

The alterations in the Rules, of which due notice had been given to the members, were proposed by Lord Northbourne and unanimously agreed to, with the following addition proposed by the Rev. C. E. Woodruff: In Rule 2, between "The" and "property" read "funds, securities, and."

On the proposition of the President Mr. Monckton was elected a Trustee in the place of the late Right Hon. J. G. Talbot.

Lord Northbourne promised that the suggestion of Mr. Boulter that the Annual Meeting should not be held on a Friday would be considered by the Council.

With this terminated the business of the meeting, and the President then gave his Inaugural Address.

Before luncheon the members inspected St. Clement's Church, which was fully described by the Vicar, the Rev. A. M. Chichester. The Rev. G. M. Livett called attention to *graphides* of a bird and a man roughly incised upon the piers of the tower, and pointed out their similarity to those in the crypts of Canterbury and Rochester Cathedrals. Luncheon having been partaken of at the Bell Hotel the members proceeded to St. Peter's Church, where they were met by the Vicar, the Rev. B. Roscow, and the architectural features were described by the Rev. G. M. Livett. From St. Peter's Church the party passed on to St. Mary's, where the Vicar, the Rev. A. M. Chichester, again acted as cicerone. "The Old House" in Strand Street, by the courtesy of T. A. Macmeikan, Esq., was next visited, where the fine panelling and Tudor fireplaces were much admired.

The members then drove to Richborough Castle, where they inspected the Roman walls and the cruciform foundations within their area, which had been excavated in their entirety for the visit of the Society, and Papers, prepared respectively by Mr. St. John Hope and Mr. Livett, were read.

Mr. Hope's Paper, which, in the absence of the writer, was read by Lord Northbourne, was as follows:—

So many theories have been put forth as to the meaning of the cruciform block, with its concrete platform and substructure, which occupies the middle of the Roman fort at Richborough, that it is difficult to induce people even to think of it from the cold-blooded view of common sense. And it is quite safe to say that the more fanciful and imaginative the theory the less likely is it to be one deserving of consideration.

In view of this present Meeting some excavations have lately been made under the direction of Mr. Herbert Jones and myself from 5th to 13th July which enable you to see what are the features under discussion.

In the first place there is the cruciform construction, consisting of two longer and narrow sections  $7\frac{1}{2}$  feet wide, meeting on either side of the middle of a shorter and much broader cross piece, which is 22 feet wide and 47 feet long. The length of the whole from north to south is 87 feet. What is left to us stands about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  feet high, and is clearly a solid mass of concrete which was originally higher. The once vertical sides have been much injured, partly through people trying to tunnel into the mass, but partly from exposure to the frost and other vicissitudes of our climate. It is difficult now to realize Mr. Dowker's statement that the ends and the inner angles had dressings of tufa blocks, but some fragments are still embedded in the ends.

The cross, which can now be examined all round, stands symmetrically upon an oblong platform of concrete, 124 feet long from north to south and 80 feet wide from east to west, and five feet in thickness. Part of the north-east quarter has been completely cleared, from its vertical edge to the cross in the middle, and at the outer angle the original surface of smoothed concrete with fine gravel embedded can plainly be seen and examined. On the same cleared space may be seen part of the foundation of a wall, which was traced throughout its course by Mr. Dowker and found to extend parallel with the edge of the platform all along it at some 15 or 16 feet within it. Just outside each of the angles of the walled enclosure Mr. Dowker also found a small rectangular hole, apparently for a wooden post. I have had opened out the north-east and the south-east openings for your inspection. They are carried right through the concrete platform. By visiting the so-called subterranean passage, which has only been formed during the last 70 years, and half of it only 40 years, a view can be obtained of the great concrete substructure of the cruciform mass and platform. This has been built into a hole excavated for it in the sand of which the Richborough hill consists, and has been followed downwards for quite 30 feet from the present level without reaching the bottom. Notwithstanding opinions to the contrary I do not think there can be any question that this substructure is other than a solid mass of concrete, and several attempts to prove the contrary by tunnelling into it have all ended in failure.

After careful consideration of the question from all sides I do not see how we can get away from an acceptance of the ingenious and simple suggestion as to the purpose of this mysterious construction which was put forth by the late Mr. Godfrey-Faussett in an editorial footnote to the account of Mr. Dowker's investigations in Vol. VIII. of *Archæologia Cantiana*.

After contending that so huge a concrete foundation was probably intended to carry some large superstructure which was never actually built, Mr. Faussett says :—

“The smaller portions of the wall remains, viz., of the wall which probably formed a complete rectangular enclosure upon the platform, are built so exactly and regularly at a short distance within that part of it which is not mere platform, 5 feet deep, but huge solid foundation, perhaps 30 feet deep, that we may conclude them to have been certainly built with knowledge of, and with reference to, the position and intention of the great substructure. [The masonry of the wall] is clearly Roman, with its red mortar and its course of binding tiles; and so is that of the broader wall of cruciform shape in the centre. May we not suppose these to have formed part of some temporary or substitutional building raised in lieu of the original colossal design? The cruciform remains have always puzzled investigators; their broadest part is too narrow to have formed the foundation of any building containing chambers, but so wide that we may well believe the solid stone wall which must have formed its upward continuation to have been of very considerable height. As a clue, perhaps not unworthy of consideration, I would suggest that this building may have formed a sort of internal buttress or support to a timber pharos built around it, as wooden houses are at this day built around and supported by their stack of chimneys in the centre. A cruciform shape would be the very form best calculated for stability in itself when raised to a great height, and for support to the timbers surrounding it. No one who has seen a Canadian town after a fire can have failed to be struck with the curious effect of these central chimneys standing tall and alone above the ashes of the wooden buildings; and in this state let us imagine the watch tower of Richborough to have been left by the first Saxon attack after Roman departure. The tall masonry also would not be long in reaching its present level.”

To this ingenious idea of Mr. Faussett I would like to add one further remark, that if, as he suggests, the cruciform mass was the

core of a lighthouse or signalling tower, the heavy concrete substructure which is united to it would serve to steady it in a gale, much as the centreboard of a yacht stiffens it in a breeze.

My old friend and co-worker at Silchester and elsewhere, the late Mr. George E. Fox, one of the soundest and most learned Roman antiquaries we have ever had, was strongly in favour of Mr. Faussett's lighthouse theory, and in an admirable Paper on the Roman Coast Fortresses of Kent communicated by him to the Royal Archæological Institute at its Canterbury Meeting in 1896 he adduced strong reasons for the erection of a *pharos* at *Rutupiæ*.

After pointing out the relative positions of *Regulbium* (Reculver) at the northern and of *Rutupiæ* (Richborough) at the southern end of the strait between Thanet and Kent, through which all the shipping into and from the Thames passed in Roman times, he says:—

“As the crow flies the two stations were something over eight miles apart. Under ordinary conditions so trifling a distance would have offered no difficulties of communication between them; but in the Roman period there were insuperable obstacles to direct intercourse, for the marshy estuaries of the greater and lesser Stour falling into the strait intervened between the two stations. They could therefore only communicate with each other by the circuitous route *viâ* Canterbury, or by water by means of the strait itself, probably not practicable in all conditions of the tide. It will thus be seen how important any means of signalling would become, and there is therefore some reason for supposing that a tower at Richborough may have been erected for this purpose as well as to serve as a lighthouse. By means of signals news of pirate fleets in the estuary of the Thames could be conveyed from Reculver to Richborough, from which station the coasts further south could be alarmed, and the headquarters of the British fleet at *Gessoriacun* (Boulogne) could be communicated with, if need were, by way of Dover.”

I may add that Mr. Fox was, like myself, strongly opposed to any such ridiculous idea as that the concrete substructure of the cruciform mass contained anything in the way of a chamber or chambers, or was otherwise than solid throughout.

There is one further point in connection with the cross and its platform and base which ought to be cleared up. From time to time, and notably in the excavations carried out within the fort ten

years ago by Mr. John Garstang as well as in my own recent diggings, there have been discovered in the earth overlying the platform a good many pieces of white marble fluted pilasters, and of steps and wall linings of the same foreign material. This is so rarely met with in Roman buildings in Britain that its discovery in a mere coast fortress is particularly noteworthy. The pilasters are worked out of very thin pieces of marble, and have clearly been built as casings to brick or concrete circular or semicircular cores. No traces of these, however, have come to light, and it is difficult to imagine where or for what purpose the marble work was set up. It is also curious to notice that the surface of the pilasters is in no case smoothed off or polished, but merely dressed to an even face with such a class tool as was used here in the thirteenth century and later. Possibly a more extended search, such as would be effected by clearing the rest of the concrete platform and trenching closely the ground immediately surrounding it, might bring to light more important and enlightening fragments than have so far been discovered, and it rests with the Society after its visit to Richborough to decide whether anything further in this direction shall be done.

---

The following Paper was then read by the Rev. G. M. Livett, F.S.A. :—

Assembled beneath the walls of the ancient Rutupiaë, whose massive structure has defied the ravages of the barbarians and withstood for fifteen centuries the assaults of the elements, we are reminded of the Roman rule in Britain, and of the great changes which have taken place since the marshes, now surrounding this *castrum*, were filled with the waters of the Wantsum, on which floated the fleet of the *Comes Littoris Saxonici*. Doubtless these shallow waters of the Rutupian shore afforded safe and commodious harbours; and Rutupiaë must have been a port of the first importance from the beginning of the Roman occupation. I propose to consider five points in connection with this ancient Roman settlement :—

1. Was *Rutupiaë* more than a port? Was it also a town?
2. At what period were the present walls constructed?
3. Were there any defensive walls before the present ones? or did the subterranean structure exist before these walls were built?

4. What is the date and what was the purpose of the Cross erected on the platform?
5. What were the walls, of which fragments are found resting on the platform and surrounding the Cross?

For answer to our first question *Rutupiæ* is mentioned by Ptolemy the geographer, who lived in the first half of the second century, as one of the three towns of the Cantii. In the Itinerary of Antonimus *Rutupiæ* is called a port or haven. In the *Notitia*, written about A.D. 450, we find that the second Legion called Augusta was located at *Rutupiæ*. Very few inscriptions have been found at Richborough, but a large number of coins, principally of late date—out of several hundred only five are earlier than the third century, and the series continues up to the time of Honorius A.D. 423. A few *minimi* of pre-Saxon times have also been found. These go to prove a prolonged occupation of Richborough, and there is little doubt that as a port it must have existed from an early period.

2. The present walls of Richborough seem especially designed to repel such sudden attack as might have been expected from the Saxon pirates. The walls were probably 30 feet high and 12 feet broad, thus not easily scaled. The Decuman or principal gate was of massive construction, the walls on either side sloping in towards the entrance, so that the defenders might observe the enemy on either side. The corners of the *castrum* were flanked by round towers, which doubtless commanded a view of the surrounding country, besides serving to defend the walls. There were also pairs of rectangular towers on the outside of each wall. The postern gate was especially designed to resist a sudden attack, and at the same time give the garrison an easy sallying point towards the sea. On the east side of the *castrum* Mr. Boys thought he could trace a wall flanking that side, which he has represented in his plan as below the cliff near the river, and during the construction of the South-Eastern Railway near this spot portions of the wall were met with, and another large mass 156 feet in length lies in the bed of the river. The walls therefore quite encircled the *castrum*, and on the eastern side they may have been below the cliff. That the sea did not cover this ground is evident from the fact that during the construction of the railway the foundations of a house were met with at the same level towards the south east. The *castrum*

appears to have been built at one time and uniformly of the same materials throughout, viz. : flint stones and chalk blocks, Portland stone with regular courses of Roman tiles laid in a mortar of lime, grit, and coarsely broken tiles. Mr. Dowker has suggested that the wall on the east side may also have enclosed a harbour to protect the fleet.

3. It has also been suggested that the present walls of the *castrum* occupy the place of an entrenched camp, and that the whole of Richborough island may have been previously occupied as a town and port, as the amphitheatre, the roads, streets, and coins, as well as the historical notices testify.

The passage from Gaul to Britain must, from the nature of the tidal currents, have run diagonally across the Straits of Dover. At the eastern extremity was *Rutupiæ*, at the western *Portus Lemanis*. With regard to this latter we have the important fact that its walls had been built of material derived from a more ancient building, for inscribed tiles and an altar with an inscription shewing that it was dedicated to Aufidius Pantera, Prefect of the British Fleet, were built into the walls, and from the fact that the altar was covered with barnacles, it is evident that it had been moved from some building overwhelmed by the sea. The *Portus Lemanis* therefore in all probability dated anterior to the present *castrum* at Lymne. In like manner the *Portus Rutupinus* may date earlier than the fort of the *Littus Saxonicum*. Richborough, as the most important station and more exposed to the attack of a naval force landing in Britain, may have been the first of these structures.

I will now discuss the extraordinary mass of masonry within the walls, which has been usually described as the platform. It is 144 feet long, 104 feet wide, and 5 feet thick. It is not in the centre of the *castrum* but nearer the north-east. It is the position in which we should expect to find the *Prætorium*, for the Decuman gate is more towards the north wall than the south, and the road from it would cut through the platform; the road from the south entrance intersecting that from the west would mark the place of the *Prætorium*. The Rev. G. R. Gleig many years ago, in tracing a cave that existed in the face of the sand cliff (also described by Leland), came upon the foundations of this platform at a depth of 30 feet, and from the excavations undertaken by the late Mr. Rolfe, and our Society, the stupendous nature of the substructure has been revealed. This platform, 144 feet long by 104 feet wide and 5 feet thick, rests on and subtends other foundations 10 feet thick in one

direction and 12 feet in the other, so that the deeper foundations are 132 feet by 94 feet, and of unknown depth, and the whole of this mass is built of flint stones, and mortar of wonderful tenacity without the least admixture of other materials, differing in this respect from the walls of the *castrum*, which have chalk and other materials, and pounded tile in the mortar. At each corner of the deeper structure are holes about 4 inches square, into which wood had been introduced, and the whole platform is covered entirely with a stratum of mortar and fine gravel.

4. Mr. Boys, the historian of Sandwich, uncovered the platform in 1792. He also dug round the cross and discovered its dimensions. It is situated in the centre of the platform, above which it rises 4 feet 6 inches at its south-east corner; it is 87 feet long from north to south, with a width of 7 feet 6 inches; transversely, east to west, 47 feet long and 22 feet wide. The longer arms run 35° east of north. Its masonry is composed of Kentish rag, oolite, tufa, and flint boulders, cemented with a concrete made of lime, broken tile, coarse sand, and grit, very similar to that in the outer wall of the *castrum*. Though resting on the platform the cross does not form part of it, but is laid on a foundation consisting of blocks of chalk and a layer of Kentish rag, broken very fine without mortar, this again resting on a layer of sand or gravel, which covers the entire face of the platform.

5. Starting from corners about 5 feet inwards from the north-west, and north-east holes through the platform, and then running parallel with its sides, have been found the remains of a wall, which may perhaps have been carried round its entire circuit. It is 3 feet 6 inches in height. It extends 26 feet southwards down the west side, with two more detached portions nearer the south end of this side. Along the north side it extends 12 feet eastwards from the north-western corner, and 30 feet westwards from the north-eastern, having apparently been demolished at the interval, and again down the east side southwards 14 feet. It is built of boulders (those on the outside squared) imbedded in mortar composed of lime, grit, and broken tile, but containing more sand than other mortar at Richborough, and easily crumbled in the fingers. It stands, like the cross, not immediately on the platform, but on a layer of intervening sand. On the outer side of this wall, at all distances up to 10 yards from it, have been found architectural fragments of white marble, moulded shells for columns and pilasters, slabs for pavements and facings, and straight mouldings for



base and cornice, even ornamental carvings and embellishments. In one place on the eastern side a piece of marble pavement, between the low wall and the edge of the concrete, was found *in situ*. All sorts of theories have been started in explanation of this marvellous structure. Mr. Boys suggested that it is the foundation of a lofty sea-mark to direct the mariner, or a cross to solicit his devotion. Mr. T. Godfrey-Faussett was of opinion that the Comes *Littoris Saxonici* designed to erect here within the camp a pharos or a watch tower of usual height, and mistrusting the sand of Richborough hill took the elaborate and thoroughly Roman step of digging it out for the required area. The Rev. Prebendary Scarth, in a Paper read before the Royal Archæological Institute at Canterbury in 1875, stated that he was inclined to think that the cross was intended to support a wooden superstructure, and quoted an instance of a similar cross within a fortified parallelogram at Banwell in Somersetshire, outside the Roman station. Mr. Roach Smith regarded the masonry of the platform and substructure as forming an underground building designed for great strength and solidity, which may have been an arsenal for arms or stores, and into which some entrance may be found. I think archæologists are agreed that the platform and substructure have nothing to do with the cruciform structure subsequently erected on it, or with the walls, which are probably of a later date. Mr. Dowker concluded that these walls were the remains of a church or chapel noticed by Leland, and suggested that the platform and masonry below were constructed for the purposes of the fleet and harbour, that they were intended to carry and hold a strong fulcrum of Roman machinery for drawing up the ships within an extended camp, to protect them from the enemy, or for repairs or building, and that a large square mass of masonry, discovered by Mr. Gleig on the eastern face of the platform, was intended to facilitate this. The holes in the corners of the platform had wooden posts; the central part may have been left for a cavity for a capstan of large dimensions. At a subsequent period of the Roman occupation this platform had been utilized for the foundation of the temple and prætorium, and the walls of the castrum made to coincide with this, the harbour being enclosed by return walls. The Temple included a cruciform raised floor, perhaps with steps towards the centre. At this period foreign materials, oolite, and marble were used. Finally a Romanesque or Saxon Church was built, enclosing the cruciform base,

and built with Roman materials. It is worthy of notice that many of the Roman castra contain a Christian Church. In Kent we have the Church of Reculver, formerly the *Prætorium*, within the walls of the castrum; at Dover a Church of a very early date, and built of Roman materials, occupies a similar position.

We know that a church existed at Richborough, for Leland in his *Itinerary* writes: "Within ye castel is a little parochie church of St. Augustine, and an hermitage (I had antiquities of the heremite, the which was an industrious man), not far from the hermitage is a cave where men have sowt and digged for treasure. I saw yt by candel withyn and there were conys, yt was so straitte that I had no mynd to crepe far yn." Mr. Roach Smith, in his *History of Richborough*, however, states that "the popular notion that the cruciform foundation upon the platform is the base of a cross need scarcely be refuted, and the opinion that it may have supported a Pharos is equally untenable. There is more weight in the supposition that it may have been the site of a small chapel, especially as there is evidence of the existence of one within the castrum, at a period not very remote. But the materials incline us to attribute it to the Roman times, whatever may have been its use, and on the eastern side, towards the cliff, are, or recently were, the vestiges of walls, certainly of mediæval date, which may be considered as the remains of the chapel."

I will only mention in conclusion that the wall towers of the castrum are octangular in form, while the corner towers are round, and that both are external. The whole enclosure is of rectangular form, 600 feet by 450 feet, with an area of just over 6 acres. In plan and size Richborough is conformable with twenty-two other large forts in the country, and its lower sea wall is uniform with others on the sea coast. But the peculiarity of its defences, the external towers, the paucity of stone cut inscriptions, and the preponderance of coins of the declining years of the Roman Empire, all point to a date not far from the latter part of the third century.

---

The Annual Dinner was served at the Bell Hotel, at which Lord Northbourne presided. After the usual loyal toasts had been proposed by the President, the Rev. C. E. Woodruff proposed the toast of "Prosperity to the Kent Archæological Society," which he coupled with the names of Lord Northbourne and the Rev. W.

Gardner-Waterman, the acting Hon. Secretary, whose services to the Society he highly eulogised. The noble President replied, and then proposed "The health of the Mayor and Corporation of Sandwich and the members of the Local Committee," to whose energetic co-operation the Society owed much. The Mayor of Sandwich acknowledged the compliment.

In the evening the members assembled in the Town Hall, where a very interesting Paper on "The home life of the Benedictines" was read by Mrs. Aubrey Waterfield, who thus had the honour of being the first lady to read a Paper before the Society. Mrs. Waterfield was followed by Mr. J. A. Jacobs, who dealt with the ancient records of the town and port of Sandwich.

Friday's proceedings commenced with a visit to the beautiful thirteenth-century chapel attached to the hospital of St. Bartholomew, outside the town walls, and the Chaplain (Rev. O. D. Bruce Payne) gave a particularly lucid description of the building and its history. Eastry Church was next visited, the members being received by the Vicar, the Rev. C. D. Lampen, who read the following Paper:—

It is only possible in a brief Paper to give a slight sketch of the points of interest in this remarkable Church, so closely knit as it is with the beginnings of English history and with the royal line of our kings. A large volume setting forth the history of the parish, with much concerning the Church, was published by my predecessor, Dr. W. F. Shaw, in 1870, but during the subsequent forty years our knowledge has continued to accumulate, and there is now enough material at hand for a more complete work.

First, as regards the history of this village, formerly a royal city, burgh, or ville.

The origin of the name Eastry has been variously interpreted. Lambarde thinks it may have been so called to distinguish it from West-Rye, now Rye, in Sussex. The more probable derivation of the name is that our Saxon forefathers, on their arrival in the year 477, erected on this spot a temple to Eastre, the goddess of Spring, from which name we also derive the title of our Spring feast, Easter, just as the neighbouring Woodnesborough is Wodensbourg, the bourg of Woden, the god of war. But this is not the beginning of our history. Upwards of 400 years earlier the conquering Romans had made a road from Dover to Richborough, which passed through Eastry, at that time a clearing in the woods,

and many interesting remains, from a Roman burying-place, have been found in and near the village.

In the dim and misty past, when Sandwich, if it then existed at all, consisted merely of a few mud huts, Eastry had grown to be an important town. This, no doubt, was caused by the fact that the local chieftains, dignified by the title of kings of Kent, resided here for at least a portion of each year in the royal palace, which perhaps we may identify with Eastry Court, which adjoins the Church. It was probably at Eastry, and not on the shores of Thanet, that Ethelbert, the fifth King of Kent, and his Queen Bertha met the Roman monk Augustine. For we learn from our proto-historian Bede that Augustine "crossed over the water," *i.e.*, over the estuary and marshes between Thanet and the mainland, for the King and his court would naturally be coming to the royal palace at Eastry, and not to Thanet.

It was at Eastry Palace, in the time of King Egbert (664), that the Saxon Princes Ethelbert and Etheldred were murdered. It is here that their ghosts have frequently appeared, of which a full account appears in the chronicle of Simon of Durham. For upwards of 400 years Eastry remained a royal town. But in 979, when Dunstan was Archbishop, a great change came, for the King, our first Edward, called "the martyr," made over to the prior and monks of the Cathedral of Christ at Canterbury his palace and manor in Eastry. The following is a translation from the words of his charter (the original is quoted by Dugdale): "In the year of Our Lord's Incarnation 979, I, Ethelred, King, Monarch of all Britain, for the safety of my soul, give to Christ's Church, Canterbury, the Lands of My Right, to wit, in Sandwich and Estree, to the use of the monks serving God in the same Church, free from all secular service and taxes. Whosoever shall presume to violate this My bountiful munificence let him be placed with the wicked in the day of judgment at the left hand of Christ, and receive the sentence of damnation with the Devil and his angels."

It was on November 2nd, 1164, being All Souls' Day, that Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, disguised as a monk, came to his favourite country house, the Court at Eastry, as he fled from Northampton. Here he remained in concealment for a full week, before embarking at Sandwich for his six years' exile from his country and See. From the secret chamber in the adjoining court the Archbishop entered Eastry Church and blessed the people assembled to hear Mass. The "Pilgrim's Way," which skirts

Eastry, still reminds us of the days which succeeded Becket's murder.

Nor was Becket the only ecclesiastic of eminence whose career was connected with Eastry. In 1287 the monk Henry of Eastry, "a native of this our parish," as Shaw puts it, was elected to the exalted position of Prior of the monastery of Christ's Church, Canterbury. His work there is well known. At Eastry he restored the private Chapel in the adjoining court. It is now used as a kitchen, and the stone altar-slab is said to be concealed in the roof. He died at the age of 92.

Speaking of monks reminds me that I must not forget to mention the three ecclesiastical houses in this parish—the Rectory, the Vicarage, and the Parsonage, all still existing. The Rectors and owners of the Greater Tithes, as I have said, were the Prior and monks, now the Dean and Chapter. Their Rectory is the former King's seat, Eastry Court. The Parsonage, until the Reformation, was the abode of the almoner, and perhaps of some of the chaplains. The Vicarage was first assigned to the use of a secular priest in 1367. The Vicar is now Chaplain to the Rectors, the Dean and Chapter.

And now to speak more particularly about the Church. As I have said, this building is probably the third on the present site. The first, or Saxon building, may even have been erected originally as the Temple of Eastre nearly a century before Augustine arrived on this spot. Undoubtedly, as Shaw says, the Church of Eastry had a royal foundation. When that Church disappeared a second Church was erected, about the end of the eleventh century; the west doorway is of this period. We may surmise that it was by the exertions of the Prior and monks of Canterbury that the second Church was demolished and the present one built.

The first parish priest of Eastry of whom we have a *fixed* date was a certain John Bacon, who resigned his benefice in 1288.

Time does not permit me to do more than to point out certain salient features of the present building. To begin with the Tower. It is peculiar in being supported on three arches. The north tower aisle had formerly a floor dividing it into two stories, being anciently used as the lodging of one of the chaplains. There is good architectural detail in the arch of the buttress which divides it eastwards from the north aisle. The similar portion on the south of the tower was blocked up by brick-work about the sixteenth century, to strengthen the buttress on that side. The nave

is of the early English period. At the east end of either aisle there were formerly chapels—on the north that of the Holy Trinity, and on the south that of St. John the Baptist. These were the parochial altars. The piscinas remain. In 1512, at the Visitation of Archbishop Wareham, the rood-loft and screen “lacked great reparation.” Alas! the Vicar and churchwardens destroyed them, as also, at a later period, they destroyed the oak Misericord stalls in the chancel. The low chancel arch is remarkable, and before the screen was removed the chancel was almost entirely divided from the nave. It is said to have been used as a private chapel by the Rectors, the Prior and Chapter of Christ Church, Canterbury. Under the high altar, “the Altar of Jesus” as it was called, there formerly existed a crypt, named the chapel of St. Mary the Virgin, which seems to have been entered by a separate staircase from the churchyard. It is my hope to explore the said chapel when funds permit. A sum of £5,000 has been spent on the Church since 1870. There are remains of frescoes on the west side of the chancel arch, as well as on the east and north walls of the chancel. The objects which strike every eye are the rows of medallions over the chancel arch, discovered when the thick coats of white-wash were scraped off walls and pillars. The two lower rows were revealed forty years ago on the removal of framed canvases on which the Decalogue was painted. Strangely enough the bottom row was afterwards again covered up. Seven years ago the three upper rows were disclosed. They were covered by thick successive coats of lime-wash, over which, at one time, had been painted stars on a blue ground. The subjects from north to south are a lion, a griffin, two doves feeding upon a bunch of grapes, in the centre a conventional lily, two birds again, a lion as number one, and a griffin as number two.

The colours are dark brown, red, and yellow, on a buff ground, and they seem to have been painted on the original plaster when it was wet. Possibly this may have been the background of the rood, and the rood-beam may have been placed on brackets, the stumps of which we found in 1903. In this case the rood would not rest upon the screen.

The present fine chancel roof was at the same time disclosed by the removal of the plaster ceiling, as were also the rafters over the north and south aisles. The nave was re-roofed and restored to its original height in 1869, the pitch having been lowered in 1687.

Contrary to what is usual, the line of the chancel inclines

towards the north instead of the south. There is a carved female head and bust outside the priest's door in the south chancel wall; it may be a figure of the Virgin. The aumbry on the north side is interesting; over it is carved the head of a bishop wearing a mitre. On the south wall of the sanctuary is a recess in which the carving is much hacked away "by axes and hammers." It may have contained a crucifix.

During structural alterations forty years ago a portion of a black velvet vestment, on which is some fine needlework, was found. The registers date from 1559. Many interesting details are to be gathered from them. John Orgraver, who became Vicar in 1542, retained his benefice throughout the Reformation changes, a remarkable proof that no new Church was founded by Henry VIII.

During the Commonwealth Nicholas Brett, who was not in Holy Orders, was intruded into the Vicarage in 1653. What became of him when John Whiston, a priest, was appointed at the time of the Restoration, is not known. A lay-registrar was appointed by the Vestry in Brett's time.

There is a curious entry in the days of Vicar Cressener, who came in 1698, and was here nearly fifty years. He writes: "Astley Cressener, Vicar, Inducted by ye Reved. Mr. Tho. Mander Dec. 11, 1698 among the savages of Eastry, who us'd my Good Predecessour almost as Ill as my Self, but Death in a little Time gave him a Happy Deliverance." This vicar presented to the Church its paten and handsome flagon of silver in 1718. The total weight of the silver is 106 ozs. troy.

Lastly I must draw attention to the Dominical Circle on the octagonal pillar, of which an account was printed in the *Archæological Journal* just forty years ago by Mr. W. S. Walford. The Sunday Letters within the Circle are carved in Lombardic capitals of the date of, say, 1325. The whole is a highly interesting specimen of a fourteenth-century parish almanac.

The safe in which the registers are kept may be Jacobean; its exact date is unknown.

I shall be glad if the members of this learned Society can throw light on the following points:—

1. The symbolical meaning of the pictorial designs over the chancel arch; for instance, why is a griffin depicted?
2. What is the date of the stonework of the Aumbry in the north wall of the sanctuary?

3. What is the reason for the replacing of a round pillar by an octagonal one on the south side of the nave?

4. Is the niche in the wall of the north aisle near the organ a Reliquary, as Archbishop Benson surmised (he visited this Church six weeks before his death), or is it a very small Easter Sepulchre?

---

Leaving Eastry the party drove to Betteshanger Park, the seat of the President, where Lord Northbourne was waiting to give the members a welcome and to entertain them to a hospitable luncheon. In the afternoon the beautiful little Church, with its many memorials of the Boys family, was visited and described by the Rector, Rev. Canon Bliss. Before leaving Betteshanger Mr. F. F. Giraud voiced the cordial thanks of the members to their President for his hospitality, and his Lordship acknowledged the compliment. Northbourne Church was next visited, where the Rector, Rev. W. C. Thomas, gave an able description of this interesting late-Norman structure.

The members then adjourned to Northbourne Court, where the large party were hospitably entertained to tea in the beautiful gardens by Mr. and Mrs. Aubrey Waterfield. A visit to Woodnesborough Church on the way back to Sandwich, which was upon the programme, had to be omitted through lack of time, but the Paper prepared by the Vicar, the Rev. F. Savage, is printed below:—

This Church, dedicated to St. Mary the Blessed Virgin, was built in 1180 by a pious lady, Ascellina de Wodenberghe, and attached to the Priory of Ledes. I believe that that date is borne out by the bases of the columns on the north side of the nave. The columns themselves have been restored at some previous time, and one old section (I presume of Kentish rag) can be seen outside the west door, one or two others being built into the wall of the south aisle, and are visible outside. Evident also are fragments of two small lancet windows which lighted this south aisle, being quite low down, no doubt on account of the roof of the nave being carried down to form the roof of the aisle. The east end of the south aisle was used probably as the Lady Chapel; at all events there was an altar, and the piscina and a small aumbrey opposite are *in situ*. In this south aisle, on the south side of the westernmost pier, there is a small piece of Norman string-course. Mr. Carøe conjectured that there might have been a small and earlier church there. On these square piers may be seen many interesting pilgrims' marks.



Going towards the chancel and close to the present reading desk there is an indication of steps, perhaps to a rood-loft.

In the chancel one is struck by the beauty of the sedilia, date about 1350, with its delightful columns and delicately-carved caps and groined canopy. The structure, very beautiful in detail and wonderfully well preserved, is well worth a close inspection. On the inside wall is a small brass to the memory of John Parcar, vicar, 1513, and also one to a member of the Spencer family. The line "Vir pietate gravis, vir gravitate pius" always strikes me as being particularly pleasing and euphonious.

In the wall opposite and close by the priest's door can be seen the end of a moulded beam, probably a candle beam.

There may have been originally a triple light in the east wall, for there appear to be indications of the apex of a central light above the centre of the present window. The shafts which form the corner of the opening with the east wall seem to be of an earlier date than the tracery of the window. The aumbrey in the east wall, which is divided into four compartments, is somewhat unusual. It was discovered underneath the plaster on the restoration of the nave some years back. The roof of the Church was ceiled inside before that restoration. A good idea of the interior may be gained from the water-colour drawing taken about 1882.

The picturesque tower and superstructure deserve attention. The west door and also the noble arch leading into the nave are quite early-English. The capitals of the shafts have been carved in accordance with a fragment that was fortunately in existence, though much time-worn. The windows above are of course a later insertion. The small pointed windows in the second story on the north and south sides had square heads before 1884, which heads were formed by the cut-away sides of the two round-headed stones now close to the sundial in the churchyard. I should be glad to know what these stones were. It has been suggested that they are gable crosses, but others have held a different idea.

We come then to several courses of bricks on the top of flint and rubble work. Originally the steeple carried a tall shingle spire, and this getting into bad repair was pulled down. Such a prominent object was made use of as a landmark for vessels entering Ramsgate Harbour or Pegwell Bay, I believe, and when the spire was pulled down the tower was heightened by the addition of the building material of that day, and surmounted by the picturesque cupola and balustrade, and used as a landmark,

though now that has ceased to be. Mr. John Scott, when he saw the tower, said: "This is most charming and almost unique," so that in the restoration which has just been completed the lines of the old work were faithfully reproduced, and all old material used again if it were possible. There was in 1883 a very ugly brick porch on the north side of the Church, with the date 1720 on the keystone of the arch. On the brick buttress built against the south wall of the Church the date 1745 is inscribed, so probably it was about this period that the spire was taken down. I have never been able to come across any print or picture of the tower with the spire, and should be grateful for any information on that point.

I do not profess any archæological knowledge, so am quite open to correction in any of the points that I have mentioned.

I trust that the members of the Society may be pleased with their short visit to this ancient village of Woden worship.

---

September 8th, 1910.—The Council met at the Bridge Wardens' Chamber, Rochester, the members being entertained to luncheon previously by Mr. A. A. Arnold. Seven members present, Mr. A. A. Arnold in the chair.

The question of the Otway sword and the leaden seal, postponed from the last Council meeting, was considered, and it was decided to return the sword on the Rev. Hyla Holden undertaking to replace it in the Church of Smarden under a faculty.

The Council thought that the seal was suitably placed in the Society's Museum, but would be pleased to permit Mr. Holden to take a cast of the same.

The Society of Antiquaries not having made a grant towards the excavations at Richborough the Society bore the entire cost, amounting to £30 13s. 3d., of the work done previous to the Sandwich meeting.

The Hon. Secretary reported the death of Earl Amherst, one of the Trustees of the Society.

The Hon. Secretary to send the usual letters of thanks in connection with the Annual Meeting.

The following were elected Ordinary Members: Dr. W. B. Brunton, F. C. S. Parker, Carmichael Thomas, Rev. J. Eveleigh Woodruff, and Mrs. Pearman.

December 8th, 1910.—The Council met in the Library of Canterbury Cathedral. Eleven members were present, Lord Northbourne in the chair.

Mr. St. John Hope wrote asking what was proposed to be done at Richborough in the future, in reply to which the Secretary was directed to state that while the Council were fully prepared to expend the balance of the £50 originally voted towards excavations at Richborough, they felt that in this case at least an equal sum, £50, should be contributed by the Society of Antiquaries.

The Rev. Hyla Holden wrote expressing the thanks of himself and the Churchwardens of Smarden to the Council for "their gracious act" in returning the Otway sword to be replaced in the Church, and at the same time assuring them that every care would be taken in future to retain it in its original place.

It was decided that the next Annual Meeting should be held at Greenwich.

The members of the Publication Committee, having met previous to this meeting, reported that at present there were no records ready for publication.

It was decided, as last year, to have an Evening Meeting at Maidstone on the day of the meeting of the Council in March.

The following were elected Ordinary Members: E. T. Clark, G. Hewitt, Rev. C. D. Lampen, J. Ward, Miss Hart Dyke, C. W. Bowles, Rev. L. P. Craufurd, Rev. B. W. Galpin, and Mrs. R. Scott.

On March 9th, 1911, a Meeting of the members was held at the Museum, Maidstone, when a large number assembled in the Bentlif Gallery to hear Sir Martin Conway's historical sketch of Allington Castle, a description of the excavations recently conducted by the Woolwich Antiquarian Society at Lesnes Abbey, by Mr. F. C. Elliston-Erwood, and Papers by Mr. Arthur Barton on "The Hall of the Corpus Christi Fraternity in Earl Street, Maidstone," and the Rev. W. Gardner-Waterman on "Dode Church."