

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

English Place-Name Society, Volume XI. *The Place Names of Surrey*, by J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, in collaboration with Arthur Bonner. Cambridge University Press, 1934; 21s.; pp. xlvi + 445.

It is a first duty, and a great pleasure, to congratulate our Honorary Treasurer on the publication of this result of his researches. Place-names, we know, have formed only one of Mr. Bonner's archaeological activities: but they have claimed a large proportion even of his energies, and it must be very gratifying to him to see this work in print. Surrey antiquaries have been awaiting its publication for many years; occasional articles in these *Collections* have served only to whet their appetites; and in fact had it not been that the foundation of the Place-Name Society made possible a wider treatment of the subject by the collaboration of other experts with our County Specialist our own Society would probably have succeeded long ago in persuading Mr. Bonner to publish a volume under its auspices. Our patience is now rewarded by the appearance of a truly notable work, fortified by the learning of three editors in addition to Mr. Bonner and owing indebtedness to something like fifty more institutions and individuals, besides the school-teachers and school-children of Surrey and a grant from the British Academy.

The volume contains first a Preface, which gives us some idea of the formidable quantity of Authorities, printed and unprinted, that have been consulted; a long Introduction; three pages of notes on the Dialect of Surrey; and eleven pages in which are set out the abbreviations and phonetic symbols used in the text and the plan on which the latter is arranged. Then comes the main body of the work in 340 pages: this, following the system now generally recognized for place-name study, consists largely of a laborious listing and comparison of all known occurrences of every name in documents of every period. In the presentation of the resultant mass of material the Hundreds are here taken as major divisions, and within these the Parish Names are treated alphabetically, variant spellings being given in chronological order; but the

smaller 'names within the Parish' are grouped in, sometimes, so many as four divisions according as they are 'of primary historical or etymological interest', of 'topographical origin', 'names embodying some family name of Middle English or Early Modern English origin' and those 'of obvious origin or for which we have only very late forms'; moreover these 'names within the Parish' do not include 'field and minor names' which are the subject of treatment under five distinct headings in a later part of the book covering some fifty pages. Other supplementary matter deals with the elements found in Surrey Place-Names, their distribution and so forth. Then Professor Bruce Dickins on 'Animal-Head Names' and Mr. Bonner on our old friend 'Coldharbour', and again on the element 'Friday', add three appendices. Finally we have thirty pages of Index; or rather this is not final, for a pocket in the back cover contains a delightful large Map of Surrey Hundreds and Parishes and half a dozen small ones shewing the distribution of certain elements in names over the County.

After such an enumeration a modest reviewer can do little more than take breath and render thanks. It is a hard task to praise adequately labours so colossal. On the other hand he would be a bold man who ventured to engage such a battery of specialists on their own ground; nor shall I try to find from our own General Indexes, though I fancy it might be possible, some few poor minor names which even this elaborately planned attack has missed. Any comment must be based on the form in which the material is presented; and it will not, I hope, seem impertinent—it may even be of some use to the editorial board of the Place-Name Society—if I describe the impressions of an ordinary reader after some study of their latest volume. They may of course say that they are not interested in the ordinary reader, that their books are written by specialists for specialists; in which case I am out of court: but if this is not so, if some attention is to be paid to the needs of the unspecialised student for whom place-name study is only a part of the general problem of historical research, then I must venture to record a certain misgiving.

Frankly, in studying this volume I had an uncomfortable feeling that for many people it might be much more useful if it contained much less; that the information is so tightly packed as to be difficult of access, the method of arrangement so scientific that one needs a special training to find one's way about it. The Editors would not, of course, admit that any of the information here given to the world could properly be withheld; I can only suggest, after an honest attempt to get on terms with all the symbols, abbrevia-

tions, typographical conventions, headings and divisions, that if so much had to be said (and I am far from denying the importance of any of it), and if it could not be said in one volume without the use of an apparatus as elaborate as this, then it might have been better, even at the cost of slowing up production, to say it in two volumes. In a space half as long again as that employed here it should be possible to set out the material in a comparatively simple and straightforward way. Incidentally it might even be possible to enlarge a little the one part of the book which is at present deficient in detail—the Index.¹

In this connexion there is one question which I venture, very diffidently, to put to the Editors. I could not help wondering whether some of this apparatus, which has no doubt grown up with successive volumes of the Society's publications, might not be susceptible of improvement; and still more whether some of it was as a matter of fact necessary. I shall instance only one of several points at which, as it seemed to me, the creators had become the victims of their own machinery—the matter of Abbreviations. The table of these, in the volume before us, enumerates nearly 350; and the situation is aggravated by the fact that they are not very methodically devised.² Now admittedly a certain amount, even a good deal, of abbreviation is necessary in a work so packed with references to Authority as a modern Place-Name volume is bound to be; the Society cannot afford to print over and over again the titles of Books and Record Classes. But it should be recognised that abbreviations, unless they are so few that they can be readily memorised, are at best a stumbling-block to the reader; they should not be used when hardly any economy is effected by them (for instance, when a title occurs only once or twice); they should not take new forms when existing and well-known ones are available; and they should, whenever possible, be suggestive, so that an intelligent reader may be saved from turning back to the table at the beginning of the volume.

I trust I have not been led by the difficulties which I myself experienced in using this book into dwelling too long on matters of form. The first and last words in any notice of it must be admira-

¹ I realise, of course, the difficulty of including in the Index all the variant spellings of place-names; but if those at least which are abnormally different from the current form were included it would add greatly to the value of the book for many readers. And there are other omissions.

² Note, for example, the different systems of abbreviation employed for rendering the names of various counties. These, by the way, are required, I imagine, mainly in the Index of Places outside Surrey; and a glance at that Index will show that the ordinary abbreviations, with which every reader is familiar, could have been used here without any sacrifice of economy.

tion and gratitude for a truly vast amount of patient and erudite compilation. This is indeed an addition to all Surrey book-shelves.

HILARY JENKINSON.

Wealden Glass—The Surrey-Sussex Glass Industry. By S. E. Winbolt, M.A. Combridges, Hove, 1933; price 10s. 6d.

After Mr. Straker's *Wealden Iron* comes *Wealden Glass*, in fitting sequence, for glass was of later origin and confined to much narrower limits than iron, though not on that account of less interest. To Surrey readers the subject has a special attraction since it was in a Surrey parish—Chiddingfold—that the manufacture of English medieval glass was first established, and this same parish became the metropolis of the district and remained so until Kirdford rose to a position of almost equal importance. It is indeed a remarkable story how, within a small and remote corner of the Weald, astride the Surrey and Sussex border, glassmaking became localized and held on its way with varying fortunes during four hundred years. The story is an excellent illustration of the way in which local history links up with national and continental history. What little we know of the glassmakers is drawn chiefly from public records. The industry was established and largely maintained by foreigners, while the demand, particularly for glass of finer quality, was never fully met by the native supplies, and imports from abroad were considerable.

A complete survey of the subject compiled from documentary sources alone would have been justified, for since Mr. Giuseppi's article in the *Victoria County History of Surrey* it has never been comprehensively treated in detail. But the author has done much more than this. His volume is the fruit not only of historical and technical research, but of systematic field work. He and his helpers have carried on with conspicuous success the invaluable pioneer work of the Rev. T. S. Cooper and his daughter, Mrs. Halahan, and by dint of unremitting toil have discovered several new sites, besides identifying others that were doubtful. As a result he is able to throw much fresh light on the subject and bring the total of sites located, including those discovered since publication of this volume and recently reported in *The Times*, up to 30, of which 18 have been proved by excavation and the others with more or less certainty by finds or other evidence. The three latest sites are all in Sussex and bring up the total for that part of the district to 12 as against Surrey's 18. Other sites are suspected, and an appeal is made for more workers to take up the quest. To those archæologists who are seeking fresh fields to conquer and do not object to look for them in

the thick clay and jungle of the Weald, Mr. Winbolt has some valuable hints to offer. Another word of practical advice for the benefit of enthusiasts who are fresh to the task may not be amiss. On most land in the Weald that has been under cultivation fragments of glass, showing more or less iridescence, and lumps of vitreous slag will be found which at first sight might be taken to suggest the proximity of a glass-furnace. Hope so raised is usually deceptive. The probability is that the glass will prove to be the debris of labourers' bottles or escape from the domestic midden which has found its way abroad with farmyard manure; while the slag is more likely to be the refuse of a lime-kiln than of a glass-furnace.

The author divides the era of Surrey-Sussex glass into two major periods. The first and by far the longest extending over more than three centuries from 1226, when Laurence, the earliest glassmaker on record, obtained a grant of 20 acres of land at Chiddingfold, till the early years of Elizabeth's reign. This is again divided under centuries, and an interesting account is given of the glass masters whose names have survived, necessarily short owing to the scantiness of the records. The second, a correspondingly brief period of only eight years commencing in 1567, when Jean Carré, the Fleming, secured a licence from the Queen for 21 years to make "glass for glasinge." Carré brought over Huguenot refugee workmen, but died in 1572, and three years later his men migrated into Hampshire. This classification gives what at first sight appears to be unduly exaggerated importance to one short spell. Yet it must be confessed that Carré's technique showed great advance on that of his forerunners in the district, and his glass, if we may safely admit as his work the specimens found at Sidney Wood, Alfold, was correspondingly superior. Where they had for centuries relied on a flux of crude potash obtained from bracken ash he mixed barilla with the ash, while manganese, which was in use among the Egyptians in the second century A.D. as a means of neutralizing the green tint in glass, was apparently not employed here for that purpose before Carré's time.

Throughout the era the leading manufacturers were usually Frenchmen or Lorrainers. The conclusion emerges that the industry in this district, as in other Counties where it was set up, never took permanent root owing to the difficulty of training native workmen, and also to the anti-foreign feeling which at times broke out into open hostility. As late as 1585 a bill before Parliament to prevent the making of glass "by strangers and outlandish men" could only go as far as to provide for the employment of one Englishman against every two foreigners, while Carré's licence required him and his

partner to instruct Englishmen in the art which they were so slow to learn. Latterly another and growing cause of offence was the serious inroad made by the glass-houses on the Wealden timber supplies, which aroused the alarm of the iron founders, who made huge demands on this fuel for their own needs. It was the opposition excited by this alarm that proved the undoing of the industry, and led up to the proclamation of 1615 prohibiting the use of wood fuel in the glass-furnaces.

The topographical chapters (VI to IX) contain a detailed description of all the known sites and the author's experiences in hunting for them. Some of his adventures read like those of explorers in primitive country, and show that a stout heart and boundless patience are essential qualities if success is to be looked for.

There is a discussion at some length of the difficult question whether coloured glass as distinct from painted glass was made in England before the sixteenth century. The conclusion reached is that it was not made here in any quantity, and that the coloured fragments occasionally found on the Surrey-Sussex sites are waste from the collections of cullet or broken glass that were brought to the houses to be mixed with the raw ingredients of the batch in order to facilitate fusion, the coloured bits being scrapped. The problem, however, cannot yet be treated as solved. Laurence, our earliest Chiddingfold glassmaker, is named among those who provided both white and coloured glass for Westminster Abbey in the thirteenth century, and one may join the author in wondering why "if Normandy coloured glass was imported, Norman glassmakers in Sussex did not continue to make it" (p. 64).¹

The volume is richly illustrated and there are several useful sketch maps by the author to indicate the position of various sites explored by him. The distribution map at page 28 would be improved by showing the county and parish boundaries. The importance of accurate mapping is illustrated by his experience at Frome Copse, Chiddingfold. Though this site was discovered by Mrs. Halahan as lately as 1921 its position had been completely forgotten in the ten years following. Its rediscovery cost many days of dogged

¹ Mr. Winbolt has since found evidence which I understand disposes him to modify this view. He writes (June 1934) "At the present time I would vouch for the making of copper, ruby, and cobalt blue at Malham Ashfold (between 1480 and 1520), and if these, why not the other colours and shades? The same batch in a pot can produce two or three different colours with different treatment. I am equally sure that cobalt blue was produced at Sidney Wood. I now feel inclined to accept ruby as made at Hog Copse, and various colours made at Frome Copse by Schurterre, probably under special circumstances for a special purpose." Schurterre was a Chiddingfold maker of the fourteenth century.

search, owing to the omission of some essential details in the map published by her.

It is to be hoped that all the important sites will be marked on future editions of the 6-inch Ordnance Sheets, and some of them scheduled, or better still taken over, as Ancient Monuments, before they are wiped out by the spread of little bungalows that are cropping up menacingly in various parts of the district.

The only serious drawback is the absence of a glossary of technical and obsolete terms, of which there are many. Not all of these are explained in the text, and they are apt to baffle the general reader, who will consult the ordinary dictionary for their meaning usually in vain. This omission should be made good in a future edition, which if the demand for the book is equal to its merits should not be long delayed.

W. H.

Abstracts of the Ancient Muniments of the Whitgift Foundation, Croydon.—Compiled by Clarence G. Paget, 1934.

These abstracts were made by Mr. Paget at the wish of the Governors, who desired that a thorough scrutiny should be undertaken of the documents in the possession of the Foundation and a complete list formulated. A list was of course made by Miss Powell and published by the Surrey Record Society in their volume relating to Records of schools and other endowed institutions (1930), but that list only covers 37 pages, whereas Mr. Paget's abstracts cover 150 pages. The Court Rolls of Croham Manor, for instance, which are listed in the Surrey Records volume in a paragraph, are fully summarized in many pages of print, and some of the documents appear to be printed almost verbatim—a great advantage for those who have not the opportunity of inspecting the originals. The documents have been arranged in nineteen groups in the order of date in which each group of property was purchased by the Archbishop, or conveyed by other donors, followed by some general and miscellaneous groups. The first group relates to the purchase of the Checquer Inn by the Archbishop in 1595 for a site for his Hospital, and the documents go back to 1438. The following eleven groups relate to houses or lands in Croydon. No. XII relates to two houses in Northampton, XIII to the property in St. Paul's Churchyard which was the subject of the Barker deed reproduced in our *Collections* (ii. 99), XIV to the Manor of Croham bought by the Archbishop in 1601, with the Court Rolls already referred to, XV to XIX to other Croydon properties. No. XX includes among other matter the award to the Hospital under the Croydon Enclosure Act, dated

2 March 1801, XXI the original Letters Patent and Deed of Foundation. The rest relates to property acquired in recent times, and miscellaneous items.

The work appears to have been very carefully and thoroughly done, and the book is most commendably free from misprints.

To comment adequately on a volume of this kind intimate local knowledge is really required, but a few points of general interest may be noted. When the Hospital was founded, Croydon, like other places in Surrey at that time,¹ had still large areas of woodland, which were later brought under the plough. Thus we get Christian Field, which is 50 acres by estimation, of which 10 acres are arable and 40 acres wood (1609), and the great field called Fryth Field, 50 acres by estimation with 20 acres of coppice in the same (1593). (Is this represented by the two Thrift Fields, 16 and 9 acres, and Thrift Wood (wood) 20 acres in 1807?) In 1555 William Squery of Hanbery, Co. Wores., let a house and 32 acres to William Ray of Croydon, butcher, for 21 years at £7 6s. 8d. a year, the tenant to find meat and drink and fuel for the landlord, his wife and three servants, twice a year for a fortnight, when they visited Croydon. The Croydon inns were presumably not tolerable.

Mr. Paget's statement in the Introductory Note, that "Under the license" (*i.e.* apparently the Letters Patent of 22 Nov. 1595) the Hospital "were debarred from acquiring lands held *in capite*, a tenure which necessitated the provision of armed men in time of war," does not seem to be correct. Tenure *in capite* (which like tenure by knight service had long ceased to mean much more than a liability to make certain payments) is not referred to in the abstract of the Letters Patent. In 1593 Parliament had legislated to make grants and bequests to be made in fee simple for the use of the Poor (Section 27 of 35 Eliz., Cap. 7). This was probably intended to provide for grants in socage free from the burdensome incidents of tenure *in capite* and without a license in mortmain. The Act was, however, ineffective, and in 1597 Parliament again legislated to enable hospitals to hold freehold land of any person whatsoever, so that the same exceed not the yearly value of £200 above all charges and reprises, and so as the same be not held of the Queen in chief, or of Her or anyone else by knight service, without license or writ of *ad quod damnum*, the Statute of Mortmain or any other law notwithstanding (39 Eliz., Cap. 5). This clearly bars tenure *in capite*, as did probably in intention the ineffectual legislation of 1593, and leaves hospitals to hold in socage, the residual tenure. It is clear from the preamble of the Act of 1597 that its purpose

¹ See for an instance the case of Chessington in 1623. (*S.A.C.* xli. 38.)

was to enable that to be done under Statute which had previously involved continual applications to the Crown for license, and the Act presumably crystallized the existing practice of the Crown in such matters as the £200 limit. The abstract of the Letters Patent contains no reference to statute, but that of the Deed of Foundation (1599) recites the Statute of 1597.

HENRY LAMBERT.

The Value of Local History. By Sir Henry Lambert, K.C.M.G., C.B., F.S.A. Printed by Pullinger, Epsom, 1934. 1s.

Sir Henry Lambert is to be heartily thanked for allowing the inaugural address he gave as President of the Mid-Surrey Branch of the Historical Association on 25 May 1934 to be printed. In dealing with the value of local history it was fitting, having regard to the venue of this Branch, that Sir Henry should have taken his illustrations almost entirely from Surrey and more particularly from that part of the county of which, as our members know well, he has a very special knowledge. In the study of local history he shows us we are brought into contact with a great variety of subjects touching the lives of ordinary men which cannot fail to help us to understand better the wider questions which fill the history books. From a brief description of the mid-Surrey parishes both north and south of the Downs and what their shape has to tell us of medieval and even earlier agriculture, he proceeds with many a reference to point out the light the manorial and other local records can throw on such subjects as the condition of the land and its inhabitants at different periods, the cost of their houses, their food, the amount of personal liberty they enjoyed, the regulation of the affairs of their villages, their general state of health, their roads and means of travel and transport, and the payment of tithes.

Altogether we have here a very readable little work which cannot fail to be stimulating to local historians not only of Surrey, but of every county throughout the kingdom. Nevertheless, Sir Henry has a warning to give. In the very diffusion of the subject-matter there is a danger, and the ideal local historian, he tells us, has unfortunately not yet been born. He can never accumulate sufficient evidence to reach binding conclusions on wide issues. To attempt generalizations from such evidence as he has collected is never safe. But the study of local history does enable us to understand more thoroughly the state of affairs at some time in one particular place and, as Sir Henry concludes, "should help to give reality and substance to our reconstruction of the past of the whole Country."

M. S. G.

The Parish Church of St. Mary, Byfleet. By Leonard R. Stevens. 1934. 1s.

This is another of those useful little guides to our parish churches of which we have happily had occasion of recent years to notice several in these pages. In addition to putting the parishioner or chance visitor in possession of all the existing features of interest in these churches they cannot fail, by recording them and creating his interest in them, to help their preservation from a better fate than has always been their fortune in the past.

In the present instance all these features at Byfleet are succinctly but adequately described and there are a few extracts from the vestry minute books, the 1552 inventory of the goods and an annotated list of the rectors from the reign of Henry III to the present day. Of special value is the detailed list of the successive alterations made to the building during the last hundred years or so, with ground plans of the church showing the 1841 alterations and again those about the year 1875. There are several reproductions of drawings in the British Museum of the church both inside and out in or about 1829 and another of Cracklow's print. In addition the illustrations, which are ten in number, include views of the church as it is to-day and the fine fifteenth-century brass to Thomas Teylar.

We are asked to state that copies of this guide can be obtained from the local stationers at Byfleet or from the author at Weycote, Byfleet.

M. S. G.

A History of Lingfield.—Edited by Arthur B. Hayward and Stanley Hazell. Tunbridge Wells, Courier Printing and Publishing Co. Ltd., 1933.

This is an excellent handbook and should give the ordinary resident in or visitor to one of the least spoilt and most interesting of Surrey parishes all the information he is likely to want respecting its history and ancient buildings. The editors make no claim to special antiquarian knowledge or research, but they appear to have omitted none of the available sources already in print and have in addition given many valuable particulars from the parish register, the vestry books and other local records. The whole has been very carefully planned, so that with the help of the index it is very easy to find one's way about the book. As a result of a movement to take into the parish of Lingfield the part of the neighbouring parish of Crowhurst, south of the railway line from Godstone, which would include

that church and Crowhurst Place, the editors have added some description of those and other buildings in the latter parish.

The book is plentifully illustrated with maps and photographs of buildings, monuments and documents, all admirably reproduced. It is a pity, however, that the editors did not obtain some expert opinion as to the practice with regard to royal charters and letters patent before they permitted the photograph of the ordinary abbreviated symbol for "irrotulatus"—the certificate of the due enrolment of the document—at the foot of the Cawarden grant to be described as the signature of King Henry VIII.

M. S. G.

Monastic Paving Tiles, with special reference to tiles discovered at Shulbrede Priory, by Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede and the Honble. Matthew Ponsonby, reprinted from the *Sussex Archaeological Collections* (price 1s.), is a paper of more than purely local interest, as it considers the question how patterns came to be distributed. Some of the Shulbrede tiles were, it seems, undoubtedly made at Waverley. On the other hand, we cannot assume that the recurrence of the pattern of the fine Chertsey pavement at Halesowen near Birmingham implies that the tiles were made at Chertsey. The paper, which carefully examines the scanty existing evidence, suggests some conclusions as to the general practice of monasteries. It is well illustrated.

H. L.

Economic History.—The January number contains an interesting article by the Rev. Etienne Robo on "Wages and Prices in the Hundred of Farnham in the Thirteenth Century," based on the Pipe Rolls of the Bishop of Winchester. The writer concludes that money had a much higher purchasing power in the thirteenth century than is generally realized, and he suggests 40 or even 50 to 1 as representing the value then and now, that is, if we had the same standard of living now. The prices collected are not tabulated owing to their bulk, and the writer rightly insists on the misleading nature of medieval price averages. But it is impossible to read through the figures given without wondering how far they can be taken at their face value. The cost of harvesting per acre, for instance, is given for wheat as 4*d.* in 1257 and 6*d.* in 1262, whereas barley stood both years at 6*d.*, and oats fell from 3½*d.* to 3*d.* and rye rose from 4*d.* to 4½*d.* Was this the cost of feeding the customary labour or of free labour? Was the customary labour already commuted? If not, is the cost of labour omitted? Again, ordinary

digging was paid at prices between 1285 and 1300 varying from $1d.$ to $2\frac{1}{2}d.$, and in 1285 it was paid $1d.$, $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ and $2d.$ Why did all changes in wages go by $\frac{1}{2}d.$ steps? The farthing never appears in these accounts except when averages are worked out, but the increase of $1d.$ to $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ is an increase of 50 per cent. at a step.

H. L.