic of the immediate area (such as Wood Street), or a person or profession (Wheeler Street).

As attractive as this seems, the hypothesis that in Surrey, and especially in the south-west of the county, “Street” signified a minor settlement strung out along a single road does not seem to be universally applicable. Viewed on first edition Ordnance Survey maps of the 1860s/70s, some instances are seen to be all but devoid of attendant habitation. Worsted Green in Godstone is an extreme example, abutted by only a single building going into the final third of the 19th century, although it should also be highlighted that doubts have been expressed as to whether the name is a corruption of “Wood Street” (see Rumble 1970-71, 21). Ryestreet Common in Chiddingfold is much more secure in its derivation, and appears on both early and current OS maps having no more than five properties standing at its margins, despite being around a kilometre in length.

Staying in Chiddingfold parish, Highstreet Green throws up some intriguing implications. A mere three houses abutted it circa 1870. The highest OS spot height within its former extent is several metres lower than the one at Ryestreet Common, so it is hard to conceive of its name being a reference to elevation. Typically, we would expect a “high street” to be the main thoroughfare in an urban centre (e.g. Guildford, the High Stret
1540: *PNS*, 10). Might Highstreet Green be in origin an ironic name, attached to an isolated strip of common land with a tiny number of dispersed farmsteads along its boundaries = the antithesis of a normal “high street”? Or, taking it at face value, is it so-named because, like nearby Ryestreet Common, it was a sparsely-settled but well-delineated focal “green” area through which the titular route ran? The latter scenario would suggest that “defined area of (common) land” should be entered alongside “settlement” as a possible way to translate some of the late-recorded minor place-names incorporating Street as their second element.

**Conclusion**

The more one looks at Surrey “Street” place-names, the more reasons they give to doubt that they all derive from roads whose main noteworthy feature was Roman-period origins. In the absence of quantifiable results derived from a dedicated study, it is postulated here that the majority of Surrey “Street” place-names had nothing to do with Roman roads. If there is an overarching point to be made by way of a conclusion, perhaps it is this; textual usage of Medieval Latin *strata* or *via* to describe a “highway” running through a settlement or area of land, in concert with vernacular oral usage of *strēt(e)* to refer to the same thoroughfare, gave rise to many of the county’s “Street”-names. For some more minor settlements, perhaps relatively late in their establishment and of dispersed morphology, the street was the standout, unifying feature, and as a result led to it becoming the eponym for the entire settlement. Thus, the choice of this particular name element was a medieval reflection of medieval circumstances and as a consequence there is in many cases no compulsion to read Roman roots into later medieval routes.

[A follow-on piece in the next Bulletin will reconsider one suggested route of the postulated London-Winchester road through Surrey in light of the alternative ways of understanding the historical/place-name evidence]

**References**

Research Committee Annual Symposium

Saturday 23 February 2019

A programme for this event in the Ashtead Peace Memorial Hall is listed on the website where it is now possible to book online. As usual there will be reports on recent fieldwork and research in Surrey with Dr Peter Guest giving the keynote presentation on Roman coins (A booking form was distributed in Bulletin 471).

We would like to see as wide a range of displays as possible, in particular from local research projects or groups who would like to highlight some of their work (whether past or on-going). Displays do not need to be large but can simply be a poster. If anyone wishes to participate or make a contribution, please contact rosemary.hooker@blueyonder.co.uk or info@surreyarchaeology.org to book a space.

Volunteers who can assist the committee in managing the day would also be very welcome.
A prone burial found atop the Hog’s Back in 1951

In mid-December, we received an email from our colleague Emily Rowland, Modern Records Officer at the Surrey History Centre, alerting us to something of apparent archaeological significance recorded in a 1951 coroner’s report. The discovery in question could not be correlated with anything on the HER, nor in any published source. All of what we knew about it was contained in just three documents: the Coroner’s Officer’s Report Concerning Death, Deputy Coroner’s General Report, and a typed-up version of the police statement given by the original finder. The purpose of this note is to outline what was found, what this may represent, and what still remains insufficiently understood about it.

Circumstances, location and recorded details of the discovery

At about 11.15 on the morning of Tuesday, 21 August 1951, a workman using an air compression drill to create a hole for a new telephone pole on top of the Hog’s Back ridge uncovered a round object that turned out to be a human skull, along with a number of other bones. Within half an hour the police had been called and, along with the Deputy Coroner, were on the scene. They proceeded to uncover what turned out to be a complete skeleton. Divining the precise find-spot from the locational details documented in the coroner’s paperwork is not a very straightforward task. It is given as 40 feet east of ‘the..."
entrance to “Greyfriars” Hogs Back, Puttenham’, and 36 feet away from the edge of the ‘offside’ of the road along the top of the Hog's Back heading towards Guildford, i.e. on the south side of what is now the westbound carriageway of the A31.

Greyfriars is a large house with an associated entrance lodge (really a gatehouse) in Wanborough parish, not Puttenham (SHER Monument 8570). However, from the information provided, it would appear the find-spot lay just inside Compton parish, at approximately NGR SU 9498 4838. Remarkably, consultation of Google Street View imagery shows that a telephone pole still stands in this approximate location (although it is doubtful that it is the very same as the one erected in 1951). To reflect its provenance, the inhumation will be referred to as the Compton burial in this note, as a more generic “Hog’s Back burial” appellation would risk its conflation with other previously-published discoveries made elsewhere along the ridge at earlier dates.

The skeleton was buried at a depth of two feet below the ground surface as it existed in 1951, angled towards the road in a 'diagonal position'. The skeleton was measured as 5 feet and 5 inches from skull to heel; the biological sex was not established in either the Deputy Coroner's General Report or the Coroner's Officer's Report Concerning Death. Many of the larger bones survived in good condition, and the skull contained a full and well-preserved set of teeth, although the rib, finger and toe bones were said to be in a decomposed state. Perhaps the most important pieces of information recorded about the burial are that it was buried face downwards, i.e. in a prone position, and that the hands were positioned behind the back.

Much has been written about prone burials in the archaeological record, which continued until astonishingly late in time given its superstitious motives (e.g. Sugg 2017). Some earlier authors were dismissive of the significance of this mode of burial, but more recent work has made it clear that such placement of the corpse was not accidental, nor a secondary development, rather 'a powerful rite that must have been enacted very consciously by a burial party fully aware of its social meaning' (Reynolds 2009, 69). Prone burial was a long-standing phenomenon as manifested in the British archaeological record. The Surrey HER contains a small number of references to prone inhumations of different dates. SHER Monument 5671 covers two skeletons found during the construction of a tennis court at Larklands, Banstead, attributed on a perhaps not altogether trustworthy basis to the Bronze Age (for further information, see Harp 2003, 15). More recently, and with a good deal more certainty surrounding their dating, early Roman-period prone burials were found by Pre-Construct Archaeology in 2015 in the course of excavations of two areas of the former Nescot Animal Husbandry Centre site south of Ewell (Monuments 22954 and 22967).

**Burial of a suicide?**

Despite a 'thorough search' being made at the time of its excavation, no further finds were made that could help to date the Compton burial. An archaeologist from Guildford called to the scene in 1951 estimated that the inhumation was 500-800 years old, i.e. late medieval, but the basis for this postulation is unclear. Perhaps it was rooted in unstated knowledge of the practice of using roadsides for burial of suicides, during the long period in which the act of taking one’s life was considered a crime of the utmost gravity. Robert Halliday has undertaken a study of post-medieval suicide burials in East Anglia, based largely on documentary and oral testimony. The main recurrent trait he highlights among these burials, other than roadside siting, often at parish edges, is not prone positioning but a stake being driven through the corpse (Halliday 2010, 82, 84, 86). No trace of a stake was reported in the case of the Compton burial, although it is eminently possible that a wooden stake would have decayed and disappeared by 1951, or else that whatever remained of one was overlooked in the course of excavation.
Consultation of the main published parish history of Compton reveals no references to a roadside burial in the parish resulting from suicide or equivalent offence (Boston with Whishaw 1987). Nor does a search of the HER turn up any close analogue, just a number of poorly-evidenced, undated burials scattered around the county, all found several decades or more ago (e.g. Monument 1186, a solitary extended inhumation found in a field at Warlingham Court Farm by a schoolboy in 1929). However, an absence of ready parallels in either the archaeological or published historical records may simply be the product of a lack of awareness and research in this regard, and cannot by itself be used to discount the possibility of a late or post-medieval origin for the Compton burial.

**Anglo-Saxon-period deviant or execution burial?**

Thanks to the work of Andrew Reynolds and others, an alternative possibility is that the inhumation was of earlier, Anglo-Saxon-period origin. The documented manner of burial befits analogy with a wealth of securely-dated early medieval examples of what are known as deviant burials, in the sense that they deviate from expected norms of burial in terms of location, i.e. not in a churchyard, and/or manner of interment (Reynolds 2009). This work has demonstrated deviant (including prone) burials are not uncommon features of otherwise “normal” cemeteries in the Early Anglo-Saxon period (Reynolds 2009, 90), but subsequently occur with much greater frequency within demonstrable or probable execution cemeteries, which in some cases at least may be synonymous with the “heathen burials” referred to in charter boundary descriptions (albeit not from the historic or present administrative county areas of Surrey) and other Old English texts of the later Anglo-Saxon period.

Reynolds uses a number of characteristics besides prone positioning to identify Anglo-Saxon-period deviant/execution burials, from the obvious skeletal indicator of decapitation, through characteristics of the grave such as shallow depth and use for multiple burials, to aspects of their location such as proximity to important boundaries, antecedent earthworks and contemporary central places. There is no mention in the various reports associated with the Compton burial that the skeleton exhibited any signs of a trauma consistent with capital punishment, although it is possible such evidence was missed in the course of the exhumation. Prone burials have been noted at both of the previously-identified execution cemeteries on the Hog’s Back, namely Guildown and “Seven Ditches”, as well as at Eashing not so many miles away to the south (Reynolds 2009, 161 Fig. 41; for Guildown, see now Bird 2018a and 2018b; for “Seven Ditches”, see English and Dyer 1999 and Briggs 2010; for Eashing, and a convincing re-dating of the burials found there in 1931 to the Mid-Anglo-Saxon period, see Reynolds 2009, 136-37). Guildown is a clear example of a cemetery containing execution burials, and recorded characteristics of the six burials found at “Seven Ditches” could also be interpreted in the same way (Reynolds 2009, 140-41, 143; but see also Mattison 2016, 62-75, for a more critical assessment of the criteria upon which Reynolds’ identifications of execution cemeteries are based, one that accepts Guildown but discounts “Seven Ditches” owing to insufficient evidence).

What can be said with any degree of certainty about the burial found in 1951 is limited because it was found and uncovered in the course of a very small “excavation”. So, for example, it is difficult to adjudge if it was an isolated interment or part of a more extensive place of burial. Arguably, sufficient testimony might already be in place at a county level to support the statement that isolated early medieval burials, deviant or otherwise, are uncommon in Surrey (one proven exception being the very late 7th-/early 8th-century furnished inhumation found at the previously-discussed Nescot site: SHER Monument 22972). But each site must be assessed first and foremost on its own terms and, in the absence of archaeological evaluation of the ground surrounding the grave, drawing analogies with other, more extensively-excavated sites is of limited practical value.
Topographical characteristics, on the other hand, may afford a better understanding of just why the burial was made in this particular location. The site of the burial is a prominent one, being close to the highest point on the Hog’s Back ridge, more than 150 metres (over 500 feet) AOD. It is also very close to the line of the boundary between Compton and Wanborough parishes. This marked the division between the medieval Hundreds of Godalming and Woking, a situation that almost certainly went back to the Anglo-Saxon period. The line of this boundary is roughly coincident with the bridleway, contained within a holloway lower down the southern slope of the Hog’s Back, linking the top of the ridge with Compton Heath. To the north, on the other side of the A31, a footpath runs downhill towards Flexford House. If these denote much earlier trackways then, accepting the likelihood of a route along the ridge in the earlier Middle Ages (as did Turner 1980, 10), the burial appears to have been placed close to a crossroads. Proximity to important boundaries and/or crossroads has been noted as characteristic of many excavated deviant/execution burials of Anglo-Saxon-period date, including nearby “Seven Ditches” (Briggs 2010, 8). All the same, it should be added that these can apply to contemporaneous isolated burials as well as to cemeteries (for an example of the former found near the White Horse Stone in Kent, see Reynolds 2011, 378), and furthermore to much later burials of suicides (Halliday 2010, 81-82), so is not diagnostic of any one particular date or type.

There can be little doubt that the execution burials in the Guildown cemetery were linked with Guildford as a central place and emergent town, while “Seven Ditches” has a documented later 13th-century connection to Woking Hundred and the execution of a convicted criminal (Briggs 2010, 8-9). If the Compton prone burial is considered to be of analogous date and derivation to these sites, then it may be connected to the conduct of capital punishment in Godalming Hundred (the burials at Eashing within the same Hundred were probably linked to its status as a burh and royal estate centre; Reynolds 2009, 137). Another possibility is that it was a sub-hundredal, proto-parish level site reserved for “heathen burials”; it is interesting to note by way of a contrast that there is evidence for possible ?Late Anglo-Saxon-period burials in the churchyard at Compton, in the form of human remains found in 1907 beneath the walls of the late 11th- or very early 12th-century chancel of St Nicholas’ church (Thackeray Turner 1908, 158; HER 22984).

Such a concentration of early medieval execution sites/burial places would be remarkable, even if it can be attributed in part to the hundredal and settlement geography of the Hog’s Back and surrounding area. It could reflect the importance of the route along the summit of the Hog’s Back, a section of what may very well have been the main road between Winchester and London in the later Anglo-Saxon period. But equally it might indicate that the ridge was seen in a negative way, as alocale around which superstition and folklore lingered, to the extent that it was treated as especially suitable for executions and “unclean” burials.

Conclusions and questions

Careful examination and contextualization of the evidence documented in the coroner’s report cannot pin down the Compton burial to a particular period or significance. It could well have been twice as old as it was reckoned to be in 1951, or alternatively as recent in origin as the early 19th century (and ultimately there is for now no guarantee that it was not considerably older, i.e. late prehistoric or Roman). Quite feasibly, there were more burials close by, which would fit a pattern established by analysis and synthesis of evidence from most other sites of early medieval deviant burials (mostly from executions?) in the county – in fact, Surrey has perhaps the largest number of known sites of this kind in England. But, by the same token, there is nothing that precludes it from being interpreted as the burial of a suicide, which were not always situated in isolation (see Halliday 2010, 85-86).
The burial prompts a range of questions, and the HER hopes readers may be willing to offer suggestions (or even answers!) in order to improve our understanding of it and the wider implications for the surrounding area. Some questions are practical, and stand a fair chance of being answered through archival research work. We know the bones were lifted and taken to Godalming Police Station, but what happened to them after that? Where they reburied, or lodged with a local museum? And what became of the photographs of the burial stated in the coroner’s report as having been taken at the time of its excavation? Others are broader in scope and may only be answered by archaeological fieldwork – most importantly (but also most intrusively) whether it was an isolated burial. Another ripe line of enquiry would be a review of the available evidence for prone burials found in Surrey, to use the information pertaining to the closely-dated examples to help with the dating and interpretation of those for which there appears to be no chronologically-significant accompanying evidence. All in all, a lot of possible new research arising from a single skeleton!

The burial has been added to the HER as Monument 23087. Please send any information or thoughts you have regarding the above to the Surrey HER team via email at her@surreycc.gov.uk.
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Roman Studies trip to the Isle of Wight on 29 September 2018

Rosemary Culshaw and Nikki Cowlard

If asked to picture a typical Roman villa site in England, I suspect most of us would think of a field at the end of a country lane, so it was surprising to find that the Newport villa is tucked away behind houses in a residential part of the town. It was discovered in 1926 while foundations were being dug for a garage and was subsequently dated to the late 3rd century AD. We were lucky to be showed around it by Frank Basford, the Finds Liaison Officer, who has been connected with the villa for many years and so has a wealth of knowledge. This is a corridor-villa with two wings; particularly impressive was the bath suite, said to be one of the best-preserved in southern England. Many of the flues and pilae stacks are still in place, and I learnt for the first time that the reason for the apse-shaped profiles which bath suites and bath houses often had was that this prevented users from having condensation dripping on them while bathing. Rather ironically, this area of the site suffers quite badly from damp, despite being under cover.

Some mosaics remain and there is some re-imagined wall plaster, notably in the triclinium. This room has quite a large area of sinkage in one corner, possibly caused by it having been built over an Iron Age pit. Unusually, the room also has a fireplace against the back wall: a possible explanation for this is that it may date from the end of the occupation period when the hypocaust was no longer in use, presumably through lack of slaves to gather fuel and keep it stoked. Reconstructed walls outside the covered area indicate the shape and size of further rooms whose use is uncertain. The skull of a young woman was discovered in the corner of one of these rooms: nothing is known about her but she may have met a violent death. Also outside is a little herb garden and outside the villa at the front is a reconstructed Roman corn drier. This was found in a farmer’s field a few miles away and, as he had no wish to keep it, it was dismantled and reassembled at the villa.

An excellent activity room, where we were served coffee and biscuits, has numerous things for education groups to try, from weaving to arch-building. The site also includes a small shop and museum. The villa is known to continue into adjacent gardens and you might expect that people from the surrounding houses would frequently be coming in with
items found in their gardens, but surprisingly almost nothing has been uncovered even during the construction of extensions. The highlight seems to be a pair of Roman tweezers found in the garden next door. An impressive bath suite and tweezers: they were obviously a very well-groomed family.

After a morning exploring Newport Roman villa we made our way across some beautiful countryside to Brading Roman villa some 8 miles away to the east. This villa is set in the countryside overlooking Sandown Bay and is an example of a maritime courtyard villa with some of the most spectacular 3rd and 4th century mosaics of their type in Northern Europe. Those of us who had not visited Brading before were impressed by the modern cover building and visitors’ centre. After a tasty lunch in the visitor centre’s busy café we met with Helen, an experienced volunteer who was our guide for the afternoon. She explained that the villa was discovered in the 1880s when a farmer, Mr Munns, who was erecting a fence post adjacent to the boundary with his neighbours, the Oglander family, hit a mosaic. A local archaeologist, Captain Thorpe, who had already established that there was a Roman settlement in the vicinity, was called in to investigate. Large-scale excavations took place 1880-1881 uncovering what turned out to be the west and north ranges of a villa complex overlooking Sandown Bay. This discovery was followed by the discovery of a south range and Sir Barry Cunliffe carried out further excavations 2008-2010 to fill in the gaps.

The Oglander family purchased the land adjacent to theirs to ensure that the villa site was protected in its entirety, and the Oglander Roman Trust was set up to protect, preserve and improve the site. A corrugated iron structure covered the western end of the exposed site from the Edwardian period onwards and the current cover building was opened in 2003. Helen then showed us around the western range which was the principal building, containing fine, although sometimes fragmentary, mosaics in the principal rooms. Representations include mythical figures such as Orpheus, Medusa, Bacchus and Achilles. The mosaic that Mr Munns originally disturbed with his fence post was Gallus – the Cock-headed Man, thought to be a unique representation.

The west range is thought to be an late 3rd-early 4th century addition to the aisled building of the north range, which was originally built in late 1st- early 2nd century AD well away from the original building (the south range) and then replaced with a larger hall providing residential rooms and a hypocaust system. This can be seen today in a hut just outside the main museum. The original detached bathhouse was replaced at this time with an addition to the aisled hall. One gets a glimpse of a well situated villa developed over more
than 300 years as a moderately lavish home with a bathhouse, heating system and fine mosaics. The owner may have been involved in maritime trade, given the villa’s position looking towards the Channel.

Our visit fortuitously coincided with a lecture on *Making Roman Art* by Dr Will Wootton of Kings College, London. Showing a wide range of mosaics he described not just the experience and technical skill that the original artisans employed in the production of mosaics but also how the ancient observer would have experienced the mosaics aesthetically. Studying mosaics can give us a connection to the beliefs, traditions and visual appreciation of individuals, groups and families and to the context in which they were created and displayed.

Thanks must go to John Felton for arranging this very successful trip. For those of you who have not visited Roman Isle of Wight those of us on the trip can highly recommend heading across the Solent.

### Note from new president

As your newly elected President I would like to introduce myself to those of you who may not know me. I have been a member of SyAS from about 2005 having completed a BSc in Archaeology and Landscape at the University of Surrey under its Continuing Education programme, which sadly no longer exists. My background was in nursing and health visiting but I soon got the archaeology bug and became involved in local and Surrey-wide initiatives. I dug at Tolworth Court Farm as a student and then joined excavations in Ewell with Clive Orton and Frank Pemberton. Living in Ewell these digs were convenient, enabling me to be involved whilst my young children were at school; I did struggle a bit though cycling up the hill out of Ewell after a day in the trench! The Roman Studies Road Group was active at the time and I joined small digs looking for Stane Street locally, and moved on to projects at Ashtead and Abinger Roman villas, and Flexford. I was given the opportunity to run the Church Meadow Project which ran 3 seasons of excavation on Stane Street in the Roman settlement 2012-14; getting this published is high on my priority list. I replaced Alan Hall as Secretary of RSG in 2014, took my turn on Council and was invited to join the Management Committee (now the Trustees) in December 2015. I have been grateful for the training and opportunities that SyAS has afforded me and I am honoured to take on the Presidency role. I look forward to meeting or working with you over my term of office.
Cocks Farm Abinger dates 2019

Now 2019 has arrived we are thinking ahead to our annual excavation at Cocks Farm Abinger. We will be opening further trenches in the field above the Roman villa looking for evidence of Iron Age and Roman rural activity. The dates for 2019 are as follows:
Saturday 15th - Wednesday 19th June
Saturday 22nd - Wednesday 26th June
Monday 1st - Wednesday 3rd July
Saturday 6th - Wednesday 10th July
Saturday 13th - Tuesday 16th July

This gives us 22 days in total with a long weekend off mid-excavation. If you have not taken part previously we ask that you commit to five days over the month. If you are interested in taking part please do let me know (exact dates will be sought nearer the time).

Nikki Cowlard (Volunteer Co-ordinator)
nikki.cowlard@btinternet.com 01372 745432

New members

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 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>Edward Dempster</td>
<td>Surbiton</td>
<td>Iron Age and Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Derriman</td>
<td>Bookham</td>
<td>Celtic through to Late Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigid Fice</td>
<td>Farnham</td>
<td>Domestic Buildings; Ecclesiastical History; Local History of Surrey and Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Fiddler</td>
<td>Frimley</td>
<td>Archaeological investigation, conservation and data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Green</td>
<td>Thames Ditton</td>
<td>Palaeolithic to Post-industrial but Medieval in particular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Leek</td>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>Archaeology, all aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Leek</td>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>Archaeology, all aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis Mallett</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>Roman Archaeology and Zooarchaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolande Monks</td>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Roman and Medieval (prior to 1400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine Severs</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>Archaeology, all aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre Sim</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>Archaeology, all aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stark</td>
<td>Haslemere</td>
<td>General History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HLF Sustainable Impact project update

Anne Sassin

The first four months of the new HLF project, which began in September 2018 and is running for two years, have been a busy time, with much time given to initial planning and organization. However, we have managed to get some key training courses in from almost the first weekend. This included a small group who were involved in small-scale excavation in Farnham, training with the Total Station and Bartington Grad601 magnetometer in Farnham and Old Woking, the new palaeography group set-up by Tim Wilcock and Catherine Ferguson, introductory courses to QGIS software, and two days of monument condition survey training at the Devil’s Punch Bowl in Hindhead which was coordinated by the National Trust team. The QGIS and monument condition training have been particularly successful – as well as popular – and there are already plans to run these courses again later in 2019.

Not all plans for more courses and training in the early spring are finalised, but the following is an example of some of the opportunities which are available. As always, anyone who is interested in a specific activity or area please do contact me at outreach@surreyarchaeology.org.uk, and be sure to also keep up-to-date on progress and future activities or courses via the website and social media (@surreyarch), including our new Instagram account (surrey_archaeology). If you would like to be added to the mailing list for the monthly e-letter – which is the best way to stay up-to-date with opportunities – please also get in touch.

Archaeology in the Archives course

Led by Jane Lewis (Surrey Heritage) and Nowal Shaikhley (SCAU), this one-day course will take place on two separate occasions (Tuesday 5 and Saturday 16 February) from 10:30-15:30 at the Surrey History Centre (130 Goldsworth Rd, Woking GU21 6ND).

This is an introductory course in how to access archives and resources at Surrey History Centre, followed by a hands-on map workshop. Historical maps can be a very useful source of information when looking for archaeological features, as it is often possible to trace the development of a landscape over hundreds of years or more, and features recorded on early maps, which often disappear on later ones, can be identified. Desk based archaeological assessments use a number of maps including Rocque’s Map of 1768, the Tithe Maps c1840-1843 and the Ordnance Survey 25 inch map series 1878-1933 to chart the development of a specific site and assess the impact on potential buried archaeological feature. The course will use a series of practical exercises to develop your skills in using historic maps.

As this is part of the HLF training programme, the course will be provided at no charge. However, booking is essential and spaces are limited, so we do ask that you will commit to attending it, once signed up. Please email outreach@surreyarchaeology.org.uk to book and for any queries.
Community Test Pitting

As part of the initiative to increase outreach potential and engage with more areas and local groups across the county, the first of the planned community test-pitting programmes will take place in April at Old Woking, followed by Rowhurst, Leatherhead in May.

Old Woking

The community test-pitting days in Old Woking have been set to run over the Easter school holidays from Saturday 13 April through to Tuesday 16 April. All test pits will be dug in the grounds of Rosemead, and for most of the days members of the public will need to apply for a time-slot to excavate, with sieving and finds-processing also taking place. More experienced diggers will also be needed to help lead on the excavations and processing – if interested please contact Pam Savage (medforum@hotmail.co.uk). On the Monday (15 April), there will be an open day where the public may simply turn up and take part in the various events, which will involve children’s activities, including Anglo-Saxon living history demonstrations. Volunteers to assist with organisation and activities will be greatly appreciated.

In order to help raise awareness of the April test pitting, a half-term event has been planned at The Lightbox in Woking on Saturday 16 February, which will include a display of artefacts from earlier seasons. A small number of volunteers are needed to support this event; please contact outreach@surreyarchaeology.org.uk if you are interested in helping.

Leatherhead and other locations

Test-pitting is also set to take place the first three weekends of May at the Fire and Iron Gallery at Rowhurst near Leatherhead, with an open day on the Bank Holiday Monday (6 May). More information will be available shortly, but those who are interested in the meantime, please contact outreach@surreyarchaeology.org.uk.

From August, test-pitting is planned elsewhere in the county, including Bletchingley in August/September and Epsom and Ewell in September. Hindhead, Old Woking and Leatherhead may also be re-visited in October.

Other Fieldwork

Specific dates have not yet been agreed, but plans to undertake geophysics – both magnetometry and resistivity with the Society’s new RM Frobisher resistivity meter – will take place from late February to late April, including at Farnham, Chiddingfold, Hindhead, Old Woking and Leatherhead. Please check the website or forthcoming e-letters.

Digitisation Project and Image Request

We are currently working on increasing the online catalogue of images relevant to the archaeology of the county – whether finds, monuments or fieldwork (both past and current) – and any images which can be shared and made available online would be greatly received. Volunteers who would be willing to work with digitising the Society’s large collection of slides currently held at Abinger and other material are also eagerly sought. More information on this will follow, but if interested in the meantime, please also get in touch.
Surrey Local History Committee

Saturday 30 March SLHC meeting on ‘Georgian Surrey – the age of enlightenment’ at Surrey History Centre (10:00 start). Details with the Bulletin or SyAS website.

Medieval Studies Forum day meeting – Medieval Guildford

Saturday 6 April (10:30)
The Trinity Centre, Trinity Churchyard, Guildford, GU1 3RR

A series of talks about the medieval town by various local speakers, with an introduction to the Historic Towns Atlas project volume on Guildford, by Prof. Keith Lilley. Further details will be sent out in 2019 to members of the MSF and will appear on the SyAS website.

Ockham field day

Wednesday 10 April

An "Ockham field-day" will explore the life and work of medieval philosopher, William of Ockham. There will be a range of speakers, including from Royal Holloway College, University of Surrey, and the Franciscans. This one-day meeting will be held at Ockham church. There will be no charge but a collection for the church will be taken. Details from John Davies at daviesjd@btopenworld.com.

Lecture meetings

4th February
‘The Blue-green Revolution: Why our Future Depends on our Knowledge of Plants’ by Tim Ridgway to Croydon Natural History and Scientific Society in the East Croydon United Reformed Church, Addiscombe Grove, Croydon at 19:45. Visitors welcome: £2

“Cannabis, combined with a stimulant in large doses, rather than small ones, may be given”: A look at drug use in Victorian Asylums’ by Helen Gristwood to Woking History Society in The Gallery, Christ Church, Jubilee Square, Woking at 20:00. Visitors welcome: £3

5th February
‘Conkers, Cordite and the Birth of Modern Biotechnology’ by Martin Adams, Emeritus Professor of Microbiology at the University of Surrey, to the Surrey Industrial History Group at Church House Guildford, 20 Alan Turing Road, Guildford GU2 7YF at 19:30. Details from Bob Bryson meetings@sihg.org.uk. Visitors welcome, £5

7th February
‘Prehistoric Astronomy’ by Mike Pengelly to Farnham & District Museum Society at United Reformed Church, South Street, Farnham at 19:45. Visitors welcome: £3
9th February
‘Suffragettes’ by Sarah Gould to Merton Historical Society at St James’ Church Hall, Merton at 14:30. Visitors welcome: £2

11th February
‘The League of Nations in Richmond’ by Steven Woodbridge to the Richmond Local History Society at Duke Street Church, Richmond at 20:00. Visitors welcome: £4

12th February
‘Sidney Sime, the “Local” Artist’ by Stephen Cranstone to West Surrey Family History Society in United Reform Church, South Street, Farnham at 14:00.

13th February
‘Recent Excavations in Southwark’ by Gill King to Southwark and Lambeth Archaeological Society at Cut Housing Association at 19:30. Visitors welcome: £1

14th February
‘Did The Romans Reach Cornwall?’ by Julie Wileman to Kingston upon Thames Archaeological Society at Surbiton Library Halls at 20:00.

‘March of the Women: Surrey’s Road to the Vote’ by Rosie Everritt to West Surrey Family History Society in Woking Methodist Church Hall, Brewery Road, Woking at 19:50.

16th February
‘The Life of the 18C British Redcoat Soldier’ by Alan Turton to West Surrey Family History Society in Camberley Adult Education Centre, France Hill Drive, Camberley at 14:00.

19th February
‘Alan Crocker Memorial Lecture – the History of Paper Making, with Particular Reference to Alan’s Research’ by Phil Crocket, to the Surrey Industrial History Group at Church House Guildford, 20 Alan Turing Road, Guildford at 19:30. Details from Bob Bryson meetings@sihg.org.uk. Visitors welcome, £5

21st February
‘River Kwai Railway – the true story’ by Paul Whittle to Farnham & District Museum Society at United Reformed Church, South Street, Farnham at 19:45. Visitors welcome: £3

25th February
‘Living on the Edge of the Green Belt’ by John Grindrod to Croydon Natural History and Scientific Society in the East Croydon United Reformed Church, Addiscombe Grove, Croydon at 19:45. Visitors welcome: £2

26th February
‘Tracing men and women who served in the World Wars’ by Simon Fowler to West Surrey Family History Society in Ashley CofE Primary School, Ashley Road, Walton at 19:45.

28th February
‘History & work of the Battersea Dogs & Cats Home at Old Windsor’ by J Robertson to Egham by Runnymede Historical Society in United Church, Egham at 20:00. Visitors welcome: £2

4th March
‘A Varied Nursing Career’ by Yvette McKinnel to Croydon Natural History and Scientific Society in the East Croydon United Reformed Church, Addiscombe Grove, Croydon at 19:45. Visitors welcome: £2
'Gypsies in Victorian and Edwardian Surrey' by Alan Wright to Dorking Local History Group in Crossways Community Baptist Church, Dorking at 19:30. Visitors welcome: £2

‘Heroes and villains of the Basingstoke Canal’ by Roger Cansdale to Woking History Society in The Gallery, Christ Church, Jubilee Square, Woking at 20:00. Visitors welcome: £3

5th March
‘Iron Men – 19th Century Engineer Henry Maudslay and his Circle’ by David Waller, author and former Financial Times journalist, to the Surrey Industrial History Group at Church House Guildford, 20 Alan Turing Road, Guildford at 19:30. Details from Bob Bryson meetings@sihg.org.uk. Visitors welcome, £5

6th March
‘John Linnell (1792-1882): Finding glory in Surrey Landscape Painting’ by Iain McKillop to Epsom & Ewell History & Archaeology Society in St Mary's Church Hall, London Road, Ewell at 20:00. Visitors welcome: £4

7th March
‘Life and Labour in a Country Village – or Learn to Love your Ag Labs’ by Jane Lewis to Farnham & District Museum Society at United Reformed Church, South Street, Farnham at 19:45. Visitors welcome: £3

9th March
‘Wimbledon Salvation Army’ by Richard Smart to Merton Historical Society at St James’ Church Hall, Merton at 14:30. Visitors welcome: £2

11th March
‘The oral history project Ham is Where the Heart is' by Jill Lamb to the Richmond Local History Society at Duke Street Church, Richmond at 20:00. Visitors welcome: £4

12th March
‘Surrey on Film’ by Matthew Piggott to West Surrey Family History Society in United Reform Church, South Street, Farnham at 14:00.

13th March

14th March
‘Visits to Some Viking Sites in Denmark’ by Richard Watson to Kingston upon Thames Archaeological Society at Surbiton Library Halls at 20:00.

‘Researching from Newspapers’ by Ian Waller to West Surrey Family History Society in Woking Methodist Church Hall, Brewery Road, Woking at 19:50.

16th March
‘Tracing Huguenot Ancestry’ by Kathy Chater to West Surrey Family History Society in Camberley Adult Education Centre, France Hill Drive, Camberley at 14:00.

20th March
‘Uncovering the Secrets of 14 Local Churches’ by Alan Bott to Godalming Museum in The Octagon, St Peter and Paul, Borough Road, Godalming at 20:00. Visitors welcome: £5
21st March
‘Aspects of the Romano-British Tile Industry’ by David Bird to Farnham & District Museum Society at United Reformed Church, South Street, Farnham at 19:45. Visitors welcome: £3

25th March
‘Conan Doyle – the South Norwood Years’ by Bernard Winchester to Croydon Natural History and Scientific Society in the East Croydon United Reformed Church, Addiscombe Grove, Croydon at 19:45. Visitors welcome: £2

26th March
‘Up with the Lark: Agricultural Labourers’ by Ian Waller to West Surrey Family History Society in Ashley CofE Primary School, Ashley Road, Walton at 19:45.

DATES FOR BULLETIN CONTRIBUTIONS

There will be five more issues of the Bulletin in 2019. To assist contributors relevant dates are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copy date</th>
<th>Approx. delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>473 23rd February</td>
<td>28th March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474 27th April</td>
<td>30th May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475 29th June</td>
<td>1st August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476 14th September</td>
<td>17th October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477 9th November</td>
<td>12th December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Articles and notes on all aspects of fieldwork and research on the history and archaeology of Surrey are very welcome. Contributors are encouraged to discuss their ideas with the editor beforehand, including on the proper format of submitted material (please do supply digital copy when possible) and possible deadline extensions.
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