

A PLACE, A NAME, A PLACE-NAME: THURSLEY REVISITED

Rob Briggs

'By the Name it looks as if the Pagan Saxons, who never arrived at questioning a Deity, here worshipped *Thor*' (Salmon 1736, 132).

The name of the Anglo-Saxon god Thunor is understood to appear in a number of surviving and lost English place-names. Building upon Nathanael Salmon's early conjecture, several of the key essays on the subject of "pagan" place-names published over the course of the twentieth century accepted the possibility of the Surrey place-name Thursley being descended from Old English *Thunres lēah*, "Thunor's *lēah*" (*Thunres* being the genitive singular form of the name: see Gelling 1973, 117, 122; 1988, 159; Mayr-Harting 1991, 24; Wilson 1992, 12; Meaney 1995, 33). However, none of their authors was able to state categorically that the place-name was of theophoric nature owing to the lateness and ambiguous nature of its medieval forms. (The term "pagan" is not used in this study as it is somewhat pejorative and outmoded - see Hines 1997, 396, for the opposing viewpoint - and references to such names being "pre-Christian" are similarly avoided since this presupposes a chronology of religious practice that to often cannot be proved from the known documentary and archaeological records.) A philological case in favour of Thursley deriving from Old English *Thunres lēah* was set out by Carole Hough in a short appraisal published in 1996. However, John Insley (2001, 431) has cast serious doubt upon the credibility of the key plank of her argument - Kenneth Cameron's interpretation of a Rutland estate boundary mark, *pureslege broc* (Sawyer [S] 1014 of 1046), as one incorporating a distorted form of the name Thunor - and by extension has thrown open the question of the original meaning of Thursley once again, making a fresh evaluation of the material necessary.¹ I will come at the matter from a different angle by considering Thursley "in the round", placing particular emphasis on the non-linguistic forms of evidence (topography, archaeology, architecture) as means of gauging the extent to which Thursley was of particular numinousness in the Anglo-Saxon period.

The meaning of the place-name

I have yet to find Hough's 1996 analysis cited as a reference in any subsequent work that has considered the composition and/or meaning of the place-name Thursley (Hines 1997, 385; Watts 2006, 615; Hooke 2010, 49; Mills 2011, 459), although none of these diverges from the interpretation of it being associated with Thunor. It is the works which touch upon the subject of Old English non-Christian place-names but omit all mention of Thursley that give more serious cause for concern. Its absence from Richard North's literature-based study is perhaps the most comprehensible, since it is likely to be a product of the book's publication the year after Hough's somewhat-obscure note rather than a negative judgement of its merits (see North 1997, 233). The section on non-Christian religious place-names in Marilyn Dunn's revisionist monograph on the Christian conversion of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms is based partly on non-specialist works whose authors may have

¹ I made my own, ill-starred contribution to the analysis of Thursley as a place-name in 2009, in the form of a note entitled 'Thursley, Thunor and Thirteenth-Century Pipe Rolls' which was published in *Surrey Archaeological Society Bulletin* 416. In it I claimed to have identified a series of early thirteenth-century trisyllabic forms of the place-name, which I proposed strengthened the case for the first syllable to derive from the name of the Germanic god Thunor. Subsequent to publication I discovered that all of these name-forms in fact stem from a lost minor place-name in Pyrford latterly remembered by Townslow Lane (now all but obliterated by Wisley Golf Course) descended from "Tunr(a)ed's/Tunw(e)ald's *lēah*" (Gover *et al* 1934, 132-33). It was a salutary lesson in the intricacies of place-name analysis, and part of the reason for this reassessment of the evidence was to atone for my past mistake; to this end an earlier version of this paper was published as 'Thursley revisited' in *Surrey Archaeological Society Bulletin*, 434 (2012), 5-10.

shied away from passing judgement on place-names of more ambiguous formation in their overviews (Dunn 2009, 74-75).

The omission of Thursley from Insley's aforementioned 2001 chapter is much harder to dismiss, since he accepts no fewer than nine other English place-names as remembering Thunor (Insley 2001, 431-42). Indeed, his silence when it comes to Thursley can only mean he rejected the idea that it contained Thunor's name. His argument, *contra* Cameron and Hough, that the first element of *þuresleġe broc* is best interpreted as 'a reflex of the Old Danish personal name *Thuri*' should not necessarily be inferred as being applicable to Thursley as well (Insley 2001, 431). By the same token, the location of the latter well outside the Danelaw may decrease the likelihood of synonymity between the two names but cannot rule it out altogether. Particular note should be taken of the grant in the reign of Cnut of an estate at East Horsley, not so far removed from Thursley, by an Anglo-Scandinavian staller named Thored (S 1222; Lawson 1993, 164-65). It is indisputable that some late Old English place-names contain the names of documented personages (Gelling 1988, 181) but Horsley - a place-name with *lēah* - was not amended in this way; indeed, no major place-names of this origin are known from Surrey (see Gover *et al* 1934, xix, for a summary of the handful of Surrey place-names incorporating Anglo-Scandinavian personal names). With the above evidence far from convincing, and in light of Insley's own suggestion regarding the distortion of the place-name Tuesley in Middle English (2001, 429-30), the notion of a partly Anglo-Scandinavian derivation should be viewed with considerable scepticism. (Much the same can be said of the possibility that Thursley derives from Old English *þyrs*, "giant", hence its note and prompt dismissal by Gover *et al* 1934, 211-12.)

There are a brace of other possible explanations of part or all of the place-name Thursley which have not been considered before. The first accepts the prefixing element derives from Thunor, but in the guise of a male personal name rather than that of a deity. The sole piece of supporting evidence for this is the occurrence of a royal official of this name in the so-called Mildrith Legend (see Rollason 1982, 11). The hagiographical context of this instance gives immediate grounds for serious doubt and this has led scholars to dismiss its basis in fact: Insley (2001, 432) calls Thunor obviously 'fictive', a view supported by Yorke (2003, 110) who interprets his character as an imaginative way of explaining a burial mound called '*Thunores hleaw*' ("Thunor's barrow") on the boundary of the lands of Minster-in-Thamet. Rather more credible in view of Thursley's very late appearance in written records known to and considered by place-name studies (in 1292: Gover *et al* 1934, 211; Watts 2006, 615) is that it is a "manorial" name derived from an individual or family who took their name from a place of the same name. Aside from Thursley, the only *Thunres lēah* place-names recorded in something other than a set of Old English charter bounds are two in Essex, Thundersley and Thunderley Hall, which appear as estates in Domesday Book and later as manors (Gelling 1973, 121; for "manorial" place-names local to Thursley see Gover *et al* 1934, 210 and 216). Nevertheless, evidence will be presented below that strongly suggests there was something particularly numinous about Thursley in the Anglo-Saxon period, which accords well with the idea of it being connected to the commemoration of the god.

Characterising "Thunor's *lēah*"

The two most recent scholarly works acceptant of Thursley as a theophoric place-name are by Sarah Semple (Semple 2010; 2011). They are especially important in regards to Thursley since it is cited in both to exemplify particular types of non-Christian sacred loci related to woodland. Accepting Della Hooke's recent reinterpretation of the Old English

place-name element as being indicative of open woodland/wood pasture (Hooke 2009), Semple suggests a *lēah* associated with Thunor was a place that was ‘cut back, coppiced and maintained’ (Semple 2010, 26). This suggestion is echoed in her more recently published piece, where she posits *Thunres lēah* place-names belonged to ‘defined and maintained and actively managed areas of open wood or wood pasture’ (Semple 2011, 745).

The immediate temptation is to suspect the *lēah* from which Thursley took its name was congruent with the site of the present parish church (as intimated by Bott 2003, 82). Standing on a spur overlooking a curving, partly-dry side valley, it is afforded extra prominence by the steepness of the slopes to the north and east (cf. Blair 1991, 115). However, there are two immediate reasons why it is unlikely to have been the solitary focus of any activity associated with the cult of Thunor. The first is Thursley’s status as one of a series of local place-names with *lēah* that can be correlated with large areas of common grazing land: Witley, Ockley (*ocan lea* in a tenth-century charter boundary clause: S 382), probably Hankley. The implication is that they took on their tree-less historic open character (which all retain to varying degrees) not in the Bronze Age or before as traditionally thought, rather at a point subsequent to the coinage of their names. It may well be connected to an expansion of sheep husbandry after the Norman Conquest, something the author first identified as part of ongoing research into the development of the landscape of Puttenham parish a few miles north of Thursley. Sheep are virtually absent from the Domesday Book entries for properties in Surrey, whereas woodland was widespread (albeit recorded in a manner that neither quantifies it as an acreage nor permits straightforward interpretation as an areal measure). If this supposition is correct then, following Hooke, “Thunor’s *lēah*” could have been one of a series of large tracts of semi-open wood pasture in the locality.

The second reason for doubt is the recovery of an urn or pot of Anglo-Saxon date during construction work some 150 metres north-east of Thursley parish church (Hope-Taylor 1950). Myres placed it in a group of narrow-mouthed globular vessels which he assigned to the sixth century; however, convincing challenges to his belief that some Anglo-Saxon pottery found in England pre-dated the end of Roman rule mean it is possible the vessel might be of a slightly later date (Myres 1977a, 6, 143 & 1977b, Fig. 37; Hines 1990, 20-22). The only details concerning the circumstances of its discovery are that it was found at a depth of ‘about two feet’ and close to a deeper-buried layer of charcoal, though conversely this may have been of post-medieval date (Hope-Taylor 1950, 153). The lack of any contemporary artefacts accompanying it may point to an origin as a deliberate non-funerary deposition. A recently-excavated urn of early to mid Anglo-Saxon date from Telex Field, Betchworth, found at the edge of a tree root cast, has been characterised as ‘an offering to a sacred ash tree’ (Entwistle 2010, 5). Proposing the species of tree the vessel was buried under is questionable, at least in terms of this analysis, although it is worth remembering the well-known connection between Thunor/Thor and oak trees (see Hooke 2010, 193-94). More important is that the deposition of the vessel could have served a votive function. A small urn found atop St Martha’s Hill may be analogous; it is of a type Myres identified as persisting from the fifth to seventh century AD (Woods 1955, 41-42; Myres 1977a, 5, 141 & 1977b Fig. 34). Without large-scale excavation (as at Betchworth, where at least one early Anglo-Saxon cremation burial has been found close to Telex Field in Franks Sandpit: Entwistle 2010, 5) the context of the Thursley vessel is hard to establish, but it certainly admits a depositional element in the cultic significance of “Thunor’s *lēah*” (cf. the early Anglo-Saxon burials noted by Welch 2011, 871, at Slonk Hill,

Sussex and Blacklow Hill, Warwickshire, both interpreted as probable sites of non-Christian religious activity).

Wilson (1992, 16) made the shrewd observation that some theophoric place-names may not denote sites of regular worship, rather ones dedicated to the deity in question on the occasion of a particular event such as woodland clearance. The presence of an urn, potentially of a votive nature, offers the merest hint that Thursley's religious significance was of a more interactive nature (if only intermittently) and by extension complements the idea of a defined area sacred to Thunor as proposed by Semple (2011, 745). However, if the location of the parish church was determined by the former practice of non-Christian activity on its site, this suggests that the notion of a monofocal sacred grove implied by some earlier philological interpretations may be inappropriate in the case of Thursley. Aliko Pantos gathered a persuasive body of evidence for Anglo-Saxon assembly and hundred sites to have been of polyfocal character, a more convincing proposition than Audrey Meaney's correlation of meeting-places with sites of early Anglo-Saxon non-Christian sacred significance (Pantos 2004; Meaney 1995). The evidence from Thursley must be considered in its own right and unfortunately in this regard at present it is insufficient to ascertain whether the *lēah* was a small sacred site with one focus or encompassed a larger area containing more than one point of religious significance.

One reading of the evidence that is to hand might contend the siting of what today is the parish church (previously a chapelry of Witley) represents a symbolic decision, its elevation being intended as a triumphant demonstration of the domination of Christianity over the "heathen" practices which took place on the lower ground to the north. The choice of site may have been designed as a clean break from the past, with the ground untainted by antecedent non-Christian religious activity. Parallels can be drawn with nearby Tuesley, a place-name whose theophoric credentials have been rehabilitated by Insley (2001, 429-30; cf. Gelling 1973, 116). There the primitively-excavated foundations of a small chapel probably mark the approximate site of an Anglo-Saxon minster (they most certainly are not those of a minster church, as was suggested by Poulton 1987, 204-205) set on high ground above a spring with an apparently medieval religious name, Lady Well. Unfortunately no Anglo-Saxon artefacts are known from the vicinity of the latter so it cannot be known for certain that it was a focus of activity associated with the cult of Tīw. Morris (1989, 267) concluded the elevated positioning of many English churches was most likely due to their proximity to residences of pre-Norman lords, which seems barely credible in the case of Thursley. Instead, using Tuesley as an analogue, the chapel may have been established not within the *Thunres lēah*, but on a prominent site overlooking it.

The early landscape context

As well as providing the most contextual published interpretations of Thursley as an early Anglo-Saxon name and place, Semple has pioneered the evaluation of place-names implicit of non-Christian religious significance in terms of the "*longue durée*" - that is to say their archaeological profiles across several periods instead of just the Anglo-Saxon period alone - through an article scrutinising the archaeological biographies of three minor place-names thought to derive from Old English *hearg* (Semple 2007). It is worth adopting and adapting this approach to appraise Thursley in terms of its early landscape archaeology. Many prehistoric worked flints have been found in the locality, in particular on Thursley Common where two Bronze Age mounds survive on the parish boundary (Graham, Graham & Nicolaysen 1999; Graham, Graham & Wiltshire 2004). The Portable Antiquities Scheme and English Heritage PastScape databases record a number of findspots of Romano-British material, encompassing artefacts of first to fourth century AD date (with a notable bias towards the third and fourth centuries AD), in the area to the south of the

modern-day village.² Some may remember sites of permanent or temporary settlement, while others could represent ceramic material deposited through manuring of arable land (as per the published reports for several large-scale field-walking projects, e.g. Dyer 1990, 102-103, for Pendock in Worcestershire). Together they suggest that, far from being marginal and unutilised, the area of Thursley parish saw sustained (or repeated) activity in the Roman era. A closer reading of the evidence, meanwhile, could admit the possibility that the dearth of artefacts from the village and its immediate surroundings stems from its status as woodland at the time. If so, the *Thunres lēah* might have had a previous identity as a *nemeton* or woodland sanctuary of Roman or even pre-Roman date (Bird 2004, 83, 87; Cunliffe 2005, 569-70). The continuance, revival or remembrance of antecedent sacred significance is a theme prominent in Semple's related work, but care must still be exercised in not putting too much stress on what is after all negative evidence, especially since no attempt has been made to test whether the observed pattern is the product of a genuine bias in the distribution of artefacts or merely a lack of data.

The picture for the post-Roman centuries is harder to interpret. The chronological gap between the fourth-century pottery scatters and probable sixth-century urn is sufficiently narrow as to arouse the notion of continuity of activity in the local landscape across these centuries, but this is beyond proof and is likely to remain so. Recent radiocarbon dating of two contiguous peat deposits from Boundless Copse two miles (three kilometres) due south of present-day Thursley village has provided dates of 580-675 for the lower deposit and 650-810 for the upper deposit (Wessex Archaeology 2009, 40-41). Future palynological analysis of these deposits may offer insights into the environmental context of "Thunor's *lēah*" around the time the name was coined. For the time being, however, the only glimpse into the nature of the Anglo-Saxon landscape hereabouts comes from a later source, one that post-dates the Christian conversion of the area - but not necessarily the cessation of non-Christian religious activity at Thursley. This is the series of boundary marks named in the vernacular clause of S 382 delimiting the Farnham estate immediately to the west. It must be remembered that, as a non-continuous description of a periphery, it cannot be understood as an accurate transect through a "normal" landscape (if such a thing can ever exist). Nevertheless, it is worthy of note because the compound *Thunres lēah* is known from four other sets of Old English charter bounds - not to mention the above-mentioned '*Thunores hleaw*' - as if they were habitually situated in liminal places. Therefore it may be no accident that the settlement presently known as Thursley sits close to the course of the boundary recorded by S 382. The names of the five points suggest a varied, populated landscape. The first two, *pudan more* (Pudmore, "Puda's marsh") and *crudan sceat* (latterly Cricchet Field, "?Cruda's corner of land"), support the sense of marginality, but also that individuals owned or were otherwise associated with particular places. To the south, *hegcumbe* (Highcombe Bottom, "hay valley") points to the exploitation of the valley bottom for winter grazing fodder, while *wulf horan* (lost, "wolf flat-topped ridge") evokes the contemporary or antecedent wildness of the environs. Perhaps most interesting of all is *finleage* (latterly Fingley, "wood-pile open woodland"), since this insinuates arboreal management of a *lēah* in a fashion much like Semple has postulated took place at Thursley.

The chapel-cum-church

The final element of early medieval Thursley to be considered here is the earliest fabric of the present parish church. There must have continued to be something numinous about the vicinity (at least in the local collective memory) for it to be chosen as the site of a

² These finds are tabulated and summarised in a two-part appendix to this piece available online at <http://surreymedieval.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/appendix.pdf>

chapel rather than Milford, Enton or another settlement within the estate-cum-parish of Witley. That the Anglo-Saxon-style architectural details of the earliest extant phase of Thursley are so similar to those of its mother church at Witley as to indicate the two must have been the products of a single concerted building project is beyond question. What remains unresolved is the date of these two buildings. Alan Bott (2003, 82-85) has made the case for a pre-1066 date based upon a number of indicators. He does so without reference to the opinions of John Blair, who floated a date 'as late as the 1080s or 1090s' for the double-splayed windows in the chancel north wall at Thursley (2003, 102) only to hint elsewhere at an even later, possibly early twelfth-century, origin (1991, 115). The crux of the argument is whether the patron of the works was the pre-Conquest or post-Conquest lord of Witley as recorded in Domesday Book. Only one church is attributed to Witley in the Survey (Morris 1975, 24,1). This may be an error but the ecclesiastical recording of Surrey, at least in terms of the existence of a church in named properties, was demonstrably more accurate than those of other shires (Blair 1991, 120-22). As a result, despite the initial credibility of connecting the construction of the two buildings with the powerful pre-1066 lord Harold Godwineson, the probability that there were not two churches (or rather a church and a chapel, as recorded at Chobham: Morris 1975, 8,22) at the time of the Domesday Survey points to both being commissioned by the first Norman lord, Gilbert de l'Aigle. This tallies with the Saxo-Norman style of the two buildings, as well as the observation made by Patrick Molineux on his now-defunct *Surrey Domesday* website that Gilbert de l'Aigle held only one other estate in England, a much smaller and less valuable holding at Mildenhall in Suffolk. Consequently, he may have been minded to invest heavily in renewing the ecclesiastical infrastructure of his main English property.

Two features of the present church building at Thursley imply a degree of prior importance that could be used to posit the Domesday church was in fact sited at Thursley and not Witley. Simple two-celled Saxo-Norman church buildings tended to have square or sub-square eastern chamber, whereas at Thursley the chancel is unusually long in the east-west dimension. This is undoubtedly connected to the existence of sizeable offsets on the internal faces of its north and south walls, which must have supported the joists for a floor. Devoid of visible internal details, it is very hard to interpret quite what this upper-floor level was used for; one possibility is that it served a residential function for a priest. The other feature of interest is the massive tub font. With its band of simple chevron decoration, it would appear to be broadly contemporary with the earliest fabric at Thursley (the pre-Conquest date suggested by Bott 2003, 99, is untenable in view of the preceding paragraph). Consequently, unless it was brought from Witley at a later date (the font there being of thirteenth-century date: Bott 2003, 34), it indicates that the chapel had baptismal rights from the time of its construction. This is seemingly very early for a daughter chapel, yet there are a significant number of twelfth-century fonts in subsidiary chapels in Surrey, and as such the example at Thursley may be merely the earliest to survive (see Blair 1991, 155). Thus in both cases the importance of features which at first seemed significant is cast into serious doubt when subjected to closer scrutiny.

It is not out of the ordinary for medieval churches and chapels to go unmentioned in written records until the late thirteenth century, often well in excess of a century after the date of their earliest surviving or known fabric. At Thursley there are perhaps as many as three phases of work earlier than the first relevant documentary testimony. The first, the Saxo-Norman fabric of the chancel and part of the nave, has been assessed already. The double-splayed window apertures containing wooden frames belonging to this phase differ sufficiently from the single-splayed form of the small round-headed window in the north wall of the nave as to indicate the latter pertains to a separate, slightly later episode of building work perhaps effected in the early twelfth century (see Bott 2003, 84-85). Finally,

towards the end of the thirteenth century there seems to have been a programme of internal alterations (new chancel arch, wall paintings) with some additional fenestration (Bott 2003, 86). All of the above had been completed by the time of the *Taxatio* of Pope Nicholas IV in 1291, which records the existence of a chapel associated with Witley church, unnamed but indisputably Thursley (*Taxatio* 1802, 208). The following year marks the first known occurrence of the place-name, sparking a steady but hardly prolific stream of occurrences thereafter (Gover *et al* 1934, 211).³

Conclusions

This essay has attempted to go beyond a contemplation of the meaning of the name of Thursley in order to assess it as a place before, during and after the Anglo-Saxon period. As a study reliant entirely on the reevaluation and synthesis of existing scholarship, rather than the presentation of the results of new fieldwork or research, it must be conceded that no conclusion can be drawn that is absolutely beyond reasonable question. The precise derivation of the place-name must remain uncertain, although the combined circumstantial evidence - the early Anglo-Saxon urn, proximity to a boundary in existence in the tenth century (and by implication considerably earlier in origin), unusual Saxo-Norman chapel building - does point to Thursley having a number of characteristics apt for interpretation as a *lēah* connected to the cult of Thunor. What is more, if Myres' sixth-century dating of the urn from Thursley village is broadly accurate then it invites correlation to the theophoric nature of the place-name, which would contradict Margaret Gelling's suggestion that such names were coined after *circa* 700 when they became exceptional for what took place (or the remembrance of what took place) at them in the face of the Christian conversion (Gelling 2011, 997).

The vagaries of Anglo-Saxon charter survival and a failure to be named in Domesday Book as a separately assessed tenurial entity go only some of the way towards explaining why Thursley has not been found in documentary records dating from before the closing years of the thirteenth century. Its invisibility in earlier ecclesiastical records is understandable to an extent, since they occur fairly infrequently, but absence from the far more abundant secular documentation of the period is remarkable. I remain convinced that earlier forms of the place-name Thursley await discovery in the written records; it is important to remember that most if not all of the ones that have formed the basis of the onomastic assessments of the name were assembled as part of a data collection exercise effected around eight decades ago. If and when one or more earlier and/or more diagnostic form of the place-name is found, the onus will be back on onomastics to pass judgement on the most credible meaning of the name - perhaps by critically evaluating Eric Stanley's ideas on the evolution of the place-name Thursley (for which see Hough 1996, 388) - and whether this supports or conflicts with the positive non-documentary indications identified above which favour a derivation from the god Thunor.

³ In the name of completeness, it should be noted that one of the editors of the episcopal registers of John de Pontoise, Bishop of Winchester, tentatively suggested a reference of *circa* 1270 to the '*Ecclesia de Horsseye*' pertains to Thursley. The place-name spelling seems too distorted for the notion to be sustained; indeed, in the endnotes of the same volume the name is proposed to represent one of the Horsleys instead. The use of *ecclesia* instead of *capella* is by itself sufficient proof of the incorrectness of the original conjecture. *Registrum*, 607 and 849 respectively.

REFERENCES

- *Domesday Book, 3: Surrey*, ed. by John Morris (Chichester: Phillimore, 1975)
- *Registrum Johannis de Pontissara, 2*, ed. by Cecil Deedes & Charles Johnson (London: Canterbury & York Society, 1924)
- *Taxatio ecclesiastica Angliae at Walliae, auctoritate P. Nicholai IV, circa A.D. 1291*, ed. by Thomas Astle, Samuel Ayscough & A. Strahan (London: Record Commission, 1802)
- Bird, David, 'Roman religious sites in the landscape' in *Aspects of Archaeology & History in Surrey: towards a research framework for the county*, ed. by Jonathan Cotton, Glenys Crocker & Audrey Graham (Guildford: Surrey Archaeological Society [SyAS], 2004), 77-90
- Blair, John, *Early Medieval Surrey: Landholding, Church and Settlement* (Stroud & Guildford: Alan Sutton & SyAS, 1991)
- Blair, John, 'Parish Churches in the Eleventh Century' in *The Story of Domesday Book*, ed. by R. W. H. Erskine & Ann Williams (Chichester: Phillimore, 2003), 97-103
- Bott, Alan, *Witley and Thursley Parish Churches* (Witley & Thursley: Parochial Church Councils of Witley & Thursley, 2003)
- Briggs, Rob, 'Thursley, Thunor and Thirteenth-Century Pipe Rolls', *SyAS Bulletin*, **416** (2009), 17-19
- Cunliffe, Barry, *Iron Age Communities in Britain*, fourth edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2005)
- Dunn, Marilyn, *The Christianization of the Anglo-Saxons c.597-c.700: Discourses of Life, Death and Afterlife* (London & New York: Continuum, 2009)
- Dyer, Christopher, 'Dispersed Settlements in Medieval England. A case study of Pendock, Worcestershire', *Medieval Archaeology*, **34** (1990), 97-121
- *The Electronic Sawyer* <http://www.esawyer.org.uk>, accessed June-October 2012
- Entwistle, Roy, 'Archaeological investigations at Betchworth', *SyAS Bulletin*, **420** (2010), 4-6
- Gelling, Margaret, 'Further Thoughts on Pagan Place-Names' in *Otium et negotium: studies in onomatology and library science presented to Olof von Feilitzen*, ed. by Folke Sandgren (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1973), 109-28
- Gelling, Margaret, *Signposts to the Past* (Chichester: Phillimore, 1988)
- Gelling, Margaret, 'Place-Names and Archaeology' in *The Oxford Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Archaeology*, ed. by Helena Hamerow, David A. Hinton & Sally Crawford (Oxford: Oxford University Press [OUP], 2011), 986-1002
- Gover, J. E. B., A. Mawer & F. M. Stenton, *The Place-Names of Surrey* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [CUP], 1934)
- Graham, David, Audrey Graham & Pat Nicolaysen 'Surface collection of worked flints from Thursley Common', *Surrey Archaeological Collections [SyAC]*, **86** (1999),
- Graham, David, Audrey Graham & Patricia Wiltshire, 'Investigation of a Bronze Age mound on Thursley Common', *SyAC*, **91** (2004), 151-66
- Hines, John, 'Philology, Archaeology and the *adventus Saxonum vel Anglorum*' in *Britain 400-600: Language and History*, ed. by Alfred Bammesberger & Alfred Wollmann (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1990), 17-36
- Hines, John, 'Religion: the limits of knowledge' in *The Anglo-Saxons from the Migration Period to the Eighth Century*, ed. by John Hines (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997), 375-401
- Hooke, Della, 'Early medieval woodland and the place-name term *lēah*' in *A Commodity of Good Names: Essays in Honour of Margaret Gelling*, ed. by Oliver J. Padel & David N. Parsons (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2009), 365-76
- Hooke, Della, *Trees in Anglo-Saxon England: Literature, Lore and Landscape* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2010)
- Hope-Taylor, Brian, 'A Saxon Pot from Thursley', *SyAC*, **51** (1950), 152-53
- Hough, Carole, 'The place-name Thursley', *Notes and Queries*, **43.4** (1996), 387-89
- Insley, John, 'Kultische Namen - England' in *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, 2nd edition, ed. by Heinrich Beck, Dieter Geuenich, Heiko Steuer & Dieter Timpe (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001), **17**, 425-37

- Lawson, M. K., *Cnut: the Danes in England in the early eleventh century* (London: Longman, 1993)
- Mayr-Harting, Henry, *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England*, third edition (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991)
- Meaney, Audrey, 'Pagan English Sanctuaries, Place-Names and Hundred Meeting-Places', *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*, **8** (1995), 29-42
- Mills, A. D., *A Dictionary of British Place-Names* (Oxford: OUP, 2011)
- Morris, Richard, *Churches in the Landscape* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1989)
- Myres, J. N. L., *A Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Pottery of the Pagan Period*, **1 & 2** [Myres 1977a & 1977b] (Cambridge: CUP, 1977)
- North, Richard, *Heathen Gods in Old English Literature* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997)
- Pantos, Aiki, 'The location and form of Anglo-Saxon assembly-places: some "moot points"', in *Assembly Places and Practices in Medieval Europe*, ed. by A. Pantos & S. Semple (Dublin: Four Courts, 2004), 155-80
- Poulton, Rob, 'Saxon Surrey' in *The Archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, ed. by Joanna Bird & D. G. Bird (Guildford: SyAS, 1987), 197-222
- Rollason, D. W., *The Mildrith Legend: A Study in Early Medieval Hagiography in England* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1982)
- Salmon, Nathanael, *Antiquities of Surrey, Collected from the most antient Records* (London: printed for the author, 1736)
- Semple, Sarah, 'Defining the OE *hearg*: a preliminary archaeological and topographic examination of *hearg* place names and their hinterlands', *Early Medieval Europe*, **15.4** (2007), 364-85
- Semple, Sarah, 'In the open air' in *Signals of Belief in Early England: Anglo-Saxon Paganism Revisited*, ed. by Martin O. H. Carver, Alexandra Sanmark & Sarah Semple (Oxford: Oxbow, 2010), 21-48
- Semple, Sarah, 'Sacred Spaces and Places in Pre-Christian and Conversion Period Anglo-Saxon England' in *The Oxford Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Archaeology*, ed. by Helena Hamerow, David A. Hinton & Sally Crawford (Oxford: OUP, 2011), 742-63
- *The Cambridge Dictionary of English Place-Names*, ed. by V. Watts (Cambridge: CUP, 2006)
- Welch, Martin, 'Pre-Christian Practices in the Anglo-Saxon World' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion*, ed. by Timothy Insoll (Oxford: OUP, 2011), 863-76
- Wessex Archaeology, *A3 Hindhead: Post-excavation Assessment Report and Proposals for Analysis and Final Publication* (Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology, 2009)
- Wilson, David, *Anglo-Saxon Paganism* (London: Routledge, 1992)
- Wood, E. S., 'The earth circles on St Martha's Hill, near Guildford', *SyAC*, **54** (1955), 10-46
- Yorke, Barbara, *Nunneries and the Anglo-Saxon Royal Houses* (London: Continuum, 2003)