

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355092111>

# Constructing a village memory: significance and story in the Buriton Roll of Honour

Preprint · October 2021

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.15774.46408

---

CITATIONS

0

READS

161

1 author:



[Clive Harfield](#)

Australian Catholic University

61 PUBLICATIONS 279 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

# **Constructing a village memory: significance and story in the Buriton Roll of Honour**

Clive Harfield

## *Abstract*

*An artefact of contemporary sentiment, and a record of individuals' participation in 'the Great War', the Buriton Roll of Honour supplements the village war memorial, a plaque in the parish church, and a workplace roll of honour compiled by the owners of Buriton's lime works, in constructing both memory of and memorial to (some of) the villagers who served in a military or medical capacity during WW1. That the Roll omits the names of some villagers who served whilst including the names of non-residents muddies the waters so that whilst the Roll might describe a constructed community memory, that memory does not recall – at least not accurately - history. Whereas the village war memorial commemorates the village's war dead, the Buriton Roll of Honour celebrates all those who served: through such identification, commemoration provides a starting point for analysis of the part played by the villagers of Buriton in the First World War. It is also the only means available through which to consider the production and purpose of the Roll.*

## The village that went to war: Buriton in WW1

On 23<sup>rd</sup> March 1917, the *Hants and Sussex News* [HSN], the weekly newspaper published in Petersfield between 1892-1921, reported that as of that date 171 men from the neighbouring village of Buriton – total population 845 men, women and children - had enlisted in the various branches of the military. Had the rest of the country responded likewise, so the Chairman of the Petersfield Rural District Council calculated, then nationwide 9,400,000 men would have been in uniform. By the end of the war, well over 200 men and boys from the village had joined up, either as volunteers or conscripts: one in four, not just of military age men, but of the total village population. Discounting those who served but not in a theatre of war (who number at least 17), approximately 50% of Buriton's servicemen were killed or wounded (Harfield 2017 v3, 102).

In varying degrees of detail, contingent upon document availability and administrator thoroughness, the war-time biographies of Buriton's servicemen can be pieced together from military service records, medal rolls, and unit war diaries variously accessible at the National Archives, London, and via multiple online subscription genealogical data search facilities. Civil administration sources, parochial registers, newspaper accounts, and – occasionally – letters, personal diaries, private photographs, and family oral traditions supplement information harvested from contemporary military sources. These various sources have been relied upon to compile a biographical dictionary of Buriton's WW1 veterans, and a day-by-day chronology of war-related village and villager events from 1914-1920 (Harfield 2017).

In addition to these documentary sources, there are several WW1 village-related memorials commissioned during the war and shortly afterwards which simultaneously serve as artefacts and documents of the memories and the sense-making of the war experience that the Buriton villagers wished to formalize. Men who *died* are commemorated through the inscription of their names on the village war memorial, and on a war memorial plaque situated in the Anglican parish church, whilst the Bonham-Carter family raised three tablets in the church chancel to honour (non-resident) relatives who died at Arras, Beaumont Hamel, and Ypres. Those who *served* are commemorated on rolls of honour; one produced by the British Portland Cement Manufacturers Limited, the other produced for display in Buriton's

Primitive Methodist Chapel. Buriton offers in microcosm, the range of memorializing that occurred throughout Britain in the immediate post-war years.

### Memorializing WW1 in local communities

Study of memory and memorial during WW1 and the years immediately following has become a specialist area of historical study in its own right in recent decades (see, for example, its summarisation in Scates & Wheatley 2014). An early example is Ken Inglis's study of the de facto communal war memorial in Cambridge (Inglis 1992), whilst Mark Connelly's study of local community and civic memorials in East London and metropolitan Essex sets a bench-mark of meticulous thoroughness for such research (Connelly 2002; Sternberg 2016; Weintraub 2002). In Sussex, Keith Grieves's study of the variety of processes and degrees of community involvement by which six village war memorials came to be designed and erected (at Angmering, Ashurst, East Chiltington, Salehurst, Slinfold, and Warnham), also demonstrated "the source materials for local war memorial committees in parochial records tantalise, and often frustrate, as fragmentary clues, comprising limited descriptions of public and committee meetings, inward letters whose replies rarely survive, undated newspaper clippings and subscription lists and sets of accounts which are often incomplete", (Grieves 2000, 40).

Communal desire to turn "the sublime and abstract emotions of grief, pride and hope into tangible symbols" emerged from the carnage of Jutland and the Somme campaign in 1916, when the reality of industrial-scale warfare was brought home to the British public (Connelly 2002, 25). Subsequent inventory indicates as many as 40,000 WW1 memorials were eventually created or erected throughout Britain (Inglis 1992, 585). Commemoration took multiple forms: individual/collective; private/public; artefact/ritual; monument/portable 'commemorabilia'; symbolic/utilitarian (Scates & Wheatley 2014, 529). Where symbolic monuments were decided upon, form and purpose were much debated: religious or secular; Christian or non-/multi-denominational; commemorate those who died or celebrate those who served; the final design often also being strongly influenced by what could be afforded from the funds donated and the situational characteristics of the memorial's intended location (Grieves 2000; Scates & Wheatley 2014). For the bereaved denied by circumstance their own burial of loved ones, a memorial with names inscribed stood in lieu of a grave marked by a

headstone (Connelly 2002, 45). But many ex-servicemen, especially those disabled as a result of their wounds, argued that assisted housing – the “habitations fit for the heroes who won the war” promised by Prime Minister Lloyd George (Stilwell 2017) - would be better recompense for their sacrifice, than a shelter-less statue, plinth, or wall tablet (Inglis 1992, 589-90). Others objected that any monument would preserve the antagonistic spirit of war and thus would be relics of barbarism (Scates & Wheatley 2014, 533). Meanwhile the language inscribed on monuments and used at services of dedication articulated not just commemoration and consolation, but also the didactic lessons of duty, service, and obligation for emerging and future generations (Connelly 2002, 65-6). These memorials spoke to the immediate and foreseeable future as they simultaneously documented the past. Above all, the activism to create and preserve memory was community-inspired, rather than state-directed (Scates & Wheatley 2014, 530-1): the instigators were variously local social and industrial worthies, vicars and vestries, parish councils, cohorts of the bereaved, or companies of comrades.

Which of these purposes, if any or all, were the Buriton memorials intended to serve? Since no contemporaneous documentation relating directly to their commissioning and construction appears to have survived – the sort of sources available to Connelly, Inglis, and Greives, for example - analysis must be reverse engineered through biography: what inferences about the Buriton memorials, particularly the Roll of Honour, may reasonably be drawn from understanding who the men named were, how they served, and what was their relationship to Buriton?

#### Buriton’s WW1 memorials

Buriton’s village war memorial [Fig 1] – a rectangular plinth 12 ½ feet high, of Portland stone on a three-stepped pedestal, topped with a tapering spire upholding a small floriated Latin wheeled cross, situated prominently on village common land where the High Street turns into North Lane, just outside the churchyard gate and close to the village pond “in full view as one passes through the village” - was dedicated by the Bishop of Guildford on Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> June 1920 before a “large and fully representative assemblage of the parishioners”, as the “golden evening brightened in the west”, (*Hampshire Telegraph and Post* [HTP] 16<sup>th</sup> June 1920) . Apparently funded by a public collection, the project clearly

had been conceived, and money-raising had begun, over a year earlier (*HSN* 21<sup>st</sup> May 1919): before many of the village servicemen had been demobilized; before the peace treaty to end the war had been signed (28<sup>th</sup> June 1919); before the village gathered to celebrate Peace Day (a day early) with supper and festivities on 18<sup>th</sup> July 1919 (*HSN* 30<sup>th</sup> July 1919).



Fig 1 – Buriton village war memorial

In the apparent absence of any parochial records directly documenting the conception and execution of the idea for a village war memorial – an absence which, if not an accident of history, might suggest the parish council was not the driving force for memorial in Buriton - newspaper reports must be relied upon to convey something of the circumstances.

That planning involved at least some community consultation is evident from the 21<sup>st</sup> May 1919 edition of the *HSN*, which reported a public meeting that had taken place on Monday the previous week (12<sup>th</sup> May 1919), chaired by the village squire, Lothian Bonham-Carter, at which it was announced that £115.17.0 had been raised to fund a village memorial: “This amount was supplemented by a donation of 10s. [ten shillings], which was received just before the meeting from Lindsay Harfield, who is with the Army of Occupation in Germany, and who stated that he desired to make that contribution towards the erection of a memorial to his fallen

comrades and as a thank offering for his own safety.” (This is the only record discovered so far that describes any particular or personal motivation for the Buriton war memorial.)

The large amount raised, and the fact that there had been sufficient time for a soldier deployed to Germany to be told of, and have arranged his own contribution to, the fund-raising suggests that the project had commenced well before 12<sup>th</sup> May 1919. The influence exercised by Bonham-Carter on this project is evident in a subsequent report in the *HTP* (5<sup>th</sup> November 1919) of a meeting held on the 28<sup>th</sup> October 1919 to decide upon the choice of design for the memorial: “The suggestion of the chairman, Mr Lothian Bonham-Carter was adopted.” In its report of the unveiling, the *HTP* described Bonham-Carter as having had “so much to do with the memorial”, another indication, perhaps, that Bonham-Carter rather than the parish council instigated Buriton’s formal community commemoration of its war dead (*HTP* 16<sup>th</sup> June 1920). In February 1920 a meeting in the village agreed upon the following inscription for the memorial: “Sacred to the men of this parish who gave their lives in the Great War,” (*HSN* 18<sup>th</sup> February 1920). But by the time the memorial came to be unveiled, for reasons unreported, the text of the inscription had been amended in more secular vein to: “In proud and grateful memory of the Men of this Parish who gave their lives in the Great War, 1914-1919,” (*HTP* 16<sup>th</sup> June 1920). The phrase “gave their lives in the Great War, 1914-1919”, at face value, might be taken to imply that all those named on the monument died during the WW1 hostilities: that is not so.

The village war memorial was originally inscribed with 37 names in alphabetical order of surname [see Table 1]. Subsequently, the name of Frederick Shepherd was added: he died during surgery in Orpington Hospital on 16<sup>th</sup> July 1924 whilst being treated for injuries received falling from a horse on active service with the army of occupation in Constantinople (Istanbul) in October 1923 (*HSN* 23<sup>rd</sup> July 1924). An early volunteer, the Army Medal Rolls Card Index 1914-1920 records he deployed to France on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 1915 (National Archives [NA] WO372/18/33658). However, Shepherd died long after the peace treaty had been concluded, and long after the period during which he would have otherwise qualified for an Imperial War Graves Commission headstone. Yet – in circumstances unknown – representations (presumably made by his relatives) secured the addition of his name to the village war memorial and to the church plaque, even though, manifestly, he did not lose his life “in the Great War, 1914-1919”. What was being commemorated through this addition?

Frederick's war service? His service in the army of occupation? Or the desire of those who survived him to be associated in full public view with a 'war hero'?

Nor were all of the original 37, "men from this parish". Nineteen of those named on the village memorial were born in Buriton and were still living there in 1911 (according to the Census returns) and/or 1914 (according to men's military Service Records and/or Electoral Rolls); or were villagers already serving in the army or navy when war was declared. A further nine had been born elsewhere but were resident in the village either by 1911 or by 1914. For the remaining eleven, either they were born in the village and were living elsewhere by 1911 or 1914, or else there is insufficient information to determine whether they were or had ever been village residents. William Tribe, for example, was born in Droxford and was living in Hambledon in 1901, then Old Blendworth in 1911 (Census returns). There is no evidence that he ever lived in Buriton, but in reporting his death the *HSN* noted that his parents were "now living" in Buriton (*HSN* 2<sup>nd</sup> June 1915), which suggests that the inclusion of William Tribe's name on the memorial was at the behest of his recently-migrated parents rather than because he himself had a direct personal connection with the village. Meanwhile, having been born and baptised in the village, scion of a long-established village family, Arthur Henry Bone (usually known as Harry) ostensibly had a stronger claim than William Tribe to be remembered amongst the village fallen, but when he was "discharged, dead" (Service Record) on the 25<sup>th</sup> September 1915 - killed in action at the Battle of Loos having deployed to France just 26 days earlier - he had been living and working in the Bexhill area of Sussex for at least four years (1911 Census). His parents' continued residence in the village probably ensured his inclusion on the Buriton memorial.

Frederick Shepherd, appended by inscription to the village war memorial in 1924 as the 38<sup>th</sup> name and to the church plaque as its 39<sup>th</sup> name, was born and bred in Weston, a hamlet hard by Buriton and within the parish boundaries. He was at least a villager even if he did not die during, or as a result of, the war.

Two other men might reasonably have had their names included on the village war memorial, given the flexibility of interpretation applied to the benefit of others. Born in the Horndean workhouse (1890) to an unmarried mother (daughter of a Buriton family) who died in the Portsea lunatic asylum when he was 10 years old, George Marriner did not have an advantageous start in life. By 1901 the orphan was living in Buriton with his maternal



grandmother who hailed from one of the several branches of the Marriner family resident in the village at the time; by 1911 George was domiciled in London with a family of his own (Census returns). Serving at Royton Camp, Cambridgeshire, awaiting overseas deployment, George contracted spinal meningitis which eventually left him paralysed and awarded a full medical pension, his condition deemed attributable to his military service (army Pension Record). He was discharged from the army – although not from hospital – on the 5<sup>th</sup> September 1917. By the 2<sup>nd</sup> October 1917 he was dead. Perhaps his unfortunate social origins led to his name being omitted from the village war memorial (despite being member of a large village family); perhaps it was because he had moved away from the village; perhaps it was because he died following discharge and so was not on active service when he died, even though he died as a result of active service and was buried in the Imperial War Graves Commission Cemetery at Hammersmith. Extensive though his military pension record is, there is nothing to inform historians as to the reason for his exclusion from Buriton's village war memorial. Yet someone ensured that George Marriner's name was included on the Buriton Roll of Honour.

The sons of Thomas and Susan Tupper were born across the county border in Sussex. In 1901 the family were living in Easbourne, Midhurst, and by 1911 had moved to Petersfield. Their association with Buriton came late in the war: son Alfred is listed as an absentee voter (on military service) in the 1918 Electoral Roll for the village; Thomas and Susan are listed in the 1919 village Electoral Roll. The eldest brother, Henry, was killed in the naval encounter near Coronel, off the Chilean coast, 1st November 1914 (Royal Navy Register of Seaman's Services), before any demonstrable family association with Buriton. Henry Tupper's name does not appear on the Buriton village war memorial, nor on the Buriton Roll of Honour. (Having served 12 years in the Royal Navy, Henry Tupper enlisted with the Coast Guard in 1911, and was stationed in Dorset when war was declared and he was recalled to the Colours: Royal Navy Register of Seaman's Services; Census returns.) The inclusion of his name on the memorial plaque displayed inside the main door of St Mary's Church at Buriton on the southern wall may be presumed to be a consequence of his brother and parents living in the village from 1918/19 – but in that case one might have expected also to see his name on the village war memorial and the Buriton Roll of Honour. The organization and execution of the church plaque would thus seem to be separate from the organization and execution of the village war memorial.

On the church plaque [Fig 2], beneath the inscription ‘TO THE GLORY OF GOD AND IN HONOURED MEMORY OF THE MEN OF THE PARISH OF BURITON WHO FELL IN THE GREAT WAR 1914-1919’, were inscribed initially 38 names in alphabetical order of surname; the original 37 listed on the village war memorial, with Henry Tupper’s name included. Beneath this list on the plaque has been appended Frederick Shepherd’s name.



Fig 2 – Buriton church plaque

Apart from the inclusion of Henry Tupper’s name, the other obvious difference between this church memorial plaque and the village war memorial is the religious character of the inscription. Not inappropriate for display within a church, a religious memorial might perhaps have satisfied the qualms of any villagers disturbed by the adoption of a secular inscription for the village war memorial. If, as had happened in other villages (Grieves 2000), the Buriton community had debated whether the main memorial should be religious or secular, within the church or without, then the presence of both a memorial on common ground, and a plaque inside the parish church, would seem to accommodate all schools of thought.

Another memorial commemorating men from Buriton who served during WW1, was never intended for public display in Buriton. In December 1917 the British Portland Cement

Manufacturers Limited (head office in Lloyds Avenue, London) produced its own Roll of Honour, naming 1,093 individuals at its 19 work-sites around the country, who had enlisted to serve in the armed forces for the duration up to that point. Amongst the 19 work-sites operated by British Portland Cement Manufacturers Limited was the lime works at Buriton, originally established by the Forder family in the mid-nineteenth century. (The Forders also built the Primitive Methodist chapel in the village, since converted to commercial premises and re-named Forder House.) The Portland Cement Roll of Honour takes the form of a booklet with board covers. One such booklet is now preserved at Snodland Millennium Museum, Kent, having been donated by a descendent of a man listed therein. How many of these booklets were printed, and precisely who the intended audience was, is unknown.

Nineteen men, presented as employees at the Buriton lime works, are listed on the Portland Cement ‘Roll of Honour’ [Fig 3]. Unlike the village war memorial, the church plaque, and the Buriton Roll of Honour, the roll of lime workers also purports to provide information about the units in which the men served. And in this regard the Portland Cement booklet would be an invaluable source of village military history assistance - were it not for the numerous individual inaccuracies that cast doubt on the integrity of the whole.

BURITON LIME WORKS, PETERSFIELD, HANTS.			
BUNCE, Albert Ed.	Pte.	Hants.	Wounded
CLARK, Frederick	Pte.	Hants.	
CLARK, Walter N.	Stoker	H.M.S. Caroline	
COOK, William	Pte.	Hants.	
EVANS, Frederick C.	Corpl.	Hants.	
EVERETT, Frank	Pte.	Hants.	
FISHER, William Jun.	Pte.	Hants.	Prisoner
HARFIELD, Lindsay	Pte.	Hants.	
HALL, Chas. Hy.	Pte.	9th Hants.	
HALL, Joseph P.	Pte.	Hants.	
HATHOWAY, Ernest	Pte.	Hants.	
HILLS, Chas. A.	Pte.	Hants.	
LEE, Edward	Pte.	14th Hants.	Gassed
LEGGATT, A.	Pte.	Hants.	
POWELL, James	Pte.	Hants.	
PRETTY, Edward	Pte.	Hants.	Killed
PRETTY, Frederick	Pte.	Hants.	
RATTLEY, Percy	Pte.	Hants.	
RATTLEY, William	Pte.	Hants.	

Fig 3 – Portland Cement Roll of Honour (extract)

The Portland Cement booklet records that 18 of the 19 men from the Buriton works listed thereupon, served in the Hampshire Regiment – the remaining man listed, Walter Clark, is described as serving in the Royal Navy. Walter Clark saw pre-war service with the

Royal Navy from 1900-1912 and was a Territorial Reservist in the Hampshire Regiment when war was declared: by the time he was invalided out of the army in November 1914, following the discovery of a pre-existing medical condition in September 1914, he had already re-enlisted with the Royal Navy in October 1914. For 27 days he was technically enlisted simultaneously in both the army and the navy, (Royal Navy Register of Seaman's Services; army Pension Records).

Of the 18 men listed in the Portland Cement booklet as serving in the Hampshire Regiment, only eight can be confirmed as having done so. Six can be demonstrated unequivocally never to have served in the Hampshire Regiment: Frank Everett served in the Wiltshire Regiment, the South West Borderers, the Labour Corps, and finally the Royal Fusiliers (Army Medal Rolls Card Index, National Archives [MRCI]); Lindsay Harfield served in the Royal Garrison Artillery (MRCI); Joseph Hall and Percy Rattley served in the Machine Gun Corps (MRCI); Percy's father, William - too old to fight in theatre and consequently ineligible for campaign medals - was a Royal Defence Corps member on the Home Front (his service identity recorded on son Lawrence's October 1917 marriage certificate); and whilst Ernest Hathoway's (sometimes Hathaway) military service has not been identified, staff at the Royal Hampshire Regiment Museum, Winchester, have confirmed (pers.comm. October 2019) that no man using that name served in the Hampshires during WW1. The military service of the five remaining men listed – some of whom have names very common at the time – is unlikely to be identified positively unless new and distinguishing information comes to light.

Most of the men named on the Portland Cement booklet survived the war. The two fatalities were Edward Pretty and James Powell, although only Edward Pretty had died (of wounds, 21<sup>st</sup> November 1917) before the Roll was drawn up in December 1917. Fourteen of the men listed on the Portland Cement Roll of Honour are also listed on a second Roll of Honour that survives: the Buriton Roll of Honour.

### The Buriton Roll of Honour

As with the village war memorial, no contemporaneous documentation relating to the commissioning of the Buriton Roll of Honour has been discovered, nor is there anything on the Roll itself that betrays its origins. Therefore, inference must be derived from indirect sources.

A report in the *Hampshire Telegraph and Post* (5<sup>th</sup> February 1926), concerning the re-opening of the Buriton Methodist Chapel (following extensive renovation), noted in its description of the chapel interior: the “laurel leaves and ribbons in red, white and blue which adorned the roll of honour bore their silent but eloquent tribute to the remembrance of men connected with that church who had served in the Great War.” This description, conceivably, could relate to freshly-cut laurel branches and real ribbons – a not unreasonable decoration to celebrate a festive occasion - but as will be seen from Fig 4, the report equally well describes the border illustration depicted on the Roll. The phrase ‘men connected with that church’ used in the newspaper report seems to imply all those named on the Roll were worshippers at the Buriton Primitive Methodist Chapel – but the journalist’s understanding and choice of vocabulary could be a misinterpretation of the title wording on the Buriton Roll of Honour which announces, rather, that the men listed are from ‘The Parish of Buriton’.



Fig 4 – Buriton Roll of Honour

An alternative proposition is that the newspaper report refers to another roll of honour – additional to the Buriton Roll of Honour here considered and to the Portland Cement Roll of Honour - exclusively naming Methodist parishioners; a hypothesis for which no other

supporting evidence has been found. Absent evidence to the contrary, the interpretation here considered more likely on the balance of probabilities is that the Roll mentioned in the 1926 newspaper report as situated in the Methodist chapel, and the Buriton Roll of Honour here illustrated, are one and the same. The Roll subsequently came to be displayed in the village hall - where the present author first saw it in 2000 (and where it reportedly remains: pers. comm. Buriton Village Association, 5<sup>th</sup> October 2018) - probably re-located there when the Methodist chapel ceased to function as such.

If correct, that inference dates the village Roll to no later than February 1926, and there is reason to suppose that the Roll pre-dates July 1924. At the foot of the Roll it is announced that “Those whose names appear in Red made the Great Sacrifice”. The name of Frederick Shepherd – the soldier who died in July 1924 during surgery to treat injuries received in 1923 - appears in black ink on the village Roll. Taken at face value, this indicates he was alive when the Roll was created. Had Frederick Shepherd’s death occurred before the creation of the Roll of Honour, it is reasonable to suppose his name would have been written thereon in red ink, given that someone went to the trouble of ensuring that Frederick’s name was inscribed on the village and church memorials to the war dead even though he died after the war. Consequently, whilst no creation date has been discovered for the Roll of Honour, it may reasonably be inferred that it was created before July 1924.

If creation of the Buriton Roll of Honour can at least be given a terminus post quem, no such definition can be ascertained for its instigation. Based as it is on the absence of evidence the inference is not strong, but it may be supposed that the commissioning of the Roll of Honour was entirely separate from the commissioning of the village war memorial. The relevant missing evidence is the name of Lothian Bonham-Carter. From the time he purchased Buriton manor in 1910 and installed himself as de facto village squire, Lothian Bonham-Carter was prominent in local affairs in Buriton and Petersfield (see, for example, *HSN* 14<sup>th</sup> July 1915; 17<sup>th</sup> February 1917). A member of the local Military Tribunal adjudicating – and mostly denying - applications for exemption from war-time military service (see, for example, *HSN* 5<sup>th</sup> April 1916), Bonham-Carter was credited locally with being responsible for ensuring that every Buriton male eligible for military service under the 1915 National Registration scheme duly enlisted; a 100% response rate apparently unmatched elsewhere (*HSN* 22<sup>nd</sup> December 1915; *The Times*, 3<sup>rd</sup> November 1915). That his prominent role in the erection of the village war memorial is attested in the local papers has

already been demonstrated. In this context of regular reference and much-reported activity in war-related effort and commemoration, the absence of any reference to Bonham-Carter in connection with the Buriton Roll of Honour seems significant. Had he been involved directly, media comment to that effect might reasonably be expected.

Under the title sequence ‘Roll of Honour / For King and Country / European War 1914-1919 / The Parish of Buriton’, the Buriton Roll of Honour lists the names of 193 men, mostly in alphabetical order of surname: 33 names are misplaced in contravention of that convention, but there is no indication that military rank or social status can explain such disruption. Transcription error is the more likely, simpler explanation.

Direct or indirect connection to Buriton has been identified for 182 of the men listed; the military service confirmed for 155 of the men listed. Research of other sources has added 49 men and five women from the village to the 193 men identified on the Buriton Roll of Honour as having served in military or medical capacities during WW1: such research thus proves that the Buriton Roll of Honour is not a comprehensive list of everyone who served. Which begs the question, how did individuals come to be included - or excluded?

Given the mores of the time, as unsurprising as it is unwarranted, the first discriminator was gender: no women are recorded on the Buriton Roll of Honour although three women living in the village during the war can be demonstrated to have served as nursing volunteers at local hospitals (British Red Cross Society records; *HSN* 27<sup>th</sup> April 1916), and two others were heavily involved in local Red Cross administration for which they were commended by Secretary of State for War, Winston Churchill (*HSN* 21<sup>st</sup> August 1918; see also Gosney, 2016; Harfield 2017. A throwaway remark in the newspaper account of Alan Kite’s funeral hints at many other unidentified Buriton women being involved in war-work of unspecified different kinds, *HSN* 22<sup>nd</sup> May 1918). Exclusion of female nurses from the Roll is rendered all the more unjustifiable because non-combatant men who served with the British Red Cross Society, ambulance driver John Hurton and Volunteer Orderly Bert Marriage, are named on the Roll: both served briefly in France and Flanders before returning to Home Front medical support services for the duration.

Altogether, five categories of individual are discernible from the Buriton Roll of Honour when regarded as an historical document: parish residents when war was declared



(the largest category); former residents who had moved away; those never resident; those for whom no supporting evidence of their existence has been discovered (some of whom can be explained as likely errors in the recording of the names of villagers whose military service and/or village connection can be otherwise demonstrated); and those of military age whose inclusion might reasonably be anticipated – and whose military service can be proved - but who, nevertheless, have been omitted.

Through its use of red and black ink, the Roll also distinguishes those who died on active service. 37 names are listed in red and these mostly, but not exactly, correspond with the names of the dead recorded on other Buriton memorials. Frederick Shepherd's circumstances have been discussed above. Ernest Dennis, who died of fever (31<sup>st</sup> August 1916) whilst a prisoner of war, is included amongst Buriton's dead on the Roll, but his name does not feature on other Buriton memorials (although he is named on the Petersfield war memorial). Henry Tupper is not listed on the Roll, and whilst George Marriner is listed on the Roll (having been omitted elsewhere), his name is written in black ink despite his death. Also written in red ink is the name 'Harry Long': no evidence of anyone with that name has been found in civil or parochial records from the period relating to Buriton, and none of the numerous Harry/Henry Longs documented in the Commonwealth War Graves Registers can be distinguished thereby as having any connection to Buriton. He is one of eleven men named on the Roll about whom nothing verifiable has been discovered.

The first name in red ink, signifying death on active service, is 'William Bewley'. Since no individual of this name can otherwise be demonstrated to have a connection with Buriton *and* to have served in WW1, this is more likely to be a mistaken representation of William Beagley's name, whose war-time death was reported in the *HSN* (13<sup>th</sup> February 1918) and is commemorated on both the village war memorial and the church plaque. As well as demonstrating error on the part of the Roll's scribe, Beagley is an example of a villager born and bred, resident when war was declared. Others in this category include the Barrow brothers, Alfred and Frank; Percy Case (mis-named Patrick on the Roll); Caleb and Percy Chitty; Wilfred and Horace Gamblen; the seven named Harfield cousins (of the ten born in the village who served, the largest family contingent from the village); the five Hill brothers; the three Legg brothers; six of the seven Marriner cousins; five of the six Powell brothers (whose mother was a Marriner); three of the four Pretty brothers (the fourth, a lime worker, was exempted military service by the Local Tribunal being an essential worker in a

reserved occupation); the five Strugnell brothers; and the six Treagus brothers – to name but a few.

Fewer in number are those once resident who had moved away – although it could be argued that the 40 village men already serving in the armed forces when war was declared also fall into this category. Arthur ‘Harry’ Bone, born in Buriton but some years resident in Bexhill when war was declared is named on the Roll of Honour as well as on the village war memorial and church plaque. Meanwhile, Harry Watts had moved to Greatham shortly after marrying Adeline Marriner in 1902. Adrian Porter is listed (mistakenly under the name Hadrian) despite having emigrated to Canada early in 1914. When the war took so many sons away, conversely it brought Adrian home – all be it briefly: having arrived in England with the Canadian Expeditionary Force, Adrian awaited deployment to France at the Bramshott army camp, just a few miles north of Buriton (Canadian military service records). That the two Harrys and Adrian had relatives still living in Buriton during the war probably accounts for their inclusion on the roll as men of the parish, even though, strictly speaking, they no longer were. Their membership of the village community remained virtual and sentimental in character long after it had ceased to be actual and physical.

Career Royal Navy sailor Thomas Monk would seem to be one of those named on the Roll despite never having lived in the parish. In 1911, living in Portsmouth where he was serving with the navy, Thomas married Lilian Hill, a domestic servant also then living and working in Portsmouth (Portsea parish register). Daughter of Walter and Ellen Hill, Lilian had been born and raised in Buriton where her parents lived throughout and after the war. Five of Lilian’s brothers served during the war – one was killed at Jutland - and are listed on the Buriton Roll of Honour. In this context, it is not inconceivable that Walter and Ellen might wish to see their son-in-law recognized on the Buriton Roll as well as their sons; he was family, after all. Might he not be considered an honorary villager, by virtue of marrying into a village family? Conceivable and plausible though this hypothesis is, it is contradicted in the omission of Walter and Ellen’s other son-in-law, Frederick Harfield.

Fredrick Harfield would have been well known in Buriton having been born and raised there. Through the pages of the *HSN*, his name may have been well recognised throughout the locality. A stalwart of the Buriton village cricket team (see, for example, *HSN* 21<sup>st</sup> July 1897; 21<sup>st</sup> June 1899; 15<sup>th</sup> September 1900; 27<sup>th</sup> August 1902; 10<sup>th</sup> June 1903),

Frederick was also an accomplished musician, who sang, played several instruments, and conducted the Buriton village band (see, for example, *HSN* 18<sup>th</sup> December 1899; 27<sup>th</sup> March 1903; 7<sup>th</sup> September 1904). After marrying Rosina Hill in 1904, Frederick moved to nearby Rake, taking over the licence of the Flying Bull pub where he remained, but for his war service in France with the Army Service Corps, until his death in 1927. Consequently, Frederick Harfield's omission from the Buriton Roll of Honour can be satisfactorily explained by his having left the village a decade before the war began. Yet, he came from a large Buriton family and had married into another well-established large village family who were apparently keen to ensure their never-resident other son-in-law was so recognised; and, as has been demonstrated, migration did not necessarily lead to exclusion from the Roll.

Brothers account for several of the missing who might otherwise have been named. Like Frederick Harfield, William Powell - born and bred in Buriton to another long-established, large village family - had moved away (to Hinton Ampner by 1911) and this is probably the reason he is not listed alongside his five brothers (three of whom were killed in 1918). Only two of the four Dennis brothers who served are listed (and the brother who died is listed on the Petersfield war memorial rather than the Buriton war memorial, which begs questions about the nature of their connection to Buriton). Fatality Cecil Cadmore's brother Norman is not listed – perhaps because Norman served in the Merchant Navy rather than the armed forces; perhaps because he moved away from the village immediately after the war and then emigrated. (Their family moved to Buriton so that the boys could attend Churcher's College in Petersfield.) Also missing, when their inclusion was warranted, are several men whose residence in the village and confirmation of military service is evident from their Electoral Roll listings (1918-1920) as absentee voters deployed on military service.

Meanwhile examples of other non-residents who are named on the Roll include John Menlove Bennion, a Kent General Practitioner who briefly served in the Royal Army Medical Corps in France in 1915, before returning to serve out the duration in a Red Cross hospital in Kent: his parents lived in Nursted House on the outskirts of Buriton. Of the Rector's five sons, the four who served are all listed even though the eldest two were only ever visitors to Rectory, not residents. And although his brother Edward lived in Buriton, Red Cross Volunteer Orderly Bert Marriage lived in Lancashire: both are listed on the Roll, both were Quakers, Edward serving what might be viewed as a 'halfway-house' role between pacifism and combat as a Lieutenant in the Army Service Corps.

For the purpose here, these inconsistencies demonstrate that there was no set formula dictating inclusion or omission from the Buriton Roll of Honour. The choice to be either included or omitted thus may have been individual. It is hypothesised that the commissioning of the Roll may have been funded by subscription rather than by a general public collection such as that which funded the village war memorial. If so, private subscription could have entitled the subscriber to have whomsoever they wanted named on the Roll, however tenuous the connection to the 'Parish of Buriton'. It might also serve as a further general discriminator: those who could not afford the subscription might be excluded through economic circumstance rather than through choice. But in one case, family estrangement seems to have been the reason for omission.

Just as the act of remembering and recognising war service could be used to incorporate non-resident family members into the village community through commemorative memory so, too, the device could be used in reverse: deliberately to exclude family members from the community identity elaborated through commemoration. Henry Fisher fell foul of this strategy.

Henry Fisher served in the Gloucestershire Regiment, being wounded in action (*HSN* 22<sup>nd</sup> May 1918). All four of his brothers are listed on the Buriton Roll of Honour, but not Henry. In November 1914 Henry, whose parents were devoutly religious, married Elsie King at St Mary's Buriton. Whether it was Elsie to whom Henry's parents objected, or the fact that she was six months pregnant standing at the altar, or both, the marriage cost Henry and Elsie their jobs on the Bonham-Carter estate and in Buriton House, and led to irrevocable estrangement from Henry's family (family information, pers. comm. 30<sup>th</sup> April 2016). An estrangement advertised and asserted through Henry's exclusion from the community commemorated – an omission that would have been obvious to contemporary villagers. For the audience beyond the village community if, as Scates and Wheatley suggest (2014, 547), a function of naming on war memorials is the parading of "imitable virtue", then those who chose which Fishers should be included on the Buriton Roll of Honour appear to have regarded Henry as unsuitable for that purpose.

Exclusion might convey another subliminal message: that those not named were the 'shirkers' who failed to do their duty (Scates & Wheatley 2014, 548). In countries that raised

only volunteer armies (such as Australia), this might be true, but in the context of conscription there will have been few who successfully evaded military service. Others may have wished to serve but were prevented from doing so. Bernard Harfield's three younger brothers all served in France and Flanders and are named on the Buriton Roll of Honour; his elder brother remained in his pre-war occupation as a Royal Navy dockyard worker in Portsmouth and so was in a reserved occupation, exempt from frontline fighting. A congenital heart defect meant that Bernard was considered by military doctors to be unsuitable even for non-combatant 'Home Service'. Instead, having left Buriton in 1907 to take up work on a Cornish farm, in October 1915 Bernard answered the call made of him by Lothian Bonham-Carter, returning to Buriton to work on the Manor Farm, a replacement for estate workers who had enlisted. Working to feed fellow villagers, the military, and the nation at large might be argued to be just as vital to the war effort as service in the armed forces, but for Bernard there was no recognition on a village memorial. For Bernard, there were white feathers from his neighbours.

#### Buriton's war-time funerals

Given that WW1 saw precedent established for formal and commemorative mass military cemeteries on or near the battlefields (Connelly & Goebel 2020; Crane 2013), it is perhaps remarkable that Buriton witnessed any wartime 'military' funerals at all; and yet, three men in uniform who died whilst serving with war-time forces lie buried in St Mary's churchyard. In two instances the men died before deployment to a theatre of war; in the third instance, the man died returning from an overseas theatre of war for demobilization.

The first of three chronologically, Private William Beagley (aged 19) who enlisted by conscription on his 18<sup>th</sup> birthday, died from pneumonia on Saturday 9<sup>th</sup> February 1918, having just completed basic training at Larkhill Camp, Wiltshire. The *HSN* reported his death the following Wednesday (13<sup>th</sup> February). His burial on 15<sup>th</sup> February went unreported by the local newspaper.

The third serviceman buried in the churchyard was Gunner Samuel Francis (aged 36), one of only two Buriton victims of the Spanish flu pandemic (Harfield 2019). Gunner Francis volunteered and was attested on 19<sup>th</sup> November 1915 (possibly a volunteer under the Derby

Scheme: Prost 2014b, 330), was mobilized on 7<sup>th</sup> April 1916, and on 16<sup>th</sup> September 1916 deployed to Aden where he remained until 5<sup>th</sup> November 1919 when he boarded the troop ship SS Guildford Castle for the journey home and demobilisation. A day's sailing out from Liverpool, Gunner Francis succumbed to the pandemic at 8.30 pm, Monday 24<sup>th</sup> November 1919 (the exact time of death contemporaneously recorded in a note included in his army Pension Record). His widow retrieved his body from the docks at Liverpool and, with his coffin draped by a flag, Francis was interred at Buriton on the 29<sup>th</sup> November 1919 as the Officer Training Corps schoolboy bugler from nearby Churcher's College sounded the Last Post (army Pension Records; *HSN*, 3<sup>rd</sup> December 1919).

The graves of Private Beagley and Gunner Francis are marked with Imperial War Graves Commission headstones: it is conceivable that their surviving relatives – particularly the impoverished Widow Francis - could not have afforded to commission private headstones even if they had wanted to (Harfield 2017 v.3, 150). Close by them in the churchyard [Fig 5], beneath a privately-erected tall cross atop an engraved headstone at the head of a kerbed burial plot, lies Alan Kite (aged 18) – the second serviceman buried in the village - whose funeral was a very different affair, the *HSN* account of it transcending reportage to read more like hagiography.



Fig 5 – The graves of Alan Kite, William Beagley, & Samuel Francis, Buriton churchyard

Royal Flying Corps Air Mechanic 3<sup>rd</sup> Class Alan Kite, 92462, based at South Farnborough, wanted to fly planes, not fix them. In December 1917 he secured a probationary Commission as a Temporary 2<sup>nd</sup> Lieutenant. On 11<sup>th</sup> May 1918, during a training flight in Lincolnshire with the 61<sup>st</sup> Training Squadron of the newly created Royal Air Force, Kite crashed having stalled his engine on his landing approach: the Board of Inquiry concluded the accident occurred due to pilot error (RFC/RAF Service record and Board of Inquiry records). He died from his injuries the next day (*HSN* 15<sup>th</sup> May 1918).

Alan Kite's funeral took place at Buriton on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> May 1918. Description of the event in the local weekly newspaper occupied several column inches (*HSN* 22<sup>nd</sup> May 1918). The contrast with William Beagley's unreported funeral just a few weeks earlier, and with Samuel Francis's subsequent funeral, could not have been more stark. The teenage mechanic-turned-pilot who had not survived basic training was afforded full military honours.

'A firing party of Royal Engineers from Longmoor, in command of Capt. Burkitt, preceded the wheel bier, on which the coffin covered with the Union Jack and all dressed in black, and other men and women, carrying floral tokens, and a contingent of the Petersfield Boy Scouts (to which the deceased formerly belonged) followed on foot. In perfect stillness but for the slow tramping of the soldiers the sad procession moved along the village street, passing the school which the gallant officer once attended and where the children were drawn up in the playground to silently salute the dead. ... There in the bright sunlight, with the military guard of honour and the big assemblage of sympathising people bidding him a last fond farewell, the body of the brave airman was laid to rest. It was a deeply moving spectacle and feeling was very tense when at the close the soldiers fired the customary three volleys and three buglers sounded the "Last Post". During the progress of the funeral service five aeroplanes happened to fly over a little to the south of village and easily seen from the churchyard.'

At the time of Alan Kite's funeral, the village had lost 15 serving sons killed (or missing presumed killed) in action, three had died from wounds, and four others from disease. It had been possible for only one of those, William Beagley, to have been buried in the village. It is conceivable, therefore, that for parents other than the widowed Mrs Kite, Alan Kite's funeral with its pomp and circumstance – an Admiral in full uniform amongst the mourners - stood proxy for the funerals they could not hold for their own sons. In this regard, Alan Kite's contribution to his community may have been more significant in death than anything he achieved in his brief life. Grief would ever be individual, but there was now a commemorative event memory that was communal. (One wonders what the Beagleys felt.)

But communal need for commemoration does not necessarily explain the extent of the ceremony adopted for Alan Kite. Given that both William Beagley and Alan Kite were teenagers who died before leaving training camp, neither being deployed to theatre, why were their funerals so different? The former, son of a farm carter, was a private soldier; the latter, son of the district nurse who resided in and served the village, was (no matter how temporarily and probationary) a commissioned officer. Perceived status in life may have provided rationalization for distinction in death. Exactly the fallacy against which Fabian Ware strove in campaigning for a communal commemoration philosophy; a vision manifested in the Imperial War Graves Commission (now the Commonwealth War Graves Commission), resulting in generals being buried alongside private soldiers, each with the same design of headstone, because in death they were equal; their personal sacrifices identical (Crane 2013, 29 and 162-3; Prost, 2014a, 574).

#### Village memory defined

In the context of WW1 memorial studies taxonomy, the place of Buriton's village war memorial seems clear enough. Such fragmentary evidence as survives indicates it to be an example of a community project to honour relatives and neighbours who died during the war, co-ordinated (and probably instigated) by the leading inhabitant of the community, squire Bonham-Carter, no doubt with the support of other prominent villagers. Funded by public collection, it is prominently sited and cannot be missed by those passing through the village along its main street. The model is common: there are many other village memorials that might be so described. Even so, it is not without enigma: why and how a veteran who died long after the war, from unrelated causes, should have been added to the memorial remains a mystery - although the fact that he was added speaks to the power of public memorial in the mid-1920s and the desire to be associated with that select sub-community carved in stone on the village war monument. Kudos and sentiment outweighed factual accuracy. History, the story of Frederick Shepherd – and by association the story and memory of Buriton's war – was subtly re-shaped.

Also conforming to a model of which there are numerous other examples is the Portland Cement Roll of Honour. As a workplace commemoration it is more likely to have been displayed on company premises than ever seen in the village. Possibly none of the



villagers ever saw it. Production of this roll remote from the community whose members it purports to record would certainly account for the numerous factual errors presented in this document. Where a man's regiment was unknown and could not readily be verified, to record that he had enlisted with his local county regiment was a reasonable best guess: many did. Add guesswork on the part of contemporary chroniclers to the research frustrations itemised by Grieve (2000:40), and the (unwitting) manipulation of memory.

How should the church plaque be interpreted? It hangs on the church tower interior wall only a few yards from the village war memorial – such proximal duplication hardly seems necessary so implies some significance. The plaque bears a sentence more religious than that identifying the names on the village war memorial, as befits a monument inside a church. Nor is it the only monument to WW1 dead in the church. Lothian Bonham-Carter's two sons survived the war to serve again in WW2, but three of his male relatives – none village residents but nevertheless numbered among society's 'great and good' – are commemorated on individual wall plaques in the chancel; a location rendered sacred and significant through liturgical convention and rite. Perhaps the inclusion of a plaque commemorating the village dead was considered a suitable symbolic counter-balance to be situated at the door of the church by which the community entered.

An alternative hypothesis might be that the erection of a plaque inside the church, despite there being another memorial at the churchyard gate, made some sort of claim about the named dead being in Communion with God and/or the Anglican Church; but if so the Anglican community – as contemporary villagers would surely know – could hardly lay claim to Fred Legg's affiliation. Fred Legg was undoubtedly a Primitive Methodist by family loyalty if not actual conviction: his father was Buriton's Methodist Lay Preacher.

Does denominational distinction explain the presentation of the Buriton Roll of Honour in the Methodist chapel? Did the Methodists want a memorial displayed in their own place of worship, and if so, why? What statement was being made?

That there prevailed from time-to-time discord and disharmony between the Establishment and Non-conformist religious communities in Buriton is evidenced in two ways. 'Christian Unity / Re-Opening of Buriton Methodist Church /Anglicans Present' is the headline in the *Hampshire Telegraph and Post* (5<sup>th</sup> February 1926), the presence of

Anglicans being not just newsworthy but attention-grabbing headline-worthy. Lothian Bonham-Carter's speech as guest of honour on the occasion was reported at length: expressing his pleasure at being there, his remarks are reported to have included the observations that "there was a time when his own personal views on the Established Church and Non-conformity would not have permitted him to do what he was doing that day, but his presence there that day indicated that his views had undergone a change in regard to these matters." In the living memory of other older Buriton residents, whose village residency predated that of Bonham-Carter, would be recalled the incumbency of Rev. John Wycliffe Gedge, Anglican Rector of Buriton from 1886-1890. In the briefing notes about the parish that he left for his successor, Gedge used red ink for the names of Methodists – whom he labelled "Dissenters" - the more vividly to alert the incoming Rector to the insurgent perils that needed confronting (Harfield 1994, 199).

Given the divisive history between the Established Church and Non-conformism – evident in other parishes also (see, for example, Connelly 2002, 32-3) - the notion that the Buriton Methodists might have wanted to mark sacrifice and service in the Great War in their own way is not far-fetched. That they sought to honour all those who served, and not just those who died, would be another distinctive point of difference from the village war memorial project promoted by Bonham-Carter. The Anglicans commemorated the sacrifice of those who died as Christ died, for the sake of others; the Methodists celebrated, rather, the service of all in a just war for freedom. Creating such memorials, so Connelly has observed, helped Non-conformism take "the final step into fully respectable society" (2002, 67), making it permissible even for Anglicans to enter a Methodist chapel.

It is conceivable that doctrinal disagreement might have been a reason that some individuals concerned, or their relatives, did not want their name included on the Buriton Roll of Honour because it was intended for display in the Methodist chapel, but the inclusion of so many men's names suggests that the majority of village families wanted to participate in the Roll, regardless of where they preferred to pray on Sundays. Wanting to see the name of their sons, brothers, or father proudly and publicly presented on the Roll may have encouraged individuals to enter the Methodist chapel who might not otherwise have done so. Memorial as subliminal marketing? Perhaps. Perhaps not: the inclusion of all may equally have been a statement of ecumenical aspiration. It is unlikely that the Methodists were making any particular claim on the souls of those named on the Roll: just as Fred Legg on the Anglican

church plaque was undoubtedly a Methodist, so the Rector's sons listed on the Methodist Chapel Roll were undoubtedly – and would remain - Anglican.

Commemorating *sacrifice* on the one hand, and *service* on the other, two separate approaches emerge from the memorials and rolls of honour connected with Buriton. The village war memorial, and the communal event that was Alan Kite's funeral, present the ideals of sacrifice and duty, the formal ceremony and styling emphasising status and traditional social order; a stability subtly subverted by the uniformity of Lutyens's vision of identical headstones paraded in ordered ranks (Crane 2013, 126). The church plaque might also be seen in this light: the villager soldiers and sailors commemorated in community at the church door, whilst the leading village family, the officer class, receive individual attention at the business end of the building. Christian sacrifice and social order reinforced, articulated in the house of God.

A different 'memory' is constructed and presented in the Buriton Roll of Honour: service, and hope founded on survival. Whereas the memorial commemorates the few, the roll celebrates the many. And in Buriton's case, there were many: one in four of the total village population entered military service during the war, leaving behind them only those too young, those too old, those too sick, and the womenfolk to preserve what they could of the village community and contribute in ways un-commemorated to supporting the war effort. Analysis of the names recorded on the Buriton Roll of Honour and the other village memorials demonstrates that not all who were named were village residents during the war period. And whilst the Buriton Roll of Honour records the many, it does not record them all. If the inclusion of non-residents creates one historical anomaly, the omission of at least 49 men (and all the women) whose military and medical service is evidenced in other sources, creates another. The 'memory' presented in the Buriton Roll of Honour is incomplete. The community of memory is not the same as the village community in reality, despite the title of the Roll. Such names as are recorded are inscribed because post-war villagers wished it so, and could afford the subscription. Others went undocumented, and not necessarily deservedly so. It is a memory constructed rather than chronicled.

Capturing not a moment in time but the manufacturing of a moment in time, the village 'memory' constructed through memorial and rolls thus is not history; not in the sense of an accurate recording and interpretation of verifiable facts. Looking back through the lens

of names recorded reveals what the memorials are not, but presents only a blurred image of what they were intended to be when created. The created memory is malleable in its meaning; the power of monumental memory erodes with time (Scates & Wheatley 2014, 554); and the relationship with the community in which the monumental memory is situated changes. Twenty years after the peace treaty was signed, just 32 of Buriton's WW1 veterans were documented in the 1939 National Register as still resident in the village (another 30 had re-located to the nearby market town of Petersfield). The community that erected the village war memorial and funded the Buriton Roll of Honour was no more extant than the sub-community of the dead immortalised in stone; the ossified memory of decreasing relevance and immediacy to those who now walked past the memorial; the 'war to end all wars' now down-graded in the annals of comparative history as a new global conflict ignited, leading eventually to the addition of eight more names to the village war memorial, redefining its original focus.

As the Buriton Roll of Honour approaches its centenary, to the modern audience it assumes meaning only in the context of surviving military, civil, and parochial records that populate the names recorded on the Roll with biography. In that regard, the Roll offers a starting point for insights into the large number of villagers who went to war, corroborating contemporary press commentary that highlights Buriton's exceptional contribution to the war effort. The community for which the Roll now holds most significance is that of family historians whose ancestors were war-time villagers. The village community continues to evolve through migration and very few of the family names recorded on the Roll now feature in the current Electoral Rolls for Buriton: the present community's relationship to those named on roll and monument now coincidental, not consanguineous. Even in the context of thirty years' research, there remain eleven names on the Roll whose reason for being there is unknown: unbound in military, civil, or parochial records, possibly unremembered by anyone still alive. As memory fades notwithstanding its manifestation in stone and ink, the Buriton Roll of Honour is gradually transitioning from artefact to artwork.

## References

- Connelly, M. (2002). *The Great War, Memory and Ritual: Commemoration in the City and East London 1916-1939*, Woodbridge.
- Connelly, M., & Goebel, S. (2020). The Imperial War Graves Commission, the war dead and the burial of a royal body, 1914–32. *Historical Research*, **93**(262), 734-53.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/hisres/htaa020>.
- Crane, D. (2013). *Empires of the Dead: How One Man's Vision led to the Creation of WWI's War Graves*, London.
- Gosney, B. (2016). *Hospitals of the Petersfield Union 1914-1919*, Petersfield.
- Grieves, K. (2000). Investigating local war memorial committees: demobilised soldiers, the bereaved and expressions of local pride in Sussex villages, 1918–1921. *Local Historian*, **30**, 39-58.
- Harfield, C. (1994). A Rector's legacy: notes on the parish of St Mary, Buriton, 1889, written by Reverend John Gedge for the benefit of Reverend Alfred Martell. *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society* **50**, 193-207.
- Harfield, C. (2017). *The Village that Went to War*, original manuscript in 3 volumes deposited in the Imperial War Museum (London) archives,  
<https://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/1500155338>.
- Harfield, C. (2019). *Buriton and the Spanish Flu*. Retrieved 25th June 2021 from  
<http://buriton.org.uk/2019/10/28/buriton-spanish-flu/>.
- Inglis, K. (1992). The Homecoming: The War Memorial Movement in Cambridge, England. *Journal of Contemporary History*, **27**, 583-605.
- Prost, A. (2014a). The dead, in J. Winter (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the First World War*, Cambridge, vol. 3, 561-91.
- Prost, A. (2014b). Workers, in J. Winter (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the First World War*, Cambridge, vol.3, 325-57.
- Scates, B., & Wheatley, R. (2014). War memorials, in J. Winter (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the First World War*, Cambridge, vol.3, 528-60.
- Sternberg, C. (2016). The Great War, Memory and Ritual: Commemoration in the City and East London, 1916–1939 (Book Review). *The London Journal*, **41**(1), 107-9.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03058034.2016.1145874>
- Stilwell, M. (2017). *Homes fit for heroes*. Retrieved 25th June 2021 from  
<http://www.socialhousinghistory.uk/wp/homes-fit-for-heroes/>.
- Weintraub, S. (2002). The Great War: Memory and Ritual Commemoration in the City and East London 1916-1939 Mark Connelly (Book Review). *The American Historical Review*, **107**(3), 940-1.

## Acknowledgements

My thanks to Professor Mark Connelly (University of Kent) and Professor Adrian Smith (University of Southampton) for commenting on an early draft of this paper, and for their encouragement. The exchange of ideas and information with Dr Lynette Watson, Buriton resident, over many years has often benefitted my research into the WW1 veterans of Buriton. In particular, I am grateful to her for drawing my attention to the Portland Cement Roll of Honour. Andrew Ashbee, Chairman of the Snodland Historical Society, kindly supplied the image used in Fig 3, and permitted its use in this paper. Figures 1, 2, and 4 are the work of Roger Morris, Buriton resident, and their inclusion here is valued and appreciated.

Table 1: Men recorded on, and omitted from, the Buriton village war memorial

<b>Name</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Theatre / Notes</b>
BEAGLEY, William	Pte	37226	4 <sup>th</sup> Res. Batt. Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry	b. 1899; died of pneumonia, Lark Hill, Wilts, 9.2.1918, aged 18 Buried Buriton churchyard Occupation in 1911: carter
BONE, Arthur Henry	L/Cpl	G/2632	8 <sup>th</sup> Batt. The Queen's (Royal West Surrey) Regiment	b. 1884; missing presumed k.i.a. 25.9.1915 Battle of Loos, France, aged 31 Commemorated Vis-en-Artois Memorial Occupation in 1911: carpenter
CADMORE, A. Cecil	Pte	PS/2008	16 <sup>th</sup> Batt. (Public Schools) Middlesex Regt	b. 1897; d.o.w. 9.12.15, No. 26 General Field Hospital, France, aged 18 Buried Etaples CWGC cemetery, France, VI.A.19A Occupation in 1911: schoolboy, Churcher's College
CASE, Percy Arthur	Pte	25331	1 <sup>st</sup> Batt. Hants Regt.	b. 1880; k.i.a. 13.4.17, Arras Offensive, France, aged 37 Buried Bailleul Road East, St Laurent-Blancy CWGC Cemetery, France, V.A.11 (following exhumation and relocation from battlefield grave) Occupation in 1911: farm labourer
CHITTY, Caleb	Pte	21370	14 <sup>th</sup> (Service) Batt. Hants Regt	b.1897; k.i.a. 3.9.16 Somme Campaign, France, aged 18 Commemorated Thiepval Memorial, France,7C Occupation in 1911: unknown (schoolboy in 1911)

CHITTY, Harold	Pte	280981	1/6 <sup>th</sup> TF Batt. Hants Regt	b. 1894; d. of pneumonia, Basra, Mesopotamia 7.11.18, aged 24 Buried Baghdad (North Gate) CWGC Cemetery, Iraq, IX.C.8 Occupation in 1911: grocer's assistant Also listed on Petersfield War Memorial
COOK, Alfred George	Pte	17899	1 <sup>st</sup> Batt. Hants Regt	b.1882; d.o.w. 3.7.16, Somme Offensive, France, aged 34, Buried Beauval Communal Cemetery, France, F.3 Occupation in 1911: carter on farm
FRANCIS, Charles G.	Sapper	15546	3 <sup>rd</sup> Signal Coy Royal Engineers	b. 1890; k.i.a. Flanders 5.6.1915, aged 25 Buried Poperinghe New Military Cemetery, I.A.3 Occupation in 1911: solider (telegraph operator)
FRANCIS, Herbert	Pte	25803	2 <sup>nd</sup> Batt. Hants Regt	b. 1898; missing presumed k.i.a. Flanders, 4.9.18, aged 20 Commemorated Ploergsteert Memorial, Panel 6 Occupation in 1911: unknown (Buriton schoolboy in 1911)
FRANCIS, Samuel	Gnr	95594	62 <sup>nd</sup> Coy Royal Garrison Artillery	b. 1883; d. of influenza, aboard SS Guildford Castle, returning to be demobbed 8.30 pm 24.11.19 Buried Buriton (CWGC headstone), aged 36 Occupation in 1911: farm labourer
HARDING, George H.	Pte	18073	2 <sup>nd</sup> Batt. Hants Regt	b. 1896; k.i.a. Flanders 8.8.16, aged 20 Buried Essex Farm, Boezhige, Belgium, III.A.24 Occupation in 1911: cowman on farm Also listed on Steep (Hants) War Memorial and Bramley (Surrey) War Memorial
HARFIELD, Godfrey	Pte	37229	7 <sup>th</sup> Batt. South Lancs Regt	b. 1887 missing presumed k.i.a. 31.7.17 Passchendaele, Flanders, aged 28 Commemorated Menin Gate, Panel 37. Occupation in 1911: farm labourer



HARMAN, Thomas H.	Pte	3/5316	1 <sup>st</sup> Batt. Hants Regt	b.1892, d.o.w. France 16.5.15 aged 23 Buried Boulogne Eastern CWGC cemetery, France, VIII.D.3 Occupation in 1911: house decorator
HILL, Tom	Gnr	RMA/8162	HMS Indefatigable	b. 1881; k.i.a. Battle of Jutland, 31.5.1916, aged 34 Body lost at sea Occupation in 1911: Royal Marine Artillery gunner Also listed on Portsmouth Naval Memorial
HISCOCK, Levi	Pte	L/10484	2 <sup>nd</sup> Batt. Royal Sussex Regt	b.1896; missing presumed k.i.a. Richebourg, France 9.5.15, aged 19 Commemorated Le Touret Memorial, France, Panels 20/21 Occupation in 1911: farm labourer
HOLLOWAY, Reginald	Pte	201036	1/4 <sup>th</sup> TF Batt. Hants Regt	b. 1889; d. of disease, Mesopotamia 23.3.17, aged 28 buried Amara CWGC Cemetery, Iraq Occupation in 1911: unknown, not found 1911 Census Also listed on Shaikh Saad Old Cemetery Memorial
KILHAM[S], Alfred	Rating J	30359	HMS Castor	b. 1897; k.i.a. Battle of Jutland 31.5.1916, aged 19 Body lost at sea Occupation in 1911: unknown (schoolboy in Arundel, 1911) Also listed on Portsmouth Naval Memorial
KITE, Alan Walter	T/2Lt		61 <sup>st</sup> Training Sqdn Royal Air Force	b.1900; d.12.5.18 training flight accident (pilot error) in UK, aged 18 Buried Buriton churchyard Occupation in 1911: unknown (Buriton schoolboy in 1911)

LEE, Charles W. F.	Cpl	43358	12 <sup>th</sup> Hy Batt. Royal Garrison	b.1893; d.o.w. Somme Offensive, France, 27.7.16, aged 23 Buried La Neuville British CWGC Cemetery, Corbie, France, I.E.8, Occupation in 1911: gardener working for Lothian Bonham-Carter
LEGG, Frederick	L/Cpl	18548	1 <sup>st</sup> Batt. Hants Regt	b. 1889; missing presumed k.i.a. Battle of Arras, France 16.4.17, aged 28 Commemorated Arras Memorial, France, Bay 6 Occupation in 1911: assistant game-keeper to Lothian Bonham-Carter
LOVELL, Thomas	Pte	20584	15 <sup>th</sup> Service Batt. Hants Regt	b.1875; missing presumed k.i.a. Battle of Flers-Courcelette, France 15.9.16, aged 41 Commemorated Thiepval Memorial to the Missing of the Somme, France, Pier 7B Occupation in 1911: farm labourer
MARRINER, Rowland	Spr	55398	112 <sup>th</sup> Railway Coy Royal Engineers	b.1890; k.i.a. Kemmel Creek Bridge, Flanders, 30.7.17, aged 27 Buried Canada Farm CWGC Cemetery, Elverdinghe, Belgium, II.B.4 Occupation in 1911: stockman on farm
PINK, Charles	Officers' Steward L 4257		HMS Prince of Wales	b.1896; d.o.w (received Dardenelles) 8.5.1916 in hospital at Greenwich, aged 20 Buried Shooters Hill, UK Occupation in 1911: Royal Navy, Officers' Steward
POWELL, Albert	Pte	PO/9440	Royal Marine Light Infantry	b.1879; died 19.3.1918 when HMS Motagua collided with the USS Manley and sank Buried at sea, aged 39 Occupation in 1911: Royal Marine
POWELL, Frederick	Pte	200707	2/4 <sup>th</sup> TF Batt. Hants Regt	b.1895; k.i.a. France 29.8.1918, aged 23 Buried Mory Abbey CWGC Cemetery, France, V.A.20 Occupation in 1911: farm carter

POWELL, James	Pte	12994	2 <sup>nd</sup> Batt. Hants Regt	b.1886; k.i.a. France 8.5.1918, aged 32 buried Cinq Rues British CWGC Cemetery, Hazebruch, Belgium, C.18 Occupation in 1911: general farm labourer
PRETTY, Edward	Pte	202367	2/4 <sup>th</sup> TF Batt. Hants Regt	b.1886; d.o.w. Palestine 21.11.1917, aged 31 Buried Jerusalem CWGC Cemetery, Israel, P.6 Occupation in 1911: lime works labourer
REAN, Ernest S.	Sgt	8618	2 <sup>nd</sup> Batt. Hants Regt	b. 1891; d. (of fever), Shoubra, Egypt, 20.10.1915 aged 24 Buried Cairo CWGC Cemetery, Egypt, D.151. Occupation in 1911: soldier
ROGERS, Henry E. R.	Sgt	4826	2/6 <sup>th</sup> TF Batt. Hants attached to 1/4 <sup>th</sup> TF Batt. Hants	b. 1886; d. (of fever) 7.7.1916 Mesopotamia, aged 31 Buried Amara CWGC Cemetery, Iraq, IX.J.17 Occupation in 1911: domestic gardener Also listed on Petersfield War Memorial
SHEPHERD, Charles	L/Cpl	T/206846	3/4 <sup>th</sup> Batt. The Queens (Royal W Surrey) Regt	b.1893; k.i.a. France 16.1.1918, aged 25 Buried Fins New British CWGC Cemetery, Sorel-Le-Grand, France, III.G.10 Occupation in 1911: farm carter
SILVER, George E.	Gnr	10905	C Battery 70 <sup>th</sup> Brigade Royal Field Artillery	b.1897; k.i.a. France 2.7.1917, aged 20 Buried Brandhoch CWGC Cemetery, Vlamertinghe, Belgium, I.L.40 Occupation in 1911: unknown (Buriton schoolboy in 1911)
STRUGNELL, Arthur S.	Driver	13156	F Battery Royal Horse Art.	B.1883; d.o.w. France 15.6.1915 aged 32 Buried Hinges CWGC Cemetery, France, B.23 Occupation in 1911: unknown (but had been a Regular Soldier in 1901 and 1911)

STRUGNELL, Percy G. Pte	18549	2 <sup>nd</sup> Batt. Hants Regt	b.1895; missing presumed k.i.a. France 21.11.1916 aged 21 Commemorated Thiepval Memorial, France, 7B Occupation in 1911: gardener
TREAGUS, George Pte	PO/14656	Royal Marine Light Infantry	b.1885; k.i.a. France 18.10.1914 aged 29 Buried Aeroplane Cemetery, Ypres, plot 1, Row E, Grave 16, exhumed from battlefield grave Occupation in 1911: Royal Marine
TRIBE, William Pte	9403	B Coy. 1 <sup>st</sup> Batt. Hants Regt	b.18965; missing presumed k.i.a. France 26.4.15 aged 20 Commemorated Menin Gate, Panel 35 Occupation in 1911: soldier
WATTS, A. George Pte	G/660	7 <sup>th</sup> Batt. Royal Sussex Regt	b.1888; k.i.a. France 4.3.1916 aged 27 Buried Vermelles Cemetery, Pas de Calais, II.H.6 Occupation in 1911: farm labourer, Harting Also listed on South Harting War Memorial
WELCH, Victor C. H. Pte	18742	15 <sup>th</sup> Batt. Roy. Warks. Regt	b.1889; k.i.a. France, 24.9.1916 aged 27 Buried Guards CWGC Cemetery, Lesboeuufs, France, XII.V.1; exhumed from battlefield grave Occupation in 1911: domestic gardener
<i>Name added in 1924</i>			
SHEPHERD, Frederick Gnr	16079	Royal Field Artillery	b.1898; died during surgery in UK (to treat horse fall injury sustained in Constantinople), 16.7.1924 Buried Buriton churchyard, aged 26 Occupation in 1911: employed by the Seward family on their farm

*Names omitted*

MARRINER George	Gnr	106612	22 <sup>nd</sup> Res. Battery Royal Field Artillery	b.1890; died of disease 2.10.1917 aged 27 Buried CWGC Cemetery Hammersmith Occupation in 1911: carman
TUPPER, Henry	ABS	204256	HMS Monmouth	b.1882; k.i.a. Battle of Coronel, off Chilean coast, 1.11.1914 aged 33 Body lost at sea Occupation in 1911: Coast Guard, Dorset, recalled to RN service Listed on Buriton church plaque; also the Studland church plaque, and the Royal Navy Memorial, Portsmouth