

Reviews

Shirley B. Aston. *A history of West Horsley: church and village.* Published by the Rev. H. W. Forder, The Rectory, West Horsley. 141 pp. £2. 25, plus 12p postage, obtainable from the author, Thielt, Farm Lane, East Horsley, or from the church after a service.

The sub-title of this history gives an indication of its author's intentions and viewpoint. It is primarily a history of St Mary's church, its rectors and its parishioners, written with the present day parishioners, including the young, in mind, and this explains the disappointing lack of precise bibliographical and documentary references. I understand these were deliberately excluded, partly on account of expense, but also because it was considered that a lot of footnotes would discourage the readers for whom it was intended. Miss Aston has, however, deposited a typescript list of references at the Guildford Muniment Room. A perusal of this list reveals how much careful research among original sources in various repositories has been carried out. Guildford Muniment Room is particularly rich in documents relating to West Horsley, including a Poor Rate list of 1573, a terrier of 1668 and rentals of the 14th, 17th and 18th centuries. Most of the Court Rolls of the manor are, however, in the John Rylands Library, Manchester.

The work is divided primarily into periods, under each of which there are sections on: the village, church patrons, church life, St Mary's church, parish clergy and (for later periods) church registers. If one is interested in a particular topic irrespective of period it is necessary to look in several places, but this is assisted by a fairly full index. For instance, the very interesting 13th century mural paintings on the west wall of the church are described and illustrated in the chapter headed 'In Norman and Mid-Medieval Times', but the discovery (1912) and restoration (1970) are dealt with in the last chapter. An index entry under 'Wall paintings' brings these and other references together. There are numerous illustrations, mainly of photographs taken by Michael Brown and John Stewart. The one map is rather inadequate and a larger, more detailed map would have helped those readers not familiar with the topography of this large parish.

There is a great deal of historical information in this book, much of it new and gleaned from wide researches. This is especially true of the later periods.

J. M. H.

John Aubrey. *The Natural History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey.* 1719, 5 vols. Reprinted, with an introduction by J. L. Nevinson. Kohler and Coombes, Dorking, 1975. £40

This is a photographic reprint of the very varied historical notes made by

Aubrey when he was riding round Surrey towards the end of the 17th century, and in view of the eleven pages of introduction by the president of the Surrey Archaeological Society an extensive review is not necessary. The work is handsomely produced with good paper and binding, and as John Evelyn says in volume 1, 'I cannot sufficiently applaud it.' A set kindly presented by the publisher can be borrowed by members of the SAS from the Library at Castle Arch, but the volumes are worthy of permanent possession. Indeed Aubrey can be dipped into with profit at almost any time.

T. E. C. W

G. J. Dawson. *The Black Prince's Palace at Kennington, Surrey, 1976.* (British Archaeological Reports 26.) 213 pp, 20 illustrations including plans. Price £3.90 post free.

British Archaeological Reports are an independent venture for the economical and speedy publication of lengthy reports that might otherwise experience publication difficulties or delay. Usually, the author provides a clean typescript to pre-determined standards on the internationally accepted A4 size and this is reproduced photographically. This reduces editorial improvement or interference to a minimum along with cost. The result is consequently no better than the author makes it: there is no opportunity for proof correction or expensive last-minute revision. Typing errors are inevitable and sometimes the layout, while obvious to the author, raises difficulties for the reader. The pottery report in the volume under review, for example, presents a number of problems.

The success of BAR shows that they fill a need. The need is occasioned partly, without doubt, by the long time some conventional publications take in the press but also, one suspects, by authors' desire for 'national' publication for material that would be more at home in a county journal. But at least this way some burden is taken from the backs of the publishing societies.

The titles offered by BAR are wide-ranging and include a number of items that might otherwise not have been published as well as many that would not have been published so quickly any other way. Publication in this way provides total customer choice—you only buy what interests you—in place of the 'captive' readership of a publishing society.

The volume under review details the relevant documentary evidence for, and gives an account of the excavation of, the Black Prince's Palace at Kennington. It also includes a full exposition of the finds made during the excavation. The text had not been offered to the SAS for publication.

Dr Dawson competently uses the available documentary evidence to draw a picture of extensive building operations on the site during the middle third of the 14th century which produced a complex of buildings that was not sub-

stantially altered before 1531. In 1531/32 the Palace was totally demolished by Henry VIII in order to use the building materials at Whitehall. However, in dealing with the problem of the existence or otherwise of buildings on the site before 1337 the documents are less helpful and Dr Dawson may have stretched the evidence a fraction beyond the justifiable limit. For example, he takes the documented re-tiling of the stable block in 1358 in conjunction with the absence of documentary mention of the stable before 1347 as evidence for the stables' existence before 1337 (p. 10). But we are told that the detailed Black Prince's Register only starts in 1346 (p. 14) and this leaves nine years in which the stables—an essential service building in any palace—could have been built without the need to postulate its pre-1337 existence. Other evidence from 1358 is, nevertheless, more convincing and does suggest that something stood on the site before 1337.

The nucleus of the Palace, including structures which Dr Dawson convincingly identifies as the hall, great chamber, kitchen and stables, was partly excavated in 1965-68 in advance of the total redevelopment of the site. Generally, the trenches dug were narrow incisions (Fig. 2) and we have to bear in mind that 1965-68 was in the days before substantial funds were available for urban archaeology (the whole excavation cost little more than £200). Dr Dawson is to be congratulated on his skilful interpretation of features often only glimpsed and his work at Kennington seems to show that excavation on this scale using volunteer labour *can* be considerably more cost effective than the currently fashionable area approach using machinery and hired labour. On the other hand, area excavation *might* have produced more evidence of the pre-1337 structures and would certainly have clarified some of the minor obscurities that Dr Dawson has had to struggle with in preparing his report. Whether this would have been a reasonable return for the money that would have been involved is another matter.

Dr Dawson argues the interpretation of the complex features of his site with conviction but not, alas, always with clarity. He leaves his conclusions interwoven with his necessarily lengthy argument and the report would have been greatly improved by the inclusion of a section setting out succinctly the architectural history of the site and leaving the reader to decide whether to take the author's conclusions on trust or to examine the argument.

The justification for publishing the argument in detail can only really be that the conclusions are sufficiently important or controversial to require public substantiation (bearing in mind that, in this case, the argument had been set out and lodged in thesis form). As the report is presented, the reader has to attempt to disentangle the conclusion from the argument before he can decide whether the conclusion is important. If one does take the trouble to do this, one is likely to finish with the impression that the conclusions are not too surprising and that the complex argument could have remained in thesis form.

The documentary and archaeological evidence is painstakingly correlated

at length but it can again be questioned whether this could have been left in thesis form and just summarised for publication.

The finds reports present much detailed and interesting background information that is often fascinating beyond its relevance to the history of Kennington Palace. The fact that this is so highlights one of the current constraints surrounding archaeology. There is a very real need for a series of comprehensive treatises on classes of finds on the lines of the BAR publications on Anglo-Saxon spearheads and clay pipes. At present, the sources to be scoured when tracking down the significance of a body of finds are legion and the worker is faced with a series of fascinating but time-consuming searches that have to be repeated for each individual site.

Inevitably, Dr Dawson can be accused of some over-zealous detail (was it really a good use of John Creswell's talents to have him draw, in superlative detail, eleven rusty nails and twelve pieces of twisted came?). But in places more detail or illustration would have helped—the reader's interests are not always those of the author. In many places, improved lay-out would have made the finds reports easier to use and understand. However, these reports will probably present useful source material for several years to come and I suspect that many more people will refer to Dr Dawson's report for this reason than for his somewhat recondite account of the building history of the Palace.

D. J. T.

S. E. D. Fortescue. *The Story of Two Villages: Great and Little Bookham.* 107 pp. Published by the author, 58 The Mount, Fetcham, 1975. £1. 50 plus postage.

This locally printed and lavishly illustrated little book in stiff paper covers could be read with interest by one who had never visited either of the Bookhams, and to the newcomer it is an ideal introduction. It is also the same size as our *Collections*. Most of the 111 illustrations are keyed to a numbered plan so that we may make a preliminary tour of the area before the author takes us 'Round and About' in Chapter III. The first chapter deals with the physical and historical setting, the second with the church, while the last describes the outlying areas of Polesden Lacey, Ranmore, and Slyfield. Five appendixes make up the hundred or so pages.

Although the book is very readable it is short and has few references. There is still need for a full history of Bookham.

T. E. C. W.

Joan Harding. *Four centuries of Charlwood houses.* 1976. 219 pp. Published by the Charlwood Society, and obtainable from the Hon. Lady Farrer, Charlwood Place Farm, Charlwood, Surrey, price £2. 50, plus postage, 20p.

When the reviewer was a student, there were many books available on sophisticated architecture but, apart from such pioneers as Barley and Peate, very few on vernacular building. Since the last war this omission has been largely repaired and nowhere more thoroughly than in Surrey where Miss Joan Harding founded and currently leads the Domestic Buildings Research Group, which has done such valuable work in recording the county's humbler buildings.

This book is an account of these buildings in a particularly rich area of half-timber: the parish of Charlwood. It is divided into three parts: a general introduction to vernacular building which is of far more than local interest, an alphabetical index of the village's historic structures, illustrated by thumb-nail sketches, and an exceedingly interesting register of inventories made at the deaths of some 32 of their former occupants.

The account appears accurate and comprehensive and is very well produced. It deserves to go into further editions. May we urge that, if this happens, an opportunity should be taken of revising the misleading illustration of English Bond on page 2 and of replacing the poor lettering below the drawings for which there is no excuse in these days when a wide variety of stencils and rub-on type-faces are available.

We hope that this excellent little book will inspire the production of similar volumes for other towns and villages in Surrey.

J. W. L. F.

Kingston upon Thames Register of Apprentices 1563-1713, edited, with an introduction by Anne Daly, 1974. (Surrey Record Society, Vol. 28.) 185 pp. £6 to non-members, plus postage.

Kingston is fortunate in the survival, among the archives of the Royal Borough, of the Register of Apprentices beginning in 1563, within a year of the Statute of Artificers (5 Eliz.c.4), and continuing without a break for 150 years. The Surrey Record Society too is fortunate in its editor of the volume, Miss Anne Daly (now Mrs. McCormack), Assistant Borough Archivist, whose careful calendar summarises the essential facts clearly and succinctly. Original entries which contain significant matter beyond the common form have been transcribed *verbatim*. In its early years the Register was used also for the Town Clerk's memoranda. Of these miscellaneous entries, admissions to freedom, a list of the town 'harnes' (1563/4) and a lease of 1597 have been calendared, while the presence of *quietus ests* and audited accounts is briefly noted without details.

Miss Daly has contributed a most useful Introduction and her outline (pp. x and xi) of *Apprenticeship in Kingston* provides an adequate background for the general reader. There is also a helpful note of other Kingston records relating to apprenticeship and of the Apprenticeship Registers in the Public Record Office, of which the Surrey entries for 1711-1731 were printed by the Surrey Record Society in 1929. The three

Ordinances of the Kingston Corporation, 1547/8, 1608 and 1635, governing the Trading Companies and conditions of apprenticeship, are printed in an Appendix.

Students of the social and economic history of Kingston must welcome this volume which makes available fresh information about the government, trade and occupational patterns of the town and its influence not only on Surrey but on neighbouring districts. For example, apprentices came from some forty Middlesex parishes to learn their trade in Kingston, mostly from the south and west of the county and, as might be expected, about one third of them from Hampton, Hampton Wick, Teddington and Twickenham. Although conditions of apprenticeship are occasionally, in the 16th and early 17th centuries, referred to as being according to the custom or manner of London, the Register reflects little actual intercourse with the City. Only four Kingston boys entered apprenticeships in London and 24 London apprentices came to Kingston to learn such trades as those of glover, brewer, maltster, draper, tailor, barber-surgeon, bricklayer, locksmith, blacksmith, cornchandler, wheelwright and cordwainer. Apprentices came also from 26 English and two Welsh counties and one Irish city (Dublin). Here is matter for the study of population movement and family history. What reasons, for example, in 1611/12, led William Hawkyns of Penmark, Glamorgan, and John Michell of Devon, to send their sons to Kingston to learn the art and mystery of joiner with James Curver, member of an already well-established family which was to provide three generations of master joiners? The position of women as reflected in the Register is predictable. Only seven girl apprentices are recorded, one being apprenticed to a seamstress, the remainder, probably pauper children, being set to learn housewifery or being designated 'maidservant'. The 1635 Ordinances, however, permitted a master's widow to retain her apprentices so long as she remained a widow and continued to practice her husband's trade. During the 150 years covered by the Register, 23 widows pursued their late husband's calling.

The illustrations are well chosen to show the change in form and writing of the entries during the period covered by the Register and they are reasonably legible despite the reduction in size. If a criticism could be made of the admirable indexes of persons, places and subjects, it is that in the last no distinction is made under the heading 'Trades and Occupations' between the trades of masters receiving apprentices and apprentices' parents or guardians. In so excellently prepared a text it is perhaps uncharitable to record the two uncorrected misprints detected while browsing through this interesting volume, namely those on p. x, 1413 for 1431, and on p. 138, 1565 for 1465.

E. D. M.