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INTRODUCTION

A research project was undertaken at Eastbrook Primary School (formerly Manor Hall Middle School), West Sussex by the author from July to November 2008, assisted by volunteers from the Southwick Society, the Sussex Archaeological Society, the Worthing Archaeological Society, and the Brighton and Hove Archaeological Society. The investigation was focused on the school playing field (NGR TQ 2445 0555), which lies close to and south of the site of Southwick Roman villa (Fig. 1). The villa site, today occupied by a Methodist church and related buildings, and several houses, is a Scheduled Monument (No. 27099), but the school and playing field lie outside the scheduled area.

The project originated as a local education and community event during National Archaeology Week 2008, with a resistivity survey across part of the playing field (recorded on the West Sussex HER) and excavation of a test-pit in the north-west corner of the field. With the support of the school, the project continued as a research excavation, undertaken at intervals over the summer and autumn 2008.

HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

The Roman villa at Southwick, dating from c. AD 75/80, is one of a group of elite Roman residences built in rural and coastal Sussex during the late first century AD (Rudling 1998, 41–6; Rudling 1985, 77). Like other early high-status buildings in Sussex, most closely the Roman Palace at Fishbourne, Southwick villa was lavishly designed, and reflected contemporary Mediterranean rather than local or indigenous styles of building and decoration (Winbolt 1931; 1932; Rudling 1985, 77–8). Recent fieldwork at Fishbourne has shown that detached buildings were also present beyond the Palace (Manley & Rudkin 2003; 2006), and it was hoped that similar outbuildings might be detected at Southwick.

Southwick villa has a long history of investigation, spanning nearly two centuries to date (Rudling 1985; West Sussex HER), and the excavations of the 1930s, notably beyond the villa site, are of particular relevance to the current project. The whole villa was extensively excavated in 1931, in a part-rescue excavation, when Manor Hall Road was built over the southern part of the site (Winbolt 1931; 1932; Collingwood & Taylor 1932, 219–21; Winbolt 1935, 25–8; cf. 1847 plan, ESRO ACC3412/3/43 and /718). Small-scale excavation was also undertaken in 1933, to the south of the main villa. The location and scale of the area investigated were not recorded precisely, and digging was halted by house construction (Fig. 1, Area A) (Ward 1934, 90; Collingwood & Taylor 1934, 217; cf. Ward 1938, 118). This work revealed flint wall foundations, which the excavator interpreted as ‘the walls of a separate building’, in an area of the site perhaps occupied by ‘workshops and yards’. Further excavation south of the south-west corner of Manor Hall Road at that time revealed ‘an angle of a flint and mortar wall’, with pottery mostly from the late first to early second century AD and two silver-plated coins of c. AD 80 (Ward 1934, 90; Rudling 1985, 74).

Near the same location, loose flints were found around 1938 during excavation (road works) in the middle of Southwick Street, interpreted as evidence of ‘the outbuildings of the villa extending in this direction’ (Fig. 1, Area B) (Ward 1938, 118). These interventions were undertaken close to the main villa site, and do not appear to have extended as far south, or south-east, of the villa as the 2008 excavation.

THE SITE

The main villa site today is mostly destroyed due to subsequent building development, with nothing visible surviving above ground. The Eastbrook Primary School playing field is the largest area of undeveloped land in close proximity to the villa, having remained an isolated open space, and represented an excellent opportunity to investigate the immediate Roman environs. The field overlies a former apple orchard and part of an earlier large market garden; this market garden was known as ‘The Roman Field’, and also contained the main villa to the north (Winbolt 1926, 88–9; see also historic OS maps). Reference to a sketch plan from the early twentieth century suggests that a wall extended due south from the main villa site as far as the orchard boundary, within the area of the modern playing field, but this has not been confirmed (Winbolt 1926, 89–90; cf. Cunliffe 1971, 145). The 2008 dig at Southwick, though small, was the first excavation undertaken at a distance from the main villa since the interventions in 1933 and 1938.

A test-pit measuring 1 m by 1 m was excavated in the north-west corner of the playing field (Fig. 1) (part of the former market garden), the area closest to the main villa itself. The test-pit was later extended to 2 m by 1.6 m, the south-east corner of the completed trench lying 4.35 m south of the adjacent northern garden wall, and the north-east corner 3.8 m east of the western garden wall. Upon backfilling, a blue tarpaulin, with a layer of sand above, was buried at the base of the trench, preserving the remains and marking the location.
EXCAVATION RESULTS

The excavation (site code SWK08) revealed several archaeological features of significance (Figs 2 and 3). Beneath the topsoil [1] and subsoil [2] in the southern portion of the trench was a clayey layer [3], which contained [cut 5] a section of unmortared wall [4] of flint, chalk and some tile pieces. This rubble-wall foundation had unabraded pottery sherds of c. 50 BC–AD 70 next to it (see Finds section, below), in direct association with animal bones including a cow jaw and marine shells, notably mussels, suggesting food refuse discard. The tile and pottery probably indicate that this is a Roman wall, of first-century AD date.

Two other short stretches of wall, also of flint and chalk,
appear to intersect this main wall, one [10] in the north-east corner at a right-angle, suggesting a possible turn in the wall or a thinner internal joining wall, the other [7] less clearly related, extending [cut 8] from the baulk at an angle.

North of the main wall was a chalk surface [12] that appears to be a rammed floor. These features may perhaps represent an estate yard (Winbolt 1932, 17; Cunliffe 1973, 81–2) or boundary wall (Winbolt 1935, 27; 1932, 15; Black 1987, 104, 240). However, the border of the chalk surface, enclosed within the main and north-east walls, was overlaid by loose mortar [11] and some pieces of daub, suggesting an internal skirting or the interior facing materials of the walls. Fragments of roof tiles were found on both sides of the main wall (see Finds section, below), indicating that
the structure may originally have been a roofed space. Taken together, the two enclosing walls and chalk floor suggest a room or self-contained building, with pottery and food refuse outside (cf. Ward 1934, 90), and evidence of an interior wall surface within. The pottery in the deposit [6] over the floor and deposit [9] over the adjoining wall suggests that the building went out of use around the third century, matching the established dating scheme for the main villa (Rudling 1985, 78). It is not clear how large the building was, but both walls extend further into the baulk.

THE FINDS

The finds considered here best indicate the date and form of the structure discovered, from the two deposits [3] and [6] either side of the main wall. All finds are discussed in the full report, which has been deposited with the West Sussex HER and the Southwick Society (Manor Cottage Heritage Centre, Southwick).

POTTERY

Twenty-nine sherds of pottery were recorded from [3] and [6] by Dr Malcolm Lyne (Table 1). Those from [3] are of Iron Age and Roman date, generally with fresh breaks and unabraded, such as a decorated sherd of a jar (grog-tempered East Sussex Ware, R1A), c. 50 BC–AD 50, and a rim sherd of a necked jar (Arun Valley Greyware, R3), c. AD 43–70 (Fig. 4, nos 1 and 2). Context [6] contained Roman and a few medieval sherds, some abraded, suggesting later disturbance. The pottery fabrics from these contexts are listed in Table 2.

CERAMIC BUILDING MATERIAL

A total of 107 fragments of Roman ceramic building material were examined from [3] and [6] by Dr Ian Betts.

The identified Roman tile types are either tegula and imbrex roofing tile or brick. A tile from [6] has two faint parallel lines which could represent combed keying. Certain roofing tiles and bricks from these two contexts seem to be first century AD, based on their dimensions and the date of the associated pottery, while the combed box-flue may be a little later.

A few fragments of abraded daub were also recovered from [3] and [6]. Three pieces from [6] have mortar attached. A relief-patterned tile (Fig. 4, no. 3), unstratified (from the baulk), was also found, keyed with die 21, one of the ‘London-Sussex’ group already known from Southwick villa (Rudling 1985, 82–83, fig. 7 no. 30). It is late first century AD in date, broadly contemporary with the (Period 2) Palace at Fishbourne, where tiles with other London-Sussex dies were employed (Ernest Black pers. comm.).
Table 1. Pottery from contexts [3] and [6] (Malcolm Lyne).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Date range</th>
<th>No. of sherds</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IA1</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>c. 300 BC–0*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IA2</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>c. 300 BC–0*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1A</td>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>c. 50 BC–AD 50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Decorated rings/chevrons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1A</td>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>50 BC–AD 250</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1B</td>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>50 BC–AD 250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1B</td>
<td>Open form</td>
<td>Late Iron Age–250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Necked jar</td>
<td>c. 43–70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Beaker</td>
<td>c. 50–100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>c. 50–100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RGX</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>c. 50–150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Necked jar</td>
<td>c. 43–70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROX</td>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>c. 43–200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1A</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c. 43–110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1B</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c. 120–200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Beaker</td>
<td>c. 50–150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Cooking pot</td>
<td>c. 1200–1550</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Cooking pot</td>
<td>c. 1200–1550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The flint-tempered Iron Age fabrics IA1/IA2 are generally dated to the Middle Iron Age with not much overlap with grog-tempered ESW, but here 50 years have been added to their terminal date.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric/Overlap</td>
<td>IA1</td>
<td>Handmade rough but regular fabric with moderate &lt;2.00 mm calcined-flint filler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IA2</td>
<td>Handmade smooth black fabric with profuse &lt;1.00 mm calcined-flint filler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Coarse</td>
<td>R1A</td>
<td>Grog-tempered East Sussex Ware with siltstone grog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1B</td>
<td>East Sussex Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Arun Valley Greywares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RGX</td>
<td>Miscellaneous very-fine-sanded greywares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROX</td>
<td>Miscellaneous very-fine-sanded oxidised wares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1A</td>
<td>South Gaulish Samian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1B</td>
<td>Central Gaulish Samian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Silt-tempered polished pink fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Silt-tempered micaceous grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Sandy grey to black with profuse &lt;0.50 mm multi-coloured quartz filler fired rough pink to red-brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Pottery and tile.
CONCLUSION

The discovery of part of a detached structure in the playing field extends the findings of the 1933 and 1938 excavations, and indicates that a building was present south-east of the southern villa wing, as well as those to the south-west found in the 1930s. The original axis of entrance to the villa was through the west wing (Fig. 1, rotated 90 degrees left), these buildings being set back to the right of the villa, perhaps in part even facing the villa (Fig. 1, Area B; cf. Manley & Rudkin 2003), as approached in Roman times. It appears that this area contained several lower-status outbuildings, perhaps used for farming or storage, or accommodation for servants or slaves on the villa estate (Johnston 2004, 24–7).

The discovery of Iron Age and transitional Roman pottery in association with the first-century AD wall is also of significance, as the pre-Roman development of the villa site is unclear (Rudling 1985, 74–8). Similarly, while it is assumed that this building is contemporary with the main villa, the early pottery may suggest, as at Fishbourne (Manley & Rudkin 2005), a pre-villa stage, or a ‘proto’ phase of construction, at Southwick.

Archive and acknowledgements

A copy of the full excavation report has been deposited with the West Sussex HER and the Southwick Society (Manor Cottage Heritage Centre, Southwick). All the finds from the excavation have been deposited with the Southwick Society for permanent storage, with significant items displayed.

For their kind assistance, particular thanks to Jane Russell, Malcolm Lyne, Ian Betts, Julie Scott and Eastbrook Primary School, the Southwick Society committee, and the volunteer excavators.
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A medieval pot from Milton Street, East Sussex

Luke Barber
Research Officer, Sussex Archaeological Society, Bull House, 92 High Street, Lewes BN7 1XH

In October 2002 a complete, though fragmented, cooking pot was recovered during building works to the rear of the house ‘Green Willow’, Back Lane, Milton Street in the lower Cuckmeree valley (TQ 534 039). The owner, Mr Christopher Ann, was having a cellar dug for a new studio to the rear of the main house. The excavations, which measured some 8 × 5 × 3 m, cut deeply into the underlying chalk and at a depth of about 2.3 m the complete vessel was found sitting in an upright position. An examination of a photograph taken when the rim of the pot was first exposed shows a distinctly circular area of dark grey fill around the pot rim, suggesting the vessel had been in a well shaft of some 800 mm diameter cut into the chalk. Thanks are due to Mr Ann for reporting the find and allowing the pot to be studied. The vessel (Fig. 1) has now been returned to Mr Ann for display in the new studio cellar.

The general lack of medieval pottery from the lower Cuckmeree valley means this vessel is of some interest. The pot is in a medium-fired fabric tempered with sparse to moderate sub-angular multicoloured (white, grey, brown) flint to 1.5 mm but no sand. It has a grey core with dull orange-brown/buff to dark grey patchy surfaces and appears to have been wheel-finished. Despite its large size (300 mm diameter rim), the exterior surface shows faint signs of sooting to within 80 mm of the rim, indicating that at some point in its life it was used for cooking. However, white lime-scale deposits on the interior suggest that it also once held water, though whether this was for cold storage or for heating is uncertain.

The fabric and simple everted rim would be in keeping with a date in the first half of the twelfth century, if not the end of the preceding century. The lack of sand in the fabric would be in keeping with this, and the general form belongs...
Fig. 1. Medieval pot from Milton Street.

to Frere’s Group III at Canterbury, dated to the first half of the twelfth century (Frere 1954, 132) and can be paralleled at Portchester (Cunliffe 1976) either side of the Conquest. However, close dating of Sussex Saxo-Norman pottery is still notoriously difficult. A number of vessels with similar fabrics/rims are known of from Lewes, but most are not yet published (Barber 2009) and those that are lack close reliable dating (Freke 1976, fig. 3, no. 18).

Without a more detailed study of the site the exact context of the find is difficult to ascertain. Certainly, at a depth of seven foot the pot could not have been dropped down the well into water — the height of the site, at about 28 m O.D., would suggest that the water-table would be notably deeper. It may be that the well partially collapsed and was abandoned, and the pot was dropped down what remained of the open shaft. The presence of some small mammal bones within the vessel certainly suggests that the feature remained open as a trap for a while. Whatever the case, this vessel is a welcome vessel certainly suggests that the feature remained open as a trap for a while. Whatever the case, this vessel is a welcome addition to the known medieval vessels from the area and highlights the potential for early medieval remains in the hamlets of the lower Cuckmere valley.
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Wildene, a hitherto unidentified Domesday Book holding in Hartfield Hundred

M. J. Leppard
20 St George’s Court, East Grinstead, RH19 1QP

Wildene, in Hartfield Hundred in Domesday Book (Morris 1976, 10.59), is not even mentioned in Mawer and Stenton’s standard work on Sussex place-names and has only once been discussed in print, together with Wildetone, the as yet unidentified ‘parent’ of Sprchrhedene in the adjacent hundred of East Grinstead (Morris 1976, 10.101).

In that discussion, in an article entitled ‘Wildetone and Wildene in Domesday Book — settlements in the wilderness?’, Pam Combes (1999) argues against Wildetone as a variant form of Willingdon, and for wilde, ‘wild’, as the first element in both Wildetone and Wildene. I have no suggestion for identifying Wildetone, but I believe I have located Wildene. I also propose an alternative interpretation of the first element in the two names.

In c. 1150, a confirmation in the cartulary of Lewes Priory of William Malfeld’s gift half a century earlier of half a hide called Posingwerda with the men dwelling on it and wood and all appurtenances, specifies these men: ‘a man, William by name, dwelling there and another William who used to dwell at Wyelden’ (Salzman 1932, 117). In the days before hereditary surnames there had to be other ways of distinguishing persons of the same name, but even so ‘who used to dwell’ is unusual. The implications are that this William is Malfeld’s to give and that Malfeld had some knowledge of him before making this donation, implying in turn that Wyelden was, or had been, Malfeld’s also.

As another document in the cartulary, a licence granted in 1334, makes clear, Posingwerda (here spelt Posingworth) was in Waldron (Salzman 1932, 114). It is duly discussed under that parish by Mawer and Stenton (1930, 407) as Posingworth or, in an alternative form in popular use, Posingford. On another page (368) they explain that Posingford Farm in Hartfield parish was part of the manor of Possingworth in Waldron, with a family of that name recorded (in the form Possingworth) in Hartfield hundred in the subsidy roll of 1327. This strongly suggests that Wyelden was the original name of Posingford Farm and corresponds to Domesday Book’s Wildene (or some part of it).

Given the well-known difficulties the Domesday Book scribes had in spelling place-names they heard uttered by informants who spoke Old English, if Wildene stood alone it would be impossible to tell whether the second element in its name was denu, ‘valley’, or dunn, ‘seasonal woodland pasture’, but (if the argument so far is accepted) the form Wyelden and Posingford’s being a High Wealden outlier of Possingworth make the latter more probable.

It also seems to me more likely that, rather than wilde, the first element in Wildene is wald or weald, ‘forest’ (in a non-technical sense), possibly strengthened by its being the first element in Waldron (Mawer and Stenton 1930, 405). This interpretation has been rightly challenged as, in effect, discounting both the <i> in Wildene and the <y> in Wyelden, but I have been advised that both forms could be taken as attempts at representing the dative singular of weald. As I...
am not an expert in linguistics, I cannot offer any further
defence of my suggestion, though I can hope that this note
may stimulate further study by those who are.

I strongly suspect that it is the first element in Wildetone
also, as it certainly is in Wall Hill Farm, north of Forest Row,
which, through a sequence of place-name forms, I have
identified as the successor to Sperchedene (Leppard 1996, 6–7).

Acknowledgement
I am grateful to the anonymous referee for guidance in revising
the penultimate paragraph of this note.
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Three place-name related
Sussex surnames

M. J. Leppard
20 St George’s Court, East Grinstead, RH19 1QP

**HELDELE**

In *The surnames of Sussex* Richard McKinley states that
topographical surnames (derived from words for features of
the landscape) and by-names (non-hereditary surname
equivalents) were numerous in the county in the Middle
Ages (McKinley 1988, 142). Some were widespread and have
survived to the present. Others, the names of two or three
persons, probably mostly never became hereditary and have
often not survived. Among the rare topographical names in
Sussex that he cites is atte Heldele (meaning ‘glade or wood
on a slope’), with a reference to the subsidy rolls (Hudson
1909, 202). This is the entry, in 1327, for John atte Heldele
in the Hundred of East Grinstead.

In fact this name is recorded as borne by seven people
in East Grinstead, starting with William de Eldelee in 1255,
a surety with several other bearers of local names to an
agreement concerning land just over the county border
in Tandridge. It is last noted in 1388, when John Heldele
was returned as one of East Grinstead’s two members
of parliament. He is the only one of the seven to be named
without a prefatory ‘atte’ or ‘de’, which, with the passage of
one and a third centuries since the first record of the name,
suggests it had become an hereditary surname (Bullock &
Palmer 1938; Stenning 1881, 107).

The name originated as a place-name, however, long
before 1255. The Hide of Heldeleia in East Grinstead was
given to Lewes Priory by William Count of Mortain in
in c. 1103–6, a north–south strip of land along the eastern side
of the River Medway stretching from Hailey bridge (NGR TQ
365362) to Willetts Bridge (TQ 382345). I have traced the
history of this hide and its components and attempted to
map it in an article in the East Grinstead Society’s Bulletin.
The name survives in Hurley Farm at the northern end of
the original strip, having endured some 30 variations in spelling
(Leppard 2004).

As a surname, therefore, atte Heldele can be reclassified
as locative (derived from a specific place-name) and probably
hereditary, though now long obsolete.

**DALLINGRIDGE**

This name is not mentioned by McKinley. Professor Nigel Saul
has stated that ‘The earliest member of the family to figure in
the records is Roger … in an extent of Ashdown Forest made
in 1274’ (Saul 1995, 123).

Roger is in fact recorded rather earlier, around the middle
of the century, as a witness to a grant of land in West Hoathly
but, more important, the name is found a generation earlier in
a significantly different form. In c. 1230 John de Halinggerige
is a witness to a gift of the land of Ashurst or Hashurst in
East Grinstead and in c. 1255, as John Alingerugge, he is a surety
alongside William de Eldelee in the agreement concerning
land in Tandridge mentioned above. Since the unspirited
form of Heldele is found only in the latter document, it may
be that Alingerugge is also anomalous and Halinggerige
the more authentic form (Holgate 1925, quoting TNA:PRO
E40/14137; Salzmann 1932, 83).

However that may be, Dallingridge seems to have
absorbed a prefatory ‘de’ rather than being the original form
of the name. If so, the etymology proposed by the English
Place-Name Society, *Daedelingahrycg* ‘ridge of Daedel’ or ‘of
Daedel’s people’, is invalidated, as I have noted elsewhere.
It was already doubtful; the editors, whose earliest citation
is ‘Daedlingregg’ from an Assize roll of 1271, acknowledged
that *Daedel* is ‘not on record’, though it ‘would be a regular
pet diminutive of an Old English personal name in Daed’. I
cannot, however, suggest an alternative etymology (Mawer
& Stenton 1930, 328; Leppard 2000).

**GRINSTEAD**

For McKinley this is one of many surnames which could be
from Sussex place-names, though in some cases they could
have alternative origins, all surviving in Sussex to the present
as the surnames of more than one or two people.

In all the medieval examples in the county that I have
found, the place-name is invariably prefaced by ‘de’, so any
isolated instance could be a by-name rather than an hereditary
surname.

Starting with Ralph of Grinstead, from whom Lewes
Priory received a saltern in Bramber before 1121, they are
almost all in West Sussex, where Richard de Grenstede
was particularly active in property transactions in the 1220s,
mostly near Chichester. It is not surprising therefore that in the subsidy rolls the name is found in the Hundred of West Grinstead: John de Grinestode in 1296, Griffin and Thomas in 1327, and Griffin again in 1332. Their leading position in most of the lists and their commensurate wealth suggest that they were descendants of the earlier de Grensteds, with an established hereditary surname (Round 1888, 13; Salzman 1902, 176, 181, 191, 298; Hudson 1909, 66, 160, 273).

In East Sussex I have found only two, isolated, instances of laymen with the name: c. 1140 Walter de Grenstede, a witness to a gift to Lewes Priory of land in Langport near Eastbourne, and 1327 William de Grenstede in the vill of Balsdean near Brighton. The former could be a by-name, not necessarily originating in West Grinstead, but the latter more probably bears the surname of the family from that place (Salzman 1932, 175; Hudson 1909, 171).

Among the clergy, with their mobile careers, it would normally be impossible to suggest their place of origin with any confidence, but I believe there are two who originated in East Grinstead even though they seem to have by-names rather than surnames. Those ordained by Archbishop Peckham in churches in his peculiar jurisdictions included Richard de Grinstede, acolyte in December 1286, sub-deacon in Lent 1287 and priest in September 1287, and William de Grenstede, acolyte in December 1287. Ordinands are normally ordained by their diocesan; the archbishops had a peculiar enclave (known as the Hamlet) in the parish of East Grinstead, whereas West Grinstead was wholly in Chichester. Moreover the acolytes in Lent 1287 included Richard le Broc de Grenstede, and a probably related Richard le Brok occurs in the Liberty of Leicester in the Hundred of Rushmondon (but within the parish of East Grinstead) in the 1296 subsidy roll. I have developed the argument of this paragraph more fully in its local context elsewhere (Martin 1885, 1041, 1042, 1047, 1044; Hudson 1909, 171; Leppard 2002).

From time to time letters are received in East Grinstead from people in the U.S.A. with Grinstead ancestors who believe they took their surname from the town (or, in one case, gave it to the town). One has to tell them that almost certainly West Grinstead was the place concerned.
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The earliest royal visit to the City of Brighton and Hove? 1

Michael Ray
24 Brangwyn Drive, Patcham, Brighton BN1 8XD
mgi.ray@ntlworld.com

An error in the calendaring of a royal patent has led to an early, perhaps the earliest recorded, royal visit to the Brighton area being overlooked. Although the uncrowned Charles II fled from England to France after his defeat at the Battle of Worcester, having spent his last night in Brighton, the arrival of the Prince Regent and his continuing commitment to Brighton, as George IV, is usually perceived as the first time the royal family became involved with the area now encompassed by the City of Brighton and Hove.

However, the first known visit by a monarch to the ‘city’ happened much earlier, and it was Patcham that was the destination. On the 12 September 1302, the man who was arguably England’s greatest medieval king, Edward I, stopped there. It is possible that Edward knew of Patcham. His longest-serving Archbishop of Canterbury, John Pecham, was born there but he had died ten years earlier. Pecham or Peccham was the spelling used for Patcham at the time, and it is as Pecham that the record in the Patent Rolls is preserved. It appears in the Calendar of the Patent rolls as Patching. Whilst he was staying at Patcham, a letter patent to Nicholas Fernbaud was authorised by the king. Fernbaud had been acting as Keeper of the bishopric of Bath and Wells since the death of Bishop William of March in June, and he was now ordered to release the property belonging to the bishops to William Haselhaw, the newly elected bishop. 2

When Edward passed through Patcham, he was on his way to Lewes, having left Beeding the day before. This journey was part of a longer one which started from Westminster on about 20 August and then went on to Chichester via Guildford. Leaving Chichester on 3 September, the king spent six days in Arundel. His journey beyond Lewes encompassed Battle, Ashford, Dover, Canterbury and Chatham before he returned to the capital on 18 October 1302. 3

1302 was one of the better of the troubled final years of Edward’s reign. A truce had been established with both the...
The leather from 1–3 Tower Street, Rye, East Sussex

Quita Mould
Eastmoor Manor, Eastmoor Road, Eastmoor, King’s Lynn, Norfolk, PE33 9PZ

In 1979 the Sussex Archaeological Field Unit (currently trading as Archaeology South-East) conducted an excavation at 1–3 Tower Street, Rye, East Sussex. When describing the preliminary results of that work it was said that a large quantity of shoes and other leather objects had been found in a gravel layer dated to the third quarter of the eighteenth century (Hadfield 1979). Leather finds were not mentioned in the summary of the excavations presented in this journal for 1981, save for a passing ‘leather was also present’ in M. J. Kylo’s report on the animal bone from the site. In the acknowledgements accompanying that note it was said that ‘the large quantity of leather is being conserved and will be published later’ (Hadfield 1981, 225). Following conservation at the Institute of Archaeology, University of London in 1981 the leather was placed in the care of the Barbican House Museum at Lewes. It seems that publication of the leather finds did not follow, and to remedy this to some degree, until such work is undertaken, a summary of the leather from the site is presented here.

On 4 June 2008 the leather from the site was quickly assessed as part of a reconsideration of the evidence for a leather tannery at Rye (Stevens in prep.). The leather seen on that day did not correspond exactly to the accompanying documentation that had been compiled when the material was conserved. Material allocated to five Laboratory Numbers during conservation was not present in the collection examined, while a small amount of leather lacked any numbering or context details. While it is likely that most of the missing material could be matched up to that with no identification, it was clear that at least one item (Lab No 4035) described as ‘waterlogged sandal — wooden sole with..."
two leather straps’ was not present. From the description this appears to be a wooden-soled patten with leather toe straps, possibly lacking the iron ring that was nailed to the underside of the sole to raise the foot from the dirt of the street and farmyard: a common item of footwear worn by the labouring classes.

The group seen consisted principally of worn shoe parts, two straps and an item of harness. As not all of the leather recorded as having been conserved in the accompanying documentation was present when the assessment was made, no quantification of the leather recovered from the excavation is given here. A single shoe was complete; the other shoe parts present suggested that it was unlikely that more than a dozen shoes were represented. Matching of the shoe parts would allow more accurate quantification. For the most part the shoes were heavily worn and occurred in sizes to fit men, women and children. A limited amount of secondary cutting was seen on the shoe parts, suggesting that some might be cobbling waste, but much appeared to be simply domestic refuse. All came from latchet-tie shoes of welted construction with low, stacked leather heels, some with hobnailing. They fastened with small latches tying across the instep through paired holes in the vamps, the low quarters joining to the vamps with dog-leg side seams. The general style of the shoe parts can be dated to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The Art and Mystery of a Cordwainer by John F. Rees published in London in 1813, one of the first text books on shoemaking (Swann 1982, 32), illustrates patterns for shoes of just this style. The leather generally supports the numismatic and ceramic dating of the gravel deposit, perhaps suggesting it was one of the last things to be thrown into that particular deposit.

It had been said that the group from 1–3 Tower Street included leather off-cuts (Serjeantson 1989). No off-cuts of primary waste, resulting from the initial trimming away of unusable areas of tanned hides, were present in the assemblage. Two pieces of secondary waste, produced when cutting out pattern pieces and trimming to size during manufacture or later repair, were seen. Three pieces of felt were also present, each recorded as being of leather, and had been conserved as such. One piece was circular, possibly suggesting that it was waste material from a hatter. Two lengths of strap were included in the group, along with a rectangular piece with seams sewn with a curved needle, suggesting that it came from an item of harness. The item of harness was not recognisable even to Lawrence Stevens, a third-generation saddler.

The group of leather briefly examined proved not to consist principally of waste off-cuts as had been suggested, but to be largely a collection of worn shoe parts and a small number of other manufactured leather objects and pieces of felt. While acknowledging that the examination of the leather was extremely brief, being restricted to the limited time available, it is hoped that the description of the assemblage presented here provides a more accurate picture of the leather than that available previously.
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The air-raid shelter at St Mary’s CE School, Climping, West Sussex

Luke Barber
Research Officer, Sussex Archaeological Society, Bull House, 92 High Street, Lewes BN7 1XH

INTRODUCTION

St Mary’s CE School, Climping lies adjacent to an access lane in a distinctly rural location on the coastal plain at TQ 004 018 (Fig. 1). Despite this, its proximity to the aerodrome at Ford would have potentially put the school very much on the front line in the aerial war, particularly between 1940 and 1944. It is no surprise that the school was equipped with a ‘standard’ 50-person communal air-raid shelter, built a little to the south-west of the school buildings. In recent years the school has seen a number of extensions, including one built in the 1990s which came very close to the eastern side of the shelter. The shelter remained as a school store (Fig. 2).

In 2006 the school decided that the shelter cut out too much light from the classroom extension immediately to the east and, after consultation with West Sussex County Council, made plans for the demolition of the structure. The author was informed of the situation by John Mills, of West Sussex County Council, which allowed a rapid survey of the structure just before demolition started. The work, which consisted of a written, drawn and photographic record, was undertaken by the author on the morning of 3 August 2007.

Many people have a negative attitude to ‘ugly’ World War 2 structures and, comparing them to many other buildings, one can see how they have reached their conclusion. However, the fact remains that these structures, from pill-boxes to air-raid shelters, stand as poignant reminders to arguably the most momentous event, albeit an unpleasant one, of the twentieth century. Such structures have rapidly vanished since the end of the war, and we should avoid selectively sanitising the past by simply preserving or recording what we find attractive. More thought needs to be given to the
Fig. 1. Site location plan.

Fig. 2. The Shelter. Looking north. 9 am.
The preservation of air-raid shelters, perhaps now one of the most poorly represented solid structure types of World War 2, particularly considering how numerous they were. Indeed, the school at Whitehawk, Brighton has been commendably forward-thinking in using their school air-raid shelter as a teaching aid for the children. Woodcock’s Well CE Primary School in Cheshire has done similar.

Although many such structures are of ‘standard’ types, very few are identical. Adaptation of a ‘standard’ plan to fit the topography or space restrictions of a site, the availability of materials and the different ‘approaches’ of various contractors have given rise to many variations and modifications. As a result, if such a structure cannot be saved it should be properly recorded. There are now only a handful of 50-person school air-raid shelters left in West Sussex, and at the time of writing over half of those are under threat.

The current short note is not intended to be a piece on air-raid shelters — that will come in time, when more surveys have been done and historical research undertaken. It is simply intended to record for posterity a now lost structure and in so doing hopefully to raise awareness of both the importance and the complexity of what is at first appearance an ugly little eye-sore.

**THE MAIN STRUCTURE (Fig. 3)**

The shelter consisted of a rectangular structure measuring 10.35 m by 3.3 m in plan by 2.3 m tall. The main exterior walls (contexts [1], [2], [3] and [4]) were 500 mm thick and demolition allowed their complex composition to be noted. The outer skin, some 105mm thick, was of hard-fired red bricks (225 × 105 × 65 mm) bonded in a light grey sandy cement and laid in stretcher bond. Behind the outer brick skin was 55 mm of concrete within which was a vertical 170 mm square steel reinforcing mesh. Demolition showed that in places this reinforced concrete skin widened to create 130 mm-square reinforced pillars within the thickness of the wall, though their spacing could not be deduced. The core of the walls was 225 mm thick, being composed of header courses of softer, more coarsely formed red bricks. The interior 105 mm thick skin of the walls was formed of similar bricks to the core but laid
in alternating header and stretcher rows, presumably to key them tightly into the core. Piercing the thickness of the long walls [1] and [3] were four and three 290 mm square vents respectively, set just below the roof line (context [11]). Each vent had a 50 mm thick ceramic grill set flush with the exterior wall faces below a wooden lintel. The steel reinforcing mesh within the exterior walls had been left in situ and was visible within the thickness of each vent (Fig. 3, B).

The demolition allowed a close inspection of the make-up of the 200 mm thick roof (context [6]). The upper 50 mm consisted of a bitumen-painted concrete containing a steel reinforced mesh consisting of 10 mm diameter smooth rods running north–south and 6 mm diameter rods running east–west. Below this was a 150 mm-thick concrete slab in the middle of which was a further steel reinforcing mesh, this one of twisted rods 5mm in diameter. The inside face of the roof clearly showed impressions from the plank formers which had normally been laid along the long access of the structure, except in restricted areas such as the entrance and toilet cubicles where the planks had been laid across the structure. Interior strengthening support for the roof had been provided by two concrete ribs, each 360 mm wide by 180 mm deep and containing an iron rod (contexts [8] and [9]). These had originally run up the interiors of the main walls and across the underside of the roof (where they protruded by 180 mm). Further support for the roof was given by the 350 mm thick internal blast wall which divided off the entrance passage from the shelter (context [12]). This was bonded to [1] and constructed of the same softer bricks as noted on the interior faces and cores of the exterior walls, usually with alternating courses of stretcher and header bond (though sometimes two stretcher courses appeared together). A concrete lintel, set 150 mm into the top of [12], spanned the interior entrance, providing a 150 mm square support to the roof at this point [13].

**THE ESCAPE EXIT AND INTERIOR FEATURES**

At the northern end of wall [3] were the remains of what appeared to be an emergency exit. The wall elevation at this point displayed an area of more orange bricks [20] measuring 210 mm long by 60 mm tall built into wall [4] in alternate courses and set below a low concrete lintel [19]. Inside the structure on the interior of the roof was the scar of a 350 mm square frogged red brick column [18]. Such an emergency escape exit would be provided in the event of the main entrance being blocked. Whether [20] represents the original brickwork is uncertain as too much had been destroyed by
the later insertion of a door [17]. However, it is quite likely that this thinner section of wall does indeed represent the emergency escape route — the wall being quite easy to knock out at this point if needed, and the column [18] providing extra strength at this weak point.

Opposite, bonded into wall [1] and clearly showing as scars on the underside of the roof, had been two L-shaped single-thickness brick partition walls forming two toilet cubicles for chemical closets (contexts [10]A and [10]B). At the far end of the chamber were further scars on the interior of wall [1] where four open header sockets were spaced in two vertical lines between every five courses of [1], strongly suggesting another partition or wooden racking/bunks at this point (contexts [15] and [16]). No scar was visible on the interior of the roof at this point so it is unlikely that whatever it was reached the ceiling. No signs of fixing positions for benches were noted during the survey and it is assumed they were free-standing.

**POST-WAR ALTERATIONS**

A number of alterations had been undertaken after the war, most of which appear to open out the interior to facilitate its use as a store, though work on increasing the security of the structure was also undertaken. The two internal strengthening ribs (contexts [8] and [9]) were cut back flush with the walls and the scars made good; only the central sections on the underside of the roof were left. Also at this time the brick column [18], toilet walls [10], internal benching and possible shelving [15]/[16] were also removed. It is probable that the wooden single door and frame were added to the original entrance together with its red Warnham brick threshold [14] and the large double door [17] punched through to aid access to the main store. The grey cement skim of the floor [5] was also added as a resurfacing of the original concrete slab floor at this time.

**CONCLUSION**

The survey of the Climping shelter has demonstrated the complexity of these simple-looking structures as well as their strength. Judging by the resistance it put up to the demolition contractor (Fig. 4), at least for the first couple of hours, it certainly would have kept the children safe against all but a direct hit by a large kilogram bomb. It is hoped that at some point the other surviving Sussex shelters can be surveyed in order to create a comparative dataset before any more are lost.
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