

A SURVEY OF KENT PLACE-NAMES

By P. H. REANEY, Litt.D., Ph.D., F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S.

THE English Place-name Society began a Survey of English Place-names in 1924 and has now published 29 volumes covering 19 counties and two of the Ridings of Yorkshire. In general, the policy has been to deal first with those counties on which no work had previously been done and secondly with those for which there was only an inadequate or incomplete survey, leaving until later those like Lancashire, Northumberland and Durham, the Isle of Wight and Dorsetshire, for which reliable books were available. Kent comes under the last class. In 1931 Dr. J. K. Wallenberg published his *Kentish Place-names* and followed this in 1934 with *The Place-names of Kent*, the two volumes containing a thousand pages, a major achievement for a single individual, especially as the author was a Swede and the books were published at Uppsala. The Place-name Society's volumes, we must never forget, are the result of co-operative effort. For various reasons, a definitive book on the Place-names of Kent is unlikely to appear in the near future. The county is large and vast quantities of material must be searched; the Anglo-Saxon Charters relating to the county are particularly numerous, with many problems of identification and interpretation still to be worked out. To foster and hasten the collection of material and to bring nearer the publication of a work we so badly need, the Council of the Kent Archaeological Society recently appointed a Place-names Committee and the purpose of this article is first to appeal to all members of the Society and others interested to support the project and secondly to indicate various ways of giving practical help.

Occasionally one meets the objection that Wallenberg's thousand pages make a further work superfluous. The truth is that, valuable as is much of his work, it is neither complete nor altogether satisfactory. The books are difficult to use. There is no general historical introduction, no discussion of the special characteristics of Kentish Place-names, no comparison with those of the neighbouring counties of Sussex and Surrey. There are no lists of the elements used or of their distribution, no lists of personal-names, no collection or discussion of field-names. The treatment of minor names is inadequate and often unsatisfactory. Material for these is usually to be found in such unpublished documents as court-rolls, ministers' accounts, extents and surveys, etc., not one of which has been used. It was, of course,

A SURVEY OF KENT PLACE-NAMES

impossible for him to use the vast accumulation of such documents now to be found in the Kent Archives Office, but there were others in the British Museum and the Public Record Office. Since 1934, too, many additional volumes have been published in the series of Pipe Rolls, Curia Regis Rolls, Close and Patent Rolls, and Inquisitions *post mortem*. Work on other counties suggests that these will contain much valuable material.

Many of Wallenberg's etymologies will need to be reconsidered. Obsessed at first by Zachrisson's antipathy to personal-name derivations, he postulated a number of unrecorded topographical terms, the majority being names of hills or streams, and more than once, after a long discussion in favour of a stream-name, he was compelled to admit that there was no stream there. In his later book, he modified his views and agreed that Zachrisson's reaction against derivation from personal-names had gone too far. But many of his etymologies are inconclusive. He gives two, or possibly three, alternatives and leaves the reader to make his own choice. It is true that for many place-names a definite etymology cannot be reached but it is an editor's duty to eliminate the impossible, so far as he can. Both unrecorded topographical elements and hypothetical personal-names undoubtedly do occur in place-names and Kent place-names need revision in the light of the advances made in the 25 years since Wallenberg wrote. The frequent survival of otherwise unrecorded Old English personal-names in post-Conquest documents not only emphasizes the gaps in our knowledge of these names but, in a few instances, has actually proved that names postulated to explain place-names did really exist.¹ Many place-names originally ending in *-ingas*, an early type denoting the settlement of a community, contain a personal-name. Rooting, from an original *Rōtingas*, means "the men, followers or dependents of a man named *Rōta*". This personal-name may well be a nickname meaning "the merry one", but Wallenberg's interpretation that the settlers at Rooting were called "the merry noble men" is impossible. A nickname may be applicable to a single individual, here the leader of the group, but to assume that all the settlers at a particular place had the same characteristics, physical, mental or moral, is absurd. The founders of Yalding cannot all have been old men or chieftains; *Ealdingas* must be "the followers of *Ealda*". Nor can all the men of Detling have been "men of a lumpy, rounded stature" or those of Malling "crazy, foolish men", or those of Hatling "men making a rattling noise".

To test how far new material will confirm, correct or add to Wallenberg's work, a preliminary examination has been made of certain sources, ready to hand and chosen at random, and not used by him.

¹ v. P. H. Reaney, *Dictionary of British Surnames* (1958), xix-xxiv.

The recently published Cartulary of St. Gregory, Canterbury,¹ gives earlier references for many places, a number going back to 1086-7. For Goldstone in Ash we have six references earlier than Wallenberg's first (1202). It occurs as *Goldstanestune* in 1086-7, which makes connection with Goldstan, son of Bruning, a juror at Sandwich in 1127, at least doubtful. Even if he were only 20 in 1086, he must have been 60 or more at this time and it is unlikely that a Saxon founded and gave his name to this farm between 1066 and 1086. The place was probably named before the Conquest from some other Goldstan.

As often, the search for place-name material throws light on the history of the place itself. Bekesbourne appears in Domesday Book as *Burnes*, a name which continued in use throughout the twelfth century (to 1198). The church of St. Peter of *Burnes* was granted in alms to Edmund the priest by Rodbertus filius Godwini between 1136 and 1150, a grant confirmed by archbishop Theobald in 1143-50. The grantor is also called Robert de Burnes and Robert de Hastings, and was the son of Godwine frenus; thus, in spite of his French Christian name, he was of English descent. Some time before 1182, Eustace de Burnis (presumably his son) granted the church to the priory of St. Gregory. Between 1182 and 1190, Hugh de Bec had illegally given the advowson of *Burnis* either to the church of Holy Trinity, Hastings, or to the Knights Hospitallers. The convent of Holy Trinity, Hastings, resigned its rights in the church of *Livingesburn* to St. Gregory. William del Bec, son of Hugh, after a dispute with Eustace de Burnis regarding the advowson of the church of *Burnis*, relinquished his claim. This connection with Hastings explains the alternative surname of Robert de Burnes. In the late twelfth century, his son Eustace and William de Bec held jointly the serjeanty of providing a ship for the king's service at Hastings and Bekesbourne became a non-corporate member of the Cinque Ports.²

Bekesbourne, like Littlebourne, Patrixbourne and Bishopsbourne, was originally named from the stream (OE *burna*) on which it stands, now the Nail Bourne. When it became necessary to distinguish between these four places, Bekesbourne was first called *Livingesburn*, a name found from c. 1180, in common use in the thirteenth century, and occasionally as late as 1541. The tenant of Bekesbourne in 1066 was one *Levine* (OE *Lēofwine*), from whom Wallenberg derives *Livingesburn*. If this were correct, the form would be *Leofwinesburne*, or possibly *Livinesburne*. *Livingesburn* presumes an OE *Lýfingesburna* or, possibly, *Lēofwinesburna*, from OE *Lýfing* or *Lēofing*. As Robert, who held the church c. 1136, and his father Godwine were English by

¹ *Cartulary of the Priory of St. Gregory, Canterbury*, ed. A. M. Woodcock (Camden Third Series LXXXVIII), 1956.

² *ibid.*, 15-18, 27, 34-39, 164, 218, 221, 222, and p. xiv.

birth, they may have been descendants of Leofwine, the tenant of 1066, but the time-factor suggests that Godwine was rather the grandson than the son of Leofwine. If so, Lyfing may have been a son of Leofwine and father of Godwine, and we have here an instance of a Saxon family retaining its possessions from 1066 to the end of the twelfth century. It may be noted that Leofwine alliterates with Lyfing, whilst Godwine contains the same second element as Leofwine, both characteristics of Anglo-Saxon nomenclature. The name Bekesbourne is not noted before 1270 by Wallenberg but clearly derives from the family of Hugh del Bec (c. 1190), most probably of French origin.

Curwood Farm in Nonington is identified by Wallenberg with *crudes siba* (873 BCS 536), a name which survived as late as 1434 as *Cruddeswode*. The wood may well have been in this neighbourhood; by metathesis the name may have become *Curdeswode*; but no explanation of the modern form has been offered. This probably preserves the memory of the heirs of Walter *Crul* "the curly-haired" who granted 5s. rent in *Ewerlande* (Overland in Ash) to the priory of St. Gregory c. 1215-27, a grant confirmed by Adam *Crul* and Dionisia his wife. The cartulary gives us forms for two names not in Wallenberg: Horton in Chartham (*Hortune* 1213-14) and Isingdane Wood in Waltham (*Isendane* 1240-50) and (among others) an earlier form for Winterage Farm in Elham: *Wintering* 1215-40. This is clearly a singular name in *-ing*, not a name in *-ingas*. In any case, a meaning "early invaders who wintered here" is absurd.

For Amets Hill in Stockbury, Wallenberg has only: "Cf. perhaps Will. *Amite* 1327 Subs". A surname *Amite* is most unlikely. It is probably a mis-reading of *Amice*, from the woman's name *Amicia*, surviving today in the surnames *Amies*, *Amis* and *Amys*. In 1317 William *atemethulle* or *ate Ametehelle* was accused of stealing a cow worth 10s. of Richard Jordan and a sheep of Bertram Criel in the hundred of Twyferde.¹ Stockbury is in Eyhorne hundred but no great distance from Twyford and cattle-stealers would not limit their operations to the immediate neighbourhood of their homes. This place-name is not common but is identical in origin with Amptill (Beds.) OE (*æt*) *æmette-hyll* "(place near the) ant-hill", the first element occurring also in Antley (Lancs). Amets Hill preserves the normal development of *æmette*, with a pseudo-manorial *s*, as if from a surname.

Parish histories often provide valuable material unobtainable except from the local historian with his special knowledge of local documents and topography. Ewing's small *History of Cowden*² provides material for no fewer than ten places still on the map which

¹ B. I. Putnam, *Kent Keepers of the Peace, 1316-1317* (1933), 20, 83.

² G. Ewing, *History of Cowden*, Tunbridge Wells, 1926.

are not included by Wallenberg: Basing Farm (1614), Beechenwood (1571), Friendly Green, called *Bartlotts* in 1505, from the family of William Bertelot (1416), Claydene (1556), Cowdenschaw (1476), Furnace Farm (1618), Glovers Haws (John Glover 1780), Saxbys (1516), from the family of John Saxpes (1505; also formerly called *Oakdene* and *Bottings*, from Hugh Botting who held Saxbys in 1555), Scarlets (*Scarlets* 1653, *Scalehurst* 1663), and Stridewood (1673). Edells owes its name to the family of John Eydell (1735) and Thomas Edell (1760) and thus has no connection with Wallenberg's Robert Hedley. Ludwells is so called in 1558 from the family of Robert Ludwell (1456) and is not from *Lodelawe* as Wallenberg hesitatingly suggests. Rickwoods derives from Laurence Rycarde (1465) and is not called *Rickwood(s)* until the nineteenth century. It is clear from this that all the parish histories of Kent must be examined, but care and discrimination are essential for it is not always easy to decide whether the author has modernized his forms or is quoting his documents accurately. Here, too, we would appeal to all authors of papers in *Archæologia Cantiana* who have used old documents to quote accurately the forms of place-names and surnames, where necessary giving identifications in brackets. From our point of view, the valuable paper of Wing Commander Dumbreck on *The Lowy of Tonbridge*¹ is of less value than it might have been because of an inconsistency in the transcription of place-name forms. Ensfield, Ramshurst and Tapners (p. 140) are certainly not the forms in the document of 1279. For these, we must still consult the manuscript.

Articles on subjects of all kinds unconnected with place-names can from time to time provide us with material. The name of a juror of 1279, Jockey *Underevere*,² gives us the first reference to Under River " (the place) beneath the edge or brow of the hill ", i.e. River Hill, earlier *æt pære yfere*, ME *atter ēfer*, *atte rēver*. The earliest full form for Hildenborough so far noted is *Hildenborough* in the Patent Rolls for 1389. The final element has not previously been explained. In 1279 we have reference to doing service and attending " the borough of Hilden ",³ so that the final element is the Kentish *borgh*, " the tithing of Hilden ". Although he gives the form *Whitley* alias *Whitcliff* (1555) for Whitley Forest in Chevening, Wallenberg prefers to derive the name from a 1313 *Whitehill* " white hill ". But *-hill* cannot become *-ley* and the true origin is made clear in the forms *Witcliff* and *Witliff wood* in the Patent Rolls for 1554, " the white cliff or slope ", with the same development as in the colloquial pronunciation of Trottscliffe as *Trotsley*. For Tyland in Boxley, Wallenberg's sole form is *Tyland* 1535, derived from OE *tēag* " tye, enclosure ". In

¹ *Arch. Cant.*, LXXII (1958), 138-147.

² *ibid.*, p. 139.

³ *ibid.*, p. 141.

1629 the manor-house is called *Tylelands* and in the parish was also a *Tyle Pond*,¹ clearly a place where material for tiles was obtained or where tiles were made.

The search for place-name forms occasionally produces material which suggests interesting historical possibilities, even if the place itself cannot be definitely identified. An Anglo-Saxon charter of 616-18 (BCS 837) gives the bounds of Burmarsh: on the east the land of the South Saxons (*supsaxe lond*), on the south the land of the people of Folkestone (*terra folcanstaninga*), on the west the land of the king and on the north the river Limen. The last is the only point which can be identified on the map today. Burmarsh is due south of Port Lympne which preserves the original name of the river now represented by the Royal Military Canal. Folkestone is some distance away to the east and the *terra folcanstaninga* probably refers to land owned by the Saxon monastery of Folkestone of which no records remain. They also had land not far away, north of Warehorne (*pes hiredes lond to Folcanstane* 830 BCS 396), and near Dover, at West Cliffe (1038-44 KCD 769).

Of *supsaxe lond*, Wallenberg remarks: " It cannot refer to Sussex itself since this county is rather far away. Besides it seems impossible for Sussex to form the eastern boundary of any place in Kent ". About seven miles north of the old river Limen and due north of Burmarsh is Hastingleigh, a name whose significance appears to have escaped notice. It can only mean " the woodland belonging to the *Hæstings* ", the people of Hastings, the name of a community or folk which settled in East Sussex probably in the latter half of the fifth century. An eighth-century chronicle written in Northumbria records that in 771 Offa, king of the Mercians, subdued by force of arms the tribe of the *Hestingi* who must have been identical with the *Hæstings* of Sussex and this mention of their subjugation in a Northumbrian annal implies that they were a people of some importance. They were still regarded as a separate people as late as 1011 when the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle states that by that year the Danes had harried, south of the Thames, " all the *Centingas* and the South Saxons and the *Hæstingas* and Surrey and Berkshire, and Hampshire and a great part of Wiltshire ". A people whose individuality could be remembered for some 500 years and who, at the end of that period, could be mentioned in a national chronicle side by side with the people of Kent and the South Saxons must have been more than a mere fragment of a larger kingdom. We know from the few Saxon charters which have survived for Sussex that at the end of the seventh century there were living at the same time in Sussex three men who bore the name of king, whilst the names of the kings of Sussex on record suggest there

¹ *ibid.* pp. 12, 13.

may have been two distinct dynasties, one of which may have ruled the *Hæstingas*. What territory this folk occupied is uncertain, but it must have been extensive, covering at least the Rape of Hastings, perhaps the whole of East Sussex, for it is significant that the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records no fighting by Aelle east of Pevensey, whilst Hastingford in Hadlow Down in the Rape of Pevensey undoubtedly means "the ford of the *Hæstingas*", probably a ford on their boundary, the entrance to their territory.¹

Did this territory of theirs extend as far east as Hastingleigh, near Wye? At first sight it appears unlikely. But we must look at the countryside as it was at the end of the fifth century. Neither archaeology nor place-names provide any evidence for early settlement south of the North Downs. The heavy clay of the Weald was well-wooded and avoided by early settlers. The area of Romney Marsh from Hythe to Guldeford Level was even less attractive for different reasons. Both areas were thinly populated, even at the time of Domesday Book,² and about A.D. 500 the whole was probably a no man's land, the effective occupation of south-east Kent ending along the North Downs from Folkestone to Wye and that of Sussex at the Rother and the mouth of the Brede. The modern Hastingleigh may be a relic of a once extensive wood near the boundaries of the *Hæstingas*.

Westenhanger may, perhaps, also refer to men from Sussex. It is admittedly a difficult name and its forms are not easy to reconcile. Most common are forms like *Ostringehangre* (1212); those like *Estringeshangre* (1231) Wallenberg regards as errors due to confusion of *o* and *e* in the manuscripts. *Westringehangre* (1270) he regards as due to folk etymology, from association with *west*. But this is clearly the origin of the modern form and the two earliest forms, admittedly poor ones, also belong here: *Witingehanger* c. 1140-4, *Witingehanga* 1135-54. These may well be from an OE *Westeringa-hangra* "the wooded hill of the men of the west". Wallenberg's derivation from *oster* "protuberance" is tautological "wooded hill of the men living on the hill" and does not account for the modern form. *Westerham* "the west homestead or village" occurs as *Osterham* in Domesday Book but *Osterland* in Stoke, so spelled in 961, is never found with an initial *W*.

A further possible indication that here we have a border area where Kent and Sussex once met is perhaps the name of Canter Wood in Elham. This is not recorded before 1240 (*Kanteuorth*) but may well be old, a parallel with Canterton (Hants) and Conderton (Wores), the latter occurring as *Cantuaretun* in an eleventh-century copy of a

¹ v. A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, *The Place-names of Sussex* (1929-30), xxiii-xxiv.

² Cf. the maps in F. W. Jessup, *History of Kent* (1958), pp. 34, 35, 47.

charter of 875. The origin is not certain. Both these may be "farm of the men of Kent" (OE *Cantwara-tūn*) or "farm of a woman named *Cantwara*" (OE *Cantwara-tūn*), a personal-name not on record. Wallenberg prefers to derive these names from the personal-name, chiefly on the ground that a settlement of Kentish men in Worcestershire (and in Hampshire) is a theory unproved "without the support of safe instances of similar migration names". But we have certainly one un doubted example, a settlement of East Saxons at Exton in Hampshire.¹ *Cantwara-worþ* should mean "enclosure of the men of Kent", "much too vague and sweeping a designation for a place of small importance situated in Kent" says Wallenberg, who consequently suggests a possible meaning "enclosure of the men of Canterbury", though they were undoubtedly called *burhwara* "men of the fortified town", as in Burmarsh and the Domesday form of the lathe, *Borowart*. Canterbury (OE *Cantwara-burh*) was the "fortified town of the men of Kent" and a name *Cantwara-worþ* may well have been given to emphasize that this was Kentish territory. The term *worþ* is old and became obsolete early for it is almost completely absent from the literary records of Old English. It is associated with a "hedge" or "fence" and compounded in some early place-names in *-ingas* and *hām*. Perhaps the enclosure at Canter Wood was for defence against the *Hæstingas* of Hastingleigh and the *Westeringas* of Westenhanger.

The present boundary between Sussex and Kent north and east of Rye is clearly artificial and has varied. In a Sussex charter of 772 (BCS 208) we have the bounds of Icklesham. None of the points can be identified except that they reached *oð Cantwara mearc* "the boundary of the men of Kent". In 830 (BCS 396) the southern boundary of Warehorne was *Seaxana meare* "the boundary of the Saxons". Neither of these can be equated with the present boundary nor have we at present the material to explain the changes. It is possible that Hastingleigh was an outlying swine-pasture of the men of Hastings. It would be no more difficult for them to reach it than for the men of Thanet to reach Tenterden "the swine-pasture of the men of Thanet". What is clear is that the early history of east Sussex and south-west Kent is more complicated than we had imagined. A thorough search of all available documents might throw more light on the problem.

THE COLLECTION OF MATERIAL

A place-name may have altered considerably both in pronunciation and spelling in the course of the centuries. Wateringbury, for example, is spelled both *Woðringaberan* and *Uuotryngbyri* c. 995, whilst Pembury was *Peþpingeberia* c. 1100. Before we can attempt an etymology, we

¹ at East Seaxnathum, 940 BCS 758.

need as full a collection of early forms as possible to show the development of the name down to its modern form. These will be found scattered in sources of all kinds and will seldom or never turn up in the correct, chronological order. The only method is to collect *all* the place-name forms from a particular document and, as we proceed with other documents, to arrange and combine all the forms for each name. Problems of identification will often arise, but by noting any useful hints in the text, these problems can frequently be solved. Some place-names have not survived in use, but they should be noted as they may be of interest historically or may help in determining the meaning of other names which have survived elsewhere in this or other counties.

The essential qualities needed in collecting this material are accuracy in copying, legible hand-writing and a healthy distrust of indexes. Forms should always be copied from the text; indexers are not infallible; misprints may occur and names may be omitted from the index; but indexes are often very valuable in providing identifications. Very many, probably most, of the printed sources can be searched by anyone willing to spend time and patience on the work. But some sources require special qualifications. In dealing with Anglo-Saxon charters, for example, a knowledge of Old English is obviously necessary. Such documents as the Curia Regis Rolls, the early Close and Patent Rolls and monastic cartularies are printed in the original Latin. The text of these early documents frequently contains information of value for the identification and sometimes for the etymology of the name and this would be missed if the original could not be understood. But the later volumes and numerous other sources are in English abstracts or translations and require no special qualifications. There is work which every member of the Society can undertake and we appeal to all to make some contribution.

An unusually large number of Anglo-Saxon charters has survived relating to lands in Kent. Very many of the places mentioned have been identified with certainty; some of the identifications proposed cannot be accepted; some are doubtful; some places are still unidentified. On the working out of the bounds contained in many of these charters, good work has already been done, particularly by Wallenberg and Dr. Gordon Ward, but here, too, there are doubts and difficulties and places still unidentified. All these bounds need reconsideration, both on the map and in the field. The clue to the identification of many such names may be found in the reappearance of the name in later documents and on Tithe maps and for this we need the help of the local historian and field-worker. We have had promises of some such assistance and appeal for more. It is interesting and fascinating work.

Another problem, peculiar to Kent, and to some extent overlapping with the last, is the identification of the dens or swine-pastures in the Weald belonging to distant, upland manors. These are frequently mentioned in Anglo-Saxon charters as belonging to a particular estate but no indication is given of their situation. Very many are still unidentified and the problem is complicated by the fact that the same modern name occurs more than once in different parishes, whilst it is often difficult to equate an early form with a modern name. The necessary material is probably hidden in unpublished manorial records and here is work for the historian who can incidentally provide valuable material for the study of these place-names.

SOURCES

These are of two main classes, national records from which material relating to Kent needs to be abstracted and documents concerned only with the county. The first type is voluminous, including the long series of Close, Patent and Fine Rolls, Feudal Aids and Inquisitions *post mortem* and, for the later periods, the Letters and Papers of Henry VIII, Privy Council Records and the Calendars of State Papers. To confront potential helpers with this vast array of material would probably be fatal to the proposed project. That is why co-operative effort is needed. Each volume searched is one stage nearer the end and we shall welcome offers to extract the Kent material from one or two or more of these volumes. They are not easily accessible, but arrangements can be made for borrowing them through the Kent County Library. In addition, there are the volumes of the Record Commission in which the arrangement is largely topographical, as in the Hundred Rolls, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, etc. And, with the previsions mentioned above, we want all the relevant material from all the parish histories published.

A great deal of valuable material, often of a kind unavailable elsewhere, is buried in unpublished manuscripts in various depositories, the British Museum, the Public Record Office, the Bodleian and the Cambridge University Library, and in certain Kent Libraries, as at Sevenoaks. Particularly important are the collections of the Kent Archives Office at Maidstone and the Cathedral Library at Canterbury. Court-rolls, rentals and surveys are especially valuable for local names. A systematic attack will have to be made on all these, but in the meanwhile time can be saved and duplication of effort avoided if those working on subjects which take them to manuscripts will come to our aid. They frequently accumulate references to place-names which the nature of their subject makes it unnecessary for them to print. If they would spare us a little time and send us this material, it would make it unnecessary to consult the same manuscripts again.

A SURVEY OF KENT PLACE-NAMES

One task we wish to accomplish is to compile a list of field-names still in use in the various parishes and, where the material is available, to explain the history of these names. For this, we need local help, persons who will compile these parish lists and collect references from local sources. We want the field-names for each parish from the Tithe Awards and Maps, with any relative information about the topography, pronunciation, or any associated local lore. For the Rochester Diocese, these Tithe Awards are now preserved in the Kent Archives Office at Maidstone; those for the Canterbury Diocese are at Canterbury. But a copy was always supplied to the incumbent, so that work on them can usually be done in the parish itself. It is useful to insert the names on a tracing of the 6 in. map. Estate maps, Auctioneers' Catalogues, etc., will also be found useful.

This work is a long-term project which can be accomplished only by continuous co-operative effort. It will pave the way for a full and definitive treatment of the place-names of the county, but can be combined with work on other aspects of county history. Meanwhile, the material collected will gradually provide a valuable series of references useful for various purposes.

ARRANGEMENT OF MATERIAL

Experience has proved that the most convenient method of arrangement is to use slips, 5 in. by 2½ in. As one side of the paper only is used, any paper with one side blank can be used, provided it is not too flimsy or too stiff. In the top left-hand corner, enter K (for Kent). For parish-names, write the name as a heading, underlined. The spelling used for all names is that found on the Ordnance Survey maps. Below this, copy the spelling found in the document, adding the date and the abbreviation for the source. Where the volume is well-indexed, no further reference is necessary, but references should be added for names not indexed or wrongly indexed. At the foot of the slip, add any relevant note from the document. But please do *not* add etymological speculations.

The abbreviations used for sources are those now regarded as standard in the Place-name Society's volumes, e.g., Pat for Patent Rolls, Cl for Close Rolls, AD for the Calendar of Ancient Deeds (with number of volume added), etc. For other sources, an abbreviation should be agreed on before beginning work. For names other than parish-names, add after K in the top lefthand corner, the parish name in brackets, and the name of the place (underlined) as a heading. If the place-name is known to have disappeared, add (lost) in brackets; if it is a surviving field-name, add (fld) to the modern form; if nothing is known beyond the former existence of the name, note the parish, but leave the heading blank.

A SURVEY OF KENT PLACE-NAMES

K East Peckham
Pecham 1317 Ass 18
Richard de Brenchisle, rector of
[East] Peckham. (Ed.).

K Boughton Alulf
Bocton' a. 1219 St Greg 199
Alulphus de Bocton' ib.

K(Petham) Debden Court
Henry de Diepedane 1190-1210
St Greg 144
witness in Petham

K(Stalisfield) Derbies Court
William Derebi 1213-14 St Greg 159
witness 'in curia de Stalesfeld'

K(Marden) Marden Thorn
Adam atte Thorne de Merdenne
1317 Ass 62

K(Naekington)
la Mollonde 1225 St Greg 169

Where the same spelling of a name is found repeatedly in, e.g. a single volume of the Close Rolls, it is sufficient to enter this on a single slip, giving the outside dates, with the number of examples, e.g. Sudberia 1286-90 (10). Occasionally, a list of consecutive place-names or field-names will be met with which cannot be placed in a particular parish. Copy them out as they stand, on one slip, noting any information likely to be of help in identification. Names of lathes and hundreds should also be noted, together with those of rivers, streams and roads.

One difficulty of identification is that the same place-name occurs more than once in the county and it is often not clear to which the particular form belongs. *Boctone*, e.g. may refer either to Boughton Aluph, Boughton under Blean, Boughton Malherbe or Boughton Monchelsea. It is important that the form should be assigned to the correct place and any information relative to the identification should be added, e.g. the name of the hundred, the honour, the tenant, etc.

All abbreviations used for manuscript sources (and these only) should be underlined and will be printed in italics. Thus, *Add* (Additional MSS in the British Museum, followed by number); *Ass* (Assize Roll, followed by number and membrane); *Ct* (unpublished

A SURVEY OF KENT PLACE-NAMES

court-roll ; with reference of depository, e.g. SC/2 203/29 (PRO) ; KAO/U89 ; or owner, if in private hands). Thus, AD iv refers to a deed printed in volume iv of the Catalogue of Ancient Deeds, but AD A 14091 is an unpublished deed in the Public Record Office.

To avoid duplication of effort, the Hon. Sec. should be informed of the specific work undertaken, and, when completed, a slip should be made showing exactly what has been done, e.g. Pat 1216-34, or AD Vol. 3, etc. This should be signed ; all assistance given will be fully acknowledged in due course. All enquiries and offers of help should be addressed to Mr. J. M. Farrar, Hon. Sec., Kent Place-names Committee, Kent Archives Office, County Hall, Maidstone.

CHATHAM DOCKYARD ; EARLY LEASES AND CONVEYANCES FOR ITS BUILDING DURING THE 16th AND 17th CENTURIES

By FREDERICK CULL, F.R.I.C.S.

ON the 30th September, 1958, the Admiralty advertised for sale "two contiguous properties" in Chatham known as the Royal Naval Gunwharf and the Royal Marines Medway Barracks. They were subsequently sold to Messrs. William Palfrey Ltd., Paper Sack Manufacturers who took possession of the properties on the 6th March, 1959. Thus a period of continuous Crown occupation of riverside land on the Medway extending over a period of 400 years came to an end. The Gunwharf extended from a point opposite Chatham Town Hall northwards along the east bank of the river for a distance of about a quarter of a mile to the old Causeway where a ferry once existed. The Dockyard proper begins here, and originally the division between Dockyard and Gunwharf was clean cut and one had to cross water to get from one to the other. Latterly, for about 50 years, one could walk unimpeded from the Gunwharf to the Dockyard. Now, in accordance with the usual practice, a boundary fence has been erected to mark the division between the privately owned Gunwharf and Her Majesty's Dockyard. The latter stretches north and north eastwards into Gillingham sprawling over an area of some 500 acres to the Great Basins and St. Mary's Island, beyond which the River widens into Gillingham Reach.

Much valuable information on the early occupation by the Crown of land in the Medway district is obtainable from the old Pipe Office Accounts (still in a remarkably fine state of preservation), which can be inspected at the Public Record Office. This system of accounting required the rendering of a full statement by the Navy Treasurer once a year of all receipts and disbursements in connection with the maintenance of Her Majesty's Ships and Vessels. The system was tightened up in 1557 when a fixed sum was allocated to the Navy Treasurer each year out of which he had to pay all necessary expenses. Benjamin Gonson received £14,000 in the year 1557 and £10,000 the next year. The amount was reduced considerably from year to year during Elizabeth's reign but the system lasted for about a century.

The earliest references in the Pipe Office Accounts to the use of

Acknowledgments.

Published by permission of the Admiralty.

Unpublished Crown Copyright Material in the Public Record Office has been reproduced by permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.