

PYRFORD, SEND, AND A TENTH-CENTURY ORIGIN FOR THE "SURREY FENS" CAUSEWAYS?

Robert Briggs
9 August 2010

Anyone with even a passing knowledge of Anglo-Saxon written records connected to Surrey will acknowledge that they are fairly thin on the ground. To find two contiguous Surrey estates-cum-parishes - Pyrford and Send - each with a reliable deed pertaining to their ownership in the second half of the tenth century (and moreover ones that in neither case are associated with the minster at Chertsey) is therefore a rare thing indeed. The purpose of this note is to explain the significance of the two muniments in question as documentary insights into the area at the time of their writing, and how they relate to the question of the age of the causeways across the River Wey floodplain at Pyrford and Old Woking discussed by Richard Savage in his presentation to the last meeting of the Medieval Studies Forum. I will argue that there are several strong reasons for attributing their construction to the lordship and/or community of the Send estate at some point between the later-tenth and later-twelfth centuries. Furthermore, I believe there is a case to be made for conjecturing that they owe their existence to the purchase of Send by St Dunstan, and his possible vesting of the estate among the lands of the Archbishopric of Canterbury - if they did not come into being during his pontificate then conceivably they did during that of one of his immediate successors.

PYRFORD

The earlier of the two documents is Sawyer number 621 (= Kemble 1203, Birch 955), a grant by King Eadwig (reigned 955-959) of 16 hides of land at *Pyrianforda*, i.e. Pyrford, to his *carus* Eadric made in the year 956. This is preserved in the cartulary of Abingdon Abbey, the subject of a superlative two-volume edition by Susan Kelly, who is the latest in a line of scholars to have adjudged the deed to be authentic.¹ The Pyrford charter is one of a sizable number of tenth-century bookland grants by Eadwig (following the lead of his predecessors Eadmund and Eadred) preserved in the Abingdon cartulary; among them is another (S 622) by means of which Eadwig bestowed a 22-hide estate at Welford in Berkshire upon his same *carus* Eadric. Being a royal diploma, the body of the charter is written in Latin, but it incorporates a description of the boundary of the estate in question written in Old English. This begins and ends at the "pear-tree ford" (variously spelled *Pirianforda* and *Pyrianford*, from Old English *pirige* + *ford*) from which the estate derived its name, and which at first seems capable of equation with the river crossing below Pyrford church at the northern end of the easterly of the two causeways. However, further consideration of the evidence suggests something else.

As Richard observed, the northern end of the Pyrford causeway was at one time adjacent to the confluence of the Wey with the smaller watercourse nowadays known as the Hoe Stream. Yet the estate boundary is said to have run "from the pear-tree ford along the Wey to the fish's stream" - the last name (*fisces burnan*) can be taken to represent the Hoe Stream, in spite of its failure to recur in later records.² Fluvial action may have shifted the location of its meeting-point with the Wey over the centuries, but nonetheless the statement that the boundary ran "along the Wey" before diverting up *fisces burnan* is a

¹ Kelly 2001, 267-68 no. 63; 'S 621', *The Electronic Sawyer*.

² Information supplied by Richard Christophers via Richard Savage.

rather superfluous one in this context. It thus seems permissible to contemplate whether the eponymous ford was in fact located somewhere downstream of this point in 956.

To the east of Pyrford Village the slopes at the northern edge of the floodplain are less steep, but more importantly the floodplain itself narrows to around 250 metres across, pinched by a "promontory" of Bagshot Sand on which Pyrford Village stands on the north and a gravel terrace on the southern side.³ This would surely represent a more convenient crossing place than any sites to the east or west. So could the "pear-tree ford" have been here, in the vicinity of what is known locally as Irish Hole? In addition, this would have been more convenient for any contemporary settlement at or near Pyrford Place, later a possession of the Prior of Newark,⁴ for which a secondary river crossing could have given access to the gravel island on which the monastery stood (with its tantalizing earlier identity as the "old *burh*"). Such a hypothesis may go some way towards explaining the curious vestiges of earlier routes hereabouts, such as the pair of bridges on a route east of and parallel to the present Pyrford causeway shown on Rocque's map of the 1760s. At the same time, it requires there to have been unrecorded major alterations to the road networks on both sides of the river. Certainly a great deal more detailed research is needed before the idea can be accepted, but the degree of change seemingly involved should not be held against it.

SEND

Establishing when the "pear-tree ford" was succeeded by the present raised causeway between the foot of the slope below Pyrford church and the vicinity of The Seven Stars pub at the junction of Newark Lane and Papercourt Lane must begin with the acknowledgement that the latter, like its shorter but higher counterpart south of Old Woking, lies almost entirely within Send parish. If the antiquity of the Send-Pyrford parish boundary along the old course of the Wey (and hence presumably that between Send and Woking in the vicinity of the "Old Woking" causeway) is accepted - and the S 621 charter-bounds represent a very strong reason why they should - then it is most logical and likely that their origins (which presumably, though not necessarily, are common to one another) lie in the post-956 lordship of Send.

Further justification for this opinion arises from taking a broader view of the locality at the time, since it becomes clear that there were far fewer reasons for the causeways to have been constructed by the lords and/or communities of the northern bank of the floodplain than their counterparts on the southern, Send side. Old Woking is in all probability the site of a minster affiliated with the great Mercian foundation at *Medeshamstede* (Peterborough) by the early years of the eighth century. This was followed by centuries in royal ownership as one of the two centres of its power in the eponymous Hundred (along with Guildford/Stoke), perhaps mirroring its pre-monastic status as the titular centre of the postulated '*regio*' of *Woccingas*.⁵ Such importance may have given it a function as a local centre of exchange and taxation, so other than to facilitate road-borne movement to and from the late-Saxon burghal market centre at Guildford, there was scant motive for the western causeway to have been a Woking project. Pyrford, meanwhile, lay not in Woking Hundred, but Godley, which was dominated by the major minster at Chertsey. If the Domesday hidages are to be believed, it formed part of a 95-hide foundation endowment made by

³ British Geological Survey 2001, *Guildford*.

⁴ Information from Richard Savage.

⁵ Blair 1989, 100.

King Ecgberht of Kent in the mid-660s,⁶ but its grant to Eadric in 956 set it apart from the rest of the Chertsey-owned Hundred, a position that was not reversed at any point after the re-establishment of monastic rule at the minster in 964. Nevertheless, Chertsey may have remained its main outlet for trade, justice, and so forth, although easy passage by river or road along the Wey may have meant it also looked to Woking for such functions.

Establishing the stronger likelihood of the two causeways being connected to the estate/manor of Send allows the second of the two pre-Conquest written records to come to the fore. Sawyer number 1447 (= Birch 1063) is not a charter like the Pyrford grant, rather 'a record of a dispute involving estates at Send and Sunbury, and a note of their purchase by Dunstan, archbishop' (according to the updated version of the eSawyer website),⁷ and reads more like an annal than any normal kind of property deed. Another unusual characteristic is that it is written entirely in Old English (which would make its lack of a boundary clause all the more ironic if it were more like a land charter of the type to which such descriptions were often appended). Scholarly opinion considers it authentic, but beyond that there has been some divergence in interpretations of the document, not least in terms of its dating.

The details of the two estates' descents given in the document are little short of extraordinary (or at least that is how it seems today - no doubt other landholdings in Surrey could have experienced equally dramatic changes in ownership in this period, the evidence for which has since been lost). The first half of the document gives a huge amount of background detail on the circumstances of the tenure of Sunbury by "Ecgferð" (*recte* Ecgfrið) an obscure figure who had pledged that estate - but apparently not his larger landholding at Send - to Dunstan in order that the ecclesiastic might act as guardian to his wife and child. But when Ecgfrið died (by drowning, possibly as a judicially-sanctioned punishment), the royal councillors declared all of his property should be forfeited to King Edgar (who reigned 959-975), who then bestowed the estates upon Ælfheah, an ealdorman. Dunstan went to the trouble of riding to the king to remind him in person that Sunbury had been pledged to him, but the king would not be persuaded, even when Dunstan offered him his wergeld. Indeed it was six years before Dunstan was able to take possession of Ecgfrið's former estates, and he only achieved this by paying Ælfheah 90 pounds and 200 marks of gold for Send and Sunbury respectively.

Despite both being bought by the same man at the same time (so far as is known), Send and Sunbury look as if they did not continue in the same ownership for long. Sunbury became an estate of Westminster Abbey, where it remained at the time of Domesday and thereon after up until 1222.⁸ This is probably the reason for the preservation of S 1447 among the early muniments of Westminster Abbey, which coincidentally was given Pyrford after 1066 but has no subsequent recorded connection to Send. A second deed in the Westminster archive, S 702 (purportedly of 962 but in its received form more likely a copy made a few years later at the behest of Dunstan himself), documents the grant of Sunbury to Ælfheah.⁹ This recommends Dunstan's acquisition of both estates to have taken place in 968. Other charters in the Westminster archive contain records of Dunstan having purchased estates at Westminster, Hendon, *Lotheres leage* and *Codanhlaw* which he then

⁶ Intimated by S 1165.

⁷ 'S 1447', *The Electronic Sawyer*.

⁸ 'Sunbury: Manors'.

⁹ 'S 702', *The Electronic Sawyer*.

gave to the monastery.¹⁰ Dunstan is said to have been responsible for assisting King Edgar in the installation of monks at Westminster in the 960s or early 970s, and the aforementioned endowments may act as evidence of his role in this. Furthermore, as a man of aristocratic lineage Dunstan may have had the personal wealth to purchase estates not for his own benefit but with which to endow certain monasteries.

Given the frequency with which Sunbury occurs in Westminster charters,¹¹ and the high levels of fabrication detectable in its archive (which might even have stretched to making fraudulent claims on estates), the absence of Send's name is reason enough to believe that Dunstan sought to make alternative arrangements for the larger and more valuable of the two estates. Dunstan is on separate record purchasing properties which he then gave to churches. S 287 incorporates a note of his purchase of land at Canterbury during his time as Archbishop that he then gave to the ancient church of St Martin's outside the city. A second possible instance is S 568, a credible Glastonbury charter of 955 recording the grant of a 25-hide estate at Badbury in Wiltshire to Dunstan in return for a payment of gold to King Eadred (reigned 946-55). Although the estate was Glastonbury demesne in 1086, it has been suggested Dunstan's name was an interpolated substitution for its non-ecclesiastical original recipient.¹² That Dunstan bought Send and the other above-mentioned estates meant they would not have reverted back into the hands of the king or other grantors after death, as happened with estates leased for life. He obviously had a different intention for Send, bought it must be remembered at considerable cost, but what was this? Could it have involved another major church, one with which Dunstan had a more direct connection? And were the causeways a byproduct of this decision?

CANTERBURY CAUSEWAYS? THE CASE FOR

One intriguing possibility is that Dunstan bestowed the Send estate upon the cathedral and community of Christ Church, Canterbury. There is of course no extant documentary evidence for this having happened, but the sources are patchy; only five muniments in the Christ Church archive are supposedly datable to the years of Dunstan's archiepiscopacy (959 or 960 to 988), and not one of these even mentions his name. That there were Canterbury estates in Dunstan's time which do not occur in its charters is hinted at by a passage in his *Vita*, written by Eadmer at Canterbury in the early twelfth century. In it Dunstan is credited with the erection of a timber church at Mayfield in Sussex, as well as at an unspecified number of other sites of his so-called *hospitii*, "hospices" or residences.¹³ Mayfield is not on record as an archiepiscopal estate even in the late eleventh century, so either Eadmer was drawing upon lost material relating to its late-tenth-century ownership by Canterbury, or it was an attempt on his part to associate a recent acquisition with the See in Dunstan's time (as suggested by the recent editors of his *Vita* and *Miracula*).¹⁴ The fact that Mayfield church is dedicated to St Dunstan, and the village and surrounding area are associated with some suspiciously formulaic legends involving the archbishop and the devil,¹⁵ leads one to suspect that there may be little if any truth in the story. Eadmer's claim

¹⁰ See S 894, 1293, 1295, 1450; none is anywhere near being authentic in their surviving form.

¹¹ Aside from S 1447 and S 702, Sunbury appears in S 1293, 894, 1039, 1040 & 1043, all of which are considered to be spurious and/or forged.

¹² 'Parishes: Chiseldon'.

¹³ Blair 2005, 394.

¹⁴ Muir & Turner 2006, lxviii.

¹⁵ Retold, and quite possibly embellished, by Hilaire Belloc: 'Folklore of Sussex - St Dunstan vs. the Devil'.

that Dunstan built churches in his diocese, on the other hand, may have more veracity, and hence could act as support for the notion that the causeways may have come into being under the auspices of Dunstan and Canterbury.

The reputation of Dunstan as a holy man of great piety is formidable, and in this respect contemporaries were sometimes 'fulsome' in their praise for him.¹⁶ He has been considered to be a linchpin of the monastic reform movement in England in the tenth century, spearheading its importation from the Continent through his re-foundation of Glastonbury as a minster community observant of the Benedictine monastic rule.¹⁷ Glastonbury had been among the wealthiest of the pre-Viking houses, with vast landholdings in Somerset and beyond, some of which it retained through the depredations of the first period of Viking attacks and to which other parts were restored or added anew subsequently.¹⁸ The heartland of its holdings, the Somerset Levels, have seen a number of important fieldwork projects in recent times, most famously the Shapwick Project, which have identified the tenth century as a period when the agricultural and settlement landscape of certain estates was subject to wholesale reorganization. Because some can be positively identified as Glastonbury estates, inevitably it has led to Dunstan's name entering the frame as the initiator of the process.¹⁹

Boundary clauses of charters relating to estates in the Somerset Levels area show that there were already drainage ditches present in the eighth century.²⁰ Yet Dunstan is credited with achieving 'a substantial extension of the irrigation [i.e. drainage?] system on the surrounding Somerset Levels' (in the words of the author of his Wikipedia entry, a source I must acknowledge straightaway has such a poor regard in academic circles that I use it with the utmost caution - I assume that the author of the entry was drawing upon an uncredited but reputable written source which I have been unable to identify).²¹ Certainly the late Anglo-Saxon period was a time in which large-scale hydrological projects were being effected elsewhere in England,²² and it seems reasonable to conjecture that the creation of causeways were part and parcel of some or all of these. Admittedly, the construction of the two trans-floodplain causeways looks to be a case apart, inasmuch as they do not look to be associated with a drainage scheme (the surrounding land remains very wet), but nonetheless they could be said to correlate with the more proactive approach to the use of wetlands of the time; either for agricultural reasons or simply to overcome their prior status as barriers to movement.

To be clear, S 1447 records the purchase of the twenty-hide estate at Send by Dunstan when he was Archbishop of Canterbury, most likely in or around the year 968; it does not specify that he then placed it among the lands of the cathedral community, or of any other ecclesiastical institution (though the charter testimony of Westminster permits the

¹⁶ Cubitt 2008, 146.

¹⁷ Blair 2005, 350.

¹⁸ Costen 1992.

¹⁹ Aston & Gerrard 1999, 29.

²⁰ Gardiner 2006, 37.

²¹ 'Dunstan', *Wikipedia*.

²² Gardiner 2006, 37 - consider too John Blair's comment in his presentation at the recent Medieval Studies Forum meeting on medieval canal digging being a phenomenon which commenced in the tenth century.

conclusion that Send did not follow Sunbury in becoming one of its estates). Nevertheless, the preceding paragraphs hopefully have demonstrated how the thesis that Dunstan endowed his own archbishopric with Send is perhaps the most credible of the various possibilities. Moreover, a credible context for the passage of the estate out of Canterbury ownership without (extant) record is provided by various documentary sources concerning certain archbishops of the late-tenth and mid-eleventh-century. In 994, a thirty-hide estate at Monks Risborough in Buckinghamshire was sold by Archbishop Sigeric (990-94) in return for gold and silver with which to pay off Sweyn Forkbeard, leader of the Danes who were threatening to burn his cathedral (S 882). Like Send, Monks Risborough does not seem to have been a long-standing Canterbury estate - less than a century previously, in 903, King Edward renewed the charter by which one Athulf granted it to his daughter Æthelgyth (S 367). If Send had not left Canterbury hands at much the same time, then it may have done so during the pontificate of Eadsige (1038-50), who is said to have leased, granted or sold considerable amounts of the lands of the archbishopric, a position that was confirmed rather than reversed by Stigand, the last Anglo-Saxon to hold the office (between the years 1052 and 1070).²³

THE CASE AGAINST

Marshaling an argument in opposition to the association of Dunstan with the construction of the two causeways must begin with recent research that has called into question the extent and efficacy of his personal involvement in the monastic revival and reform movement of the mid- to late-tenth century. While accepting Dunstan's status as a scholar and statesman, Nicola Robertson has pointed to the lack of contemporary testimony for his role in the reform process at both Glastonbury and Canterbury; in the case of the latter it seems very likely that the (re)introduction of formal monastic rule to the cathedral community did not occur until some time after his death (although his successors' attentions may have been directed on more immediate problems such as finding tribute to pay off marauding Danes).²⁴ In this regard, it may well be noteworthy that a number of the medieval churches dedicated to St Dunstan in south-east England (including Cheam) show signs of having been built in the early eleventh century (the church at Mayfield seemingly attests to the fashion having continued into the twelfth century).²⁵

Suspicious over the centrality of Dunstan to the reform process within the minster at Glastonbury have been mirrored by revisions to thinking on the level of his involvement in the internal reorganisation of its estates. Costen noted that Somerset estates both within and without the Glastonbury demesne underwent 'replanning' around the time of Dunstan's abbacy, implying the phenomenon was a wider one that may neither have been instituted by the re-founded monastery nor have been especially synonymous with it.²⁶ Recently Stephen Rippon has sought to temper the degree to which Dunstan was responsible for stimulating such restructuring still further by highlighting the heterogeneity of settlement morphologies within Glastonbury-owned estates, and how those responsible may more often than not have been 'subtenants and even the local communities'.²⁷ Whatever Dunstan's level of interest or involvement in the process in Somerset, the

²³ Smith 1994, 212.

²⁴ Robertson 2005.

²⁵ Tatton-Brown 1992, 80-81.

²⁶ Costen 1992, 29, 31.

²⁷ Rippon 2008, 59-90, 102-105.

dispersed medieval settlement pattern of Send does not bespeak of he or any other lord before or after him having attempted to re-plan its landscape at the macro scale (indeed there is scant evidence for planned rural settlement nucleation anywhere in Surrey before the twelfth century).²⁸ But at the same time, it would be ridiculous to assert that no physical interventions were made in the landscape of late Anglo-Saxon Surrey, a period in which many of its manors and parish churches came into existence. In light of this, and given that the inhabitants of the Send estate are almost certain to have played an active part in both the conception and construction of the two causeways, arguably it is more germane to focus upon when they came into being, rather than at whose behest it was.

Send could have been valued by the archbishops as a useful stop-off on the way between London and Winchester, the major regional centres of power at the time. But the same could be said of it in the context of its ownership by subsequent lords, ecclesiastical or secular. Unfortunately Send is not heard of again until Domesday, but its entry does contain important information concerning its ownership in the years either side of the Norman Conquest. Up until 1066 it had been in the hands of a certain Karl (other authors have chosen to render his name as Carl/Carlo/Karli). As a common moniker of Anglo-Scandinavian origin, which appears in Domesday Book in connection with no less than 55 separate holdings, it would be hard to distinguish how many different men so-called held the various estates and other properties were it not for the fact that many of them - including Send - were in the hands of Alvred (or Alfred) of Marlborough by 1086 (including 14 of the 24 such properties in Wiltshire). This suggests these of Karl's estates were deliberately settled upon Alvred after 1066.²⁹ The name Karl occurs just the once in Surrey, at Send, and no more than a handful of times in surrounding counties.³⁰ If there was one man of this name holding a dispersed group of estates in south-east England, then at the regional level he was a comparatively minor landholder. Moreover, none of these estates had a hidage or valuation as large as that of Send, and it could be inferred that Karl consequently would have been more inclined to invest in improvements to its infrastructure, such as the construction of the two causeways.

Alvred of Marlborough's landed interests in England spanned the Conquest period, having held the Herefordshire manor of Pencombe in the time of King Edward the Confessor. He profited greatly from the advent of Norman rule, rising rapidly to become 'a great tenant-in-chief' of William I, notably in Herefordshire, where he was given the castle at Ewyas *circa* 1070.³¹ It is understandable that Alvred seems to have chosen to focus the bulk of his energies on his manors in Herefordshire and Wiltshire, and was willing to pass the running of some of his more easterly manors to tenants. In the case of the two most valuable manors, Send and Shipton Bellinger in Hampshire, the mesne-tenant was Rainald fitz Erchenbald, possibly Alvred's nephew.³² Alvred is known to have died around the time of the Domesday Survey, maybe two years after *circa* 1088, but possibly while Domesday Book was still being put together - it is Rainald and not Alvred whose name appears as

²⁸ Turner 2004, 136. The same author has recently floated the idea that Ripley may be in part a planted roadside settlement of the latter half of the twelfth century - Turner 2009, 2.

²⁹ Skidmore 2010, 11.

³⁰ Berkshire: 10 hides in Speen - Hampshire: 3 hides in Eastrop, 10.5 hides in Shipton Bellinger - Sussex: 0.5 hides in Barkham, 1 hide in Hartfield, 6 hides in Wappingthorne. Information taken from 'Karl 2 (male)', *Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England*.

³¹ Skidmore 2010, 8-9.

³² An idea first put forward by Bruce Coplestone-Crow: Skidmore (2010), 16, 20.

holder of Send in an index appended to the collated rewritten returns.³³ The manor did not revert to Alvred's daughter and sole heir Agnes after his death because her husband had taken part in a rebellion against the King in 1075, and instead was retained by Rainald until his own death *circa* 1120.

Both Alvred and Rainald are, for slightly different reasons, candidates for instigating the construction of the Send causeways: one being a wealthy tenant-in-chief, the other a lesser-ranking relation with fewer estates and consequently more reason to oversee improvements to those he did possess. Their claims also have to be appraised in the context of the Wey itself. Just like the modern parish of Send, the Domesday estate bordered a lengthy stretch of the river and, far from being peripheral to the activities of both the lordship and its tenants, it was heavily exploited. Domesday Book records two watermills (of which the one in demesne paid a considerable 21 shillings and sixpence) and five fisheries (together rendering 54 pence). But the most remarkable attribute of the estate at the time was its extraordinarily large acreage of meadow, measured at "100 acres less 16", by far and away the biggest such area in Woking Hundred. A resource like this - which Molineux concludes gave Send a 'higher value in proportion to its ploughland than [the royal manors of] Woking and Stoke'³⁴ - can be expected to have been carefully managed in order to maximize hay production. The two causeways could have played a role in this by facilitating access to and from the meadows, and possibly by retaining floodwaters for longer thereby increasing the time for alluvial enrichment, but there can be no certainty about such hypotheses at the present time.

The existence of a very large meadow resource (or of the five fisheries or two watermills) is not proof in itself of the existence of the two causeways, let alone that they were functionally interrelated. It might be argued that the scale of the estate's river-related resources was such that it could not have arisen in the two decades between the Norman Conquest and Domesday Survey, but this is an argument based on probability rather than certainty. Yet both points all the same may hint at 1086 being the *terminus ante quem* for their construction, thereby limiting the number of their potential progenitors, while still not bringing us any closer to ascertaining which of them was the man responsible.

Skidmore conjectures Rainald either made Send the *caput* of his holdings or inherited it as such from his father Erchenbald fitz Erchenbald - in the opinion of this author the former scenario is the more credible.³⁵ However, 10.5 of the 20 hides were held from him (and presumably Alvred before) by men named Herbert and Walter in 1086. If Domesday Book is to be believed, neither had pre-Conquest precedent; quite possibly they became the sub-manors of Papworth (later Papercourt) and Dedswell. If this was the case then Papworth in particular is worthy of note, since it lay close to the southern end of the "Pyrford causeway", and would have been a disproportionate beneficiary of the advantages over the old "pear-tree ford" it brought. That said, it is not unrealistic to suppose that there was already something of a settlement nucleus at Pyrford Village which influenced its siting, although no church is mentioned here in Domesday Book and architecturally the present church has no fabric earlier than the mid-twelfth century; the postulation that the knoll upon which it stands was a place of pre-Christian ritual significance at present has no basis in fact. Alternatively, it may be the case that the

³³ Skidmore 2010, 11.

³⁴ Molineux, 'Woking'.

³⁵ Skidmore 2010, 16.

causeway was merely an improvement of an existing secondary route across the floodplain via the Newark "island". Such ambiguities serve to show how any future archaeological investigation must take a holistic approach, looking not just at the causeways themselves but around their extremities as well for evidence of contemporary settlement and other activity.

CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing discussion has dealt with a number of overlapping issues: changes in ownership of the Pyrford and Send estates in the second half of the tenth century, the prolonged phenomenon of the reorganization of landscapes within such estates to ameliorate production and movement, and the attitudes of different types of estate owners or holders towards their property and their abilities to bring about improvements like the creation of causewayed floodplain crossings. When all is said and done, however, one cannot hope to give a definitive answer to the question of the origin (or origins) of the "Pyrford" and "Old Woking" causeways on the strength of the evidence presently available. Close dating of the causeways, and proof or otherwise that the two are coeval, will only become possible through careful archaeological and palaeoenvironmental analysis. However, a few points can be made about things as they stand.

The two causeways may be marked by the proximity of their northern terminations with the medieval settlements of Old Woking and Pyrford Village, but their origins are far more likely to lie with the lordship of the neighbouring Send estate. The eastern causeway is unlikely to have come into being until after Pyrford had been gifted to Eadric in 956 (although one can never be completely certain that the boundary clause was contemporary with the rest of the document), which at least allows the supposition that the first possible initiator of their construction was Ecgfrið. As a estate quantified at twenty hides in the 960s, 1060s and 1080s, Send constituted a sizable landholding of the sort that would be expected to be owned by relatively important people. There are several names of men fitting this bill to conjure with in addition to Ecgfrið: Ælfheah the ealdorman, Dunstan or one of his successors as Archbishop, Karl, Alvred of Marlborough or Rainald fitz Erchenbald. Nor can it be ruled out that the causeways were in fact the innovations of one of Rainald's descendants.³⁶ Ultimately, just as individuals like Dunstan should not necessarily be apportioned almost "superhuman" inclinations and capacities to make important practical improvements to the landscape, so the claims of lesser-known men to have brought about such changes should not be underestimated. At the very least this note has sought to furnish those interested in finally answering the question of the origins of the two causeways with as much of the historical background detail as possible.

³⁶ Following Rainald's death around the year 1120, the lordship of Send passed to his son Erchenbald (recorded as Erchenbald fitz Rainald in the Pipe Roll for Surrey in 1130), about whom little is known. His daughter Beatrice de Send was his sole heiress, and consequently was a wealthy one, who married a knight Ruald de Calne. He held two "old" fees at Send of Robert de Ewyas in 1166, and together with his wife gave lands there and in Shipton Bellinger to the newly-founded Newark Priory in the 1190s. Skidmore 2010, 16-18. Dennis Turner's postulation that the ambitious design of the chancel of Ripley church (previously a chapel of Send, but with an obscure original function), dateable to around the 1150s or 1160s, may be of a piece with the plantation of the adjacent settlement nucleus is a very interesting hypothesis if one is inclined towards a mid-to-late-twelfth-century date for the causeways. Turner 2009, 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aston, Michael, and Christopher Gerrard, 'Unique, traditional and charming: The Shapwick Project', *Antiquaries Journal*, **79** (1999), 1-59
- Belloc, Hilaire, 'Folklore of Sussex - St Dunstan vs. the Devil', *Ye Olde Sussex Pages* <http://yeoldesussexpages.com/folklore/dunstan.htm>, accessed 7th August 2010
- Blair, John, 'Frithuwold's kingdom and the origins of Surrey', in *The Origins of Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms*, ed. by Steven Bassett (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1989), 97-107
- Blair, John, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)
- Costen, Michael, 'Dunstan, Glastonbury and the Economy of Somerset in the Tenth Century', in *St Dunstan: His Life, Times and Cult*, ed. by Nigel Ramsay, Margaret Sparks and Tim Tatton-Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1992), 25-44
- Cubitt, Catherine, 'Archbishop Dunstan: A Prophet in Politics?' in *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks*, ed. by Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 145-66
- 'Dunstan', *Wikipedia* <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dunstan>, accessed 16th July 2010
- Eadmer of Canterbury, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan and Oswald*, ed. and trans. by Muir, Bernard J., and Andrew J. Turner, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)
- *The Electronic Sawyer* <http://www.esawyer.org.uk>, accessed July/August 2010
- Gardiner, Mark, 'The Transformation of Marshlands in Anglo-Norman England', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, **29** (2006), 35-50
- *Guildford: Solid & Drift Geology Map*, England & Wales 1:50,000 Series, **286** (Nottingham: British Geological Survey, 2001)
- Kelly, Susan, *Charters of Abingdon Abbey, Part 2*, Anglo-Saxon Charters, **8** (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2001)
- Molineux, Patrick, 'Woking', *Surrey Domesday* http://www.users.waitrose.com/~epmolineux/domesdaybook_000019.htm, accessed 28th July 2010
- 'Parishes: Chiseldon', in *A History of the County of Wiltshire: Volume 9* (1970), 6-23 <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=66536&strquery=chiseldon>, accessed 28 July 2010
- *Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England* <http://www.pase.ac.uk>, accessed July/August 2010
- Rippon, Stephen, *Beyond the medieval village: the diversification of landscape character in southern Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Robertson, Nicola, 'Dunstan and Monastic Reform: Tenth-Century Fact or Twelfth-Century Fiction?', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, **28** (2005), 53-67
- Skidmore, Warren, 'Some notes on the Skidmore (Scudemmer) family from the 11th to the 14th centuries in southwest England', *Occasional Papers*, **44** (2010) http://www.skidmoregenealogy.com/images/20100423_OccPap_no.44_Notes_11th_to_14th_cent.pdf, accessed 28th July 2010
- Smith, Mary Frances, 'Archbishop Stigand and the Eye of the Needle', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, **16** (1994), 199-219.
- 'Sunbury: Manors', in *A History of the County of Middlesex: Volume 3: Shepperton, Staines, Stanwell, Sunbury, Teddington, Heston and Isleworth, Twickenham, Cowley, Cranford, West Drayton, Greenford, Hanwell, Harefield and Harlington* (1962), 53-57 <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=22249>, accessed 28th July 2010.
- Tatton-Brown, Tim, 'The City and Diocese in Dunstan's Time', in *St Dunstan: His Life, Times and Cult*, 75-87
- Turner, Dennis, 'Manors and other settlements', in *Aspects of Archaeology and History in Surrey*, ed. by Jonathan Cotton, Glenys Crocker, and Audrey Graham (Guildford: SyAS, 2004), 133-46
- Turner, Dennis, 'Ripley: a tentative re-interpretation', email attachment to *Surrey Archaeological Society Medieval Studies Forum Newsletter* (December 2009)