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The influences which led to the holding of a service on the actual day our Society was founded a century ago may briefly be stated. In the final and recently published volumes of his great work, The Study of History, Professor Arnold Toynbee declared that the entire story of man on earth has no meaning except a religious meaning, thus acknowledging that religion is the key to history.

Many students of archaeology are conscious of a physical connection across the centuries between themselves and the men of the long-forgotten past, who fashioned the relics and erected the buildings, which it is their pleasure to study. ‘The spirit haunts their handiwork, and one can absorb it by mere contact.’ To some minds the emotion stirred by these links with those of old time is more than mere sentiment. Human life is seen as a panorama as generation after generation pass before the mental vision, and imagination is quickened on the spiritual side.

When a suggestion was made at a Council meeting of the Society that a religious service would be appropriate for such a special occasion, it was unanimously adopted. Certainly nothing else could adequately express the deeper feelings of human nature, without which the archaeologist may find himself in a by-road leading to a dead end.

The service was held at All Saints’ Church, Colchester, on Sunday, 14 December, 1952 (the Third Sunday in Advent), at 2.30 p.m., by A
kind permission of the rector (Canon R. H. Jack, R.D.). Owing to the cold and uncertain weather some anxiety had previously been felt regarding the attendance, but the size of the congregation far exceeded expectations, and included members from Chelmsford, Dunmow, Frinton, Halstead, Sudbury, etc.

A shortened form of Evensong was conducted by Canon Jack, and the lessons were read by the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley (Past President and Hon. Excursion Secretary), and the Rev. W. R. Saunders (Hon. Librarian). The Bishop of Colchester (the Right Rev. F. Dudley V. Narborough), a Vice-President of the Society, gave an address, in which he recalled that no fewer than 18 clergymen were present at the inaugural meeting in 1852, partly because of their trusteeship of the churches in which some of the artistry of our country was enshrined. He also referred to the recent announcement that the vast sum of £4,000,000 was needed in the next ten years to preserve our ancient churches, £50,000 of this amount being required for Essex churches.¹

Before the address, the President (Rev. G. Montagu Benton) vested in a rich cope (lent by the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley), and standing before the altar, read a Bidding Prayer, and a Form of Commemoration which he had compiled (see below). Two members of the Council, Messrs. Duncan W. Clark, and F. W. Steer, acted as sidesmen, and a collection was taken to defray expenses.

The service opened and closed with a procession down the nave, preceded by the cross-bearer. The Bishop wore the pontifical vestments, cope and mitre, and carried his crosier. It was generally agreed that the service was 'most impressive'. The impression it left in one member's mind may be quoted as expressing what many must have felt. 'I was conscious,' he said, 'of a fine spirit of reverent attention, worship, and interest, and I was deeply conscious of the presence of those I had known when the Commemoration was being read, and also of those who were only names to me.'

On leaving the church—the nave of which was built probably in the twelfth century—it was sad to reflect that, owing to the Reorganization Scheme, it would shortly be permanently closed for worship. There were hopes, however, that the building would be preserved for use as a museum [This has since been arranged].

¹ It was later computed that altogether not less than £225,000 would be required for this purpose.
THE CENTENARY SERVICE AND FORM OF COMMEMORATION

AT EVENING PRAYER

Hymn—'Thy Kingdom come, O God.'
(Tune by Leighton George Hayne, rector of Mistley and Bradfield, 1871-1883.)

Psalm lxxiv (14th evening) Ut quid, Deus?

First Lesson—Isaiah xxvi, 1-9

Second Lesson—Revelation xiv, 13—xv, 4

Hymn—'Nearer, my God, to Thee.'
(Words by Sarah Fuller Flower (Mrs. Brydges Adams), born (1805) and buried (1848) at Harlow.)

Then, all standing, the President shall say:

Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Church of England.

And herein I require you especially to pray for the Queen's most excellent Majesty; for the Ministers of God's holy Word and Sacraments; for the High Court of Parliament, and all Ministers of the Crown; and for the whole Commons of this Realm.

Ye shall pray for the peace of the whole world.

Ye shall pray also for the President, Officers, Council and Members of the Essex Archaeological Society, that they may be endued with wisdom, increase in knowledge, and advance the cause of learning.

Finally, let us praise God for all those who are departed out of this life in the faith of Christ, and pray that we may be partakers with them of the glorious resurrection to eternal life.

Our Father ... For ever and ever. Amen.
As in duty bound, we honour with remembrance all those members who have given to the Essex Archaeological Society true and laudable service in their day and generation, and who have bequeathed to us the inheritance which we enjoy.

And especially would we have in mind at this time:

EDWARD LEWIS CUTTS, priest, our virtual founder, and the author of several books on historical matters that are still read.

FREDERIC CHANCELLOR and HENRY WILLIAM KING, Foundation members.

WILLIAM STUBBS, vicar of Navestock and afterwards Bishop of Oxford, the distinguished historian; an early member and supporter.

JOHN HOWARD MARSDEN, B.D., priest, Disney Professor of Archaeology in the University of Cambridge, who delivered the inaugural address on 14 December, 1852.

Those who have held the office of President, namely:

JOHN DISNEY, F.R.S., F.S.A., 1852-1855, the founder of the Disney professorship.¹

RICHARD CORNWALLIS NEVILLE, LORD Braybrooke, F.S.A., 1855-1861, an early exponent of Field Archaeology.²

¹ At the Annual General Meeting of the Society, held on 30 August, 1855, Disney announced that 'advancing years obliged him to retire from the post of president'. He was then in his 77th year. He died in 1857. For a brief biographical notice, see J. A. Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, vol. ii, part ii (1752-1900), p. 302.

² Lord Braybrooke died in 1861, at the early age of forty-one. The amount of archaeological research he accomplished during his brief life is remarkable. He was the author of *Antiqua Explorata, Sepulchra Exposita*, and *Saxon Obsequies*, and he also contributed several papers to *The Archaeological Journal*, and *The Journal of the British Archaeological Association*. His private museum of British and Roman Antiquities, mainly comprising the 'finds' made by him, remained at Audley End until recently. This valuable collection is now in the Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology.
SIR THOMAS BURCH WESTERN, BART., 1861-1873.

SIR HENRY J. SELWIN IBBERTSON, M.P., 1873-1876.

SIR THOMAS SUTTON WESTERN, BART., 1876-1877.

GEORGE ALAN LOWNDES, 1877-1903.

HENRY LAVER, F.S.A., 1903-1908, a notable local archaeologist, and one of the Society's most active members; for many years Hon. Curator of the Museum, to which he was a generous benefactor.

FREDERIC CHANCELLOR, F.R.I.B.A., 1908-1911, a constant supporter of the Society for 66 years, and author of 'Ancient Sepulchral Monuments of Essex'.

THOMAS STEVENS, D.D., F.S.A., Bishop of Barking, 1911-1916, whose keen interest in the work of the Society is recalled with gratitude.

JOHN HORACE ROUND, LL.D., 1916-1921, one of the most distinguished members the Society has had; historian, and foremost authority on medieval genealogies.

FRANCIS WILLIAM GALPIN, D.LITT., priest, 1921-1926, a leading authority on ancient musical instruments.

GEORGE FREDERICK BEAUMONT, F.S.A., 1926-1928, Hon. Secretary for ten years, and a well-known local antiquary; an authority on the law of copyholds.

CHARLES FREDERICK DENNE SPERLING, F.S.A., 1928-1933, a born local historian, his knowledge of the heraldry, genealogy and antiquities of north-west Essex being unrivalled.

PHILIP GUYON LAVER, F.S.A., 1933-1938, who inherited his father's archaeological tastes, and like him was zealous in preserving every ancient feature in Essex. His gifts to the Museum were numerous, and the remarkable development of our Library in recent years is due to his munificence.
FREDERICK WYKHAM CHANCELLOR, F.R.I.B.A., 1938-1944, who also inherited his father’s interests. For many years he acted as lecturer at the Society’s excursions, and did much to arouse an interest in the ancient buildings, especially the churches, of Essex. He bequeathed to the Society his extensive collection of Essex books and manuscripts.

THOMAS HIGHAM CURLING, priest, 1944, elected as President less than a fortnight before his death. For many years he gave unstinted service to the Society as Hon Secretary, and especially in connection with excursions.

*We further recall those who have held the office of Hon. Treasurer, namely:*

CHARLES GRAY ROUND, 1852-1867.


WILLIAM CHAPMAN WALLER, F.S.A., 1916-1917, previously Vice-Treasurer from 1905; a scholar, whose literary work for the Society is of lasting value.

CHRISTOPHER WILLIAM PARKER, 1917-1929.

HENRY WILLIAM LEWER, F.S.A., 1929-1949, previously Vice-Treasurer from 1917; a generous supporter of, and tireless worker for, the Society, and for half a century a leading member.

*The past Hon. Secretaries are also remembered with gratitude:*

EDWARD LEWIS CUTTS, priest, 1852-1866, who, although he left the county soon after his resignation, remained a member of the Council until his death in 1901.

HENRY WILLIAM KING, 1866-1893, a learned antiquary, whose knowledge of the history and antiquities of Essex was extensive and profound. He contributed many important articles to the early volumes of *Transactions*, and bequeathed to the Society his valuable manuscript collections.

GEORGE FREDERICK BEAUMONT, F.S.A., 1893-1903.

THOMAS HIGHAM CURLING, priest, 1903-1923.
Anything like an adequate Bede Roll of supporters and benefactors would be of wearisome length, but a few outstanding names may be briefly mentioned:


Rest eternal grant unto them, O Lord,

*And let light perpetual shine upon them.*

**LET US PRAY.**

Grant, O Lord, that we may all use this time of work while it is called to-day, remembering gladly and thankfully those who have gone before, who have stood by this Society and helped it in past days, and who have strengthened us their successors by their example. Confirm our faith and hope in the Resurrection, and bring us with them to that eternal home which Thou hast promised to Thy children; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

O God of our Fathers, before whose face the generations of men rise and pass away, we Thy servants delight to remember the days of old, to consider the years of many generations. Illumine and inspire us, we beseech Thee, in our desire to seek for truth and to rejoice in beauty; and enrich our minds with the sense of the mysterious, which is inseparable from the relics left by our forefathers. Reverently tracing the pilgrimage of man from prehistoric days to our own time, may we become more fully conscious of 'the one far-off divine event, to which the whole creation moves'.

Thou hast taught us to give thanks for all things, and we heartily thank Thee, on this our Centennial Anniversary, for the blessings vouchsafed to our Society during the past century; for the voluntary services rendered by the various officers, for work accomplished, and for the good fellowship among our members, which has led to lasting friendships. May we make traditions as well as uphold them.
All good things come from Thee, O Lord, and we pray Thee that the Society may continue to prosper in the years ahead, and that peace and good-will may prevail among our members. We ask this for Christ’s sake. Amen.

Hymn—'Through the night of doubt and sorrow.'
(Words by Sabine Baring-Gould, Rector of East Mersea, 1871-1881, and a member of the Society.)

ADDRESS.

Hymn—'The day is past and over.'
(Tune by Arthur Henry Brown (1830-1926); organist at Brentwood Church and School, and a member of the Society.)
SOME NOTES ON ROMAN ART AT COLCHESTER

By Professor J. M. C. TOYNBEE, M.A., D.Phil., F.B.A., F.S.A.

These notes obviously do not profess to cover the whole field of Roman art at Colchester. They are confined to material which is either unpublished or on which the writer believes that she has some new point, or points, to contribute.

I. THE SMALL IMPERIAL BRONZE BUST (Pl. I, figs. 1, 2).

The small, hollow-cast bronze bust, 5 inches high, found in 1845 about a mile east of the Colchester-North railway station, was published by the late Mrs. Arthur Strong in the Journal of Roman Studies, vol. vi (1916). As Mrs. Strong pointed out, the globe to which the point of the bust is soldered, and which appears never to have been detached from it, makes it certain that the personage portrayed was a member of the Imperial House, most probably one who actually reigned as Emperor, shown in civil attire (tunic and toga); the globe symbolizes world-domain and the assimilation of the ruler to Jupiter as cosmocrator, without necessarily implying specific deification, whether in life or after death. The form of the bust and the hair-style are Julio-Claudian; and of the various possible candidates for its identity the Emperor Gaius has generally been judged, by Mrs. Strong and others, to be the most plausible. The features bear too little resemblance to those of Claudius for our bust to be reckoned as even a provincial attempt at his likeness; Germanicus, for whom Claudius issued commemorative coins, would appear to be excluded by the globe of sovereignty; while the shape of the face and the thick thatch of hair crowning the brow distinctly recall the fine head of Gaius in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, although the latter differs from the Colchester bust in showing no reminiscence of the 'Augustan fork' of locks in the centre of the forehead. Moreover, the line of the nose of our portrait, as seen in profile, can be paralleled by that of Gaius' nose in his coin-portraits.

2 Ibid., pp. 32-46 passim.
3 E.g. Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, vol. i (1922), pl. 37, nos. 2, 9. Gt. the commemorative coins of Germanicus struck by Gaius, ibid. pls. 29, nos. 3-6; 30, no. 3.
5 E.g. Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, vol. i (1922), pls. 28, 29.
But the identification of the bust as that of Gaius raises a problem which Mrs. Strong did not discuss. When, and under what circumstances, did it reach the neighbourhood of Colchester? It can hardly have been imported, after its subject's death and damnatio memoriae, into the new Claudian *colonia*. It must have already reached Celtic Camulodunum before the Roman conquest, perhaps from Gaul, where it was, in all probability, manufactured, and have been the property of a British notable belonging to the pro-Roman party led by Cunobelinus' son Amminius, if it were not the property of Amminius himself. The find-spot, some way beyond the north-west corner of the *colonia*, suggests that it might have been lost by someone residing in the Celtic city in the Sheeepen area.

II. THE SAXMUNDHAM BRONZE HEAD (Pl. II, figs. 1, 2).

This life-size bronze head, 13 inches high, which ranks with the over-life-size bronze head of Hadrian from the Thames as one of the most imposing Roman portraits yielded by Britain so far, was found in the River Alde at Rendham, near Saxmundham, in Suffolk, in 1907 and was fully published by the late Sir George Macdonald in an article contributed to the *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. xvi (1926). In 1950, on the occasion of the nineteenth-centenary celebration of the foundation of the *colonia*, its present owner, Mrs. E. R. Hollond, of Saxmundham, loaned the head to the British Museum, where it was re-cleaned and re-photographed, before being temporarily exhibited in the Colchester and Essex Museum during the July centenary-conference. The new photographs, made by the Photographic Service of the British Museum and greatly superior to those which illustrated Sir George's article, are published here by kind permission of Mrs. Hollond and the Trustees of the British Museum and they offer a *raison d'être* for this note.

As Sir George observed, the torn and ragged lower line of the neck leaves little room for doubt that this head had been violently hacked from its body and carried off as loot from some important Roman centre, which can have been none other than the *colonia* of Camulodunum; and since the portrait is unquestionably Julio-Claudian, the looters are likely to have been none other than the

---

2 *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. xvi (1926), pl. 1; *Guide to the Antiquities of Roman Britain in the British Museum* (1953), pl. 15, no. 5.
3 Pp. 3-7, pln. 2, 3.
4 The profile view appeared in *The Times* for 1 March, 1950, and, on pl. 1 of the catalogue of the nineteenth-centenary exhibition of Romano-British antiquities held at Colchester in July, 1950.
(1) The Saxmundham head of Claudius (?): in the possession of Mrs. E. R. Hollond.

(2)
HEAD OF STATUE OF CLAUDIUS AS JUPITER: VATICAN MUSEUM.
followers of Boudicca in A.D. 61. It has been already noted\(^1\) that the fact that the head is not over-life-size probably precludes the idea that it belonged to the cult-statue of the deified Emperor in the temple of Claudius. It is more likely to have adorned some other public building, such as the theatre or the basilica. The slight backward tilt of the head \textit{may mean}, as was once suggested,\(^2\) that we have here the remnant of an equestrian statue. At any rate, it must have stood at some height above ground-level, since the eyes gaze out into the distance, as though above the heads of, and oblivious of, bystanders.

The identification of the personage portrayed as the Emperor Claudius has, of course, been widely accepted. Sir George appears to have had no doubts whatsoever about it; and the Saxmundham head most certainly reproduces the flat crown, thick, neat hair, and protrusion on the bridge of the nose familiar to us on well-authenticated portraits of Claudius—on coins, on cameos, and in sculpture in the round. But what we find there and miss here are the high, vertically furrowed forehead, the longish upper lip, the fold of flesh round the mouth, the double chin, and the thick, bull-like neck. Particularly striking is the divergence of our bronze in these respects from the brilliantly realistic head which crowns the colossal statue of Claudius in the guise of Jupiter in the Sala Rotonda of the Vatican (Pl. III, and \textit{Frontispiece}).\(^3\) The ‘Augustan fork’ in the locks on the brow of the Saxmundham head offers another point of contrast with the Vatican portrait. On the other hand, the projecting, flap-like ears, which are so salient a feature of the latter, re-appear in startling fashion in the former, where they are emphasized almost to the point of caricature.

On balance we are inclined to feel that the resemblances between the Saxmundham head and the authenticated portraits of Claudius outweigh the discrepancies. The latter might be accounted for by the supposition that our head is of provincial, probably Gaulish, workmanship, the artist having also somewhat idealised the Emperor (apart from the ears) by representing him as younger and leaner than he normally appears in his official portraits. The bronze busts of Augustus and Livia in the Louvre, found at Neuilly-le-Réal (Allier) and fortunately provided with incised inscriptions stating their identity, reveal the transformations which Imperial features could undergo at

---

\(^1\) \textit{Journal of Roman Studies}, vol. xvi (1926), p. 6, note 2.

\(^2\) \textit{Athenaeum} report of a meeting of the Society of Antiquaries of London, 3 December, 1908.

\(^3\) C. Lippold, \textit{Die Skulpturen des Vatikanischen Museums}, vol. iii, part i, pl. 41, no. 550; \textit{Photo}, Anderson, Roma, 2252. A small, fine, marble head of Claudius, recently acquired by the British Museum, perhaps derived from some historical scene in high relief, shows similar divergencies from the Saxmundham bronze.
the hands of provincial portraitists. The Saxmundham bronze undoubtedly resembles Claudius more closely than any other member of the Julio-Claudian line, whose features are known to us. Yet we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that it has immortalized some unknown Roman official or prominent private individual in the province. The two over-life-size second-century marble busts, unidentifiable with any Emperors, found in 1949 in the Roman Villa at Lullingstone, Kent, warn us that members of the Imperial House did not monopolize all large-scale iconographic honours in Roman Britain.

III. THE BRONZE MERCURY FROM GOSBECK'S FARM (Pl. IV, fig. 1).

The fine bronze statuette of Mercury, found at Gosbeck's Farm and acquired by the Colchester and Essex Museum early in 1948, has received full treatment from Mr. M. R. Hull in these Transactions. The purpose of this note is to supplement that account by a brief discussion of one detail.

As Mr. Hull has pointed out, the figure is no 'cult-figure' in the technical sense of that term. Not only is it too small to be such, but the god's attention is not directed towards the front, to receive the homage of worshippers, but is turned towards some person or thing, slightly below his eye-level, on his left. The inclination of the head and the posture of alighting, as upon a steeply sloping rock, suggest that we have here an extract from a pictorial group comprising at least two figures; and this may provide a clue to the meaning of an otherwise somewhat puzzling feature. The lower part of the god's brows is contracted and bulging, and above them a deep horizontal furrow spans the forehead. This 'scowl' is explained when we reflect that knit and furrowed brows are a convention occasionally employed in Roman art to indicate that two persons are engaged in conversation. For example, on one of the Flavian reliefs discovered in 1939 near the Cancelleria in Rome, a 'scowling' praetorian officer gives an order to a private soldier, who 'scowls' in answer (Pl. IV, fig. 2). On this analogy we may interpret the 'scowl' of the Colchester Mercury as 'conversational', as signifying that he is delivering a message or command to an interlocutor once grouped with him on the spectator's right.

---

3 Vol. xxiv, n.s. (1951), pp. 43-46, pl.
4 Mr. Hull (op. cit. p. 44) writes of 'the frontal bone being noticeably prominent'.
5 F. Magi, I ritratti fusti del Palazzo della Cancellaria (1946), pls. 3; 17, fig. 1; 18, fig. 1.
(1) HEAD OF BRONZE MERCURY FROM GOSBECK'S FARM: COLCHESTER AND ESSEX MUSEUM.

(2) DETAIL OF FLAVIAN RELIEF FOUND NEAR THE CANCELLERIA, ROME: MUSEO CAPITOLINO NUOVO.
IV. FUNERARY MONUMENTS (Pls. V, VI).

(a) Lions, sphinxes, and griffins.

The group consisting of a winged sphinx with flanking lions and snakes, which crowns the Longinus stele, is familiar to all students of Romano-British art. Similar groups occur on stelai in the Rhine-land, where winged griffins, also surmounting military stelai, are occasionally found. Large groups of a lion devouring another animal, comparable in scale and general character to the famous Colchester sphinx, are common both to Roman Germany and Roman Britain. Such creatures undoubtedly belong to the regular repertory of Roman funerary symbolism. The winged griffins and sphinxes are the inscrutable watchers at the tomb, who guard the secret and mystery of death; while the lions and snakes signify death’s ravening and all-consuming jaws. An attempt has, indeed, been made to equate the sphinx and griffin on military tomb-stones with Cyprius, the title of the second Mithraic grade, and the lion with the fourth Mithraic grade of Leo; and to read into these figures allusions to the grades of Mithraism through which the deceased soldier in question had passed. But this theory, in itself far-fetched, fanciful, and unnecessary, cannot survive confrontation with the stele from Murrell Hill in the Carlisle Museum, published here by kind permission of the Museum Committee. Here we have a sphinx and two lions crowning a niche in which a woman is seated with a child standing beside her (Pl. V, fig. 1). This stele is purely civilian; and it is well known that women were almost certainly not admitted to Mithraic initiation.

(b) The sandstone head (Pl. V, fig. 2).

This unpublished sandstone fragment shows part of an over-life-size female head, c. 15 inches (45 cm.) high. It came to light in the grounds of the Royal Grammar School, on the site of the Roman cemetery to the south-west of the colonia, close to the find-spots of the Facilis and Longinus stelai and of the funerary inscription of Macrinus, eques Romanus, also in the Colchester and Essex Museum. Only the left-hand portion of our head is preserved and practically all the face has gone; but we see the thick, twisted, wispish locks

---

2 E.g. Germania Romana, ed. 2, vol. iii (1926), pls. 13, nos. 1, 3 (Bonn); 25, nos. 2, 3 (Cologne).
3 E.g. ibid. pls. 21, no. 4 (Cologne); 25, no. 1 (Trier).
5 E.g. Germania Romana, ed. 2, vol. iii (1926), pls. 44, no. 5 (Munich); 47, no. 3 (Speyer); Roman London (Royal Commission on Historical Monuments), pl. 11 (Guildhall Museum); Journal of Roman Studies, vol. ii (1912), pl. 5, fig. 2 (Cambridge Rom).
7 F. Haverfield, Catalogue of the inscribed and sculptured Stones in the Carlisle Museum, Tullie House, ed. 2 (1911), p. 37, no. 103, with plate opposite.
which once framed the face. These locks are crowned by a diadem and a veil is drawn over the back of the head. The Museum label describes it as 'from a statue', perhaps of a 'priestess or deified Empress'. But since the head rests directly on a square base it can never have been attached to a body; and the style of the hair finds no parallel in the coiffure of any Empress or Roman lady of the first and second centuries A.D. Its find-spot, in a cemetery, rules out an Empress; and the scale would appear to be too large for that of a funerary portrait of a priestess. A head without a body in such a context is most likely to have been a funerary mask: Espérandieu's corpus of Gallo-Roman sculptures contains a number of large stone or marble masks resting directly on bases and attributed to funerary monuments. Such, for instance, are the Hercules mask from Mauritius (Bouches-du-Rhône), 83 cm. high, now used as a fountain-decoration in the Château de Servane (Pl. VI, fig. 1), and the group of theatrical masks at Vienne (Pl. VI, fig. 2). The Colchester fragment may be the left-hand portion of just such a mask, if somewhat more modest in dimensions, crowning a stele and probably representing a goddess.

So far as we can judge, the Colchester head was executed in the same classical style as Espérandieu's masks; but it and they had their native counterparts, both here and on the continent. The most striking piece of British work of this class is the head, now in the British Museum, from Towcester on Watling Street (Pl. VII, fig. 1). Carved in local grey stone, it stands some 22 inches high on a base measuring c. 12 inches from back to front. The modelling of the face stems from classical tradition; but the intensely doleful expression, conveyed by the staring eyes, puckered brow, and drooping mouth, and the highly stylized rendering of the hair and side-curls, give to the head a strange, barbaric power. In spiritual content it is almost medieval, an imposing instance of classical form infused with native feeling. Gaulish heads of similar type have been published recently by M. E. Thevenot. These naïve 'têtes coupées' may possibly be of some significance for Celtic religion. More probably they are rustic versions of the classical funerary mask.

The precise date of the Colchester head is hard to determine in

---

1 E. Espérandieu, Recueil général des bas-reliefs de la Gaule romaine, vol. xii (1947), pl. 17, no. 7888, 1 and 2 (63 cm. high).
2 Ibid., vol. i (1907), pp. 276-277, nos. 396 (60 cm. high), 63 cm. wide, 41 cm. from back to front, 397 (60 cm. high, 53 cm. wide, 27 cm. from back to front).
4 'Sculptures inédites de Choréy' (Gallia, vol. v, part 2 (1947), pp. 427-433, figs. 3-5).
PLATE VII.

(1) Funerary head from Trowbridge. British Museum.

(2) Ivory gladiator from Colchester. British Museum.

(3)
view of its fragmentary state. But it has an early look, as of the first or second century.

V. THE IVORY GLADIATOR (Pl. VII, figs. 2, 3).1

The small ivory statuette of a gladiator, found at Lexden, was presented to the British Museum by Pelham R. Papillon, Esq., in 1899. A line-drawing in the British Museum Guide, 1922, p. 47, and in Benham's Colchester, 1948, p. 12, are the only previous publications of it known to the present writer. The figure stands, in its present condition, 2.8 inches high, is 1.3 inches wide at its greatest extent, and measures .6 inches from back to front. The lower part of the right leg, from the knee downwards, is lost; so is the left foot, which must originally have rested on some support, since the left knee is raised and bent. The back of the right arm, the small of the back, the buttocks, and the left elbow have all been shorn off and produce a flat surface behind. The champion's equipment is of the normal 'Samnite' type. The head, turned towards his right, is enveloped in a crested helmet, with visor drawn down and a now undecipherable motif decorating the cap. The upper part of the body is naked, the right arm is cased in an arm-guard, and a scabbard and an 'apron', or loin-cloth, falling in vertical folds in front and in a sagging, horizontal line behind, depend from an ornamented belt. Both thighs are bare, but a decorated greave protects the left shin. The right hand flourishes a drawn sword, while the left hand rests on the upper rim of a large, cylindrical shield, which covers the left side of the figure completely. On the exterior of the shield, in relief, are two gladiators in combat, one lunging forward as he brings his opponent to his knees.

It is a realistic and spirited little piece, if of somewhat commonplace and clumsy craftsmanship.

VI. En Barbotine POTTERY (Pl. VIII).

Among the names of potters who signed the 'imitation-Samian' made locally at Camulodunum towards the end of the second century A.D.,2 that of Acceptus is of particular interest, in that he has also left his stamp on a fragment of en barbotine ware, of the Castor type, found on the same kiln-site.3 This fact is of some importance, since it suggests that en barbotine ware was not, as has sometimes been

---

1 The photographs on Plate VII are published by courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum.
2 M. R. Hull, 'Eine Terra Sigillata Töpferei in Colchester (Camulodunum)' (Germania (1934), pp. 27-36).
3 Ibid., pp. 35-36.
hinted, a consciously native Celtic reaction against imported, continental traditions, or Celtic art ‘behind the façade of romanization’, if some, at least, of the potters who made it, themselves reproduced in this country the Gaulish products. It is, indeed, possible that from this local ‘Samian’ pottery came also the four *en barbotine* black-coated pots for which Colchester is famous—the chariot-race beaker in the British Museum, the beaker, known as the ‘Colchester Vase’, with a gladiatorial combat on one side of it, the lidded pyxis with hunting-scenes, found at Sheeple Farm in 1933, and the hunt-beaker. The last-mentioned pot shares with the back of the ‘Colchester Vase’ a rare motif—a two-tiered hunting scene; the latter vessel shows a hound pursuing a hare and two stags from left to right (Pl. VIII, fig. 1), the former, hounds speeding at the heels of a stag, hares, and fawns (?) in the reverse direction (Pl. VIII, figs. 2, 3). The dotted lines which frame each figure on the hunt-beaker are paralleled on the lidded pyxis; and on all three pots the treatment of hounds, stags, hares, fawns (?), etc., is remarkably similar and closely related, moreover, to that of the horses in the chariot-race. The whole quartette may well be the work of a single hand. The three Colchester beakers are of an identical squat shape, offering a contrast to the more elegant, elongated form of the Corbridge and Peterborough beakers, on both of which the dotted vertical lines also occur, but are of a finer and less conspicuous variety.

VII. THE GLADIATOR PLAQUE (fig. 1).

Akin in style to the *en barbotine* pottery is a fragmentary terra-cotta plaque said to have been found at the Union House (St. Mary's

---

3. M. R. Hall, *Roman Colchester* (1947), p. 29; Benham's *Colchester* (1948), pl. opposite p. 80. The beaker bears the graffito Secundus Mario Memnon secutor viii Valentin Legionis xxc (GLL vii, 1335, 3). But the fact that Legio XXX Ulpii was stationed at Vetera in Lower Germany (H. M. D. Parker, *The Roman Legions* (1928), p. 161) does not necessarily imply that the vessel was made in the Rhineland and imported into Colchester. It could equally well imply that it had passed into the possession of a gladiator, once attached to Legio XXX, for the entertainment of the soldiery (cf. Tacitus, *Ann. I*, 22; Suetonius, *Tiberius* 72), who had settled in the colonia—if the legend does not refer to some famous army-gladiator, whom the attacking figure was intended to portray.
4. *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. xxiv (1934), pl. 22. For the attribution of this pot to the late-second, or early-third, century see ibid., p. 211, note 27.
8. One of the most intriguing objects in the Colchester and Essex Museum is a large, very fragmentary, *en barbotine* beaker, dark-chocolate (almost black) coated and decorated with a strangeness, perhaps consciously comic, *venato* scene, in which hunters (one of them hunch-backed), hunch-backed and hooded dwarfs, and animals participate. The pot, which shows colour applied to the figures, is most probably later in date than the four vessels, discussed above, but was also possibly made at Colchester. It is to be published shortly by Mr. Hall.
 Hospital, Colchester, but now known only from a drawing made by Josiah Parish c. 1870, and discovered by Mr. Hull in a collection of drawings of many other Colchester antiquities. A photograph of this drawing is published here by kind permission of Mr. Hull, in the hope that it may elicit information as to parallels. Neither the accuracy of the drawing nor the authenticity of the object portrayed can, obviously, be guaranteed; and the size of the original is not recorded.

Fig. 1.—Lost terra-cotta plaque from Colchester.

The scene is a novel and entertaining one. Beneath a running ivy-scroll a pair of armed gladiators, one complete, the other represented by one foot at the extreme left of the fragment, are fleeing for dear life along a rocky ledge, knee-deep in waves, before the onslaught of a whale-like monster, with crest erect and gaping jaws, which rises from a billow on the right. How are we to interpret this situation, in which two (or more) gladiators seem to have been surprised while 'paddling'? Is it a comic version of a marine venatio, in which the infuriated quarry successfully routs its human opponents?¹

VIII. The Glass 'Medallion' (Pl. IX).

On April 16, 1863, the Rev. John H. Pollexfen exhibited at

¹ Mr. Hull suggests to me that the fragment of a flat negative mould in the Colchester and Essex Museum, showing the figures of a gladiator and animal (?), may have belonged to the mould for just such a plaque as that depicted in the drawing.
the Society of Antiquaries of London a fully preserved glass 'medallion' which had been recently found in a 'black urn', brought to light by workmen while excavating the foundations of a house in Beverley Terrace, Colchester, on the site of the Roman cemetery. Seven years later the medallion passed, with other objects from the Pollexfen Collection, to the British Museum, where it is now kept in the Department of British and Medieval Antiquities. The medallion itself is of a deep, translucent blue, with a film of opaque white glass at the back, and measures 1 ½ inches in diameter. It is mounted on a thin plate of bronze, once coated with white metal, which extends beyond the edge of the glass to form a convex frame, of an inch wide. The total diameter of glass and frame is 2 ½ inches. The frame is damaged in two places; and the medallion has obviously been detached at some time from its mount and re-set in it incorrectly, for the breaks in the frame now appear on either side of the design (Pl. IX, fig. 1), whereas in the drawing made for the original publication they occur above and below it (Pl. IX, fig. 3). Moreover, the upper (now the right-hand) break, which, when the object was first discovered, seems to have been no more than a slight 'bite' into the rim, has since developed into a gap piercing the frame completely.

The relief-design on the glass shows the frontal bust of a young man, clean-shaven, with neat, straight hair combed forward in the Julia-Claudian style, and wearing a cuirass, on the left shoulder of which appears the fold of a cloak. The face is turned slightly towards the spectator's left. Over each shoulder peeps the head of a young child, while the head of a third child nestles in front of the breast. Three other examples of this type of design (Type A) are known to the present writer—one, complete with bronze backing, frame, and ring, from Rheingönheim, now in the Pfalz Historical Museum, Speyer, the second from Haidin-bei-Pettau, now in Vienna, and a third, of unknown provenance, in the Department of Greek and

2 Inv. No. 1870.2-24.2. Figs. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 on Plate IX are published by courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum.
4 Drexel, op. cit. figs. 4 and 10; Freimolders, op. cit. figs. 3a, 3b; Alfeld, op. cit. p. 71, pl. 2, nos. 1, 2.
5 F. Richter and E. Kris, Die Kameen in Kunsthistorischen Museum (1927), p. 60, no. 16, pl. 7; Cambridge Ancient History, Plates, iv, 184, b; Alfeld, op. cit. p. 71, pl. 5, no. 5.
Plate IX.

Glass plaques with portraits: British Museum, etc.
Roman Antiquities of the British Museum. Another type of design (Type B) shows a cuirassed male bust facing fully to front and the heads of two children, somewhat larger, and placed higher in the field, one on either side. Of this type twelve examples are known to the writer, one found at Xanten, one at Niederbei-Köln, one at Vechten, and two at Nijmegen, while the rest are of unknown provenance. A third type is represented by a fragment from Xanten, now at Bonn, which shows part of the right side of a frontal cuirassed bust, with a small child’s head surmounted by a star (set in the field at a point slightly lower than the heads on Type B, but higher than the lateral heads in Type A) above the right shoulder (Type C). Three more types known to the writer each present a frontal male bust unaccompanied by children—one, with cuirass and the head turned slightly towards the spectator’s left, represented by three examples in the Museum of Vindonissa (where the piece was found), in the Giorgio Sangiorgi Collection, Rome (two examples), and in the British Museum respectively (Type D), the second, with the folds of a cloak on both shoulders and the head again turned slightly towards the spectator’s left, represented by an example, which is equipped with a bronze backing, clamped to the glass by four clips, and a ring, in the British Museum (Type E = Pl. IX, fig. 6) the third, with cuirass and head turned slightly towards the spectator’s right, also known from an example, somewhat damaged on the right-hand side, in the same collection and from two fragments in the Röm.-German, Zentralmuseum, Meinz (Type F = Pl. IX, fig. 5). Finally there is the type depicting a frontal bust of Agrippina I (Type G), known to the writer from three examples—a complete piece at Avenches, where it was found, a fragmentary specimen of unknown provenance in Berlin, and an almost perfect specimen found at Luguvallium (Carlisle) and now in private ownership, the only other glass medallion of this series.

1 Drexel, op. cit. fig. 3. A variant of this type in the Musée d’Art et d’Histoire in Geneva shows the two lateral heads placed curiously and clumsily in horizontal positions (Drexel, op cit. fig. 7). Cf. Alföldi, op. cit. p. 69, pl. 1, nos. 7 (and p. 67), 9.
2 E.g. Drexel, op. cit. figs. 5. 6. 9; Alföldi, op. cit. pp. 69, 71, 73, pls. 1, nos. 2-6, 2, nos. 3, 9. Two fragments, one in the British Museum (H. B. Walters, B M. Cat. of Gems, etc. (1926), no. 3921), and the other in the Louvre (Hull, Musées de France, May 1950, p. 83, fig. 6) are unknown to Alföldi.
3 Drexel, op. cit. fig. 8; Alföldi, op. cit. p. 69, pl. 1, no. 1.
4 Curius, op. cit. pl. 29, figs. 1, 2; Alföldi, op. cit. pp. 71, 73, pl. 2, no. 4, pl. 3, nos. 1-4; British Museum, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Inv. No. 65.12.14-86: portrait in white on dull, dark-blue ground: unpublished (Pl. IX, fig. 4).
5 The ‘cuddled’ or ‘scrumbled’ effect on the brow of the British Museum piece would appear to be due to some disturbance of the mould during the process of manufacture.
6 Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities; Alföldi, op. cit. p. 69, pl. 1, nos. 10-12.
7 Drexel, op. cit. fig. 1; Alföldi, op. cit. p. 73, pl. 3, nos. 6, 7.
8 Drexel, op. cit. fig. 2.
besides the Colchester piece, discovered as yet on British soil. ¹

All the medallions listed above show Julio-Claudian coiffure and style and are of uniform size and character; and Drexel suggested that the whole series was issued by order of the Emperor Gaius as a set of military decorations, worn on the person (hence the mountings and rings, which survive in the case of several specimens), for the German campaign of 39, and that they depict various members of the Emperor's family, whose memory he honoured with conspicuous piety.² The fact that the find-spots, when recorded, are all in, or near, military centres on the north-west frontiers of the Empire undoubtedly hints that some, at least, of these objects were distributed to, or inherited by, petty officers (?) stationed in those areas. In small, inexpensive works of this kind we can hardly look for minute iconographic precision; and while Agrippina I can be distinguished with certainty by her hair-style, the six male types are less easy to identify from hair and features, although we may assume (pace L. Curtius and A. Alfoldi) that the variations between them indicate that they were meant to portray six different personalities. His great-grandfather, Divus Augustus, his father, Germanicus, his mother, Agrippina I, and his brothers, Nero and Drusus Caesar, are commemorated on Gaius' coinage,³ and these numismatic commemorations may serve, in some measure, as a guide. Of the glass-medallion male types, Type F, the most idealised, lacks divine attributes and scarcely resembles even an exceptionally plump and youthful Divus Augustus, portrayed as imperator of the troops; it might show Gaius himself, looking, however, considerably younger than the age of twenty-seven to which he had attained in 39. But it would not be unnatural to suppose that, if Gaius issued the series, Type B portrays his father, Germanicus, with Nero and Drusus Caesar (the two eldest members being selected to represent that notably large family) as boys. The last two princes may appear in adult guise in Types D and E. In Type A we might, in this context, recognise Gaius' paternal grandfather, Drusus I, with his three children, Germanicus, Livilla, and Claudius. Type C, with the child's head surmounted by a star, may have shown Gaius' paternal grandfather, Agrippa, with Gaius and Lucius Caesar, to whose Mares, after their untimely deaths, divine honours were paid at Pisa,⁴ perhaps with the infant head of Agrippina I in front of the breast. The Pollexfen

⁴ Dessau, *Inschr. Lat. Sel.*, nos. 139, 140.
medallion would, presumably, have been brought to Colchester by a soldier or veteran-colonist who had served under Gaius, or by the heir of such a soldier, and buried with its owner's remains.

To this theory of the series' date and origin one particular objection suggests itself. If Gaius ordered the series for the war of 39, we should expect to find in it one type, not only showing his portrait, but also singling him out as ruler; and while there is, as we have seen, one youthful portrait-type, Type F, which might be thought to reflect his features, it is of the same uniform size and character as the rest and in no way distinguished by special marks of sovereignty. A fragmentary blue glass medallion of larger size, found at Carnuntum and once in the Deutsch-Altenburg Museum but now, unfortunately, lost, bore, in very fine, high relief, a youthful head, laureate and facing three-quarters to front, which might pass as a portrait of Gaius of the type that we are seeking. But even if we assumed (what is by no means certain) that this piece belongs to our series, there would still remain the difficulty of finding, on Drexl's theory, a suitable candidate for identification with the portrait of Type F.

There is, however, in the British Museum (from the Blacas Collection) the portion of a circular, or possibly oval, portrait-medallion (Pl. IX, fig. 7), executed in the same Julio-Claudian style and of the same deep, translucent blue as the pieces with which we have been dealing, but deriving from a piece considerably larger in diameter and carrying a laureate male head in profile to right. The neck and bust have vanished, and with them all evidence for dress and attributes. Nor is there any record of the fragment's provenance. But the comparatively large size of the medallion and the laurel-wreath combine to suggest that we have here the likeness of a reigning Emperor, whose profile is not that of Augustus or of Gaius or of Claudius, as we know them from their coin-portraits, but shows the phenomenally large and markedly hooked nose familiar to us in coin-portraits of Tiberius. The British Museum fragment may, then, represent the key-type in the whole medallion-group, indicating that the date of its issue is to be sought within the principate of Tiberius, rather than within that of his successor. Since the identification of the female type as Agrippina I is certain, the group is likely to date from before the

---

1 Röm. Mitt., vol. liv (1929), p. 144, fig. 10; cf. Alföldi, op. cit. p. 70 and p. 80, notes 15, 16. The features of this head, at least as seen from the front, would seem to bear little resemblance, pace Alföldi, to those of Tiberius: the face is too full and square to be his. The upward glance is more suggestive of Nero; and this may have been the centre-piece of a later and quite different series and have been combined with Medusa-heads, Victories, and Dionysiac figures.

2 Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, from the Blacas Collection; Alföldi, op. cit. p. 73, pl. 5, no. 8. The writer reached this conclusion about the Tiberius piece before Professor Alföldi's paper came into her hands.

3 Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, vol. i (1923), pls. 22-25.
beginning of open tension between her and Tiberius in 24; \(^1\) and her presence in the series is unintelligible apart from that of other members of her immediate family, of her husband, Germanicus, and of her children. The one moment at which we might expect Tiberius to have accorded iconographic honours to the House of Germanicus was the occasion of the death of his own son, Drusus II, in September, 23, when the bereaved Emperor committed Germanicus' two eldest sons, Nero and Drusus, as 'unica presentium malorum levamenta' \(^2\) and 'Augusti pronepetes', to the Senate's care. \(^3\) To this occasion A. W. Byvance assigns the famous 'Grand Camée de France' in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, \(^4\) the main scene on which depicts, according to his interpretation, \(^5\) the presentation to the Roman world of the three sons of Germanicus, Nero, Drusus, and Gaius, as Tiberius' heirs, after their adoptive uncle's death. Returning to our glass medallions, seen in this context, we might identify Germanicus, with his three sons as infants, in Type A. \(^6\) In Types D, E, and F we might recognize the same three princes in more adult guise, more or less as they actually were in 23, Type F portraying the youngest, Gaius (who appears in military dress on the cameo) as somewhat mature for his eleven years. Type C we might still interpret, as in the context of Drexel's theory, as Agrippa, \(^7\) linking the sons of Germanicus directly with Augustus through their mother, Agrippina. Lastly, in Type B we might recognize a special commemorative portrait of the dead heir to the throne, Drusus II, with his twins, Gemellus and Germanicus Cæsar, aged four in 23, the second of whom died late in the same

\(^{1}\) Tacitus, Ann. iv, 17.
\(^{2}\) Ibid., iv, 8.
\(^{3}\) Cambridge Ancient History, Plates, vol. iv (1934), 156, b.
\(^{5}\) In the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum there is yet another unpublished medallion, oval in shape and of large size (c. 2.3 x 1.9 in.), showing the head of a youthful Julio-Claudian prince in profile to left, and executed in white glass on a dull, dark-blue ground. It is set in an ancient bronze frame, with traces of gilding on it, and is backed with bronze (Pl. IX, fig. 8). We cannot prove that this piece belongs to our series: but it may do so, since the small white-on-blue piece of Type D in the British Museum (cf. p. 19 note 4), executed in the same technique, clearly belongs. The new medallion is on an even larger scale than is the large fragmentary translucent blue piece portraying Tiberius (vide supra, p. 21); and it must represent an important personage. The features recall fairly clearly those of Germanicus in his coin-portraits (Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, vol. i (1923), pls. 27, nos. 9-10; 28, nos. 1, 2; 29, nos. 3-6; 37, nos. 2, 9). As we have seen, the issue of a specially large and fine medallion with the portrait of Germanicus could be made to fit either of the two theories put forward above of the origin of our series. But if the British Museum medallion does belong to that series and represents Germanicus, we should expect that a correspondingly spectacular white-on-blue piece, portraying the reigning Emperor, either Gaius or Tiberius, was also issued and is still to seek. Medallions of this type are likely to have been presented to persons of higher rank than those who were decorated with the translucent glass pieces.

\(^{6}\) A small, oval glass medallion in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum shows a white-on-blue male frontal bust, unaccompanied by children, with features reminiscent of those of Agrippa. This piece may possibly belong to our series, to which it is linked by the white-on-blue specimen of Type D.
year. There is a distinct resemblance between the face of Type B as seen in profile and the coin-portraits of Drusus II. Our medallion-group may represent a form of this ‘family propaganda’ designed for the north-west frontier armies, in which the memory of Germanicus and of the military exploits of his father and uncle was still held in particular reverence. The Pollexfen medallion might easily be the personal decoration of a Colchester veteran, who was presented with it c. 23 and died not long after the founding of the *colonia* in 49-50. The Carlisle medallion is unlikely to have been lost on that site before the establishment of a garrison there in the early seventies; and, if issued c. 23, it can hardly have been the personal decoration of the man who dropped it. But single pieces, once part of a set of nine (?) pieces, might have been bequeathed by those who received them, in the first instance, to their heirs and have been carried about by the latter, not as decorations, but as mementos or amulets. The find-spot of the Carlisle piece, and even that of the Pollexfen piece, could be explained not unreasonably on such lines.

(The thanks of the Society are due to The Council for British Archeology for a grant of £50 towards the cost of printing Professor Toynbee’s paper.)

1 Tacitus, *Ann.* iv, 15. It is possible that we have in Type C a variant of Type B, showing Drusus II with his twins, here portrayed as the Dioscuri with a star above the head of each; see Alfoldi, *op. cit.* p. 75 and p. 71, pl. 11, nos. 6, 7.
3 According to Professor Alfoldi’s recently published view of these glass medallions (*op. cit.*), Types A, B, C and D all portray Drusus II, and the series was issued by Tiberius himselves in 19 and the death of Drusus in 23: Types E and F respectively depict Nero and Drusus, sons of Germanicus; while in Type G we are to recognize a portrait of Livilla, wife of Drusus II. To this theory various objections may be raised:—(I) While it may have been the case that Type C is possibly a variant of Type B (*vide supra*, note 1), the persons portrayed in Types A, B and D would seem to be clearly differentiated from one another by features, hair-style, and number, or absence, of children. (ii) Our medallions are likely to have formed part of an original set of nine phalerae (cf. the Laursen set of nine, *Berlin Winchelmuspro-
gramma*, 1932, and representations of sets of nine phalerae on military stelai). Of such a set we now have eight (or seven, if Types B and C are to be identified as variants of one another) different types and it seems impossible to believe that Drusus II would have appeared three times in the same set in different guises. (iii) The lady of Type G has the characteristic hair-style and features of Agrippina I; had Livilla been intended, it is likely that she would have been differentiated from Agrippina more sharply. (iv) A series of Imperial portrait-medallions produced, as these clearly were, for the Rhinehland armies and intended as ‘propaganda’ for the unity of the two branches of the Imperial House, could hardly have included portraits of Germanicus’ sons and omitted those of their parents, to whom the Rhinehland troops had been so deeply attached. Professor Alfoldi’s statement that military decorations could not have carried portraits of dead members of the Imperial House (Divus Augustus excepted) is not convincing. Again, while the preservation of portraits of Germanicus and Agrippina I as military heirlooms at Colchester and Carlisle respectively is perfectly intelligible, the preservation of portraits of Drusus II and Livilla in such circumstances is not so easy to explain.

If our medallions formed a set of nine, the missing type might have been that of Antonia, mother of Germanicus. If Types B and C are variants of one another and there are two gaps to be filled, a second missing type could have been that of Livia.

There would appear to have been four different versions of the set in four different kinds of glass—(I) clear opalescent (the majority of the present piece), (ii) blue (the British Museum example), (iii) translucent green (one of the Sangiorgi Collection examples of Type D), (iv) white-on-dark-blue (the British Museum example of Type D; *vide supra*, p. 19, note 4).
THE SOUTH WING OF
THE ROMAN 'FORUM' AT COLCHESTER:
RECENT DISCOVERIES

By M. R. HULL, M.A., F.S.A.

Early in the summer of 1953 part of the premises of Messrs. Kent, Blaxill was burnt out, and by November the site had been cleared. By the excellent co-operation of the firm and the architects, Messrs. Duncan Clark and Beckett, it was possible to cut a trench across the line of the south wing of the 'forum' before rebuilding began. It was also possible to watch the subsequent building.

The work thus fell into two parts, that done under my direction, and that done in excavating for the new building. Each operation had its advantages and disadvantages, and I am most grateful for the intelligent interest taken by two of Messrs. Hutton's workmen (Mr. W. Smith and Mr. R. Coan), and the patience of their Clerk of Works, Mr. Philip Hutton, without which this report could not have been written.

The first trench was 3 feet wide and 37 feet long north to south. After removing the brick footings and old floors of recent buildings there was less than a foot of dark sandy soil, presumably that of the gardens of the seventeenth-century houses. Below this lay several layers of little else but rubble from Roman buildings. Traces of masonry (or anything else) of the Norman period were sought, but none were found.

The building exposed had a single massive foundation, 15 feet broad from north to south, and was unquestionably Roman. It presented the appearance of having a well-built wall, only 18 inches thick, running east to west down its centre. Over this centre wall and northwards from it, extending beyond the north end of the trench, i.e., 25 feet or more, the rubble (B, C) was so loose that it could not stand, and the trench had to be completely shuttered. It was noted, however, that the rubble seemed to lie in one continuous curved bank covering the masonry, and this was later amply confirmed elsewhere. South of the centre this bank was of yellowish loam and gravel, with a copious admixture of broken mortar and rubble, comparatively compact and stable. It was clear that the building had been robbed from the north.

1 The letters refer to the section, fig. 3 A.
Fig. 1.—General plan of the Temple and 'Forum' at Colchester.
Before the great demolition, which we ascribe to the Normans, the floors of the building had been robbed, and the wall-facings. There is about a foot of earth (D) lying, here and there, on the ruined floors, sealed down by the rubble of the demolition, and the line of a spoil-trench can be seen as a dip in the rubble, filled with mortar of a greyish colour or sometimes marked by dark earth. In all this layer very little was found. The few scraps of Roman pottery are all of fourth-century date.

The surface here slopes slightly down to the south, owing to the former presence of the remains of the Norman rampart and ditch. The natural yellow sand lies at 9 to 10 feet below, at about 78.5 above Ordnance datum. Into it was cut the foundation trench for a wall 15 feet thick. On the south side the wall was built against the yellow sand, on the north two or three feet of the trench was in excess and allowed the face of the wall to be built free. It shows as four carefully built courses of dressed stone standing on six inches of concrete. Above this the face of the wall is covered by an inch or more of rough but even plaster, the lower edge of which shows that it marked ground level. The total height of wall remaining is over four feet.

On the south face the lower part of the foundation slants inward as it did further east. In the upper part the coursing is visible, in the lower it is obscured by the mortar of the joints (Pl. II); there is no plaster and there has not been any. The material of the wall throughout seems to be large water-worn cobbles of septaria, which are only dressed when used in the face. The mortar is yellowish. The stones are from a sea-beach, some bearing barnacles, and many perforated by boring molluscs.

The top of the wall, as found, is irregular, but seems originally to have been levelled off and used as two floors, one on each side of the central wall. On the north about 2½ feet of pink mortar floor, 3 inches thick, extended from the central wall (Y), and remains of it were seen later behind this wall on each side of Hole 15. It was never possible to discover its original form to the north, and in Holes 14 and 43 it could not be observed with certainty at all, but this could be due to the way in which the builders did the excavation work. This floor is smooth but coarse, and finishes against the red plaster skirting of the wall. It slopes a little, down to the north. It seems always to be broken as it approaches robbed masonry, so that there may have been masonry all along its north side.

The raw surface left by the removal of this pavement and of the ashlar blocks (when the very hard mortar on which it was bedded came away with the stone, as it frequently did) extended often south of both walls and piers. On this south side it was very difficult to
come to any firm conclusion regarding the nature of the floor. It was first noticed in a pilot shaft sunk by the architects, when, after penetrating the heavy deposit of rubble, the men came upon a level surface of very white mortar, which was quite hard.

When this surface was exposed in our trench, close alongside, it appeared to me to be of yellowish-brown mortar, but afterwards when it had been exposed to some frost, I asked the men to remove it, and after they had removed what would come away freely they left a more or less smooth white surface, lying on brown mortar, the removal of which seemed to me too laborious to be undertaken. Later still, the whole top of the platform was cleared from here eastwards and one part of this floor (or rather, I think, bed for a floor) could be examined. It lay on the south edge of the platform opposite pier 2 (visible in Pl. 1, X in fig. 3), and was almost two feet wide, north to south, sloping down further to the hollow left where the cement bed for the ashlar lay. Its composition was clear, about three inches of brown mortar, then a thin, hard white layer, then another three inches of brownish mortar.

Elsewhere I searched particularly for signs of marks to show either variations in this mortar or traces of what had lain upon it. But the manner in which the work was done, the labourers simply working away as fast as possible with heavy shovels and trampling on the part exposed, really made useful observations impossible. I had the impression that the mortar layer varied, but in no comprehensible manner. I think it is safe to say that it bore no marks of slabs of stone or tessere, nor was it really ever smooth enough to have been itself a finished floor. The builders were of the opinion that the piece examined opposite pier 2 had been built upon, but I feel that if this were so we would have to suppose that pretty well the whole platform south of walls and piers was built upon, which I do not see can be contemplated.

The platform was erected to carry a structure built along its centre line, the visible remains of which appear to have belonged to five masonry piers linked by narrow walls bearing plaster skirtings. These were all recovered piecemeal, each discovery being made almost separately, and the measurements in each case could only be taken from the sides of the hole, sometimes with timbering in position, sometimes without. Consequently they are not reliable to an inch, and one might say not to a foot, were it not for the fact that, when plotted they fit in together so well that it seems we may rely upon them pretty closely.

1 This was done following the suggestion of Sir Mortimer Wheeler that the masonry must be examined for joints.
The piers are normally built of a rubble concrete core, apparently continuous with the platform below, the mortar being yellow-brown. The core was usually well-defined, often having vertical and straight sides round the base to a height of eight or ten inches. Above this the core was usually damaged and receded towards the centre; the height remaining reaching two feet or more. But in one or two places the core was observed to overhang the flat face somewhat. The faces mark where ashlar blocks have been robbed, and one large example of these still lay in position at the south-west corner of pier 3 (Pl. I, A). It was so firmly bedded that it was difficult to remove intact even with modern tools. The ancient robbers must have broken many blocks, and a broken one was found abandoned against the east side of pier 2. They were laid, the builders told me, in ‘hot’ mortar; that is to say while the lime was freshly mixed and still warm, and this they assured me accounted for its great tenacity and hardness.1

This very hard mortar is easily recognized where it remains round the piers, but it sometimes adhered to the ashlar and parted from the platform, leaving a ragged hole, the division of which from the adjacent natural surface of the platform is not always recognizable. Nevertheless, in the end we have been able to put together what appears to be a fairly consistent picture of the plan of these piers with their ashlar facing.

The piers were united by thin walls, the ends of all of which had been cut away in the operation of robbing the ashlar of the piers (Pl. I, A & B). The walls themselves had been neglected almost as much as the cores of the piers, for they contained no ashlar, but were built of septaria and tile, with plaster mouldings on both sides at the base.

We will now describe these units in detail:

PIER 5. This is the most westerly found, and it is unfortunate that we do not know how far it is from the south-west corner of the whole building. This distance might reasonably be something like 18 feet. The shaft sunk is not shown on the architect’s plan and is un-numbered. It was 4 feet north to south by 6 feet east to west and lies under the T-junction of walls, near the north-west angle of the new building. It was excavated 20 August, 1953, and I was unable to have access to it to measure as I would have liked. In the centre of the hole lay the core of a pier, surrounded by the hard mortar bed for the ashlar facing. The width of the core was not secured; we have assumed that it was as usual.

1 I have since learnt that this explanation is without scientific basis.
Fig. 2.—Detailed plan of the Kent, Blaxill site.
WALL 5. Only seen in Hole 15, where its broken end protruded from the west side. Its base begins with two courses of septaria laid on the platform, to a width of 31 inches. Upon this is a foundation of four courses of tiles, 5 inches high and 21 inches wide. Upon this the wall was built, 15 inches wide, with a 3 inch offset on each side, consisting of two courses of septaria crowned by one of tile.

The stone base had been concealed by the flooring; on the south face the tile base had been plastered with fine hard white plaster, half an inch to an inch thick, with a step or offset at half height. So far as we know this plaster would be continuous with the surface of the floor. On the north the floor was in position, of hard pink mortar about 3 inches thick, laid upon a white mortar.

On both north and south sides a plaster moulding had been added at a later date. On the north this was a plain, tall skirting some 12 inches high with a convex curve. The surface was not carefully smoothed. On the south the moulding was set high up, so as to cover the offset of the wall, and had two limbs, both convexly rounded. The upper was nearly vertical on the face of the wall, the lower was fatter and more horizontal, covering the offset. The under side was smooth, where it had been set on the floor. The plaster of both skirtings was of large crushed tile in very white mortar.

South of the wall and Pier 4 our floor was the rough top of the platform, lying six inches below the level of the pink floor to the north. Upon it lay a few inches of brownish soil, otherwise the earth covering the remains here was all black, and that north of the wall was mixed with mortar.

PIER 4, in Hole 15. The core of the pier was of the usual nature; the mark of ashlar was clear on its west and south sides. The former would take a block 18 inches high by about 20 inches wide and perhaps 4 feet 6 inches long, but several blocks would be used to fill this space. The space on the front was 8 inches high and 17 inches wide, length unknown. The south face of the core, behind, was covered with smooth mortar, as if plastered, but it was thin and rough, and bulged forward at the top. The width of the ashlar on the east is conjectural.

WALL 4. Was uncovered in our own second trench at leisure. As in the case of the others it had been broken at both ends by the stone-robbers. At the west end there was a good two feet left between the broken end and the end of our trench, and in this space there must have stood the ashlar of Pier 4, but no trace of it could be found on the platform.

This wall was built as the last, having a base of septaria supporting a base of tile upon which stood the wall proper, built of septaria and

---

1 Sections of the walls are shown, fig. 3, B-E.
South face of platform, with pier 2 and the plaster moulding of wall 3 (left).
tile. On the north lay a portion of the same pink floor that we saw at Wall 5, on the south lay only the ragged top of the platform, at a low level.

The tile base consisted of three courses, 7½ inches high and 27 inches broad, reduced at the top by an offset to 26 inches, the thickness of the wall, which had been of septaria and tile (see section). On the north, as in Wall 5, there was plastering, but in this case, perhaps owing to the thicker wall, it amounted to a flat plaster on the face of the wall. On the south there had first been the hard white plaster, with offset half way up, and later a new skirting had been made in the white mortar full of crushed tile. This had not a clear double moulding such as was found elsewhere, but was moulded in a broad flat curve, laid very horizontally so that it is the widest of all these mouldings. The soil under the overhang of this (where the floor had been) was yellow loam full of small gravel.

PIER 3 (Pl. I, B.). Was excavated by ourselves. The rubble core was well-preserved, being 3 feet 3 inches wide and nearly 3 feet high. Its sides were all straight at the base, where ashlar blocks had been robbed. Only one block, at the south-west corner, remained in position. It measured 26 by 10 inches in plan. The height was between 8 and 10 inches, for the under side is quite rough and undressed. The upper surface on the other hand is not only well-dressed, like the other four sides, but is worn smooth as by foot-traffic. It is unlikely that it was thus worn while lying in its position in the ruins, so that this seems to be a stone re-used from another building.

The floor around this pier was carefully examined for us by Mr. R. Dumbreck. To the south the face of the pier was perfectly flat, and the hard cement for the ashlar extended for a width of at least 19 inches, finishing with a broken edge, so that it might have been more (see plan). On the west the end of the existing ashlar block seems to have been the face of the pier, so that the ashlar course had been narrower, for the core overhung somewhat. On the east side one block had projected into the core to an extent of 19½ by 7 inches, while the total extent of the thickness (at the south-east corner) had been 21 inches, as shown by the hard cement. Further back this decreased to 10 inches, but the east edge may be imperfect.

The evidence at this pier was better than at most, the width of the rubble was 2 feet 1½ inches on the south face and 3 feet 4 inches further back. Like most of the piers there was here some slight suggestion that the east and west sides of the rubble splayed a little wider apart towards the north. In the rubble one or two fragments were noted of the same bluish lava which was used in definite facing courses in the masonry found in 1932.
Wall 3. This was the first masonry found. It was broken at both ends by robbers, but the centre was in good order. The base was of septaria built in one with the platform, and upon this stood the tile base, of five courses, 21 inches wide. This reduced by offsets to a wall only 15 inches thick, built of two courses of septaria followed by one of tile. The offsets were covered by plaster; in the first period, on the south side only, by a skirting of fine white plaster, with a sharp offset at half-height. The height was 11½ inches, which is one Roman foot. In the second period the floor was raised a foot and a new skirting laid, consisting of a double-curved moulding 14 inches high and 12 inches broad, projecting 9 inches beyond the white plaster beneath. The under-side of this was perfectly smooth, showing that it lay on a perfect floor. The plaster this time was of large crushed tile in very white mortar, and the finish was almost a polish (Pl. III, A).

On the north side the skirting was also of pink mortar, but not, I think, of the same mix as on the south, moreover it ran into the pink mortar floor, with which it was continuous, so that I do not know whether this floor is of period one or period two. But the question depends on whether we have two floors on the north side at Wall 4.

Pier 2. The rubble core of this pier stood high. As at Pier 3 it extended eastwards towards the rear, so here it extended westwards. The trenches cut through walls and rubble to extract the ashlar on each side were very clear, and easily distinguished, for once, by a different shade in the mortar. In the eastern trench lay the remains of one of the stone blocks, abandoned presumably because it was broken. The south front of the rubble was 3 feet wide and quite rough, it projected one foot beyond the limit of the pink plaster, whereas the south front of Pier 3 was in line with the latter. But the southern part of this pier was destroyed by the pilot-shaft, so that the position of the ashlar face is quite conjectural. In the later clearance of this area we had hopes that we might determine the outline of the rear, or north, side of this Pier. But when the occasion came the builders were in such haste that no opportunity could be gained to examine the surface of the platform. As I watched I had the impression that there was no more to be seen than what we already had on the plan.

Wall 2. This was the one case where the builders really let us down. Traces of pink plaster along the south front were noted early in the clearing of the boiler room, but remained untouched in the bank until the last, when the work of clearing approached from the north side. I saw the earth removed up to the back of the wall, when there was revealed the pink plaster skirting of the north side in perfect condition, looking exactly like that of Wall 3. Mr. Philip Hutton
Fig. 3.—Sections A to F, Kent, Baxwall site.
had said he would preserve anything found for me, but on return from lunch I found the men looking very guilty, and the whole wall broken out and removed except for some large pieces of the pink plaster.

This wall, so far as I can now guess, was a duplicate of Wall 3, but this cannot be regarded as certain. The men tried to tell me that there was nothing more there than the north skirting, but this I do not believe, or at least, find it hard to do so. If it was so I think the wall must have been much further south than any of the others. The exact position of the north skirting was not obtained and its position on the plan is assumed. I feel that the plaster we saw from the south was not the south side of the north skirting, but the broken edge of the south skirting, with which its height above the top of the platform would agree. Unfortunately we shall never know the truth.

The pieces broken out and shown to me were rather strange; for some of the lower part of the wall adhered to the plaster, and it consisted of small pieces of tile in very dry mortar with many cavities. It seemed much less careful than the other walls, and reminded me of the pier removed at St. Martin's House in 1950.

PIER 1. This pier was scarcely recognizable, the robbers had practically razed it. All that was left was part of the trace of the hard mortar for the ashlar round it, and, in the middle, some large rough stones set in the top of the platform as a base for the rubble core. (cf. the large stone under Wall 3). Otherwise, however, it falls into its right position, and seems to have been of the regular dimensions. The exact dimensions of the ashlar are not certain, for some of the marks are ambiguous, as shown on the plan.

WALL 1. By the time we came to this wall we had gained experience of the regular spacing to be expected, and were ready for it. Unfortunately, this wall had been damaged more than the others. It was founded like the rest, with four courses of tiles on septaria, the tiles having one offset; above them were two more courses of tile each offset a little. The lowest tile course was 24½ inches wide, and the wall itself was 17 inches. Parts of two courses of septaria remained.

On the south we found the usual first skirting of white plaster with sharp offset. Upon it was laid the second skirting of pink or red still 10 inches wide, but broken, and its original shape uncertain, but apparently again different from the others. On the north side the pink skirting was thin, just sufficient to cover the tiles. Its continuation as a pink floor could not be clearly made out.

Owing to the piecemeal way in which the work was done, the accurate plotting of the remains was difficult, especially before the lines of the new building had been laid out. After this a plumb-bob could be used. It was even very difficult to lay out the line of the great
PLATE III.

A. SOUTH FACE OF PLATFORM.

B. THE SMALLER DRAIN.
platform. In the end, however, we feel that the plan submitted is satisfactory. The centre line of platform and wall were definitely fixed in relation to the corner of the existing red brick building, and the south edge of the platform in relation to stanchion 23 of the new building. When plotted on these lines all discoveries fall into the correct positions where they were made. The only variation possible being a very slight swing about the position of the first point mentioned.

When drawn out at 4 feet to the inch, on an enlargement of the 1:500 map (where some little latitude must be allowed), the line of the platform strikes the masonry found in 1932 correctly on the west side.

The broad, tiled drain, the line of which we have, can also be projected, and joins accurately with the same drain on the 1932 plan. Our foundation joins the 1932 one about the middle of the west side, and the 5 feet thick wall found in 1932 begins to look like the eastern-most pier of our series.

The next consideration is whether or not our foundation really runs through to join the masonry of 1932. In that year we were digging in a very confined space, and it was quite impossible to uncover the foundations of the east to west wall. On the other hand we did find an edge, or an offset, along the west side of the great foundation. I am, however, quite unable after this lapse of time to say whether we might then have missed seeing our foundation had it been present. I feel that it had been present we would have known.

Next, if it were present, the 5 feet wall should be one of our piers and I feel that it cannot be so. With the ashlar our piers seem to have measured at the very least 6 feet from south to north. This wall retains its facing (in the upper part) and this is of small (though well-cut) blocks. We know that the lower part of our ashlar was of large blocks, but we have hints that the upper part may have been of smaller stuff. This may account for the undercutting seen in 1932, which would then be due to the extraction of the large blocks lying low down. Indeed, we are now illumined on the fact that part of a large block actually remained in situ in the deepest part of the undercutting at the south-west corner of the great 1932 foundation. The facing higher up, here too, was of small blocks.

It is not impossible, therefore, that the style of the facing may have been similar throughout our building.

Despite the difficulty of measuring and aligning masonry at the bottom of deep excavations it is encouraging to find our plan coming out as consistently as it does. Thus Wall 3 appears to have been 6 feet 6 inches long, with Pier 2 on its east 6 feet 3 inches wide, and
Pier 3 on its west 5 feet 7 inches wide. Wall 4 seems to have been 6 feet 6 inches long, and Pier 4 about 6 feet wide. The position of the core of Pier 5 (not at all accurately known) seems to indicate that Wall 5 was 6 feet 6 inches long, and Pier 5 5 feet 6 inches wide. Eastwards, the mark of the ashlar of Pier 1 suggests that Wall 2 was 6 feet 6 inches long, and the pier itself 5 feet 6 inches, with ashlar of uneven thickness. There is nothing to indicate how long Wall 1 was, but we assume 6 feet 6 inches.

The walls therefore seem to be quite standard at 6 feet 6 inches; the piers are not so uniform, but seem to have run alternately at widths of 5 feet 6 inches (nos. 1, 3, 5) and 6 feet (nos. 2, 4). Though equal in length, all the walls seem to have differed in some way, sometimes in thickness, always in outline of the red plaster moulding, and I strongly suspect, in the dimensions of the first white plaster moulding. The piers may have differed more than we know, for the outlines of the marks of the ashlar are only occasionally certain. The exact line of the face of the ashlar of Piers 3 and 2 is not certain. In the case of the former it was never properly uncovered, in the case of the latter it was cut away by the pilot-shaft sunk by the architects. There are other cases, such as Pier 1, where the signs are ambiguous or too vague for certainty. There also remains the doubt about the very flat face of the core on the face of Pier 3; one wonders whether it was actually faced or exposed.

Before going on to describe the nature of the loose and broken ruins lying over these remains we will complete the description of the Roman remains found in situ south of the great foundation. (Fig. 3 A and F.)

In the first trench cut, as we left the platform, the layer of white mortar was found to continue at a level about 6 inches lower. But it could perhaps originally merely have been thicker, and so have continued horizontal. It ran on southwards for 4 feet when we came upon a drain (N) built of stone and lined with plaster, running parallel to the platform. First impressions were that the walls of this drain were shoddy, but the plaster was strong, for the floor was all plaster and several inches thick, and so strong that the builder's men said it was special waterproof stuff. Our photograph failed and we have only the unsatisfactory Press photo. which we use (Pl. III, B), and which, nevertheless, does give some poor idea of how the alabaster blocks were visible in its walls.

When demolished this drain proved to be of inferior workmanship. The floor was of very thin plaster (the thickness noticed in section 1 was purely local), but thick under the walls, so that, with two courses of stone on top, the walls seemed to contain three courses, but the lower one was plaster. The walls were thinly plastered over, but it
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was possible to discern the white blocks of alabaster, which were almost continuous in the lower course on the north side, and frequent on the south.

One of the upper stones on the south side was the large lump of moulded plaster (no. D6 below) lying face down. Not far away another stone in the wall had been cut from a larger stone carved, apparently, with a witherath. The other stones were either rough lumps of (Lincolnshire?) limestone, broken from larger pieces, or rough blocks of alabaster, rough only because of decay, for they had, it seemed, been well-shaped. The drain therefore was built of reused material, and I attribute the decay of the alabaster to the action of fire. The whole could have been salvaged from the ruins of the Temple after its destruction by Boudicca, and one can imagine that this drain might have been built in this comparatively shoddy manner in a rehabilitation scheme carried out at great speed.

Beyond the drain some trace of a street was sought, but there were only the layers R and Q which appeared to be earlier than the drain, but actually the ground was disturbed of old, and, more recently by a large pit full of black soil and pottery of seventeenth-century date.

The most notable point here was that the natural sand, found at approximately the same level as on the north side, was overlaid by a layer of soggy, clayey loam (T) 2½ to 3 feet thick, which was obviously placed in position, for it raised the surface two feet or more above the equivalent natural surface on the north, and, against the foundation, contained odd septaria blocks (at Z). Careful watch showed no pottery or other remains in it. In the opinion of the builder’s men it was laid to make the drain waterproof.

This first section was spoilt by the seventeenth-century pit. Later excavations for stanchions 24, 25, 26, fell on the line of the broad drain discovered in 1932 (Pl. VIII, A). This was first found in Hole 26, where excavations for cellars and a baker’s oven had left the northern part of the drain in position. In Hole 25 a cellar or oven had completely removed it, but in Hole 24 part of the northern half was again seen, and the two exposures give the line on which this drain comes through this part of the site. It is parallel to the foundation, and the centre-line of the drain (assuming it to have been three feet wide as before) is 18 feet 6 inches from the south face of the foundation. In neither case could one gather anything of its relationship to any other levels. Its floor was at 80.59 above O.S. datum; that of the smaller drain was 80.36.

In the long, broad cut made between stanchions 23 and 24 (see

1 Exceptions noted on p. 51.
section, fig. 3, R) some road-metalling was seen on the line of this drain, and since it rises higher than the bottom of the smaller drain it must also have interrupted the larger drain. Thus we have to expect that the latter stops or turns aside at stanchion 24.

Disappointingly, little evidence regarding the Roman street was found. It was hardly to be expected between the foundation and the smaller drain, but we hoped to find it south of the latter. In our first trench we were baulked by the large black pit which had cut nearly everything away. The west side of the trench, however, gave the impression that we were looking at the side of the pit. Upon the natural sand was a somewhat dirty layer of loam and pebbles, and upon this a confused layer, including black soil, and a large slab of fine pink concrete with broken edges, which I judged to be well out of place. Other odd pieces of this were found tumbled in the filling of the pit. Above the concrete was about 3 inches of broken plaster. Then there had been a thick layer of gravel, possibly a road which had been partly dug away, and then levelled with yellowish loam. Above this there was what appeared to be a road, consisting of over a foot of yellowish loam and gravel, with some mortar, and the top of it appeared to have formed a gravelled surface. Now the top of this lies at 82.77 feet, which is well above the top of the platform and fits in better with the level of the turf line over the Roman ruins.

I must register my lack of confidence in this part of the work. I felt that, although I drew in what I saw, so far as I could, there was something amiss, either in interpretation or in the soil before me. I felt, among other things, that lumps of the side of the large pit might have slipped and appear before me in a wrong order, but this could never account for something appearing too high up in the section, which I think this 'road' does. I am quite at a loss to account for heavy fragments of concrete—apparently flooring—being found at a low level outside (south of) the smaller drain.

Later, when this cut was widened to 10 feet or more (eastwards), it was found that the pit had spared a portion of road which lay (as I think did that just mentioned) upon the spongy pug under the small drain (fig. 3, above U). On the pug lay a 2-inch layer of grey clay stained with charcoal, and then a very fine road-metalling of extremely hard sand, pebbles, and mortar, 6½ inches thick (R). Above this there was a small fragment of a second metalling of a more loose gravel, also 6½ inches thick. The top of the larger remnant was particularly smooth and hard. Its level is at 80.96 feet—that is about level with the top of the wall of the smaller drain, and much lower (1.8 feet) than the gravelling just mentioned, which may correspond to the next layer above. Since this lies upon the pug it must represent the first
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Roman street (for there is none, and has never been one, lower). No other remains of a street, as such, were observed, chiefly due to the way in which the ground was disturbed by cellars and other old excavations. Before continuing with other gravel levels we will deal with the deposits covering the remains of the masonry.

In the first trench, which we cut ourselves, the rubble was found to be piled high over the centre of the foundation or platform. Indeed, it was covered by only about two feet of modern rubbish. It turned out to consist, northwards of the centre, of very loose lumps of mortar, stone and tile, in very confused layers, and south of the centre, of several layers of yellowish earth variously admixed with mortar and scattered rubble. (Modern deposits are here omitted.) The whole followed a general pattern whereby it was humped high over the centre and sloped down to north and south and this seemed satisfactorily equated with the Norman rampart.

Now we are told by Morant that the Normans had a wall with towers here, and we know that about 1683 Robert Northfolk filled in the Norman Ditch and built houses upon it. Accordingly, we were always aware that Norman remains might be encountered, with signs of Northfolk's activity. It can now be said, briefly, that the signs of cellars, cesspools, etc., of Northfolk's houses were certainly found, with an abundance of remains of clay pipes, and the Norman Ditch had certainly been filled in (with little or nothing in the filling), but of any Norman masonry there was no trace at all (but see p. 45).

The observation of the layers in the section of the bank of rubble presented many difficulties. In the first trench (Section I) observation was only partial, owing to the necessity to shutter the sides. Later, the broad cuts made by the builders without shuttering gave much better opportunity for observation, but sections were short and incomplete, and the surface had been lowered, so that it was difficult to make vertical measurements. The following is the best account I can give:

From work done east of Trench I it was clear that the main mass of rubble was divided by a former surface or turf line. Below this line the rubble was connected with the broken masonry, but divided from the broken top of the platform, at least in places, by yellowish earth often containing much gravel. This lower rubble (C) contained no chalk. Above the turf-line the rubble was quite different in character, being very loose and open, and full of lumps of chalk (B). The main mass of rubble, in each case, lay north of the centre of the walls and piers, south of this mortar and rubble appeared in most layers, but not in comparable quantity.

The rubble layers seemed to have been very uneven on top in
some places, and in our second trench, which ran westwards from the first one, along the line of the piers, we were cutting down straight into rubble, which, at least in one place, was lying on black soil (D) containing Norman and Roman pottery. Here I could not see the turf line. In both these trenches we found masonry remains as soon as we entered the rubble. Over Wall 3 there were two lumps of conjoined voussoir-tiles from an arch, and lumps of a thick slab of Puzzolana stone, with smooth top where marble slabs had been bedded. These were all jumbled up with blocks of septaria, broken tile and mortar. Immediately north of this, under all the rubble, two conjoined voussoir-tiles lay on the pink floor of the platform. In Trench II there was so much fallen rubble packed so tightly that it was quite difficult to decide when we had come down upon the firm masonry of a pier. Over Wall 4 there was a large piece of an arch, with a few courses of stone and tile above the voussoirs lying on its face. Here and there in the rubble other recognizable pieces were found, which are described among the finds. It was uniformly observed, throughout the work, that wall-plaster, whether coloured or plain, was absent, except for a few fragments of the large red skirting mouldings. There is, therefore, we feel, no question of any of the walls in the second period of the building having been plastered.

On the other hand there is evidence that both they and the floor were covered with marble. Many fragments of cut slabs, some thin, some thicker, were found lying along the top of the smaller drain (N). The marble is chiefly of Purbeck type, but foreign marbles also occur. Some of the thinner slabs have dowel holes in the edges for the iron-holdfasts. There are also fragments of mouldings and other carved work in marble, but no lettering or statuary.

Our knowledge of the stratification on the north side is poor. In Trench I natural yellow sand was found at a little over 9 feet from the surface on the south, and at 10 feet on the north. But the foundation trench (W) for the masonry had gone 18 inches lower. Its width appeared to be 3 feet, and it was full of fragments of fine white wall-plaster, with a fine, polished, ivory-like surface. This I cannot believe came from our building, and I think it may have come from the ruins of the Temple. Further east, when the boiler-house was excavated, I could not see traces of this foundation trench, which may not have been a continuous feature. There was only a slight indication of an old surface on top of the white plaster, its presence was better indicated by the unmistakable bottom edge of the rough plaster on the north face of the platform. This is at 78.25 feet and there never seems to have been another floor above it. The earth may, however, have accumulated slowly so as to raise the level, but the
A. CORNICE-MOULDING WITH DOWEL-HOLES.

B. SPRING-MOULDING WITH DOWEL-HOLES.
evidence is against this, for the only pottery found in the next 3 feet (including the lower rubble) was fourth-century. This is the same layer that underlay the fallen column, which lay north of Pier 4, in which some peculiar pieces of glass were found, one of them painted.

This fallen column is somewhat of a problem. We already knew from fragments of segmental tiles, that we had to deal certainly with built columns of nearly 3 feet diameter, and probably with others of smaller diameter, but hardly expected to find one fallen and recognizable. There was a length of at least 8 feet lying north to south, where it had fallen from some part of Pier 4; we could not determine which part. Its foot lay higher than its head, confirming our impression that the ground level on the north always lay below the top of the platform. It had been shattered in its fall, so that every stone and tile was loose, and much had been taken away by robbers; nevertheless, much of the shaft could be recognized. The remarkable fact was that I could find no trace of any facing plaster, from which I conclude that this column had stood erect so long that the plaster had weathered off completely. If so, it would have made a heap at the base, but this must have been disturbed when the building was robbed, and before the column fell.

It is time now to consider the extremely difficult stratification south of the platform. It is not at all clear whether anything lay on this site before the platform was built. The only evidence was in the south end of Section A (west side), and this was no more than a pebble surface on the sand at 79.3 feet; for the concrete, plaster, and gravel, a little higher to the south could have been put in at the same time as the pug and the smaller drain. I feel that the pug is contemporary with the platform, and was put in to carry the drain and a path (at P and O). The path was, at first, of concrete, but had been altered more than once (compare the successive paths at the larger platform further east), always, it seems in such a way as to continue the floor over the platform. The latest path was a rather poor one, of gravel. These paths drained into the smaller drain. One naturally begins to think of the drip from a portico, but no portico could have existed, for there is no stylobate, nor are there separate bases for columns.

Further east, the nature of this path becomes even more difficult. We are hampered by the lack of a full section, but it is clear that besides the gravel path which covered (if patchily as found by us) both the south part of the platform and the space to the drain, we have to deal with other features. The section along the south side of the platform (westwards from Hole 19) shows that the white concrete path was here 7 inches thick and particularly good, being of medium-sized
gravel in pure white mortar, at the east end, but in several layers of this and other materials, further west. Here too the gravel floor above is very thick, enough for a road, and shows in its lower part evidences of several repairs or alterations. Upon it there lies a layer of earth and rubbish, chiefly dark sandy soil with mortar on top. Above it is a second broad and level expanse of gravel about six inches thick, its surface approximately level with the top of the red mortar skirting. Above this there is a final accumulation of dark earth and mortar, which is capped by the very distinct turf layer. This consists of about two inches of clay, often accompanied by about an inch of very black material, probably containing much charcoal or soot.

We were fortunate to be able to obtain a section continuing these layers over the platform. In this section there is a remarkable feature. Between the white concrete path and the platform is a layer of a peculiar material, which is no other than a mixture of wood-shavings in mortar, which produces a kind of soft breeze. This lies on a filling of septaria in loose mortar and soil against the foundation, which we saw less clearly in Section A (at Z). The next three layers run up to the remains of Wall 5 as if they are all Roman. If so, the upper gravel belongs to a period when the building was old and neglected, for it covers the skirting, which is damaged.

Apart from one portion, which was cut under conditions precluding a record being taken, this section was continued further north from the platform than we had previously seen. It will be noticed that the critical point where the foundation trench might be found could not be touched. Otherwise the section shows much more clearly than our first trench the nature of the strata over the foundation. There are a number of confused tips of rubble lying in soil which is dark or light, according to the quantity of mortar loose in it, with, at one point in the upper layer, a large block of tumbled masonry. All this is quite parallel to the discoveries made by us in Trenches I and II. Despite its tumbled nature, all this rubble is fairly level on top, where it is sealed by the turf line.

Above the turf line, beyond question, we have the remains of the rampart of the Norman Castle, and on the left (north) the several tilted layers of rubble, gravel, and sand, point to the approximate position of the tail of the bank. It is quite clear that the turf line formed before the Norman bank was thrown up, and that after the turf line formed, there was an enormous bank of rubble laid upon the Roman ruins. This formed the core of the rampart, and was full of lumps of chalk. We have seen chalk in Norman connection under the rampart north of the Castle, and it seems that this rubble is perhaps not equivalent to another plundering of Roman ruins at this
A. Dressed stone with hollow-moulding.

B. White plaster moulding.
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point, but to the cleaning up of the Keep site by the removal of waste material (which must have been very great) from the dressing of the stones and tiles used in building the Keep.

The following, therefore, is the sequence on the site:

1. Pre-Boudiccan, possibly nothing, at most something at present indefinable.

2. Post-Boudiccan, the great platform, built in conjunction with the greater platform further east, bearing an architectural screen comprising an arcade with columns at the piers, and mostly sheathed in marble. Reused material in the small drain probably comes from the Temple destroyed by Boudicca.

3. The screen receives repairs, and a new floor and skirting on the south side.

4. The building falls into disrepair.

5. A new street is laid down covering the plaster skirting.

6. The building is demolished, and the ruins ransacked for stone.

7. A turf line forms over the ruins.

8. Rubble is dumped upon the ruins, the Norman ditch is excavated, and its upcast thrown upon the rubble to form the Norman rampart.

Eight is Norman, and so may be 6 and 7. If they are, the turf line should represent the pause in building between the erection of the first 30 feet of the Keep and the completion of the upper part. The two layers of rubble could thus correspond to the two periods of building, and the second ties in with Mrs. M. A. Cotton's suggestion that the rampart was built after the Keep; it also has chalk tying in with the chalk layer found by her.

We are left with the most interesting possibility that the Street 5 is Roman, or may, we hope, be even post-Roman. Its surface is at 83.5 feet. In a section taken along the north side of a trench which followed the south side of the larger platform further east (in 1932) there is a similar layer of gravel lying upon the intensely black soil which covered the platform, with more black soil above it, and then the gravel of the Norman rampart. The parallel seems complete and it looks as if there was a late road running on this line, which is only seen along the south side of our platforms, the ground north of it, so far as we know, being then in a chaotic state.

For before this gravel could be laid down we must suppose that the Roman buildings were in decay. They had been spoiled for building-stone and marble (the latter to burn for lime), and of the former we have only a few pieces to show the nature of the rich spoil available, of the latter we have many pieces, but unfortunately only of
a scrappy nature, chiefly fragments of sheathing from walls and floors, but there are remains of panelling and carvings to show such things were present; there is, however, no trace of an inscription. Apart from a few pieces found in the rubble, all the marble was found in a limited area which extended along the line of the smaller drain. I can offer no suggestions to account for this. It would appear that when the robbers came to remove the marble from the building it was already in a dilapidated condition, and fragments of the marble lay scattered around—or possibly the robbers scattered it in taking it off—at any rate the pieces which had fallen along the line of the drain, and some into the filling of the drain, escaped observation when the bulk was collected.

The main destruction of the building followed, and over the larger platform, was succeeded by a period long enough for 2 feet 6 inches of intensely black soil to accumulate.

Finally, a word about the Norman ditch. Accurate observation on this was not possible because the work was done in stanchion-holes at great depth with complete shuttering. The line of the ditch is along the south side of the site, and is occupied by the cellars of the buildings, destroyed in the fire. These are of 'Tudor' and of modern brick, and it is not clear how far we may trust the simplicity of the story of Northfolk filling in the ditch and building houses, for the buildings west of the site, including Weddell's and Farmer's shops, are clearly older than 1683, and were therefore not built by Northfolk, yet they stand directly upon the filled ditch.

Although these cellars occupy so much of the ditch, much of its filling remained to be moved. The bottom seemed to lie approximately on the line of stanchion-holes 33 and 37, and was 18 feet below the High Street. The northern lip seemed to me to show somewhere about the north side of stanchion-hole 29, and, to the eye, it appeared as if the south lip must extend part of the way under High Street. The width was certainly not less than 36 feet. One would expect a width of 54 feet against a depth of 18 feet, but about 5 feet must be deducted from the 18 feet to allow for subsequent accumulation of earth. If we call the depth 13 feet, a width of 39 feet would be reasonable.

The filling was most disappointing. No layering or festooning could be seen in it, and the archaeological finds were few. In parts a great quantity of very large food-bones occurred. Now and then a few pieces of pottery were found, and these were particularly disappointing. The bottom, in which we had hoped for a good haul of distinctive Norman material, was no more productive than the filling—perhaps less—but it did produce one or two problems.
A. Drain found in 1932.

B. (1) Pottery Ball. (2) Lug-handle of a vessel with green glaze, 16th century.
Hole 30, on the north slope of the ditch, revealed, on its south side, at a depth of 13 feet 6 inches, a row of Roman tiles, lying flat about 6 inches above the natural sand, 'like a path', as the men reported. I did not see them in position. In Hole 29, next to the west, tiles, stones, and mortar, were lying on the sandy slope of the ditch, and in Hole 38 there was a layer nearly 2 feet thick across the bottom of the ditch, composed of masonry rubble. Much of this, in all the holes mentioned, was good, including whole Roman tiles and blocks of masonry. The general effect was to give the impression that after the ditch was cut some demolition had been carried out on masonry along the north side of it, from which a certain amount had rolled into the ditch and been left there. But as we have seen, we do not find that the strata show that any such thing was done, and one has to consider the possibility that this rubble in the ditch is from a Norman bridge or barbican, the foundation of which we have not found.

Throughout the work the analysis of nearly 40 samples of mortar carried out by Dr. Norman Davey, of the Building Research Station, Watford, has been invaluable in correlating and identifying different sections of the Roman work, and in the case of the masonry found in the ditch filling he has shown this is mainly of a certain type which is quite different in composition from any of the Roman samples, and may, therefore, be set down as belonging to Norman masonry which formerly stood on top of the rampart or formed a bridge or barbican.

The bottom of the ditch was further remarkable for the fact that it had a drainage ditch about 18 inches deep running along it.

There is left for discussion the fragments of the building which were found in the lower part of the rubble. Although there was so much of the latter, pretty well every stone which could be used for building had been extracted. The few significant pieces which remained are as follows:

A. MARBLES.

Over 200 fragments of marble slabs were found varying in thickness from about ½ inch to 1 inch or more. All are quite plain, none having any mouldings for panelling. One fragment alone preserves part of a carved astragaloid-moulding (Pl. IV).

We are greatly indebted to Miss M. O. Morris and her colleagues of the Geological Museum, who came to Colchester specially to examine the material and also took much of it back to their Museum for direct comparison with the specimens there.

Some of the Purbeck slabs have small dowel-holes in the edges which show that they have been attached to upright walls by T-shaped iron
clamps. The more detailed description we leave to Miss Morris, whose report is appended below.

B. OTHER STONES.

**Alabaster.** Great quantities of alabaster were found used in the construction of the smaller drain, and fragments occurred elsewhere. The specimens were damaged building blocks which had been dressed as ashlar, but in every case one side had been more or less damaged, presenting the appearance of having been eaten away by acid. We assume that these had been used in some early building, possibly the Temple of Claudius itself, and had suffered this damage from fire, after which they were used as waste material and built into the drain reversed, so that the best side was exposed. This material is a soft white alabaster with some red veining, but its source cannot be determined, nor can that of the one or two blocks of gypsum which were also found.

**Brown Shale.** Two pieces of brown shale must be mentioned. One about 4\(\frac{1}{2}\) inches square and 1\(\frac{1}{4}\) inch thick, the other shaped like an ordinary Roman building tile, about 17 inches by 12 inches by 2 inches thick. The material resembles Kimmeridge shale.

C. INDIVIDUAL STONES.

(1) A piece of freestone, 13 inches wide by 5 inches high by 10 inches deep, slightly tapered backwards, bearing a deeply-incised pattern on the front. The top is cut in a peculiar manner, and the stone must have come from a decorated façade. The material seems to be the same as that of the next two (Pl. V, A).

(2) A small piece of a projecting cornice (Pl. VI, A).

(3) A fragment of an ornamental string-moulding (Pl. VI, B). These bear very weathered carving and it appears that a restoration became necessary, for both stones bear several dowel-holes cut in them. I can only think that these were to peg a substitute over them, though I must admit that I have never heard of such a remarkable method of effecting a restoration.

(4) A piece of fine limestone, perhaps from Lincolnshire, preserving part of a carving, possibly part of a wreath. This was found in the walling of the smaller drain (Pl. V, B).

(5) Part of a stone bearing a deeply cut hollow-moulding. This also is a very fine limestone and the cutting is exceptionally good (Pl. VII, A).

D. OTHER REMAINS.

(6) Remains of white plaster have already been mentioned. The largest example is about 16 inches long and about 7 inches wide by
RECENT DISCOVERIES.

4 inches thick, and comes from a heavy convex moulding from panelling or the jam of a door. This fragment was also found with others built into the smaller drain and, therefore, comes from the earlier building (Pl. VII, B).

(7) Between the piers on the platform we found fragments of arches, in some cases several voussoirs were still joined together by their mortar. These are carefully made of good red clay. They measure 15 inches or 19 inches long by 10 inches wide and are 2 inches thick at the small end and perhaps twice that at the opposite end.

(8) Among the rubble there were very many fragments of tiles in a segment of a circle—in this case apparently about a 6th of a circle—but none could be found complete so that we cannot give the diameter. Some of these had been chamfered round the edge as if to assist in building bases which would be finished in plaster.

(9) There is one complete building tile, 16 inches by 10½ inches by 2¼ inches, with one end chamfered before firing.

E. THE BUILDING STONE.

The Geological Museum Report shows that the limestone imported for building was more difficult to identify than might have been expected. The ashlar of the piers was of a shelly limestone which has now been identified as from Ham Hill in Somerset. The other limestone is identified as coming from Taynton (?) in Oxfordshire, and a third, of fine grain, has proved impossible to identify. It may have come from abroad but is more likely to be British, and if so its probable source is in the neighbourhood of Lincoln, where there may be an undiscovered Roman quarry. We are very grateful to the staff of the Geological Museum for the great trouble they have taken in working upon these stones.

NOTES ON DECORATIVE AND BUILDING STONES FROM THE TEMPLE SITE, COLCHESTER.¹

By MARGARET O. MORRIS, B.Sc.

Specimens of decorative and building stones from the Kent, Blaxill site at Colchester, collected by Mr. M. R. Hull during recent investigations at the site, have been examined at the Geological Museum.

Their variety is considerable and it is clear that their sources are widespread. In preface to the following notes it must, however, be emphasized that one can rarely be quite certain on geological evidence

¹ Published by permission of the Director, Geological Survey and Museum.
THE SOUTH WING OF THE ROMAN 'FORUM' AT COLCHESTER:

alone, without historical evidence in support, of the exact original source of a stone used in an ancient building.

The specimens can be separated into four groups.

**TRUE MARBLES (Pl. IV).**

These are marbles by geological definition—limestones or dolomites which have been completely metamorphosed and recrystallized.

Identification of the source of these is an essentially empirical process of attempting to match them with localized specimens in museum collections. The principal criteria are colour, texture, and pattern of veining and brecciation. There can, of course, be great variation in the pattern of a brecciated marble from a single bed in a single quarry, and it is particularly difficult to be sure of a good match if the specimens are small.

All the true marbles from the Kent, Blaxill site are certainly foreign.

*Africano Marble.*—There are sixteen specimens of a coarsely brecciated marble, varying considerably in colour and pattern, which after careful examination and comparison we think are all from one source. The marble consists of white, purple and pink fragments in a black or very dark green groundmass. We believe that this is the Africano Marble which was largely used in Ancient Rome. The source of this marble is not definitely known, but it is said to have come from Asia Minor. Our slabs are mostly an inch or more in thickness.

*Rosso Antico.*—There are twelve pieces of an even-textured unpatterned marble of a deep red colour. These appear identical with museum specimens of Rosso Antico quarried in the Cape Matapan peninsula of Greece.

*Pavonazzetto.*—There are nine pieces of a white or pale cream marble, with purple and red veins, which correspond with museum specimens of Pavonazzetto, including one from the Forum Augusteum and others from a villa in Rome. It is recorded that this marble comes from quarries in Phrygia in Asia Minor. Our slabs are thin, rather less than .5 inch thick.

Both Rosso Antico and Pavonazzetto were extensively used in Ancient Rome.

*Giallo Antico.*—A thin slab of yellow marble with some red veins is closely comparable with museum specimens of the marble known as Giallo Antico or Marmor Numidicum, which is also known to have been used in Rome and is recorded as coming from quarries in Algeria and Tunisia.

---

RECENT DISCOVERIES.

Cipollino.—There are some small chips of a white and green banded marble which resemble specimens of Cipollino Marble—Marmor Carystium—from Greek quarries on the Island of Eubœa. The characteristic banded pattern is due to the presence of scales of mica and talc interlaced with the white calcite. Our fragments are .5 inch thick.

Carrara.—Two specimens of a white uniformly crystalline marble precisely match a fragment of statuary in Carrara Marble from the Claudian Aqueduct, Rome.

Other Specimens.—There are also fragments for which we have not been able to suggest a name—a brecciated white and pink marble, and a chip of black marble.

OTHER DECORATIVE STONES.

Green Greek Porphyry.—Among the decorative stones other than marble is a small chip, one inch square, which is a green porphyritic rock. It has a dark green groundmass in which are embedded lighter green felspar crystals. The petrological characteristics of this rock are highly distinctive and there is no reasonable doubt of its source. It is the Green Greek Porphyry obtained from quarries between Sparta and Marathonisi.

Alabaster.—Other stones which may have been used for decorative work on this site include several specimens of weathered alabaster—soft, white and fine-grained with some red veining—the massive variety of the mineral gypsum. There is no geological criterion by which the source of the alabaster can be established; it may be foreign or it may be from a British source.

Tufa.—There is also a specimen of calcareous tufa—soft limestone deposited by spring waters. Again, there is no special characteristic to indicate its source.

PAVING STONES.

There is a great variety of sawn slabs an inch or two thick, which are presumably decorative paving or facing stones. All these specimens are Purbeck Marble. We have no doubt that they come from the Purbeck Beds, near the top of the Upper Jurassic rocks in the Isle of Purbeck.

Purbeck Marble is a fresh-water limestone and consists very largely of myriads of shells of the small gastropod Viviparus. It is not a true marble in the geological sense, but a limestone hard enough to take a polish. The highly distinctive pattern of the polished surface is produced by the fossil shells. Some varieties of Sussex Marble, from the Weald Clay, of Lower Cretaceous age, resemble Purbeck Marble, but there are certain differences in tint and in the contained fossils.
Building Stones.

The fourth group of specimens from the Kent, Blaxill site consists of massive building stones in large quantity. All of them are limestones, but there are at least four different types.

Dr. F. W. Anderson, Mr. R. V. Melville, and other officers of the Geological Survey and Museum, have kindly given much consideration to the nature and likely sources of these stones.

*Kentish Rag.*—One type can be identified with certainty. It is a tough fine-grained dark-grey sandy limestone, which is Kentish Rag, from the Hythe Beds of the Lower Greensand of the Weald.

*Ham Hill Stone.*—There is a great amount of coarse-textured limestone varying in colour from yellow-grey to yellow-brown, and chiefly composed of comminuted shell fragments. It is very like Ham Hill Stone, quarried from strata of Jurassic (Upper Lias age) in Somerset, and Mr. Melville has no doubt that this limestone comes from the Ham Hill neighbourhood.

*Taynton Stone.*—Mr. Melville has also examined chips of a shelly oolitic limestone taken from a column found at Colchester. He judges this to be from the Great Oolite Series of Oxfordshire, and it closely resembles Taynton Stone, which is known to have been worked by the Romans.

*Undetermined.*—Finally, there is a cream-coloured shelly limestone composed of small rolled grains of calcium carbonate and unidentifiable shell debris in a matrix of calcium carbonate. Some of the rolled grains may be recrystallized organic matter. We have not so far been able to suggest a source for this stone. It is probably of Jurassic age. It seems to have been used in Colchester in considerable quantity, and we might therefore expect it to be from Britain and not from a foreign source, but we do not know of any British limestone which matches it closely. It may nevertheless be from this country; the Lincolnshire Limestone has been suggested as a possible source. Alternatively it may have been brought from France.

**Museum Collections**

The museum specimens used for comparison with the specimens from Colchester are in the collections of the Geological Museum. Two collections of stones from Rome, presented by Dr. St. Clair Baddeley and by Miss L. F. N. Preston, have been particularly useful.

I am indebted to Mr. A. W. G. Kingsbury for facilities to examine the Corsi Marbles at the University Museum, Oxford, in order to confirm certain comparisons.

M.O.M.
THE POTTERY.

Pottery was scarce and much of it unstratified owing to the many comparatively recent disturbances on the site, and also the fact that it was not possible to watch closely the recovery of it all. It is, however, noticeable that the Roman sherds found in the later disturbances are practically all of late Roman type. The stratified sherds are nearly all of the same period, and it seems clear that post-Roman activities found practically no pottery but late Roman lying about.

The two earliest sherds are a fragment of base of f.140 and a rim of 266, both from the pug layer (T). The only others are mortaria rims, perhaps late first century.

The remainder presents a late fourth-century group and is illustrated in figs. 4 and 5.

There are many points of resemblance in form with the pottery from the late bath at Cobham (S.A.C., 1, 84, figs. 5, 6, 7, 8), and from the late fourth-century kiln in New Field, Farley Heath (S.A.C., xlviii, 38, fig. 3). There can be no doubt about the late fourth-century date of our group; and the proportion of fine red-coated ware, Castor ware, late mortarium forms, and gritted ware, is typical of the period.¹

In the following description the number in brackets is the number in the field list. The number in the margin is that on the illustration.

The wares are divided into four categories as follows:

1. COLOUR-COATED WARES.

A. Tile-red paste (sometimes partly grey, owing to poor firing) with fine red coating, polished. It was intended to be Samian and, now that Samian glaze is said to be merely a clay slip, it is not really distinguishable from Samian. There are several varieties, indicating more than one place of manufacture. If the red slip is accidentally burnt it becomes black or chocolate in colour, and is then liable to be confused with the commoner and better-known class of colour-coated ware. The transition from the one to the other is only one of degree, and both could well have been made in the same pottery. The link is completed by No. 13, a typical piece of class A with a very fine slip, bearing the white painted scroll of C.

B. A duller red paste, with deeper red, usually matt coating.

¹ S.A.C., Surrey Archaeological Collections.
Fig. 4—Roman Pottery from the Kent, Blaxill site. Scale 1.
C. Colour-coating (usually chocolate to black, but bright red is common and other shades occur) on white, cream, red-brown, and red paste. The white and cream probably come from the Peterborough district (Castor) and/or Swanpool. The others are probably local. The Castor, as usually on late sites, runs to some unusual forms.

1. Rim, diam. 8½ inches, orange-red ware and coating, finely polished, resembling Samian, found in or under rubble over east end of platform (48). The type seems to imitate form Drag. 32.
   Cf. Sandford, Arch. lxx, figs. 1, 5, which has no connection with Walters form 79 and is not c. 190 in date.

2. Rim of bowl form 314, with slight cordon and rouletting on neck, vermillion-red paste with grey core and bright glossy red coating. Black soil under mortar, layer D, fig 3 (21).

3. Rim of similar bowl without cordon and rouletting, hard light red, with bright red coating, or possibly only polished. Diam. 6½ inches. Under rubble in dark soil (46).

   These two are of a well known fourth-century New Forest form, compare Hambleden, Arch., lxvi, figs. 11, 70 and 74, and A.C., lxv, 51, nos. 34 and 35 (with painted decoration) and lxvi, 31, no. 148; also lxviii, 109, 83.


4A. Base of the same, or another vessel, similar clay, grey at core where thick. Polished outside and under base, but burnt nearly black. Black soil (layer D) between pier 4 and wall 4 (34).
   Cf. A.C., lxv, 58, no. 81. Colour-coated, etc., as ours, and deposited in second half of fourth century.

   Worn fragment from ledge of a similar vessel; pale orange-red with thin orange-red slip. Unstratified (41).

5. Rim of bowl like nos. 2 and 3 but neck resembling a double-beading (Cf. Cam. form 48; Plate li). Very fine orange-red clay with similar darker coating. Diam. 6 inches. Black soil, layer D, fig. 3 (26).


7. Rim of bowl, form 316A. Red-buff ware with fine red polished coating; much damaged and diameter uncertain. Layer D by wall 4.

---

1. A.C., Archaeologia Cantiana.
8. Rim of similar bowl, bright red paste, slightly micaceous, with grey core, blood-red colour-coating, mostly flaked off. Diam. 7\(\frac{1}{4}\) inches. Under tail of Norman rampart (39).

Rim of similar form, possibly the same ware, but red all through and slip not so dark. Layer D, fig. 3 (6). Cf. Hambleden, Arch. lxxi, figs. 12, 84 and 85.


10. Rim of bowl form 308, very fine and hard red ware, overfired to grey (nearly stone-ware). Surface red to chocolate, rouletted. Layer D, fig. 3.

11. Rim of large bowl with at least one three-ribbed handle. Paste nearly white, with grey, metallic-chocolate coating, painted scroll in white. Layer D, by wall 4 (38).

12. Similar rim from a smaller and lighter vessel, no handle preserved; same ware, slip, and decoration. Layer D (6).

In 28 years' work on the masses of Roman pottery in Colchester I have not seen anything like these two rims, which seem to be Castor ware. Something similar has occurred several times at Richborough in polished grey ware and in colour-coated ware of local type: e.g. Richborough, I, nos. 128, 129, both attributed to mid-fourth century; and III, nos. 330, 331, dated similarly.

There is a chip in the same ware from a large vessel, and another, also from a large vessel, is decorated with rouletting and white slip, both quite similar. Unstratified.


There are several bases of vessels in fine red ware which merit publication.

14. Fragment of base, fine orange-red ware, with slip like Samian, large and tall, angular foot-ring. Unstratified.

15. Heavy base of bowl of thick dull red ware, with heavy foot-ring of squarish section. Unstratified (36).

16. Fragment of a heavy base, copying form Lud. Sh., with deep double groove inside, one groove rouletted. Foot-ring of large diameter, perhaps about 5\(\frac{1}{2}\) inches. Surface almost resembling a glaze, unstratified.

Fragment of base of another wide bowl, in dull red ware. Of similar outline, but foot-ring rounded in section. Found in rubble (4).

17. Fragment similar to No. 14, same ware, but smaller. Under tail of Norman Rampart (39).
18. Base similar to No. 15, same ware, but smaller. Unstratified. This and 15 are almost certainly from copies of forms Drag. 38 (Form 316).

These bases can be paralleled at Canterbury, A.C., lxiii, 110, 96 and 97.

Of ten other red fragments several come from large closed vessels (olla-shaped or even narrower in the mouth) and lack any colouring on the inside.

Fig. 5—ROMAN POTTERY FROM THE KENT, BLAXILL SITE. Scale 1.

The colour-coated wares of more usual shades are:

a. *Of usual pattern.*

A fragment from a large bulbous beaker with applied overlapping scales (form 396), in bright red ware with chocolate slip, from layer D, fig. 2 (21).

A base of a tall beaker of form 319C, or 407A, with beaded foot and grooved beneath; red buff ware, chocolate coated. Level H (8).

b. *Of unusual pattern.* Besides numbers 11 to 13 there is:

19. part of the neck of a flagon or jug with one or two handles, red ware, chocolate-coated on the outside, possibly spoilt polish. Probably fourth century. Found under rubble with rim No. 40 (44).
2. **WHITE AND BUFF WARES.**

Rims of five mortaria, two of which are early but unstratified:

Thick buff ware, with small white grit, mostly gone, which ran over the rim. The form is 195A and the date should be around A.D. 100.

Whitish-buff, with sparse white grit; flange well above lip, form 496. Date, Trajan-Hadrian.

20. Rim of hard white ware, form 505, with deep groove on lip and slight one on flange. Small coralline grit. Level H (8).

21. Another rim, same form, without grooves; fine hard white ware, with pale-orange core; surface shading to biscuit colour. Grit small, coralline. From below yellow sand, Hole 11, under tail of Norman Rampart (39).

22. Three fragments of one rim, same form, grooved as number 14; fine hard red ware, white coated, with grey core. Part of spout remains. Grit small, coralline. Layer D in fig. 3, Hole 26.

This type of mortarium is well known in the fourth century. Cf. Hambleden, *Arch.,* lxii, figs. 14, 121 and 122; Canterbury, A.C., lxiii, 106, no. 66, and 109, 92; Ibid. lxi, 26, no. 18, "Late 4th to 5th-century", and 33, no. 55. Many other quotations could be given.

The remaining fragments are rather indefinite, a few fragments of buff ware lay on the top of the pug below the level of the lesser drain, but the only recognizable piece was part of a base almost certainly form 140. This might have made the pug date soon after A.D. 50, but, unfortunately, just here it shows a disturbance in Roman times and is mixed with pieces of mortar or plaster. The whole being sealed by the drain and path.

The remaining fragments are of no account, except that it is noteworthy that the cup-mouth flagon, form 156, is represented by only one unstratified fragment.

3. **GREY AND BLACK WARES.**

23. A fine grey fragment, polished outside, is of form 339, with large bosses and groups of small round impressions. Layer D, fig. 2 (26).

24. Rim and shoulder in the same grey ware, but not decorated, from Layer D, at Wall 4 (50).

These two belong to a series which Mr. J. N. L. Myres holds to be late Roman in date and verging on Saxon.

25. There are four rims of form 305 in coarse grey black ware, two with red core. There are no examples of 305B, and what we have are not typical 305A, because
28. the exterior is polished in bands only and not all over, with one exception which is crudely finished.

One rim was under the Norman rampart in Hole 11, one was in the filling of the Norman ditch, and another may have lain in Layer M, but this is not certain. This is a well known fourth-century form and further references are unnecessary.

29. Two rims resembling a deep worn f. 39 (side over 2 inches high), are of good grey-black clay, black polished inside and out. Both were unstratified (41). Another chip is of form 40A, found in rubble (48); another rim is of form 40B (36). Two sherds are from under the Norman Rampart, and a grey base with scored pattern on the inside is from the seventeenth-century pit.

30. A rim of black ware, with a little sparse white grit, is of the so-called Derbyshire type (form 276) from Layer D, fig. 2.


31. A coarse brown rim of unclassified form, unstratified.


The fragments of jars are unimportant; there are fifteen rims, some polished, some not. Most important is a fragment of form 266 which was stratified in the pug under the smaller drain. It should be Claudius-Nero, but could easily have come where it was in Flavian times (52). Of the rest, a large form 272 is recognizable, unstratified. The remainder are too small to identify. The body fragments include no typical form 278 or 279, and no rim can be identified as form 268, which is very remarkable. Two fragments might come from the late form 119 (3, 37), one was in the rubble, one under it, and there is one fragment with a panel of dots (as form 123) (35).

4. GRITTED WARES.

This is a most interesting section, comprising twenty-one fragments, many of which would be pronounced Roman without hesitation, but one has a waved lip which should be Norman and two or three rims so much resemble those found at Rayleigh Castle that one is forced to consider them with some care.

After careful consideration I have come to the conclusion that all these pieces should be regarded as Roman with the possible exception of the last three.

The ware is coarse, mixed with crushed grit (very fine, probably shell), the colour varying from black to yellow-grey, and light brown-red to light brown. One piece, No. 38, alone seems to have an almost glossy wash over the irregular surface.
34. Grey rim with grey to black surface and sparse white grit, unstratified.
35. Small fragment, same ware, diam. c. 6 inches. Under rubble (3).
36. Chip of rim, same ware, diam. about 6 inches, under rubble (46).
37. Rim, clay black to red with much white grit, diam. 4½ inches, under rubble by Wall 4 (47).
38. Larger fragment, similar in clay and shape, found with the preceding, diam. 4½ inches.
39. Similar rim but almost with a lip, similar ware, harder and thicker, diam. about 5½ inches. Under rubble (6).
40. Rough yellow-grey ware, with knobbly surface and almost glossy wash, mottled. Diam. 4 inches. Found in rubble (4).
41. Rim with squarish lip, black clay with white grit, unstratified (11).
43. A large rim like No. 41, with which it was found, red with white grit.
44. Similar rim of hard red clay with white grit. The rim slightly waved or frilled as shown, unstratified, presumably Norman.

With these rims compare the following: A.C., lxiii, 106, 70 (hand-made), and 76 to 80; with references to Richborough I, 57, 2149, 3, 333 to 334, all these are referred to the late fourth century, but the clay is not gritted; see also ibid., no. 94, with reference to Arch., lxxxiv, 257, no. 21, described as very common, after A.D. 379. Similar rims have been found at Chester with examples of our 7, 8, and 9 (Cheshire and North Wales Soc., xxxiv, 32, fig. 7, 1) and compare ibid., xxiii, 55, 10, 8, calcite gritted, with crushed snail shell, references to Segontium 161, 163, fig. 78, 58, and Prestatyn, Arch. Camb., 1938, 181, nos. 2, 6.

With our No. 42 compare Lullingstone in A.C., lxv, 59, 82, which is also hand-made, and Richborough III, pl. xi, 333

The Contents of the Ditch

The bottom of the ditch contained no visibly distinct deposit, and no remains, such as potshterds, were found of an earlier date than thirteenth to fourteenth century. Even these were quite few.

From about midway up in the filling there was a greater amount of pottery and great quantities of food bones. These must antedate Northfolk's houses (1680) and, since the pottery is nearly all dateable to c. 1650 onwards, it seems reasonable to connect this deposit with
the period of the Siege of the Town in 1648, especially when the following analysis of the report on the bones\(^1\) is considered.

The percentages are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the small proportion of horses, the large proportion of cats associates this collection with the Siege, for the besieged were reduced to eating even the vermin, after slaughtering all domestic animals—especially, of course, the horses of the troops, which we know were butchered exactly here, in the Castle Bailey. The small number of horses in this lot of bones is partly made up for by the size of some of the joints, one in particular consisting of about 18 inches length of backbone.

The pottery of this period comprises the usual brown glazed wares, plus Delft, drug-pots, stone-ware and beer-jars, and only two pieces of this late material from the whole excavation call for comment.

Pl. VIII, B 1, is a ball of yellowish clay, about 2½ inches in diameter, with a small hole through the middle. It is cast in a mould, quite solid, with continuous parallel ribbing. Its purpose is quite unknown.

Pl. VIII, B 2, is a very curious, flat, lug-handle in green-glazed ware with an incised human face.

**Summary**

The general nature of the building which extended across the S. side of the insula containing the Temple of Claudius is now to some extent revealed to us. It consisted—so far as we know it (see fig. 1)—of a massive central block set in a long façade erected on a platform 15 feet wide. Any suspicion that there may have stood here a range of buildings of commonplace utility, such as shops or offices is now quite disposed of, and it is natural to suppose that it was purely ornamental.

If that is true, then we have to try to imagine what kind of an architectural embellishment would at once appeal to contemporary taste and suit a plan such as we have before us. One naturally tries to turn to other known plans where a large temple court is separated from a main street by a purely decorative feature. No temple of the Emperor has ever been so far explored as to furnish us with this detail, nor has the writer, with the means to hand, been able to find any really similar lay-out. The Colchester plan, in this respect at least, is grander than

---

\(^1\) We are greatly indebted to Mr. F. C. Fraser, of the Natural History Museum, for a detailed Report on the bones.
those of the Forum of Augst, Paris, and St. Bertrand de Comminges; it has something in common with the temple on the Schönbiuhl at Augst, where the surround of the temple is purely ornamental, but there is no architectural screen—for that is what we have here.

The massive platform was built to carry a series of solid piers which probably averaged about 6 feet wide by 8 feet deep. These were united by brick arches. On the breast of each pier, before, we think, and, certainly, behind, stood a column about 2 feet 6 inches diameter.

The arches were closed by thin, but carefully built, walls, so that the whole became a series of arched recesses or exedrae which would be extremely effective as positions for statuary or reliefs or inscriptions—unfortunately we have not the smallest suggestion of such.

The central block is to be imagined as carrying a monumental gateway opening into the temple court, and the whole south front, facing the street, was carefully decorated with marbles from all over the Roman world.

The north side, as has been remarked, was much less carefully finished. Either it was invisible, even from the inside, or it was frankly utilitarian. It is not easy to imagine either, but one may point to the temple of Artemis at Gerasa as one solitary—though far more elaborate—parallel to our plan. There, there was a row of vaulted chambers, in the same position as our screen, and doubtless presenting to the street a very effective façade, which ours may well have been built to imitate. Further, the vaulted chambers are undoubtedly treasuries, and it may be suggested that each of our exedrae was allotted to one of the British tribes and had a small lock-up behind it. This would provide a utilitarian aspect to the back of the screen—but the idea is pure imagination and without supporting evidence. Indeed, the imagination could provide a number of attractive solutions to the problem of the purpose and appearance of this screen, but in the absence of any evidence of inscriptions or statuary there is insufficient evidence for more than the broad statement that the temple court was divided from the street by a massive columnated arcade, to some extent sheathed with marble, and with a monumental entrance in the middle.

This purely ornamental feature need not have begun before the insurrection of Boudicca in A.D. 61; it was certainly, we think, not finished until after that date. It seems probable that the ruins of the first temple supplied much material fit for it.

Its subsequent history was noteworthy among Roman remains, for it seems at all times to have been kept clean and free from the usual accumulation of pottery, bones, etc., which normally disfigured Roman buildings, even those of public importance. Considering the length of the Roman occupation, in this case from about A.D. 50 to
A.D. 400, the number of levels, or consecutive layers, is small for a place which was, beyond doubt, much frequented, and there is only one major period of repair indicated—apart from the first disaster of A.D. 61, which probably preceded this building.

There is no deposit of black earth and pottery until we reach the one such level which has to cover the whole period from A.D. 400 to A.D. 1066. We conclude that this very important public building was kept clean and in good repair throughout the Roman occupation, and even after the adoption of Christianity had seen the end of Emperor worship. It is even possible that in Colchester the Christians took over the Temple. But our present inability to date fourth-century pottery more accurately precludes any attempt to date the actual abandonment of the site.

(The thanks of the Society are due to The Council for British Archaeology for a grant of £35 towards the cost of printing Mr. Hull's paper.)
THE SAXON BURIALS
AT GERPIN S FARM, RAINHAM

By JOHN G. O'LEARY,
Librarian, Borough of Dagenham.

GERPIN S Farm lies in Gerpins Lane, Rainham (Ordnance Survey National Grid 51/5583). Some time before 1937 gravel winning was commenced on part of the farmlands. In the year mentioned, the gravel diggers (the process being carried out by large mechanical grabs) noticed objects strange to them among the gravel. Some local gossip concerning these things reached the ears of Mr. G. Carter, a local resident, who had also worked for many years in the neighbourhood, and at this time was a Public Health official with the Borough of Dagenham. He bought the objects from the men in question as they found them and eventually he got together the collection listed below. He wrote to Mr., now Sir Thomas Kendrick, F.S.A., at the British Museum, who immediately came to Romford and took the collection back to the British Museum, where it was examined and displayed.

It was Mr. Carter's wish that it should form part of the newly-formed Museum devoted to Dagenham antiquities and local history. As the site of the discovery was adjacent to the Borough, the collection was accepted for permanent preservation on its return from the British Museum. At the outbreak of war, it was packed away, and in 1945 was again brought out and displayed. No further particular attention was paid to this collection until the organisers of the Festival of Britain South Bank Exhibition made enquiries as to the whereabouts of a singular piece of Saxon glass, reported to be part of the find. This was a drinking-horn, made of glass, described in the Archaeological News Letter, dated July, 1950 (Vol. 3, No. 2), by Dr. D. B. Harden, F.S.A. This horn, practically complete, had been mounted and repaired at the cost of the Borough of Dagenham, and it was lent to the Festival Exhibition. Two other portions of an incomplete horn had been presented by the finder to Mr. J. Herington, now lecturer in Classical Archaeology at the University of Manchester. Mr. R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford, F.S.A., Keeper of the department of English and Medieval Antiquities, asked to see the collection and consequently the British Museum applied for the loan of the glass horn for exhibition. It was now generally realized that this piece of Saxon glass was of some rarity.
By courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum.

Glass Vessels of the Saxons found in England.

The Rainham drinking-horn shown in centre.
The Borough of Dagenham decided not to lend the glass horn to the British Museum, but to present it for permanent preservation in the collection of Saxon Glass there, and Mr. Herington also presented his two fragments. These can now be seen to-day in the North Gallery (Pl. I). The remainder of the collection is in the Dagenham Museum at Valence House, Dagenham, with one exception, namely a coin- pendant or bracteate. This was a gold coin of Mauritius Tiberius, A.D. 582-602, made into a pendant with twisted gold wire. I have never seen this object. It went to the British Museum with the original material and a cast was made of it there and it was photographed (Pl. II, 1). I was personally handed the collection by Sir Thomas Kendrick (all properly packed) at the Museum and brought it back to the Dagenham Museum for display in new cases provided by the Borough Council. No inventory or catalogue, or list of objects, was given to me, and consequently the existence of the gold bracteate was completely unknown. Mr. Bruce-Mitford raised the question of this gold bracteate, which he was very anxious to examine. He knew of it from the casting and photographs made in 1937-8. The original wrappings used for packing the collection were still in existence and were thoroughly searched but without success, and this bracteate is missing.

The interest aroused in this find prompted me to have an expert description made; all this would probably have happened long before had not the war intervened. I approached Mr. Bruce-Mitford, whose work at Sutton Hoo had won wide attention, but he felt unable to spare the time to deal with the matter, and suggested the name of Miss Vera Evison, a lecturer at Birkbeck College. The descriptions of the Saxon objects printed below are hers. A complete and fully illustrated account of the Gerpins Farm burials will appear in the forthcoming volume of *Archeologia*.

The importance of the burials may be summed up under two headings: —

(1) Evidence of Saxon life on the north bank of the Thames which has so far been sparse and is matched only with the Prittlewell burial.

(2) The singular contribution made by this find to the known examples of Saxon glass.

**SAXON OBJECTS FOUND AT GERPINS FARM, RAINHAM.**

Coin- pendant or bracteate (diam. 2.3 cm.): a gold coin of Mauritius Tiberius (582-602), set in a double row of coarsely-beaded gold wire. The suspension loop is apparently composed of five rows of braided wires, or an imitation of such filigree work, a decoration
commonly used on seventh-century jewellery, although its use on the loop of coin-pendants is less usual. (The description is taken from the cast and photographs in the British Museum.)

Bronze-gilt square-headed brooch, 3.5 inches long. There is a zoomorphic border to the top and sides of the head, and a pair of descending animals occupy the central field on each side of a small square. The bow is convex with a descending animal in each panel, and a circle-and-dot centre stud. The foot is undivided, with lozenge-shapes in the centre and downward-biting animal heads above; there is a small mask at each side terminal, one immediately below the bow, and a large and unusually realistic one, complete with ears, at the foot. The damaged ends of both side arms and of the foot are wide and flat and decorated with a repeated punch of two V's, one inside the other. At the sides of the foot, just below the side terminals, there appear to be a pair of descending animals, but details are obscured by damage to the brooch (Pl. II, 2).

Bronze square-headed small-long brooch, 2.5 inches long. The sides of the head curve inwards and narrow towards the bow. Traces of three parallel scored lines outline the head. Immediately below the bow are triangular lappets merging into a circular shape and triangular finial. Two lines are scored across the end of the foot (Pl. II, 3).

Bronze square-headed small-long brooch, with lozenge-shaped foot, 2.2 inches long. A scored double line borders the head, which has a circle-and-dot motif at each corner and centre. Similar circles are irregularly spaced on the foot, which is scored by horizontal lines about half-way down and again towards the terminal. The surface reveals traces of tinning (Pl. II, 4).

Bronze girdle-hanger, 5.2 inches long. The shaft ends in a broken suspension-ring, and a horse’s head. The shape of the nostrils is not clear, but the eyes are prominent knobs, and below these are four scored transverse lines. The shaft is slightly hollowed behind the horse’s head, but the rest of the hanger consists of a T-shaped flat band, the ends of which continue upwards parallel to the shaft and end in birds' heads with curling beaks. Circular impressions are irregularly stamped along the edges of the shaft and arms (Pl. III, 5).

Bronze finger-ring. The hoop is a flat band widening towards a circular hollowed bezel, about 3 mm. deep (Pl. III, 1).

Bronze coin, perforated for suspension and worn smooth both sides (Pl. III, 4).

Bronze disc, .8 inch diameter, with a hole in the centre surrounded by a slightly raised rib. There is a second circular rib between this and the outside edge. At one point the edge projects slightly and is
PLATE II.

Fig. 1.—COIN-PENDANT, MAURITIUS TIBERIUS, A.D. 582-602.

SAXON BROOCHES.
GERPINS FARM, RAINHAM.

Photos, by British Museum.
SAXON BRONZE GIRDLE-HANGER, RINGS, ETC., AND GLASS BEADS.
GERPINS FARM, RAINHAM.
folded over to the back. At the opposite edge on the back is a tiny square projection. It seems likely that these are the remains of a hinge and catch, and that this is the lid of a Roman seal-box (Pl. III, 3).

Bronze ring, 3.6 inches in diameter. Round in section. May possibly be an arm-ring (Pl. III, 6).

Bronze ring, 1.3 inch in diameter. Roughly round in section, worn thin in places (Pl. III, 7).

Bronze ring, 1.5 inch in diameter. Rather flatter than the one last listed and irregularly worn (Pl. III, 8).

Bronze ring, 1 inch in diameter. Round in section (Pl. III, 2).

Bronze-bound wooden vessel, 3.7 inches high. Made of vertical pieces of wood held together by three horizontal bronze hoops, each .7 inch wide, at top, bottom, and centre. The lower edge of the top band is decorated with a row of impressed dots. Three vertical bands, slightly thicker, with toothed edges and borders of punched dots, are pierced by a rivet with a circular washer at the points where they cross the hoops, and are folded over the top of the vessel to be fastened inside by the top rivet. These vertical bands were no doubt originally equidistant from each other. There is no trace of a handle. The wood is .2 inch wide at the base and narrows to a sharp edge at the top. A narrow bronze tubular rim ran over the top hoop, but underneath the vertical bands. At one point a short bronze band is rivetted over the edge, probably as a mend to the tubular rim. Just below the top rivet each vertical band is pierced by a bronze staple, from the loop of which swings a bronze spangle, decorated with punched dots.

Bronze-bound wooden vessel, 3.8 inches high. Similar to above, but none of the hoops has survived, although marks of them are preserved on the wood. The hoop, .3 inch from the base, was .65 inch wide, the centre one .7 inch wide, and that at the top .9 inch wide. The two vertical bands are .4 inch wide, thin, and lightly fastened to the wood by looped staples; one finishes with a rounded end .4 inch above the rim of the wood and a short bronze band inside is rivetted to it. Sandwiched in between them are the remains of another bronze band, no doubt the end of a handle. Inside, and .3 inch from the bottom, is a groove in the wood to receive the base.

Bronze-bound wooden vessel, 4.4 inches high. Similar to above, but has traces of four bronze hoops, the widest, 1.2 inch wide, being at the top. Four vertical bands, two of which still lap over the top, are fastened with four or five looped staples. There is no trace of a handle, but there are traces of a tubular rim.
A number of iron sword fragments in two widths, about 2 inches and about 1.7 inch; the fragments together total about 73 inches in length and include one tip and one hilt. These pieces must have constituted at least two swords and possibly more. Remains of a wooden scabbard are evident on most pieces. Radiographs made of three of the pieces revealed pattern-welding in each case.

Iron spearhead, 14.3 inches long, leaf-shaped blade with a split socket.

Iron spearhead, 9 inches long. An angular blade with a split socket and the tip missing.

Iron spearhead, fragment 5.8 inches long, with a split socket 2.5 inches long.

Iron shield-boss. Wide flange, incurved waist, straight-sided dome ending in a wide, flat button. Diameter about 7 inches, height 3.5 inches.


Iron shield-boss. Flange damaged. Upright waist with ridge at carination, slightly convex dome, with stud. Diameter about 7 inches, height 3.2 inches.


Iron shield-boss. Flange damaged, knob missing, vertical waist, dome slightly concave.

Iron shield-boss. Fragments; sloping waist, straight-sided dome, button.

Iron spike. 3.5 inches long, circular in section, pointed at both ends. Possibly used to push the woven threads closer together when weaving.

Glass drinking-horn. Put together from broken pieces by British Museum craftsmen. The outside contour measured about 18.5 inches. The diameter at the mouth is 2.8 inches. The glass is 3 mm. thick at the mouth and solid for about two-and-a-half inches from the point. The glass is olive green and bubbly. The body is slightly twisted, and the rim is roughly chipped. It is decorated with self-coloured trails; there is a thick snickered band 1 inch below the rim, and 1 inch below this is a thick trail pulled down into the shape of arcades. Thick vertical trails run from the point of each arcade to the tip of the horn, where they are flush with the surface (Pl. IV).

Glass drinking-horn. Fragments only. Similar to above. Diameter at the mouth is 3.15 inches.
Glass bead, 1.6 inch in diameter and in the shape of a truncated cone. Of very dark brown or black glass decorated with creamy-coloured marvered threads forming a five-petalled flower in a circle, and with a zig-zag line round the outer edge (Pl. III, 11).

Glass bead, of a maximum diameter of 1.1 inch. An irregular and flattened disc with rounded edges, and of dark blue glass decorated with an off-white, unmarvered, zig-zag thread within a circle of white thread (Pl. III, 10).

Fragments of a Frankish wheel-made bi-conical bowl (restored). 3.5 inches high, 3.8 inches diameter at mouth. Of hard, light-grey ware, it has a slightly everted rim, and a ridge just below the neck. The base shows marks of severance from the wheel. There are two rows of faint, irregular, chevron-patterned rouletting on the shoulder.

Cooking pot with flat base and almost parallel sides. 4 inches high, 3.9 inches diameter at mouth. Very roughly hand-made, coarse, badly fired clay, discoloured by fire.

Globular pot with an almost vertical neck, slightly everted, base slightly flattened, 5.1 inches high, 3.6 inches diameter at mouth. Hand-made of reddish ware, discoloured by fire. It is pitted by marks of grass or other plants used in mixing and shows some traces of burnishing. It is decorated completely by rows of dots, probably made by the teeth of a comb; there are four parallel, horizontal rows round the neck, a zone of diagonal parallel lines on the shoulder, and three parallel and horizontal lines below.

Bowl. 4.5 inches high, 4 inches diameter at mouth. Rounded, but with sharply carinated shoulder, slightly everted rim and flattened base. It is hand-made of grey ware with a black burnish. The base has been discoloured by fire and there is no decoration.

(The thanks of the Society are due to the Borough of Dagenham for defraying the cost of the blocks illustrating this paper.)
PART OF THE KALENDAR
OF A XIIITH-CENTURY SERVICE BOOK
ONCE IN THE CHURCH OF WRITTLE.


The Dean and Chapter of Liverpool have recently acquired, through the generosity of Sir Frederick Radcliffe, two leaves from the Kalendar of an early thirteenth-century service book which at one time belonged to the church of Writtle, about four miles west of Chelmsford, then, and until modern times, in the diocese of London. Although only containing the four months of May, June, July, and August, these two leaves are of exceptional interest, as they represent one of only three surviving books of the liturgical use of St. Paul's, London. In 1414, Richard Clifford, bishop of London, with the consent of the Dean and Chapter, ordered the substitution for the old use of St. Paul's of the increasingly general English use of Sarum. With the exception of two psalters in the library of St. Paul's Cathedral, other service books which have survived from the pre-Reformation diocese of London are later than 1414 and therefore of the use of Sarum. We now have four pages from the Kalendar of a third book of the older use.

In the following pages an attempt will be made to describe and analyse the contents of these leaves, here presented in printed form, and also to compare them with the Kalendars of the other two St. Paul's Service books, which are here printed for the first time. In addition to these there is a Kalendar in a book of Statutes printed by the Camden Society.

The two leaves are of vellum, measuring about 12 3/4 inches by 9 inches. They have been cut down at the top and also to an extent at the sides. The ruled area is about 9 and 1/8th inches by 7 inches. The writing is of the usual English type used about 1200 or a little later. The initials KL are decorated with a little rough acanthus foliage. The feasts of first dignity are in blue and red, and have been filled in at a rather later date.

A second series of entries, with a feast-grading which applies to all the original entries also, was added early in the fourteenth century;

---

1 The text of the mandate, edited by the late Dr. Sparrow Simpson, is printed in Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London, vol. xiv, p. 118.

a few more names were added at the very end of the fourteenth century, while some time in the fifteenth century a rough attempt was made to adapt the Kalendar to the use of Sarum by adding certain feasts and crossing out others.

In 1348, or soon after, an obit was added which proves the connection of the book with Writtle. It is on 20th May and reads:

Obitus fratris Iacobi de ciuitate sancti angeli custodis ecclesie omnium sanctorum de writtle Anno domini millesimo. cc0e x0l viii o cuis anime propicietur deus.

Now the constitutional position of the church of Writtle was very unusual. According to Tanner's Notitia Monastica it is said to have been given by King Stephen to the Cluniac monastery of Bermondsey and subsequently transferred by King John to the Hospital of St. Mary in Saxia at Rome, otherwise called the Hospital of the Holy Spirit for English people. An ecclesiastic called a custos, or in one document a prior, appears to have been sent from this Roman house to administer affairs at Writtle, and no doubt to collect the revenues and send them to Rome. Brother James of the city of Saint Angel must have been one of them; the designation de ciuitate sancti angeli appears to indicate that he came from the city of Saint Angelo de Lombardi in Campania, not far from Naples.

The connection of the church with this Roman Hospital must have ceased before the end of the fourteenth century, as Richard II gave it to the Warden and Scholars of Winchester (i.e. New) College, Oxford, in 1391.

We will now try to analyse the Kalendar itself. Generally speaking we may class it with the calendars of the earlier or non-Sarum type, such as were in use in England before the introduction of the Sarum rite. Of the subsequent additions, the first set are chiefly non-Sarum names, while the later ones appear to be part of an adaptation to Sarum use after its introduction in London in 1414.

For convenience we will take the normal Sarum kalendar as the groundwork and will examine the entries which form no part of it, and first those in the original hand. These are:

20 May St. Aelbert or Ethelbert, king and martyr
3 June St. Osida, virgin
8 July St. Grimbald, bishop

H1
29 July St. Olave, king and martyr
31 " St. Neot, abbot
6 August Transfiguration of our Lord
20 " St. Philibert, confessor
25 " St. Genesius, martyr

St. Aelbert is St. Ethelbert, regarded as the original founder of St. Paul's Cathedral, d. 793. St. Osida is the same as St. Osyth, 7 October. St. Erasmus has no special local connection but is common in non-Sarum English calendars and St. Quirinus is not common, but St. Leufrid is frequently found, so also St. Grimbold. St. Silas occurs at Barking but is not common. St. Olave is found at Exeter and Aberdeen, St. Neot at Exeter and Croyland.

The Transfiguration, 6 August, one of the principal feasts of our Lord in the Orthodox Eastern Church, was not generally observed in the West until after 1457 when Pope Calixtus III ordered its observance in thanksgiving for the victory over the Turks at Belgrade, and it did not find its way into the Sarum rite until about 1480. But it was observed earlier in some places, e.g., at Exeter Cathedral and among the nuns of Barking.

St. Philibert, 20 August, was an abbot of Jumiéges, and not a martyr.

We now come to the saints added early in the fourteenth century:

27 May St. Petroc, confessor
7 July St. Marcial, disciple of Christ
13 " St. Middrithe, virgin
15 " St. Eadgythe, virgin
31 " St. Paulinus
" St. Aidan, bishop

St. Petroc is the great Welsh missionary to Cornwall; his name is found not only in West country calendars, such as Winchester, Evesham, Sherborne, Wells, and Exeter, but in parts of England as far away as Reading, Bury St. Edmunds, and York. His usual date is 4 June. St. Edith is usually on 16 September.

The late fourteenth-century additions are:

17 June St. Botolph
26 July St. Anne
18 August St. Helen

The scribe of this second series of additions has added the feast-grading with some care on the right side of each page. This is
remarkable, as it follows the unusual classification of *prime, secunde, tercie dignitatis, novem leccionum, trium leccionum, (cum) pronunciacione evangelii* and *commemoratio*. This corresponds, with but slight difference of nomenclature, to the classification in the Statutes collected by Ralph Baldock, Dean of St. Paul's, 1294-1305, for St. Paul's, London. The only difference is that the statutes speak of *quarte et quinque dignitatis* for *novem et trium leccionum*.

The present writer cannot recall any other instance of this form of classification. Its adoption here seems to amount to proof that the use of St. Paul's, London, was followed in parish churches in the diocese.

The following are summarised from the thirteenth-century *Statutes of St. Paul's Cathedral*, book i; Statutes of Baldock and Lisieux, par. iii, cap. 46.

*Prime dignitatis.*

Christmas, SS. Stephen, John, Innocents, St. Thomas of Canterbury, Circumcision, Epiphany, Conversion of St. Paul, Purification, Annunciation, Easter and three days following, St. Erkenwald, St. Ethelbert, Ascension, Pentecost and three days following, Trinity, St. John Baptist, SS. Peter and Paul, commemoration of St. Paul, feast of relics, St. Laurence, Assumption and Nativity of B.V.M., Dedication, All Saints, Translation of St. Erkenwald.

*Feasts of Second Dignity.*

'Sunt et alie festivitates secunde dignitatis inferius notate, que apud nos simpliciter duplices dicuntur'—SS. Michael, Jerome, Osyth, Martin, Katharine, Andrew, Nicholas, Vincent, Gregory, Ambrose, *Octava Pasche*, SS. Mellitus, Philip and James, Invention of Holy Cross, St. Mary Magdalen, St. Peter's Chains, St. Augustine, Translation of St. Thomas of Canterbury.

*Feasts of Third Dignity.*

SS. James, Oswald, Octaves of St. Erkenwald, of SS. Peter and Paul, of St. Laurence, of the Assumption, Exaltation of Holy Cross, Octave of Nativity of B.V.M.

*Feasts of Fourth Dignity.*

'que simplices dies dominicos . . . imitantur' having nine lessons.

*Feasts of Fifth Dignity.*

'Preter has . . . sunt et alie quinti ordinis et ultimi que videlicet tres tantum habent lecciones . . . in his non negligenda diversitas est.'

---

Nam cum de Sanctis non nisi iij lecciones leguntur, tune vel pronunciatur evangelium, et illius expositione omnes ille tres lecciones fiunt, vel saltem prima de expositione evangelii, et due relique de vita ipsorum: vel non pronunciatur evangelium et leqitur tantummodo de vita ipsorum'.

From this it would seem that the term 'double feast' was used rather loosely at St. Paul's for feasts of first and second dignity, that fourth dignity was equivalent to a feast of nine lessons elsewhere, and that feasts of fifth dignity were feasts of three lessons and were divided into those on which the gospel was read at mattins with or without lessons of the saints, and those on which the gospel was not read but only the lessons of the saints.

Later in prescribing for the ringing of bells the phrases iij leccionum sine pronunciaione Evangelii and iij leccionum cum pronunciaione Evangelii are used as a distinction exactly as in this kalendar.

The last series of entries in the kalendar dates from some time in the fifteenth century after the introduction of the Sarum books into the diocese of London, and represents a rather rough and ready adaptation to the use of that illustrious church of the months of May and June.

The scribe has written non Sarum against St. John of Beverley (7 May) and the Translations of St. Andrew and St. Nicholas (9 May); he has drawn a line through St. Ethelbert (20 May) and St. Urban (25 May); he has written non Sarum against St. Petroc (27 May), drawn a line through SS. Osyth and Erasmus (3 June), adding vacat and Nichomediae martyris. He puts non Sarum after St. Quirinus (4 June). On 9 June he adds Translatio Sancti eodmundi confessoris, and he adds non Sarum to St. Botolph on 17 June and St. Leufrid on 21 June. He has done nothing towards adapting July or August to Sarum use save to write vacat against St. Neot (31 July); there are several non-Sarum feasts he has not indicated in any way and he has not added St. Edward the Martyr on 20 June, nor the Translation of St. Swithun on 15 July. He has indicated by the letters 'b' and 'co' over SS. Primus and Felician on 9June, and 'a' over Translation of St. Edmund, that the latter takes precedence with only a commemoration of the former. On the 16th SS. Circius and Julitta and the Translation of St. Richard are similarly treated.

THE KALENDAR OF ST. PAUL'S, LONDON.

The Writtle fragment we have described only includes four months. For comparison with the other three extant St. Paul's kalendar, a

---

1 This is apparently the interpretation of 'co' though one would expect the Sarum word memoria.
transcript follows of the whole year as given in the kalendar of a
thirteenth-century psalter, MS. 40 B, in the library of St. Paul's
Cathedral, with which have been collated the kalanders in the
Greater Statutes and in a smaller and later psalter, MS. 38 c. 19.

Entries not in MS. 40 B, but in the Statuta Majora, are marked †,
those in MS. 38 c. 19 are marked ‡. Entries not in the Statutes
kalendar are enclosed in square brackets, those not in the smaller
psalter in round brackets.

Some contractions, e.g., Sci., have not been extended, for the
sake of space. As † has been used for certain additions § has been
used to indicate erroneous spellings retained. The feast-grading has
been retained as contracted.

The later psalter appears to be a fourteenth-century book probably
written for some individual, and it gives the impression of being more
for use in private than in choir. Moreover, it found its way to the
continent, for there is added in a very late hand 'Ad usum monasterij
S. Petri de Principiano'. The Kalendar contains a number of entries
in a late hand, which were probably added abroad and are unconnected
with St. Paul's. The value of this book as representing the use of
St. Paul's does not seem to be very high.

When we come to analyse the St. Paul's Kalendar as exhibited
in the text here given, which is that of the thirteenth-century psalter
collated with the one in the Statutes and with that in the not very
satisfactory fourteenth-century psalter, we arrive at the same general
conclusions that result from an examination of the four months in
the Writtle fragment. There is a general likeness to the pre-Sarum
kalanders and there are the special London festivals of St. Mellitus,
24 April,¹ and St. Erkenwald, 30 April,² and 7 May.³ The feast
on 30 April is the Despositio: what is this feast on 7 May? The Translation is on 14 November.⁴ Strange to say none of these
feasts of St. Erkenwald are in 40 B save 30 April in a later hand.
The London feast of St. Ethelbert on 20 May is in 40 B, but not in
the others. Yet two feasts of St. Erkenwald and that of St. Ethelbert
are prime dignitatis in the Statutes, where SS. Osyth and Mellitus
are secunde dignitatis.

There are a number of saints who seem to have had no special
reason for inclusion, but who occur in one or other of the older
English Kalanders. Some had a widespread cultus, e.g., St. Milburga,
23 February, or St. Felix 'in Britannia', 8 March, i.e., St. Felix
of East Anglia.

Others seem to have had little local connection. St. Gregory on

¹ In Statutes not in 40 B.
² Later addition in 40 B but original in Statutes.
9 March is probably St. Gregory Nazianzen kept in Milan on this day. The ordination of St. Gregory the Pope, 31 March, is more usually on the 3 September. St. Pancras on 3 April is not the boy martyr but a Sicilian bishop. St. Eufemia on 13 April seems to be an obscure Euphemia of Chalcedon who was really the same as Euphemia the Great. St. Marcellus, Pope, 26 April, is usually on 16 January.

The feast of St. Edburga, patroness of Winchester, on 18 July, is her Translation.

St. Edith seems to have been transferred from 16 to 17 September in MS. 38c to make room for St. Euphemia.

St. Byrnstan, 4 November, was a bishop of Winchester.

Of the additions made in MS. 38 after being taken to Italy we note SS. Thomas Aquinas, 7 March; Honofrius, 11 June; St. Anthony of Padua, 13 June; St. Venecius, 16 June; St. Margarita, 5 July, the Ambrosian date; St. Jacobus de Voragine, bishop of Genoa, d. 1298, 6 July; St. Brigid, 24 July (Translation of St. B. of Sweden); St. Bernard, 20 August; St. Hermes, 28 August; St. Romulus, bishop of Genoa, 13 October; St. Raphael the Archangel, 30 December—a festival apparently very rare. Although included here these festivals have nothing to do with St. Paul's.

For the fragmentary Kalendar from the Writtle service book, and the Kalendars of two St. Paul's service books, see the next and following pages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iij' dig.</td>
<td>[iij] le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 Scor' Marcellini et Petri martirum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 Sco' &quot;Oside&quot; et Sci Heraemi epi et mr&quot; &quot;Nichomedis mr' iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 Sci Quirini episcopi et martiris non sar' [p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 Sci Bonefacii episcopi et martiris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–7</td>
<td>6–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 Sco' confessorum Medardi et Gildardi p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Sb'cor' Primi &quot;e&quot; et Feliciani &quot;Tra' nslacio Sci eodemundi conf'd' p'n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11 Sci Barnabe apostoli iij' dig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12 Scor' Basilidis, Cirini. et Naboris, iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14 Sci Basilij episcopi iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 Scor' Uiti et Modesti martirum iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 Sb'cor' Cirici et Iulitte &quot;matris et 'Tra' nslacio Sci Ricardi' p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17 &quot;Sci Botulfi abbatis' non sar&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18 Scor' Marci et Marcelliani martiris ix le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19 Scor' Gerusaj et Protasij martiris ix le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 [iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21 Sci Leufridi abbatis 'non sar'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22 Sci Albani martiris ix le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23 Sco Edeaudrita virginis Vigilia p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24 Natuitas Sci Johannis Baptistae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25 [i'] dig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26 Scor' Johannis et Pauli martiris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28 Sci Leonis pape Vigilia p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29 Apostolorum Petri et Pauli j' dig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30 Commemoracio sci Pauli j' dig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>KL</strong></th>
<th><strong>KL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ing. see crucis iij' dig.</td>
<td>Iunij. Sci Nicomedis martiris iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[iij] le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 Scor' Marcellini et Petri martirum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 Sco' &quot;Oside&quot; et Sci Heraemi epi et mr&quot; &quot;Nichomedis mr' iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 Sci Quirini episcopi et martiris non sar' [p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 Sci Bonefacii episcopi et martiris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8 Sco' confessorum Medardi et Gildardi p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9 Sb'cor' Primi &quot;e&quot; et Feliciani &quot;Tra' nslacio Sci eodemundi conf'd' p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11 Sci Barnabe apostoli iij' dig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12 Scor' Basilidis, Cirini. et Naboris, iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14 Sci Basilij episcopi iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15 Scor' Uiti et Modesti martirum iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16 Sb'cor' Cirici et Iulitte &quot;matris et 'Tra' nslacio Sci Ricardi' p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17 &quot;Sci Botulfi abbatis' non sar&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18 Scor' Marci et Marcelliani martiris ix le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19 Scor' Gerusaj et Protasij martiris ix le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>20 [iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>21 Sci Leufridi abbatis 'non sar'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>22 Sci Albani martiris ix le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23 Sco Edeaudrita virginis Vigilia p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24 Natuitas Sci Johannis Baptistae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25 [i'] dig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26 Scor' Johannis et Pauli martiris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28 Sci Leonis pape Vigilia p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29 Apostolorum Petri et Pauli j' dig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>30 Commemoracio sci Pauli j' dig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>KL</strong></th>
<th><strong>KL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ing. see crucis iij' dig.</td>
<td>Iunij. Sci Nicomedis martiris iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[iij] le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 Scor' Marcellini et Petri martirum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 Sco' &quot;Oside&quot; et Sci Heraemi epi et mr&quot; &quot;Nichomedis mr' iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 Sci Quirini episcopi et martiris non sar' [p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 Sci Bonefacii episcopi et martiris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8 Sco' confessorum Medardi et Gildardi p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9 Sb'cor' Primi &quot;e&quot; et Feliciani &quot;Tra' nslacio Sci eodemundi conf'd' p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11 Sci Barnabe apostoli iij' dig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12 Scor' Basilidis, Cirini. et Naboris, iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14 Sci Basilij episcopi iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15 Scor' Uiti et Modesti martirum iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16 Sb'cor' Cirici et Iulitte &quot;matris et 'Tra' nslacio Sci Ricardi' p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17 &quot;Sci Botulfi abbatis' non sar&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18 Scor' Marci et Marcelliani martiris ix le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19 Scor' Gerusaj et Protasij martiris ix le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>20 [iij le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>21 Sci Leufridi abbatis 'non sar'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>22 Sci Albani martiris ix le'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23 Sco Edeaudrita virginis Vigilia p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24 Natuitas Sci Johannis Baptistae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25 [i'] dig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26 Scor' Johannis et Pauli martiris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28 Sci Leonis pape Vigilia p'n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29 Apostolorum Petri et Pauli j' dig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>30 Commemoracio sci Pauli j' dig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KL Julij. Oct' sci Iohannis Baptist 
tiste p'n.
2 Sc'i Swxthunijs epi et maris. 
Processi et Martiniani co.
3
4 Translatio sci Martini p'n.
5
6 Oct' Apostolorum iij* dig.
7 'Sci Marcialis discipuli christi'. 
Translatio sci thome martiris 
j* dig.
8 Sci Grimbaldi episcopi iij le'.
9
10 Septem fratrum§ p'n.
11 Translatio sci Benedicti p'n.
12
13 Silee apostoli 'et see middrithe 
virginis' pro'n.2
14
15 'See Eadgythe virginis' 
16
17 Sci Kenelmi martiris p'n.
18 Sci Arnulfi episcopi et martiris 
iiij le'.
19
20 See Margarete uirginis ix le'.
21 See Praxedis uirginis iiij le'.
22 See Marie Magdalene iiij dig.
23 Sci Appollinaris martiris iiij le'.
24 See Cristine uirginis Vigilia 
iiij le'.
25 Sci Iacobi apostoli iiij* dig.
26 'Mte Anne matris mariea ix le'.
27 Septem Dormientium iiij le'.
28 Pantaleonis. Samsonis. Nazari et 
Celsi iiij le'.
29 Felicis Simplicij, Faustini. et 
Beatricis. et Olanj iiij le'.
30 Scor' Abdon et Sennen martirum 
iiij le'.
31 Sci Germani episcopi et 
ambaties est4

ij* dig.
2 Sci Stephani pape et martiris 
p'n.
3 Inuentio corporis sci stephani 
ix le'.
4
5 Sci Osuualdi regis et martiris 
ij dig.
6 Sixti epi. felicissimi. et Agapiti. 
et t'nsiguratio dni 'iiij le'.
7 Sci Donati episcopi et martiris 
iiij le'.
8 Sci Siriaci martiris p'n.
9 Sci Romani martiris Vigilia 
10 Sci Laurencii martiris iiij* dig.
11 Sci Tiburciij martiris co.
12
13 Sci Ypoliti sociorumque eius p'n. 
Sci Eusebij Vigilia
14 Assumpctio see marie  
iiij* dig.
15
16
17 Oct'. sci Laurentij martiris 
iiij* dig.
18 Sb'ci Agapiti martiris 'See 
Helene regine' ix le'.
19 Sci Magni martiris co.
20 Sci Philiiberti martiris co.
21
22 Oct'. See Marie, et Timothei. et 
Simphorianii iiij* dig.
23 [Sci] Appollinaris martiris Vigilia 
24 Sci Bartholomei apostoli iiij* dig.
25 Sci Genesij martiris iiij le'.
26
27 Sci Rufi martiris iiij le'.
28 Sci Augustini doctoris iiij* dig.
29 Decollatio Iohannis baptiste 
30 Scorum Felicis et Audacti iiij le' 
31 'Sci Paulini. aidani episcopi'

1,3 added early 14th c.
2,3 added late 14th c.
4 added 15th c.
### KALENDARS OF TWO ST. PAUL'S SERVICE BOOKS.

#### KL January.
1. Circumcision domini
2. Oct. S. Stephani prothomartiris
e [Genoufe v.]
4. Oct. S. corun Innocentum
5. [S. Simonis monachi] + S. Thome
6. Epiphania domini
7.
8.
9. [Tr. Iudoci C.]
10. [S. Pauli primi heremto.]
11.
12.
14. S. Felicis in pincis,
15. S. Mauri abbatis,
16. S. Marcelli pape,
17. S. Antonii abbatis,
18. S. Prisce
20. S. corum Fabiani et Sebastiani martirum
21. S. Agnetis virginis
22. S. Uscenti\'\'i martiris
23. S. Emericiane virginis
24. [S. Babille episcopi]
25. Conversio S. Pauli \et S. Priscet, martiris
26. [S. Policapi episcopi]
27. S. Iuliani episcopi et confessoris
28. S. Agnetis secundo
29.
30. [S. Baltildis regine]
31.

#### KL March.
1. [S.corum Albini Davidi confessoris]
2. + Donati martiris
3. [Cedde]
4. [S. Cedde] + Albani episcopi
5.
6.
7. S. corum perpetue et Felicissi \Thome de Aquino
8. + [Felix in Britannia]n
9. [S. gregorii]
10.
11.
12. S. Gregorii pape
13.
14.
15.
16. [S. Eugenii virginis]
17. + [Patricii papa]
18. S. Edwardi regis et martiris
19. S. Catherinii episcopi et confessoris
20. S. Igridici abbatis
21.
22.
23.
24.
25. Anunciacion S. Marie, virginis
26.
27. + [Resurreccion Domini]
28. + [Ordinacion sancti Gregorii pape]
29.
30.
31.

#### KL February.
1. [S. Ignazii mvt. S. Seueri episcopi]
2. See Brigida v.n.
3. Purificacion S. Marie virginis
4. S. Iuliani et antiqui
5. S. Agathe virginis
6. S. coru' Vedasti et Amandi episcoporum
7.
8.
9.
10. S. Ellenae virginis
11. [S. Eulalie virginis]
12.
13.
14.
15.
16. S. valentini martiris
17.
18.
19.
20.
21. Cathedra se\'i Petri
22. [S. Milburiae virginis]
23. [S. Mathie episcopi]
24.
25.
26.
27.
28. [S. Osvaldi archiepiscopi]

#### KL April.
1. [S. Marie Egyptiaca]e
2. [S. Pancreas] martiris]
3. S. Ambrosii episcopi et confessoris
4.
5. [S. Sexti pape et martiris]
6.
7.
8.
9.
10. [S. Gaudiaci confessoris]
11.
12.
13. [S. Eufemie virginis]
14. S. corum Tiburci et Valeriani, martirum
15.
16.
17.
18.
19. [S. Aelphegi archiepiscopi]
20.
21.
22.
23. S. Georgii martiris
24. + [Mellini episcopi]
25. S. Marcelii evangeli\etania maior
26. [S. Marcelli pape]
27.
28. S. Ubaldi martiris
29. [S. Germani episcopi]
30. (S. Erkenwaldi episcopi)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KL May.</th>
<th>KL July.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (Oct’ Sci Iohannis baptiste)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (S’culorum processi et martiniani martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (Sci Benedicti Abbatis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (Sci Antonii padan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (Sci Nichomediae Martiris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (S’culorum Medardi et Gildardi episcoporum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 (Sci Marcili et Petri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 (sci Iohannis ante portam latinam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 (S’culorum Primiti et Feliciani martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 (Sci Barnabae Apostoli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11 (Sci Basilii episcopi et confessores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12 (S’culorum Basiliis, Cirini, Naboris et Nazarii martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13 (Sci Basili episcopi et confessores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14 (S’culorum Ufii et Modestii Martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 (Sci Loefridi abbatis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 (S’culorum Hieronymi et Iulii II matris eius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17 (Sci Acta et Agapei martiris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18 (Sci Annibali et Iohannis baptiste)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19 (S’culorum Sturni et Pauli martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 (S’culorum Minorum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21 (S’culorum Iohannis et Pauli martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22 (Sci Leonis ecclesiae)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23 (Sci Augustini episcopi et confessoris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24 (Sci Benedicti Abbatis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25 (Sci Dominici martiris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26 (S’culorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27 (Sci Augustini episcopi et confessoris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28 (Sci Augustini episcopi et confessoris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29 (Sci Benedicti Abbatis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30 (Sci Benedicti Abbatis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KL June.</th>
<th>KL August.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Ad uirginitatem sanctae Matris,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 S’culorum Marcelli et Petri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (Sci Petroci confit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (Sci Iohannis ante portam latinam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (S’culorum Medardi et Gildardi episcoporum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (S’culorum Primiti et Feliciani martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 (Sci Domitii episcopi et confessoris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 (S’culorum Basiliis, Cirini, Naboris et Nazarii martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 (S’culorum Ufii et Modestii Martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 (Sci Loefridi abbatis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11 (S’culorum Hieronymi et Iulii II matris eius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12 (Sci Acta et Agapei martiris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13 (S’culorum Sturni et Pauli martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14 (S’culorum Minorum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 (Sci Leonis ecclesiae)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 (S’culorum Iohannis et Pauli martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17 (Sci Augustini episcopi et confessoris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18 (Sci Benedicti Abbatis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19 (Sci Augustini episcopi et confessoris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 (Sci Loefridi abbatis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21 (S’culorum Iohannis et Pauli martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22 (Sci Leonis ecclesiae)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23 (Sci Augustini episcopi et confessoris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24 (Sci Iohannis baptiste)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25 (S’culorum Iohannis et Pauli martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26 (S’culorum Iohannis et Pauli martirum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27 (Sci Augustini episcopi et confessoris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28 (Sci Augustini episcopi et confessoris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29 (Sci Benedicti Abbatis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30 (S’culorum felicis et aduocati martirum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ONCE IN THE CHURCH OF WRITTLE.

KL September.
1 Sci Egidiis abbatis
2 (Sci Antonini martiris.)
3 + Ordinacio Gregorii
4 (+ Translacio Cutthberti) + Trs. Byrini ep.
5 ° Sci Bertini abbatis
6
7
8 Nativitas Sanctae Marie virginis.
9 Sci Gorgoni martiris
10
11 S'corum Proti et lacincti martirum
12 + Maurici episcopi
13 Exaltatio Sancte Crucis (Cornelii et Cipriani)
14 (+ Oct. Marie et Nichomedi)
15 (See Eumenia urig.) + Nichomedi
16 (Sci Lamberti martiris) + Edwithe virginis
17 + Lamberti martiris
18
19
20 Vigilia
21 Sci Mathei apostoli
22 + Tene virginis et martiris
23 + Maurici sociis
24 + Conceptio Sci Johannis Baptiste
25
26 (See Cypriani martiris)
27 S'corum Cosme et Domiani martirum
28
29 Sci Michael archangelus in monte Garagano
30 Sci Ieronimi presbyteri et confessoris

KL November.
1 Festivitas omnium sanctorum
2 Sci Eustachii sociorumque eius (Se6
3 + Se Byrnstani episcopi et Se perpetue urig.
4 Sci Leonardi confessoris
5
6
7
8 S'corum quatuor coronatorum
9 (Sci Theodori martiris)
10
11 Sci Martini episcopi et confessoris
12 Sci Bricii episcopi et confessoris
13 (+ Translacio Ethelwoldi)
14 + Machuthi episcopi et confessoris
15 (Sci Edmundi archiepiscopi Cantuariensis et confessoris)
16 Sci Aniani episcopi et confessoris
17 (Oct. Sci Martini episcopi
18 + Sec vitalis
20 Sci Edmundi regis et martiris
21 (+ Columbani abbatis) + Sci Ruffini confessoris
22 See Cecilie urig. S'corum Tiburci et Valeriani
23 Sci Clemeutis papa et martiris 1 columbani
24 Sci Grisoponi martiris
25 See Katerine virginis et martiris
26 (Lici pape et martiris)
27
28 Sci Saturnini martiris Vigilia
29 Sci Andree apostoli
30 1 Machloui in 39 e.

KL October.
1 Sci Remigii episcopi
2 Sci Leodegarii episcopi et martiris
3
4 [Sci Francisci confessoris (et ordinis fratum minorum fundatoris)]
5
6 See Fidis urginis et martiris (+ Oslihe virginis)
7 (Translacio sci Oswaldi episcopi)
8
9 Sci Dionysi Rustici et Eleutherii martirum
10 (Paulini episcopi)
11 ((Nichasi martiris)) + Edelburge virginis
12 [Wilfridi episcopi]
13 (+ Translacio Edmundi regis) + Romuli
14 Galacti pape et martiris
15 ([Sci Michael in monte tumuli])
16
17
18 Sci Luce evangelistae et Sancti Iusti
19 + Austrebente virginis
20 (Undecim milia uriginum) + Ursule
21 + Romani
24 + Crispini et Crispiniiani martirum
26 + Amandi confessoris
27 S'corum Apostolorum Simonis et Iude
29 + Germani episcopi
30 Sci Quintini martiris Vigilia
31

KL December.
1 S'corum Crisanti et Darie martirum
2
3 (! Birini episcopi]
4
5 Sci Nicholai episcopi et confessoris
6 Oct Sci Andree apostoli Sci Ambrosij
7 (+ Conceptio Marie)
8
9
10 (+ Domasi pape)
11 See Lucie urginis
12
14
15
16 See Barbare urginis]
17 ((Sci Ignatii martiris)) (IO Sapiencia)
18
19
20
21 Sci Thome apostol
22
23 + Vigilae Domini Nostri
25 Nativitas Domini Nostri Ihesu Christi
26 Sci Stephani prothomartiris
27 Sci Johannis apostoli et evangelistae
28 Sanctuarium Innocentium
29 Sci Thome archiepiscopi et martiris + tome
30 + Rafaelis
31 Sci Silvester pape et confessoris

1 Mistake for Edwardi.

2 Later addition.
THE BOURCHIER SHIELD
IN HALSTEAD CHURCH

By THE REV. T. D. S. BAYLEY, M.A., F.S.A.

In his paper 'Armour in Essex', published in these Transactions in 1939, Mr. J. G. Mann, M.A., B.Litt., later Sir James Mann, Pres.S.A., gives some account of a wooden shield in Halstead church, which he then thought 'may be as old as the early years of the fourteenth century', and thus 'must be added to the exiguous number of English medieval shields'. At that time, however, the shield was fastened to the wall under the arch of the monument to John, second Lord Bourchier, K.G., and Elizabeth (Coggeshall), where it could not be closely examined. It can just be seen in this position in Pl., p. 150, R.C.H.M., N.W. Essex. It is not known when it was fastened there, but probably during the extensive repairs and alterations carried out in the church during the eighteen-forties and -fifties; to these there are references among the parish records, but a search revealed no mention of the shield.

In February, 1950, an altar was being set up in the south aisle or 'Bourchier's chapel'; at the same time the stained and dingy walls and stonework were being distempered, and repairs to the monument undertaken. It then became necessary for the shield to be taken down, thus providing an opportunity to study it at leisure and enquire more fully into its purpose and history. It was found to be a fine piece of carpentry, carved from a solid block of wood. A small fragment detached from the back was sent to the Forest Products Research Laboratory at Princes Risborough, and pronounced to be 'definitely oak'. The shield has rounded corners, and is 36 inches long by 15 inches at the widest part. It presents a convex surface, its greatest thickness, near the centre, being as much as 2¼ inches, but at the sides it dies away to about ¼ inch. The top edge is throughout about 1 inch thick. On the front is excellently carved, in relief about ¼ inch high, the arms of Bourchier. The correct blazon is argent a cross engrailed gules between four water-bougets sable, but consideration of the painting the shield has received may be deferred until later. From the lower part of the sinister side a portion had been removed by two neat cuts with a saw; and, rather higher up on this side, a small wedge-shaped piece had been similarly cut out and supplied with a fragment of oak, which was loose when the shield was taken down. The purpose of

PLATE I.

From photo. in R.C.H.M., Essex, vol. i, pl. p. xxxii. By courtesy of H.M.S.O.

The Bourchier Shield in Halstead Church, before removal from the wall of the south aisle.
these mutilations, believed to be of nineteenth-century date, is unknown. A photograph of the back of the shield (fig. 1) shows clearly these details. The back is of uneven but smooth surface, and, in the centre, is shaped to an angle of 155° to a depth of 6 inches from the top. There are no nail-holes, nor any indications whatever of a former lining or strap. About the middle and to one side is a protuberance. Deliberately so fashioned, its purpose is unknown; it is of no assistance to the seating of the shield when fastened in the manner presently to be described. The shield had been attached to the wall by two very large nails, the heads of which are visible in the plate previously mentioned, and here reproduced (Pl. 1); but not there discernible is another hole, at the intersection of the arms of the cross, which passed originally right through the shield, and was then blocked from the front, thus reducing its depth to 2 inches.

Shortly after the removal of the shield from the wall, Sir James Mann kindly journeyed to Halstead to examine it. It was his view that, from its general character, it was probably of seventeenth-century date, and certainly not a medieval piece. He also drew attention to its unnatural proportions, it being far too narrow for its length. But this consideration might not apply, if the shield was carried, or were a replica of one carried, by a man of unusual size. The writer's height is 6 feet 4 inches, and he has exceptionally long legs. Standing before a mirror, with the shield adjusted in precisely the position of the
very normal fourteenth-century shield shown on the brass of Sir William FitzRalph at Pembris,
he found that the base reached to an identically similar point on his thigh. The shield was then
submitted for an opinion to the late Professor E. W. Tristram, D.Litt.,
F.S.A., who was also inclined to a seventeenth-century date. It is
noteworthy that these two authorities, each in their respective spheres
in the foremost rank, came to a similar conclusion. But it will be
well for a final opinion on this point to await an appraisal of further
evidence and discussion.

The shield is traditionally associated with a monument, now placed
against the south wall, to the east of that previously mentioned.
Formerly it stood in the aisle, and it will be convenient to trace the
history of both shield and monument together, for there is a good deal
of documentary material concerning them. R.C.H.M. opines that the
fragments of carved panels, now assembled to form an altar-tomb for
the slab and pair of effigies above, are of later date. But, if this were
so, there is strong evidence that the union had taken place by the
beginning of the seventeenth century, a very unlikely happening.
William Tylottson, c. 1594, recorded the Bourchier arms as being
in the church, but he may have seen the coat elsewhere than on the
shield. On 29 June, 1629, however, there was made in 'South Halsted
Church', by an unknown hand, rapid pen-and-ink sketches of each
of three monuments in the south aisle, all of which carried a pair of
effigies. These are on fol. 146 and v. of Harl. MS. 4204 (Pl. VIII and II),
and the old catalogue (1808) at the British Museum states that this vol-
ume 'seems to have been the work of Robert Brooke the herald'. Ralph
Brooke, who became York Herald in 1593, is evidently indicated.
Although the last digit of the year in the MS. is not very clear, several
experts consulted are in agreement that it is a 9. In that event, the
sketches cannot be by Brooke, for the Parish Register of Reculver,
Kent, records his burial there on 15 October, 1625. Moreover, this
sheet is written in a hand different from that on many other pages in the
volume. One only of the three sketches shows a cross-legged male effigy
(Pl. II), and is hereafter for convenience referred to as by 'Brooke'.
It is headed: 'In the middle of the s[a]me Ile', and beneath is written
'two friers at either of their feete on either sid[e] a spannell'. Especi-
ally worthy of note is that a shield can be seen fixed to the left arm
of the male effigy. That this is the same shield as that which still
exists cannot be proved. But it is obviously a disproportionately longer
one than might have been expected; rough and almost childish though

---

1 Trans. F.A.S., vol. xxii (n.s.), p. 279, fig. 2.
2 Soc. of Antiqu. MS. 4.
the sketch is, a comparison of another sketch on the back of the same sheet (Pl. VIII) with the existing monument of John Lord Bourchier and his wife, shows every detail exactly reproduced; here, indeed, is no artist, but a man with considerable knowledge, an accurate observer with a keen eye for detail. Above the effigies, two shields are tricked, the arms of Bourchier over the man, and over the woman this coat, *gules a fesse between two bars gemel argent within a bordure engrailed azure*. In the centre above these, the Bourchier arms are repeated on a smaller shield, and at the feet of the effigies, in the centre, the Bourchier arms appear again. Except on the smaller shield, however, the Bourchier cross is not engrailed. These coats, no doubt, were to be seen on the two ends of the altar tomb.

Turning next to the record of Richard Symonds, who visited the church on 10 March, 1637, his description of the monument may be given in full:

In the middle of this Chappel lyes a Monument of Free Stone about one foote from the Ground upon the surface thereof lyes the portrait of a man in Chayned Armo's, his legs lying cross'd the right leg lying over the left. Upon his left arm an Escocleon of wood was fastened Whereon is very neatly carved a crosse engrailed between Fower waterbudgets. Upon his right side lyes the statue of a woman. Upon the south side of the Tombe these 4 coates are carved in stone—[tricked but not blazoned].

[1] *gules a fesse between two bars gemel [argent]. Prayers.*
[2] [Bourchier, with engrailed cross]
[3] [As No. 1]
[4] *Barry of eight* [evidently in error for ten, argent and azure. Mountichensy.]

Since William Holman ministered for 30 years in the Independent Chapel almost opposite the church, it might have been expected that his record of c. 1715 would be of exceptional value. On the contrary, he omits some important details noticed by Symonds, but he adds a description of the little figures at the feet of the effigies, and also that the shields 'at the feet and sides' are 'pendant between imagery work'. Symonds had not mentioned the shields at the ends of the tomb noticed by 'Brooke'. Symonds and Holman agree, however, on one point, which seems to be of particular importance, namely, the tenses of the verbs they use. The tomb either *lyes or is* in the chapel; the wooden shield *was* fastened on the arm. Taken in

---

2. This attribution of the coat by Symonds is no doubt correct, and the additional note at the end of this paper seems to offer convincing proof. Nevertheless, a long search at the College of Arms failed to identify it.
4. How the legs were crossed, and the charges on the shields.
conjunction with 'Brooke's' sketch, this suggests that shield and effigy parted company at some time between 1629 and 1637.

Examination of the fragments of the altar-tomb which still remain shows that the panels (about 18 inches high) contained a series of quatrefoils, occupied alternately by a shield and a weeper. Seven would be required to fill a side, and, if the same arrangement was used, which is uncertain, three for each end. It is noteworthy that each of the coats mentioned by Symonds is represented on the existing fragments; moreover, upon the large piece now leaning against the wall beside the tomb (fig. 2), the top of the Mountchensy shield has chipped away, so that the coat might at first sight be considered barry of eight,

and the injury is clearly of long standing. A prolonged attempt to reassemble the existing fragments in the manner indicated by combining 'Brooke's' sketch of the two ends and Symonds's description of the south side, ended in failure; a process complicated by the fact that no one has recorded the north side. Very probably this carried the same shields in a different order. On the fragment against the wall, the shield of Mountchensy is not at the extreme end of a row, as it must have been on the south side, if four shields alternating with weepers are to be fitted into seven quatrefoils. This fragment, therefore, probably belonged to the north side, and F. Chancellor's
conjectural restoration¹ of it may well be correct. Taking the foregoing evidence together, the suggestion is strong that wooden shield, effigies and altar-tomb are all parts of the same monument, to Robert, first Lord Bouchier, who died in 1349, probably of the Black Death, and Margaret, née Prayers (Pl. III).

It was in or about 1747 that disaster befell the Bouchier chapel.² The fate of the tomb, with which the wooden shield was concerned, and of other monuments there, is disclosed in the album³ of notes and drawings compiled by the Rev. D. T. Powell, for which excellent and too rarely quoted antiquary the writer would here record his deep regard. He visited Halstead on 3 September, 1804, and made extensive and detailed notes on the monuments of the Bouchiers. Powell wrote with indignation:

This church formerly contained many tombs of that family [Bouchier], but, infamous to relate, the splendour of their name was not able to save those monuments from the destructive hand of modern innovation, and, although they only occupied that part of the building which was their own property, and the beauty and grandeur of the tombs would have proved an interesting and gratifying spectacle to posterity, by order of a later rector⁴ [i.e., vicar] (Son-in-law to a Bishop of London⁵), most of them have been removed, and I came just in time to notice some fragments, which by this time are lost for ever. This was done by leave⁶ of the Bishop, for the purpose of increasing the number of pews.

Of the wooden shield Powell made a drawing (Pl. IV). No part is shown as cut away from it, nor are any holes in it indicated; but the drawing is unfinished. He gives the correct blazon, which must then have been visible. He saw the shield against the east wall on the side of the window [of the Bouchier chapel] fixed by 4 iron clamps⁷. These clapsed the shield at the sides and not through the holes. The effigies, however, Powell did not see; here a valuable informant was the old clerk⁸, who told him:

At the alteration ... this monument was taken down and the slab and figures, which was of the enormous weight⁹ of 70 cwt. or 3 ton and half, was turned with the face downward into the earth and laid level with the pavement of the chapel, the bottom of the immense slab¹⁰ of which is now to be seen as the pavement of the pews.

¹ *Ancient Sepulchral Monuments of Essex* (1890), pl. xx.
² Gibbons, *op. cit.*, p. 150.
³ *Addl. MS.* 17460; pp. 171-188 concern Halstead.
⁴ Christopher Wilson, D.D., vicar 1744-68; afterwards Bishop of Bristol.
⁵ Edmund Gibbons.
⁶ This note suggested that a faculty might have been obtained, but a search of both Vicar-General's and Bishop's Register was fruitless.
⁷ A local monumental mason, invited to estimate the weight, thought five tons a more likely figure.
⁸ 7 feet 1 inch by 3 feet 5 inches.
Powell anticipated the view of R.C.H.M., that the effigies were those of John Bourchier, Justice of the King's Bench, who died in 1328, and Helen (Colchester). He also saw 'the side or pannels of the tomb', which 'the clerk shewed me thrown in a corner under the tower', of which he made careful drawings. He was not deceived by the injury to the Mountchenesy shield, and underneath his drawing made the valuable note: 'These shields I discovered on the pannels with some of the original colours still remaining'. There is now no trace of colour visible.

The effigies were recovered from the floor about the middle of the nineteenth century. But their condition is not wholly accounted for by the shocking and deliberate wrecking of the tomb at the hands of one who became a prelate in the Church. They are grievously worn and defaced, the faces and the tops of the canopies especially, but a century's sojourn upside down in the earth would not account for this. The lower parts are well preserved, but the uppermost surfaces are worn, but not evenly, throughout. It may be that, at one period, either people sat in a seat with their feet on portions of them, or clambered over them in order to reach a pew. The ecclesiastic at the man's left foot has lost his head, where a small hole may represent a repair, but the shoulders are now worn down. A curious feature of the man's left forearm is that a shallow oblong piece has been deliberately cut out and plastered in again.

The method of fastening the wooden shield to the effigy may now be described. A portion of the rounded upper arm was cut away to provide a flattened area as a seating for the shield. In this area a hole, about 1½ inch deep and ¾ inch in diameter, was bored in the stone. A peg, firmly wedged in this hole, engaged with the hole in the centre at the back of the shield. It is possible that the other two holes in the shield were added, as an afterthought or at a later date, to ensure greater stability; through them passed two other pegs, which were received into two additional holes bored into the stone; one of these holes is about 2½ inches above the other on the flattened area, and the other on the scabbard, just below the hilt (Pl. III and fig. 2).

At this stage of the enquiry, therefore, the conclusion of the matter seemed to be that, probably in the early part of the seventeenth century, someone with an antiquarian turn of mind decided to renew the missing shield in wood. There was, at this period, a good deal of activity of this kind. Sir Thomas Kendrick has given a lively account\(^1\) of some of these antiquaries, several of whom were officers of the College of Arms. A good Essex example can be seen in the

\(^1\) Op. cit.
PLATE IV.

By courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum.

THE Bourchier Shield; drawing by the REV. D. T. Powell, 1804.
very curious set of mural monuments in the Pointz chapel in North Ockendon church,¹ said to have been set up by Sir Gabriel Pointz, died 1607, in memory of his ancestors; the figures being portrayed in quite tolerable representations of the armour and costumes of the periods in which they lived. It is just possible that a shield, which formerly hung over the tomb of John of Eltham, died 1336, in Westminster Abbey, was a renewal of such early date as to deceive William Camden, c. 1600. The only reference known to it is by Ralph Brooke, previously mentioned, a capable herald and a scholar, who, in the course of a violent controversy² with Camden, wrote³:

... lest any of judgment vewe the said Tombe at Westminster, and the Targe of armes pendant over the same, and They will neither saye nor judge the same to be 266 years ould, for so long is it sence John of Eltham died, neither was there... such fashion of Targe used at Noblemens funerells in that age nor in many yeares after John of Eltham's death.

It cannot now be determined whether Brooke was sufficiently informed on the subject of medieval armour to pronounce so confidently on the date of this shield; for his bitterness against Camden may well have warped his opinion.

However that may be, it is highly improbable that the renewal of the Halstead shield was nothing more than a quaint piece of antiquarianism. On the contrary, it seems to have been a much more intelligent act than at first sight it appeared. Most unlikely, moreover, is the view, to which the writer at first inclined, that the same restorer effected the flattened area, thus removing all trace of a former stone shield; perhaps he enlarged one (or both) existing holes thereon, while that in the scabbard is even more likely to be his work.

II.

An unexpected happening directed the writer to a fresh line of enquiry. Having occasion to consult the R.C.H.M. volume on Westminster Abbey for quite a different purpose, he thought something was indicated in one of the plates which was worth investigation. When he visited the Abbey, he was given much help by Mr. Lawrence E. Tanner, M.V.O., F.S.A., and by Mr. R. P. Howgrave-Graham, F.S.A., both of whom gave him the benefit of their extensive knowledge, and offered him every facility for examining what he desired to see; Mr. Howgrave-Graham, moreover, kindly remained late one evening in order to take photographs by artificial light. On the north side of the

¹ F. Chancellor, op. cit., pp. 151 ff., pls. lv-lx.
³ Second Discoverie of Errors, ed. 1723, p. 126.
presbytery is the splendid monument of Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke. The level of the floor of the ambulatory is a good deal lower than that of the presbytery, and for this cause the effigy is more commonly examined and pictured from the south, although the left arm can be clearly seen from the opposite side. Just above the point of the elbow, and in line with the sculptured guige across the breast, is a small hole (Pl. V, fig. 1), which clearly provided the sole support for the lost shield. It could have been but a flimsy fixing, little more than for a pin the size of a pencil. If the lost shield was of wood, it must have been very thin and light; it might very well have been of metal. Moreover, as evidence that, from the first, the sculptor envisaged a separate shield, the 'other end' of the guige is shown\(^1\) emerging from underneath the body about the middle of the left upper arm as a sculptured strip on the slab. Since the date of this effigy hereafter becomes of some importance, the evidence afforded by a document\(^2\) to which Mr. Tanner kindly drew the writer's attention, is valuable; this shows that the monument could not have been begun until after Aymer's death in 1324, for it was only subsequent thereto that the King decided he should be accorded burial in the Abbey.

In the next bay of the presbytery to the east is the equally sumptuous monument of Edmund Crouchback, Earl of Lancaster, died 1296, and dated by the late Professor Lethaby\(^3\) c. 1300. On the left arm (Pl. V, fig. 2) is a flattened area, but larger and less defined than that at Halstead. In this area are two holes, about 2 inches apart and \(\frac{3}{8}\) inch in diameter. Particularly interesting is the fact that the uppermost hole still contains the remains of a broken wooden peg. Since, when the monument is viewed from the south, this peg is out of sight and reach of prying fingers, it may well be the original support remaining when the shield was wrenched away. Two such pegs would have been adequate to carry the weight of a shield of some solidity. In this instance the 'other end' of the guige is not portrayed. Professor Lethaby thought it possible that the missing shields on these two monuments 'were originally separate works of enamel like the shield of William de Valence'.\(^4\) William's magnificent shield, however, is an object of some weight, in section very similar to the Halstead shield, well bonded in at the back to the side of the effigy, and along the sinister edge to the slab.\(^5\) Such an object as William de Valence's shield could have been held by Crouchback's two pegs, but hardly by his son Aymer's solitary pin.

---

4. Ibid., p. 269.
Fig. 1.—Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke.

Fig. 2.—Edmund Crouchback, Earl of Lancaster.

Effigies in Westminster Abbey.
These evident tokens of the use of separate shields of other material in connection with stone effigies made it apparent that the Halstead example was not without parallels, and it seemed likely that, at some time, the whole matter had been investigated. This may be so, but some rather extensive enquiries failed to locate information on the subject. The writer then consulted Mr. Arthur Gardner, M.A., F.S.A., who has studied and photographed so many effigies, but the point had not previously engaged his attention. Mr. Gardner, however, kindly examined his large collection of photographs, with a view to discovering other examples, and, at his suggestion, a visit was paid to Englefield church, Berks., a building standing in a park of great beauty. Here, in a modern arched recess in the south wall of the nave, lies a stone effigy, hemmed in by rows of pews. It represents a knight with legs crossed, clad in mail and in the act of drawing his sword, and appears to be of c. 1300. The left elbow (Pl. VI, fig. 1) has an oval flattened area, about 4 inches long and 2 inches across, and thereon is a hole, about $\frac{3}{4}$ inch in diameter; a second minute hole near it is probably only a fault in the stone. Moreover, on the inside of this elbow is sculptured the énaume, through which the arm passed to hold the shield. The effigy is commonly attributed to a member of the Englefield family, but there are now no heraldic indications to prove this. The conjecture is also made by Charles Tomkins, who in a drawing makes an odd mistake in interpreting the left elbow; he thought it was an oval piece of reinforcement strapped on over the mail, and he, accordingly, furnished the right elbow with a like addition to match. Reference to Ashmole's notes on the church in the Bodleian Library, dated 12 July, 1665, however, makes it clear that the Englefield arms were then visible on the surcoat, thus confirming the attribution:

In an Arch of the South wall of the Church is cut in stone the Portraiture of a Knight, lying cross-legg'd, in armour of male, over wth a loose Coate girt close to him and thereon the following armes painted, Barry argent and gules on a chief or a lion passant azure. [Englefield.]

In the margin is written, in a later hand, 'his shield is tore away'; either the writer of this note had more insight than Tomkins, or it may be that the stump of a peg in the hole or some fragments of the shield yet remained to give the clue. It is very probable that the effigy is of Sir Roger de Englefield, died c. 1316. Thanks are due to


2 View of Reading Abbey, with those of the churches originally connected with it, in the County of Berkshire (1805).

3 MS. Ashmole 850, p. 12. Thanks are due for this reference to Mr. P. S. Spokes, F.S.A.

the Rev. G. B. Ashburner, M.A., for his efforts to obtain a photograph in exceedingly difficult conditions.

Following our Society's visit to St. Stephen's chapel, Bures, on 20 May, 1950, it became possible to add another example to the foregoing. Among the monuments transferred in 1935 from Earls Colne Priory to this restored chapel is the effigy believed to represent Robert de Vere, 5th Earl of Oxford. The altar-tomb beneath it is of considerably later date, and may well belong to a different monument.1 The portrayal of the 'other end' of the guige immediately recalled the like feature on the tomb of Aymer de Valence; here, however, it not only is shown on the upper surface of the slab, but it hangs down over the moulded edge and the chamfered side of it. This detail must be very uncommon, and it would not be surprising if it was confined to these two effigies. Close comparison between them revealed a number of other resemblances, sufficiently marked as to warrant the suggestion that they may be of some significance. The following are worthy of notice: the lozenge-shaped cushion under the head and the little figures on either side of it; the quatrefoils on the scabbard; the 'fluted' effect of the loose sleeve, and the sharply-pointed elbow; the continuation of the loose end of the sword-belt on the slab; while the curving back, turned head and protruding left fore-trotter of the boar at the feet recall the like attitude of the less spirited lion at Aymer's feet. There was, however, no trace of a hole on the left arm for the shield. But, when these monuments were set up at Bures, small additions were made in plaster to replace chipped and missing portions, e.g., in this instance the nose, and the pommel of the sword. This was skilfully done, and it is not now always possible to identify with certainty the original stone. With the approval and kind co-operation of the owner of the chapel, Col. G. O. C. Probert, C.B.E., an investigation was made. Taking the effigy of Aymer de Valence as a guide, the exact spot where the hole should have been was determined, and a penknife pushed into the arm. This at once withdrew a plug of plaster from a hole about \( \frac{3}{8} \) inch in diameter and 1\( \frac{1}{2} \) inch deep (Pl. VI, fig. 2). The Earl died in 1296, and therefore his effigy is, almost certainly, earlier than Aymer's, which, as already stated, should not be earlier than 1324. Among the Kings' masons mentioned by Lethaby2 was one, Master Richard of Wytham, records of whose activities he notes from about 1290 to 1310. The date of his death does not seem to be known. But he was followed

---

1 Dr. Fairweather, F.S.A., considered it to belong to that of Robert, sixth earl, d. 1331 (Archeologia, vol. lxxvii, p. 287n).
Plate VI.

Fig. 1.—Englefield, Berks.: Effigy of (? Sir Roger) de Englefield.

Fig. 2.—St. Stephen's Chapel, Bures: Effigy of Robert de Vere, 5th Earl of Oxford (?).
by Reginald of Wytham,¹ possibly his son, who was working in London as late as 1336. If these men came from Witham in Essex, distant only about eleven miles from Earls Colne, it is possible that one of them was concerned with the making of both effigies. When it was in the passage at Earls Colne Priory, stated to have been built about 1827, this de Vere effigy stood with the left side against a wall, and was in consequence never illustrated from that side.² Daniel King’s drawing³ of 1653, however, was made from the left side, but it is so inaccurate and crude as to be valueless for the purpose of this enquiry; hardly any of the above-mentioned details are apparent. The only point of interest that emerges is that no shield is shown on the arm; it had evidently disappeared by King’s time. The effigy and altar-tomb are now set up at the north-west corner of the chapel at Bures, where there is a narrow passage between them and the north wall. Thanks are due to Mr. David George for the photograph he obtained, notwithstanding the confined space and the absence of any near-by window to afford light.

It is quite probable that other instances could be cited of knights with these queer ‘vaccination marks’ on their left arms. But they are not easy to trace, for, unless a photograph or illustration is made from that side and is very detailed, it is of no value; moreover, the laconic ‘shield gone’ used by antiquaries in their descriptions is particularly unhelpful, for these words may betoken a stone shield which has broken away. Nevertheless, the five examples described suffice to establish the practice of fixing these wooden, or it may be metal, shields to the arms of stone effigies in certain instances during, approximately, the first half of the fourteenth century. It may be said with tolerable certainty that no original example of such a shield remains, and that the Halstead shield is, probably, the only survivor of any such that were later renewed. Of effigies with stone shields numerous examples remain; but they are invariably well bonded in, both to the arm and elsewhere on the side of the effigy, or the slab beneath it. The two types of shield are clearly distinguishable, nor can it be that the flattened areas on the arms are the work of later antiquaries, who thus obliterated all traces of former stone shields, for two of the instances described have not any such areas. Attempts to explain the reason for these detachable shields are unconvincing. Some considerations may, however, be worthy of mention, for there is always the possibility that one of them might receive some illumination or support from a literary or documentary source.

¹ Lethaby, Westminster Abbey and the Kings’ Craftsmen, pp. 188, 193.
² E.g., R.C.H.M., N.E. Essex (1922), pl. p. 86.
³ Archaeologia, vol. lxxxvii, pl. 87.
(1) It might simply represent the taste and fancy of certain tomb-designers. The use of mixed materials is not uncommon. The great tomb of William de Valence, previously mentioned, is a notable example, with its stone base surmounted by a chest and effigy of wood, the effigy covered (and the chest formerly so) with copper plates adorned with enamel. In Towcester church, Northants., is the remarkable monument of Archdeacon Sponne, died 1448, the head and hands of whose effigy, previous to an unfortunate restoration in 1883, were of wood, while the remainder of the figure is of stone. On the other hand, it is difficult to believe that sculptors, who produced such solid memorials as stone effigies, would have been content to render the shields in such impermanent a fashion, for they must, before many years, have become peculiarly liable to come adrift.

(2) Our late President, Canon T. H. Curling, M.A., for many years vicar of Halstead, thought it possible that the Bourchier shield might have been preserved in the family as an heirloom. He explained to the writer how evident it was that the shield belonged to the effigy.

(3) The obvious suggestion that the shield was the one actually carried in battle by the knight concerned meets with equally obvious difficulty. One could imagine that a knight might desire that an old and trusted shield, which had served him well in the field, should form part of his memorial. But, although the three holes in the Bourchier effigy at Halstead and the two in Crouchback's arm at Westminster might have held pegs sufficiently robust to have supported such an object, it is not credible that the single pin attached to the arms of the other three examples would have been competent to have done so.

(4) To Major M. R. Trappes-Lomax, Somerset Herald, is due the suggestion that, conceivably, if a man in medieval times set up his own memorial during his lifetime, the shield might be attached thereto after his death, to complete it, and make it, by this token, definitely his own. If so, it could be that, by reason of the minority of the heir, or on account of his service in the wars in France, this process might be delayed, or even neglected entirely; a glance at the Complete Peerage suggested that such conditions might certainly have obtained in regard to the subjects of one or two of the monuments concerned. An interesting piece of evidence, which seems to offer some support for this ingenious theory, is provided by the two effigies which display

---

2 Albert Hartshorne, Portraiture in Monumental Effigies, pp. 34-5; V.C.H., Northants., vol. 1, p. 410, with drawing (dated 1869) by Mr. Hartshorne.
4 Of this explanation of the Halstead shield, Mr. Fred Roe (Essex Survivals (1929), pp. 138-9, with two drawings) erroneously thought 'there is not the slightest doubt'.

---
the ‘other end’ of the guige. This feature would, of course, have subsequently been concealed by the attachment of the separate shield. But one of these two is that of Aymer de Valence, previously stated to have been erected after his death. Is it, however, possible that it was made before, but not erected until after, that event? Or, alternatively, have been erected elsewhere, before burial at Westminster had been decided by the King? In this connection it is noteworthy that both Lethaby and R.C.H.M.\textsuperscript{2} incline to date Aymer’s effigy some years previous to his death. On the other hand, an effigy would have looked very odd without any shield, particularly when it was new, and resplendent in all its detail and colour, and it is difficult to resist the thought that a knight represented with a guige across his breast, and no shield attached thereto, must have looked ‘improperly dressed’ in a peculiar degree. A modern statue of a British general, in all the glory of full-dress uniform with cocked hat, and a belt without a sword, is hardly to be imagined!

(5) The writer, working on a theory almost the converse of the foregoing, examined the methods by which a funeral shield\textsuperscript{3} in medieval times was suspended over a grave, after it had figured in the ceremonies at the funeral, with the thought in mind that it might have been transferred to the arm of the effigy when it was set up, perhaps many years later. The result, although perhaps of some interest in itself, does not seem to help the present enquiry. The materials for the study of the subject are very slight. The conventional representation of a shield as pendant from a peg by a strap, attached to either side of the shield at the back near the top, is so common in medieval sculpture that it must have been a usual practice to suspend it thus by means of the guige; an alternative method is to place the strap in a central position, as in the quatrefoils on the altar-tomb at Halstead. The shield associated with the Black Prince’s tomb at Canterbury appears in a drawing,\textsuperscript{4} stated to be of early sixteenth-century date, fastened, without visible means of support, to the north side of the pier at the north-west corner of the tomb, with, above it, another shield now lost. On this pier can be seen two L-shaped hooks with rounded uprights. Since two exactly similar hooks occur on the opposite pier on the other side of the Trinity chapel, just west of Henry IV’s tomb, it may be that they held a pair of tie-bars, like the hooks in the chapter-house at Westminster, or even at one time supported some textile

\textsuperscript{1} Westminster Abbey and the Kings’ Craftsmen, p. 184.
\textsuperscript{2} \textit{p. 24 b.}
\textsuperscript{3} Sir Guy Laking, \textit{A Record of European Armour and Arms}, vol. v (1922), p. 170, records the opinion of others that the Halstead shield was a funeral piece.
\textsuperscript{4} Laking, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. i (1920), fig. 185.
hanging. Nevertheless, the two hooks are in precisely the right position to have held the shields. Such a hook is exactly what is needed to carry a wooden shield painted with the Royal Arms, quarterly France modern and England, now on a shelf at the west end of the north aisle at Bakewell, Derbyshire (Pl. VII, fig. 1), to which Sir James Mann kindly drew the writer's attention. Its origin is obscure, but it may well be of late medieval date. At the back (Pl. VII, fig. 2), besides several modern patches of iron, is an ancient iron strap near the top, which in the centre bows out into a loop. If placed over a hook, rather thicker at the bottom than the top, this would in time make such a mark on the back of a shield as this one bears below the loop; one of the Canterbury hooks does taper in this manner. It looks as if a similar hook supported the curiously-shaped shield, together with the forward end of a lance, on the tomb of John of Gaunt in Old St. Paul's, illustrated in Hollar's engraving. The shield over Henry V's tomb at Westminster, however, has, so far as can be ascertained, always been fastened to the wooden beam by means of two iron grips, clasping it at the sides, in exactly the manner in which Powell saw the Halstead shield secured. Notwithstanding the head of a screw visible in one of these grips, they appear to be ancient, or at least replacements of early date. It is reasonable to suppose that this method of fastening a shield inspired the convention in sculpture of a shield held by an angel or other figure, the tips of whose fingers appear round the edge on either side; at a later date, this convention could degenerate into the suggestion of fingers only, as on the Duke of Gloucester's tomb at St. Albans (1450). Although this digression points only to diversity of method in the manner of suspending shields over tombs, it may serve to bring the notion of such a shield being intended for subsequent transfer to the arm of an effigy less outside the bounds of possibility.

(6) There is evidence to show that, whatever were the circumstances which gave rise to the practice of fixing detachable shields to stone effigies, they must be applicable with equal cogency to effigies of wood. Of military effigies of this material a number survive, and it is remarkable how closely the technique and design of the carvers in wood followed the principles of the craftsmen in stone. The tendency of the medieval carpenter to borrow ideas from the mason has often been observed by antiquaries, for example in screenwork and tracery. It is not, therefore, strange that, in regard to the shield, similar
By courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum.

Sketch of Monument in Halstead Church to John, Second Lord Bourchier, K.G., and Elizabeth (Coggeshall) (Harl. MS. 4204).
analogies are found. These shields, one imagines, were normally also of wood, but Mr. F. H. Crossley, F.S.A., thinks that they may sometimes have been of metal. Thus, the shield is shown as an integral part of the composition, as on the effigy, c. 1310, at Elmstead. In the north aisle of Bures church, however, is a very fine wooden effigy; here the shield is most carefully bonded in, both to the figure and the slab beneath it, in exactly the same manner as in many stone examples. One of the wooden effigies (c. 1270), belonging to Little Horkesley, carries a shield treated in a similar manner. But at Danbury are three wooden effigies, where the shield, now lost in each case, was pinned to the side of the body, in precisely the manner previously described. There is the same flattened areas on all three of the upper arms. In two cases, the guige crossing the breast ends with a round hole in the side of the body, about 1 inch and ¼ inch in diameter respectively. Although the third effigy carries a guige, there is no hole at all, and it is not clear how this shield was secured.

(7) Attention may be drawn to the exalted stations occupied by four of the men commemorated by these shields. Aymer de Valence and Edmund Crouchback were near of kin to the Crown and buried among the Kings; Robert Bourchier had been Lord High Chancellor, although for a few months only in 1340, being the second layman appointed to that office; Robert de Vere inherited the office of Lord Great Chamberlain, or, more correctly, that of Master Chamberlain of England, though adherence to the cause of Simon de Montfort resulted in his loss of the office in 1265. It might be supposed that, in the case of certain effigies set up to commemorate persons of great consequence and wealth, a practice grew up of issuing a separate order for a shield of peculiar richness and beauty, to a different craftsman, at the same time as the effigy itself was put in hand. But again the argument on these lines is stultified by the existence of the effigy at Englefield; so far as can be ascertained, no member of this ancient family was of anything like comparable status or wealth, c. 1300, with the other four persons concerned.

Here these speculations must be left, and it will be well to return to the Halstead shield, and explain in detail exactly what has been done to it, lest antiquaries of the future should, as a result, become still more puzzled. It was entrusted to the tender and experienced hands of Mr. Kenneth Mabbitt, F.S.A., who took much trouble to accord to it the best treatment. It was clearly wrong to leave it displaying incorrect tinctures, and false heraldry as well. The complicated story of the painting the shield had undergone gradually

emerged. Before receiving attention, the cross displayed a coating of gold leaf over oil size, the water-bougets were painted black and the field a broken white, although grime had given to the latter a semblance of brown. It was found that underneath all these was a thick coat of pale stone-coloured paint, of an attractive shade and completely covering the whole of the shield. This coat was retained on the field to represent argent; the water-bougets, being already correctly coloured sable, were only touched up where the stone colour showed through. The period within which these two applications of colour were made can be exactly defined; both must have been between 1804, when Powell noted the gules on the cross, and 1890, when F. Chancellor wrote that the shield had been 'wrongly tintured by some restorer'. Mr. Mabbitt observed that the uppermost coats might well have been the work of a Victorian coach-builder, who were often good craftsmen. When the stone colour was, in turn, removed from the cross, traces only of the original gules were found, a very little at the extreme top, and some quite definite indications at the end of the sinister arm. The cross was then repainted gules, with the exception of this latter portion, which Mr. Mabbitt covered with an ingenious hinged contrivance of leather, invisible until closely examined, and which can be unhooked to reveal the original paint underneath. It was found that between this original paint and the oak a very thin undercoat had been applied, but this was certainly not gesso. The missing pieces from the side of the shield Mr. Mabbitt supplied and fitted, painting them in harmony with the stone colour of the field. The shield was then attached to the effigy by means of screws, passing through the two holes from the front into wooden plugs driven into the corresponding holes in the arm and scabbard of the effigy, the tops of the holes being afterwards closed by small discs painted over. Previous to this operation, a large accumulation of grime was gently removed from both the effigies. That the shield, notwithstanding its size and proportions in relation to the effigy, should be thus dealt with appeared reasonable and proper, for it is part of the chequered history of the monument. It now looks extremely decorative. The restoration of the Bourchier chapel has caused the worn effigies to be stationed within the communion benches, where they are hardly ornamental; to them the shield serves to some extent as a mask, and affords a needed touch of colour to this attractively furnished little sanctuary.

Finally, the date to which the shield should be ascribed must be reconsidered, for there are indications of a date earlier than the seventeenth century. Although the pieces of evidence that follow are in

---

each case unconvincing in themselves, yet taken together they carry considerable weight.

(a) It will be remembered that in 1629 the observant 'Brooke' recorded the shield, and it is difficult to believe he would have done so without comment if it was then of quite recent date.

From drawing by Mr. Kenneth Mabbitt, F.S.A.

FIG. 3.—MARKS SCRATCHED ON SHIELD.

(b) Mr. Mabbitt is strongly of opinion that the oak, unless it has acquired an unnatural appearance of age through undergoing some abnormal process, is at least as old as the middle of the sixteenth century, and that it could well be much older. The view of so experienced a student of medieval woodwork is particularly worthy of respect.

(c) When the paint was being removed from the cross, the initial A and three other marks were found to have been scratched on the dexter arm (fig. 3). They are obviously the work of some vandal of uncertain date, and although the first rather looks like a cross on steps, it is impossible to give a satisfactory description of the scratchings of a casual idler. Oddly enough, they afford further evidence, if such be needed, that the shield was formerly attached to the effigy, for the culprit stood at the head thereof to write; the letters are upside down when the shield stands upright. Later applications of paint had filled the scratchings, which are not now visible. As has been stated, the shield seems to have been separated from the effigy before 1637.

(d) Some fragments of the lowest application of paint were submitted to Dr. A. E. Werner, of the National Gallery, in the hope that an analysis of them might prove helpful. Dr. Werner took infinite
pains, preparing cross-sections of two of the fragments in order to obtain an idea of the relationship of the various layers. 'There is nothing particularly remarkable', Dr. Werner reported, 'about the pigments present, since they have all been in use since the earliest days of painting... The only possible clue which emerges, and which might give an indication of date, is the use of *tempera* as a medium. This medium began to go out of fashion about the middle of the sixteenth century. I do not believe that the painting would be as late as the seventeenth century, because I should then have expected to find an oil medium instead of *tempera*. This is, of course, not a very convincing argument, but rather some indication of a probable date.'

A conclusion, then, not without reason and support, is that 'probably early sixteenth century' is a likely date for the Bourchier shield. If this be accepted, by whom was this renewal effected? Idle though it be to speculate further, it is difficult to resist the temptation to mention two possible men. John Bourchier, Lord Berners (d. 1533), and Henry Bourchier, Earl of Essex (d. 1540), both had marked historical and heraldic interests, and both were lineal descendants of the Lord Chancellor himself.

The writer desires to thank all those named in this paper for their kindness in assisting this enquiry, and would mention also Mr. F. W. Steer, F.S.A., for his help with the heraldry. The vicar of Halstead, the Rev. A. W. Swallow, B.Sc., at all times gave every facility for the study of the subject, and has shown keen interest in this unusual possession of his church.

**ADDITIONAL NOTE.**

It has been stated that 'Brooke' sketched two other monuments in Halstead church, and some information concerning them may now be given.

(1) Beneath the sketch of the monument with the shield is a very rough outline of a monument which has entirely disappeared (Pl. II). It is of 'Another Tomb betweene the South Ile & y* midle of y* Church with a dainty arch ou' them'. There is no indication of what this arch was like, but a pair of effigies lies on an altar-tomb. They appear to resemble in every detail those of Sir John, second Lord Bourchier, and his wife, still to be seen in the church, but there is a second dog at the lady's feet. There is, however, one interesting variation; the tilting helm under the man's head points in the opposite direction. On this account it is possible for the 'long cap' on the 'old man's head', which forms

---

1 *D.N.B.*
part of the strange Bourchier crest, to be introduced. If this cap had been added to the head at the top of the helm on Sir John Bourchier's monument, it would have been pointing into his wife's face. 'Brooke' shows three shields on either side of the tomb, and two at the foot of it; the three on the north side all carry the Bourchier arms, but the others are blank. Gibbons gives Holman's description of this monument, but Symonds is more precise:

Within the South Wall of Boussers Chappell a lofty and stately Arched Monument of White Stone is erected. The portraiture of a man and a woman lying about 4 feet from the floor within the Walle. Under his head is a helmet whereon is a Saracen's head Crowned and with an antique Capp, the feet resting upon a lyon and hers upon a Dog. Upon the breast was a Crosse engrailed between 4 Waterbudgets, one of them stille remaynnes. Three Escocheons which were on the for part towards the bottom are quite worn away and decayed. At each end are Angells supporting an Escoccheon which is carved in y Stone, and the charge embossed out. [Arms of Bourchier drawn.]

Powell, who had made a copy of 'Brooke's' sketch, identified the pathetic remains of this monument. 'The clark had preserved', he wrote, 'the fragments of a statue of a noble person of this family [Bourchier], as appeared by the surcoat of his arms [sic] still tho' faintly remaining on his surcoat'. Then follow sketches of three fragments: (1) a section of the waist, with the lower half of the two arms of the engrailed cross, and the belt for the sword over it; (2) the trunk, from the neck to where it joined the fragment just described. The uppermost dexter water-bouget is vaguely indicated, but the sinister one is clearly defined, thus confirming Symonds's statement that 'one of them stille remaynnes'. Here the writer must record the satisfaction with which he found the two excellent antiquaries, their visits to the church separated by 167 years, noting the same small point, passed over by the better-known but not always so acute Holman; (3) the upper part of an arm, with the note 'mail sculptured in the finest manner'. There were also 'fragments of his hands and thighs scattered about'. Of all these painful tokens of Bishop Wilson's appalling vandalism in the previous century no trace whatever now remains.

Powell, moreover, noted: 'On inspecting the present pavement there is good reason to think that many [monuments] were reversed and placed in the ground'. In 1950 the whole of the pavement of the aisle, from the door to the east end, was renewed, but nothing of the kind was found.

1 Chancellor, op. cit., p. 77.
3 The pieces of diapercd stonework now set against the wall behind the tomb of Robert Lord Bourchier, appear to be portions of the soffit of a canopy to a tomb, but these by no means suggest 'Brooke's 'dainty arch' (fig. 2).
(2) The reverse of the same leaf (Pl. VIII) bears a sketch of the monument to John, second Lord Bourchier, K.G., and Elizabeth (Coggeshall). Of the very full details represented, the following are not now visible: (1) the breast of Sir John’s effigy bore the Bourchier arms; (2) of the six panels on the lower part of the north side, the westernmost, which has now entirely disappeared, contained, like the easternmost, an angel and a cockle-shell (for Coggeshall). This is, of course, the heraldic scallop with a flat top to the hinge, and not the shell known as a cockle to-day;¹ (3) the four shields between these two panels, now entirely defaced, bore, alternately, the arms of Bourchier and those previously attributed to Prayers. This occurrence adds to the likelihood of the attribution being correct, for a coat twice repeated on the side of a man’s tomb, not being that of his wife, is in all probability his mother’s. These shields were so well protected by pews that Powell had difficulty in drawing them; since they are now completely blank, they have probably been deliberately mutilated since 1804.

There are also defaced shields in the lower part of the east and west ends. These are supplied by Symonds, who says that they bore, respectively, the arms of Bourchier and of Coggeshall (argent a cross between four scallops sable), and adds that the shields were all coloured. He also gives the position of the monument in his time, ‘Betweene the uppermost pillars of y° church and next to this Chappel’.

(The thanks of the Society are due to the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley for defraying the cost of the blocks illustrating his paper.)

¹ ‘Cockle’ is used now for one particular genus of bivalve shells, but was anciently used for any ribbed ‘shellfish’, apparently derived from Gk, kohlias; the use of the word ‘cockled’ for wrinkled or wavy paper is an illustration. The word ‘cockle’ would therefore equally apply to Cardium (the true cockle), or toPECTEN, the scallop, both of which have ribbed or grooved shells. The cockle referred to by ancient writers is undoubtedly the scallop (PECTEN HACOBEUS), a common Mediterranean species. (Information kindly supplied by British Museum (Natural History)—Mollusca Section.)
WALL-PAINTINGS IN ESSEX CHURCHES

IX

A Wall-painting recently discovered in Lambourne Church

By E. CLIVE ROUSE, M.B.E., F.S.A.

and

Essex Wall-paintings of St. Christopher

—By THE REV. G. MONTAGU BENTON, M.A., F.S.A.

In July, 1951, extensive repairs were being carried out in the church of St. Mary and All Saints, Lambourne; and after traces of wall-painting had been observed on the removal of some plaster and limewash, I was asked to visit the church and make an examination and report. This I did, and partly uncovered a particularly fine example of a painting of St. Christopher, which I should have liked to deal with myself. But as time was pressing, and I was already heavily committed elsewhere, the work was entrusted to Mrs. Monica Bardwell, formerly resident near-by, and an associate of the late Professor E. W. Tristram.

My report was as follows:

'The church, though extensively altered in the eighteenth century, retains a considerable amount of medieval work. In particular, far more of the nave walls appear to be of this early period than was at first thought.

'On the North Wall traces of several layers of Post-Reformation texts on successive coats of limewash were found. These were very fragmentary and since much of the basic twelfth-century plaster of poor, sandy quality had perished, these very small fragments do not justify preservation. The removal of defective plaster also disclosed the stone jamb, part of the head, and deep splay of one of the Norman lights. As a matter of structural interest this should be preserved. No other remains of paintings could be found on this wall.

'On the South Wall, the western section was found to contain considerable remains of a post-Reformation text in an elaborate frame of yellow strap-work and scrolls outlined in red. This, though fragmentary, should be kept, and I have indicated the appropriate areas
on the plaster. The central section of this wall contains a most interesting discovery—a large figure of St. Christopher and the Holy Child. The head of the figure is cut off by the eighteenth-century plaster cornice of the nave roof, and the bottom of the figure is destroyed by a wall tablet. The intervening portion is, however, in good order and many of the essential details, including the features of the Saint and the entire figure of the Child, are exceptionally well preserved. The painting has additional interest in that it is a palimpsest, a fourteenth-century St. Christopher whose curly beard and one eye are traceable, having been repainted in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century. The Saint (14 feet high to the nave cornice) wears a blue cloak and purple tunic with brown neck hem. He looks upward at the Child seated on his left shoulder.

‘The staff, with tau-cross top, is in his right hand. The Child has a green cloak, lined with ermine, caught by an elaborate morse, and a purple tunic. In one hand he holds a red orb with green and yellow cross, and blesses with the other hand.

‘The whole is on a deep red ground, powdered with very small sexfoils in a darker red.

‘The elaborate colour scheme, and the preservation of so much detail, make the painting, in spite of the damage it has suffered, an extremely important discovery, and goes yet further to prove the universal popularity of this Saint in medieval England.’

Mrs. Bardswell completed the uncovering and cleaning, and there is little to add, except that she found evidence of the flesh tints being laid over a dark under-painting, such as is met with in several fourteenth-century paintings in England, namely, at Longthorpe, St. Albans, and elsewhere. The range of colours is particularly striking, especially the brilliant blue, green, and reds. The repainting is also a rare feature, for our medieval predecessors had little antiquarian prejudice as a rule, and preferred to embark upon something entirely fresh. But it may be the small space available dictated to them.

The painting is recorded in the late E. W. Tristram’s posthumous volume, English Wall Painting of the Fourteenth Century (1955).

The accompanying illustration is printed from a block kindly lent by the Rev. Ralph Stevens, M.A., rector of Lambourne. E.C.R.

Called by Martin Luther ‘a fine Christian poem’, the legend of St. Christopher is so familiar that there is no need to repeat it here. The story may be read at length in The Golden Legend, compiled by Jacobus de Voragine, Archbishop of Genoa, about 1275.1

There is no doubt that the name of the saint (Christ-bearer) was the starting-point of his legend. The earliest evidence of his cult dates from A.D. 452, but, as nothing authentic was known about him, a legend was invented after a conventional pattern, relating his Eastern origin, conversion, missionary work, and consequent martyrdom, prolonged by various tortures. Then, in the twelfth century, it seems that

---

22, Wiltshire, 17, Cambridgeshire, 14, Hampshire, 10; then came a drop from Devonshire, 9, to Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, and Staffordshire, one each. Essex was the eleventh on the list of thirty counties, with 7 (since increased to 12)—a rather small number for an extensive eastern county.

Although we have a fair number of wall-paintings of St. Christopher dating from the fourteenth century, his cult did not become popular in England until the fifteenth century, during which period it has been conjectured that ‘every English church possessed a figure, either in painting or sculpture, of this saint’. Probably this is an overstatement, though St. Christopher’s immense popularity is unquestionable. He was usually depicted on the north wall, opposite the south door, the principal entrance, so that he could be easily seen by the passer-by. ‘There is’, as the late Dr. G. G. Coulton aptly remarked, ‘the best of reasons for his popularity and his position; the sight of him was talismanic’.

A glance at the gigantic figure of the saint, striding through the river, clutching his staff, and turning his head to look at the Christ-child seated on his shoulder—the latter wearing a royal mantle, and with the orb of sovereignty in one hand, and the other raised in blessing—assured the beholder that on that day at least he would be preserved from harm. The origin of this superstition, which is probably of fairly late growth, is somewhat obscure. It finds expression in a Latin couplet occasionally placed under the saint’s picture, and of which there are various versions:

\[
\text{Christophori sancti speciem quicunque tuetur} \\
\text{Ista nempe die non morte mala morietur.}
\]

(Whosoever seeth the representation of St. Christopher, on that day surely he shall not die an evil death.)

As might be expected, St. Christopher was frequently engraved on amulets worn as ornaments upon the person. The squire in the ‘General Prologue’ to Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales, wore:

A Cristophere on his brest of silver sheene.

And the saint, whose figure is often met with on the bezels of fifteenth-century finger-rings, occurs on a gold signet-ring of the period, found at Layer Marney.¹

The cult of St. Christopher, like that of many of the saints, was entirely due to popular enthusiasm, at a time when the saints were prominent in the lives and beliefs of the people.

It will be seen from the following list that including two problematical instances, twelve wall-paintings of St. Christopher have been

¹ *Trans. E.A.S.*, vol. (N.S.), p. 82 and illus.
noted in Essex. Of these, six are no longer extant; the traces of three are slight; and only three, namely those at Little Baddow, Lambourne, and Layer Marney, are, at least in part, fairly well preserved.


**BADDOW, LITTLE.**—This fine example of a St. Christopher was exposed in 1922, on the north wall of the nave, opposite the south door. The colouring is unusually brilliant, and the head of the saint and the figure of the Child are well-preserved—the orb held by the latter, surmounted by a tall cross with flying pennon, is a conspicuous feature—but the lower part of the picture is somewhat indistinct. A chapel is depicted on the saint's right, in front of which stands a hermit carrying a lantern. The painting, which is of fifteenth-century date, and measures about 10 feet by 7 feet, is superimposed on an earlier masonry pattern, of which slight traces are visible here and there.

Canon Jesse Berridge, the then rector, was led to the discovery by a tiny spot of colour on a rubbed portion of the wall, and by the following entry in the churchwardens' accounts for 1749:

To plastering about the new door and putting out Saint Christifer, 3s. 0d.


**BRADWELL-JUXTA-COGGESHALL.**—High up, on the north wall of the nave, near the west end, and facing the south porch, is a small head, probably of the Infant Christ. The subject and position of this fragment suggest that it may be the remains of a St. Christopher.

**CANEWDON.**—Morant records (*Hist. of Essex*, vol. i, p. 317, footnote) that 'in the year 1711, when the Church was beautified, a figure of St. Christopher, painted on the right side of the door, appeared'. It has long since been obliterated.

**FAIRSTEAD.**—On the south wall of the nave, opposite, but a little to the left of the north door, is an indistinct painting of St. Christopher. Although hardly more than a faded silhouette remains, the staff and posture of the saint indicate that it dates from the fourteenth century;
it lacks the elaborate details which characterize fifteenth-century representations.


FEERING.—A wall-painting of 'St. Christopher carrying Christ' was discovered about 1845 above the north doorway, during repairs to the church. It is said to have been 'in bad preservation', and no trace of it is now visible. *Journ. Brit. Archl. Assoc.,* vol. ii (1847), p. 190.

FINGRINGHOE.—A large painting of St. Christopher was discovered in 1917-18 above the north doorway, and in the usual position opposite the main entrance. It is in a very fragmentary and faded condition, but in a favourable light the main outlines can be faintly seen. The saint, whose features are just discernible, appears to be bareheaded, and has a nimbus with black invected border. He bears the Divine Child—who wears a flowing light-blue robe, and carries an orb surmounted by a cross—on his right shoulder, and holds a staff in his left hand.


INGATESTONE.—In or about 1867 a painting of St. Christopher, 'small, very faded, and scarcely visible', was revealed 'on the wall near the tower', only to be covered up again almost immediately after its discovery. It was assigned to the fourteenth century.


LAMBOURNE.—Described above.

LATTON.—This is a remarkably small St. Christopher, being only about 20 inches in height. It is regrettable that it is so fragmentary, since it must have been of an unusual artistic excellence. Dating from the latter part of the fifteenth century, it occurs on the wall of the north or Arderne chapel (built c. 1470), by the west door. The head of the saint is gone, except for an outline on the right side, and the beard. He wears a red cloak of two different shades, edged with a narrow double yellow stripe and with a green lining, which billows out in the wind; the skirt is also edged with a similar stripe. The fingers of the right hand remain, grasping the staff (imperfect); the left leg is clearly visible; and two fish can be seen swimming in the river. There is now no trace of the Christ-child, but he is shown carrying an orb, and seated astride the saint's neck, in a drawing of the painting, made many years ago, which hangs in the chapel; the drawing also includes the small figure of a hermit, holding a lantern—another missing feature.

The above note is based on a photograph, kindly taken at my request,
by Mr. Wyndham D. Clark, in 1943, and on the detailed description that accompanied it. Since it was written, I have been informed that all traces of the painting were practically obliterated when the chapel was redecorated about three years ago. This recalls a similar incident at Good Easter, where traces of painting, dating probably from the thirteenth century, were likewise effaced in recent times.

The drawing in question is reproduced in J. L. Fisher’s The Harlow Deanery (1922), p. 100.

LAYER MARNEY.—On the north wall of the nave, immediately to the west of the chancel screen, is a late painting of St. Christopher, which is easily visible from the south doorway. The picture is at least half an inch deeper than the surrounding whitewash. It dates from the early part of the sixteenth century, and was brought to light in or about 1870 (Trans. E.A.S., vol. i (N.S.), p. 62). The figure of the saint is somewhat squat and ungainly, and it is evident that since its discovery it has been ‘touched up’, and the outlines renewed. A large rosary hanging from the waist is a rare feature; the only other recorded instance in English wall-paintings of the subject occurs at Bramley, Hants. The Christ-child, who carries an orb, is seated on St. Christopher’s right shoulder, but the figure is faded and the lower part obliterated. An eel curls round the saint’s right leg, and fish are seen swimming in the river, which flows between rocky banks. On the left is a small standing figure of a fisherman, with a bait tub by his side.


ONGAR, CHIPPING.—A St. Christopher, discovered on the north wall, and destroyed prior to 1883, is recorded by C. E. Keyser (List of Buildings having Mural Decorations (1883), p. 191).

ORSETT.—On the north wall of the north aisle, almost opposite the south porch, a fragmentary painting was discovered in 1917. Little more than traces of a long staff and small figure were visible, but doubtless they were the remains of a St. Christopher. The painting perished during a disastrous fire in 1926.


G.M.B.

1 This little oblong handbook, well-illustrated and bound in boards, and issued at the modest price of 6d., did much to arouse an interest in Essex and its antiquities. Reginald A. Beckett, in his attractive volume, Romantic Essex (1901), gratefully acknowledges the debt he owed to it.
An additional note on a Brass at Saffron Walden (Trans. E.A.S., vol. xxiv, p. 157).—When describing the brass of a priest recently returned to Saffron Walden church, the ornament on the orphreys of the cope seemed familiar to my colleagues and myself, but we were unable at the time to locate it. Subsequently, I came across, by chance, in The Oxford Journal of Monumental Brasses, vol. i, p. 176, an illustration of the lost brass of Robert Abdy, Master of Balliol College, 1493, formerly in the church of St. Mary Magdalene, Oxford. This must have been the brass we had in mind, for it was practically a replica of the Walden figure. It was only 2½ inches less in height, and the treatment of the front orphreys, and of the surplice and hands was identical. The design of the orphreys is described as 'double-stalked oak leaves, tied round the stalk'; and there was the same single roundle on either side of the tie. A very narrow orphrey, decorated with annuletts and carried round the hem of the cope, was the only fresh element.

It is evident that both brasses came from the same workshop, and the unusually close resemblance between them is remarkable. Their geographical position leaves little room for doubt that they were the work of the London School of engravers. The distance from London to Saffron Walden is 44 miles to the north-east, and to Oxford, 57 miles to the north-west.

G. Montagu Benton.

British Stater found at Shoebury.—A gold coin unearthed in March, 1952, in a garden in Antrim Road, Shoebury, within a foot of the surface, has been identified by the British Museum as an ancient British Stater (c. 90 B.C.). Gold staters were the earliest coins struck in this country. They were crude imitations of the gold stater of the Kings of Macedon and were uninscribed. Mints existed in Gaul and in Britain, and it is not possible to say in which country the present find was struck, since the distribution of these coins found in this country, between Gaulish and British mints, is uncertain. The design consists of a head in profile with flowing hair and, on the reverse, a horse surrounded by grapes. The diameter is 21 mm., and the weight, 6.680 grms. A specimen is described and illustrated in J. Evans' The Coins of the Ancient Britons (1864), p. 50 and pl. A4.

At the suggestion of the British Museum, it is hoped to explore the site further, though the fact that a bomb disturbed the ground in the vicinity may be confusing.

W. A. Voss.
A Saxon land-owner of Essex birth.—In 1066 Alwin Godtuna held Cuica (Quickbury in Sheering) as three hides.\(^1\) He was a man of some importance with more extensive holdings over the border in Hertfordshire, where he held three hides under the abbot of St. Albans. His own estate seems to have been at Stanstead Abbots, where he had 11\(\frac{1}{2}\) hides.\(^2\) As a man of King Edward, he held a hide at Hoddesdon,\(^3\) whilst at Ayot (St. Lawrence) a man of his held 9 acres of the King\(^4\) and at Stanstead ten men of his had three hides and gave custom to the king’s sheriff 12d. yearly.\(^5\)

He is the alleged donor of Ayot to Westminster Abbey, Edward the Confessor, in 1060, confirming the grant of the *coltif* there with its appurtenances which Ælfwine Gortune and his wife had held and had granted to St. Peter’s for their souls.\(^6\) Between 1080 and 1086, the Bishop of Lincoln and the sheriff of Hertfordshire were notified by William I that St. Peter’s, Westminster, were to have their manor of Ægate with the church and other appurtenances given them by Ælwinus Cotton and his wife as confirmed by King Edward.\(^7\) His local importance is indicated by an instruction from the Conqueror in 1067 to Edmund, sheriff of Hertfordshire, Alfwine Gottun and Leofwin Scufe to let St. Peter of Westminster have full possession of estates at Datchworth and Watton (Herts.).\(^8\) As all his lands had passed to others in 1086, Alfwine had presumably died before that year.\(^9\)

Tengvik identifies *Godtuna* with Gotton (Somerset);\(^10\) von Feilitzen suggests an unidentified place in Hertfordshire.\(^11\) It is much more likely that Alfwine took his name from a lost place in Hempstead (Essex)—*Godington*.\(^12\) This is no great distance from Sheering and Alfwine’s other possessions just over the border in Hertfordshire. Although this place has been noted only once, and though it is often dangerous to speculate on the basis of a solitary form, the name was probably originally *Godan-tun*, ‘the farm of Goda’. This would develop quite naturally to *Godetun, Godton, Gotton* or, alternatively,

---

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 343b.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 343a.
\(^5\) Ibid., p. 326b.
\(^6\) Kemble, *Codex Diplomaticus Ævi Saxonicæ*, 864. See also 1066 ib., 824, where Ælfwine, Gottom,Ægote (as printed) should read Ælfwine Gottune (granted) Ægote.
\(^8\) Ibid., 16.
\(^9\) See also F. E. Harmer, *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, p. 552.
\(^10\) *Old English Bynames*, pp. 43, 123.
\(^11\) *Pre-conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book*, p. 181.
\(^12\) P. H. Reaney, *Place-names of Essex*, p. 592.
to Godenton, Godington. Both developments could exist side by side. The by-name is noteworthy for the early loss of the prepositional *de*. In Domesday Book, we have Aluinus *de Godtuna* thrice,¹ side by side with Aluinus *Godtuna*, Godton, Gotone.² In the two charters from Kemble and the two documents of William I, all four references are without the preposition.

P. H. REANEY.

John Ball in Essex.—John Ball’s part in the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381 is well known. He was then in Kent, but several years before then he had been preaching his revolutionary sermons in Essex. As early as 1364 he had been excommunicated by the Bishop of London, Simon of Sudbury,³ who was to be murdered in the rebellion, but he seems to have disregarded this, as in 1367 Simon de Langham, Archbishop of Canterbury, as appears from the following extract from his Register, ordered notice to be given in the deanery of Bocking⁴ that nobody should attend John Ball’s sermons, and that the disobedient and John Ball himself should be cited to appear before the Archbishop.

Contra J. Balle et sibi adherentes.—Simon etc. decano de Bockyng nostre jurisdiccionis immediate omnibusque alis et singulis rectoribus vicaris et capellannis parochialibus dicti decanatus salutem etc. Ad nostrum pervenit auditum fama publica referente quod quidam Johannes Balle presbiterum se pretendens infra jurisdiccionem nostram predictam mulplices errores et scandala [predicet] tam in anime sue et ipsius in hac parte fautorum animarum salutis dispendium quam universalis ecclesie scandalum manifestum. Nos vero hujusmodi absque nostre conscientie lesionre tollerare salubriter non valentes, vobis conjunctim et divisim committimus et mandamus firmiter injungentes quatinus omnes et singulos dicti decanatus nostre jurisdiccionis subjectos in forma juris efficaciter momentis et vestrurn quilibet quatenus ad ipsum attinet moneat cum effectu, eius peremptorie inhibiendo ne quis eorum predicacionibus dicti Johannis interesse presumat sub pena excommunicationis majoris, quam omnes hujusmodi monicionibus canonice non parentes mora et culpa eorum precedentibus incurrere volumus ipso facto. Reclamantes vero seu delinquentes si quos inueniret vel vestrurn aliqua inuenirit in hac parte cietis eosdem seu citari faciatis peremptorie quod compareant coram nobis aliquo certo die juridico quem eis videritis prefigendum ubicunque in nostris civitate diocesi aut provincia Cantuariensis tunc fuerimus, etc. Citetis insuper seu citari faciatis peremptorie dictum Johannem Balle quod compareat personaliter coram nobis aliquo certo die

¹ ff. 118b, 140, 142b.  
² ff. 36, 135b, 143b.  
³ Registrum S. de Sudbury (Canterbury and York Society), vol. ii, p. 138.  
⁴ The deanery of Bocking consisted of the parishes of Bocking, Stisted, Latchingdon and Southchurch in Essex, and Hadleigh, Monks Eleigh and Moulton in Suffolk, all in the Archbishop’s immediate jurisdiction.
juridico quem sibi videritis prefigendum super certis articulis et interro-
gatoriiis correccionem et salutem anime sue tangentibus ex officio nostro
eidem obiciendi responsurus et de veritate dicenda si oporteat personaliter
juraturus et juri in omnibus pariturus. Et quid feceritis in premisis certi-
cificentis nos dictis die et loco per litteras vestras patentes vel certificet ille
vestrum per suas harum seriem et citatorum huianodi nomina et cogn-
nomina continentes. Data ut supra [28 January, 1367].

But nothing seems to have had any effect upon the preacher, as we
find a commission dated 13 December, 1376 from the King to the
rectors of Panfield and Little Tey, to Thomas Joye and John Blyton,
both of Colchester, and John Flecham, of Shalford, to arrest John
Ball as a contumacious excommunicate.

A. C. WOOD.

Dengewell Hall in Great Oakley.—In Place-names of Essex
(p. 345) it is suggested that this name would seem to be of manorial
origin, but the place from which the family derived its name was
unknown. They probably came from a place Denscewelle, which does
not seem to exist to-day, but was probably in or near Layham (Suffolk).

P. H. REANEY.

Wall-paintings in Writtle Church.—Owing to the foresight of
Mr. G. J. Bragg, L.R.I.B.A., the architect in charge, traces of painting
were brought to light in the north and south aisles of Writtle church
in 1948, when the walls were cleaned down previous to colour-washing.

Over the north doorway is a very fragmentary St. George and the
Dragon; the upper part is entirely missing, and little more than the
dragon’s head, showing a fearsome set of teeth, remains, though slight
traces of the armoured right leg of the saint, and of the horse’s forelegs,
lance, etc., are visible. The painting is outlined in red, the only relief
being a narrow slanting band in black. It is surrounded by new plaster,
and there is nothing left to show whether the original design included the
frequent accompaniments of the castle, with the king and queen, and the
princess; but the figures of St. George and the Dragon, when complete,
probably resembled those in the woodcut of the subject in Caxton’s
Golden Legend, 1493.

For references to representations of St. George in Essex, see Trans.
E.A.S., vol. xxii, pp. 12 and 16-17. Miss Ethel Carleton Williams,
F.S.A., listed 94 examples of the subject in her article ‘Mural Paintings

---

1 Langham’s Register, i. 52. Printed in Wilkins, Concilia, vol. iii, p. 64.
Historical Notes.

As soc n., Third Series, vol. xii, pp. 19-36); of these, only two were in Essex.

On the north face of the arches of the north arcade of the nave, and on the south face of one of the bays of the south arcade, a simple, painted design was revealed a good many years ago, and is recorded by the R.C.H.M. It is dated 'probably thirteenth century'.

In 1948 scattered fragments of painting were discovered on the wall of the south aisle, midway between the Carpenter chantry-chapel and the porch. Nothing can be made of them in their present condition, but they are not without interest, and provide an object lesson.

Last year I had the privilege of accompanying Professor Kurt Wehlte, of Stuttgart, during his tour in Essex, when he was studying the general condition of wall-paintings in England, on behalf of the Central Council for the Care of Churches, with a view to recommending the best method of preservative treatment in the line of modern scientific advance. Writtle was among the churches we visited (on 22 July, 1954), and the Professor's attention was drawn to these fragments. After a careful inspection he said that they belonged to three paintings of different periods that had been superimposed one on another, as was a common practice. To recognize the several paintings in such cases obviously requires the specialized knowledge of the expert, whose advice, it was emphasized, should always be sought before any attempt is made to uncover and preserve paintings that have long remained hidden on the walls of our ancient churches.

G. MONTAGU BENTON.

Copto Family of High Easter.—In the church of High Laver is a brass (c. 1495) on which are effigies of Edward Sulyard and his wife Myrabyll, their daughter and four sons. Myrabyll was a granddaughter of John Coptoo of High Easter who held land in Essex and Suffolk and has left his name in Coptoes in Great Whelnetham in the latter county.

His will was made in November, 1469, and proved at Lambeth in January, 1470:

He desires his body to be buried in the church of Highstre near the grave of Sir Thomas Coptoo, clerk, his brother. He leaves to his wife Johanna an annuity of 12 marks from his lands and tenements in Great and Little Whelnetham, Newton, Stanfeld, Brend-bradfield, Cokefeld, Lawshull, Hausted and Bury, all in Suffolk. All his lands in these towns are held in trust

1 For a full description, with the inscription and illustrations, see Trans. E.A.S., vol. vii (n.s.), pp. 13-16.
2 Not a daughter as in op. cit.
for 'Merabil, daughter of my son Thomas Coptoo' until she comes of age, and if she die without lawful heirs, to Johanna, his daughter, wife of Robert Parker, and her heirs; failing such, to John, son of John Coptoo his brother.

Other bequests are:
To the repair of le Closet of the Holy Trinity in the church of High Easter, 6s. 8d.
To the high altar of the church of Great Dunmowe for tithes and offerings, 3s. 4d. To the repair of the said church, 3s. 4d.
To the mending of the muddy way in the king's highway between my tenement called Podypales (Pooey Pools in Roxwell) and the tenement of William Trenchant, 6s. 8d.
To every priest who comes to my funeral and to the mass on the day of my burial, 4d.
To every clerk who comes in like manner, 2d.
For distribution among the poor who are most in want on the day of my burial, 20s.
To Johanna my wife all my household goods,
To the friars Minors preachers of Chelmsford, 10s.
To the friars Minors of Badwell, 20s.
To the friars Minors of London, 20s.
To the repair of the church or Chapel of Bishoppeswoodchapell (near Bishop's Green in Great Dunmow), 6s. 8d.
For the keeping of torches burning round my body within the church of Highestre on the day of my burial, 6s. 8d.

Various bequests to servants and relatives including: to Johanna his daughter, wife of Robert Parker of Writtle, 20 marks; to Johanna, wife of Henry Bury, his cousin, 10 marks; to Margaret Edolf his cousin, 10 marks; to John Coptoo his cousin, 20s.; to Henry Parker, son of Johanna his daughter, when he comes to an age to find himself at school, 20s.

His wife Johanna to have the custody of Merabil, daughter of Thomas Coptoo his son, until she is of legal age.

Residue to Johanna his wife, Robert Kylliner, rector of Mashhebury, William Peck, rector of Margaret Rothing, Henry Bury and Walter Bust, who are appointed executors. Supervisors: Geoffrey Gattes miles and John Grene armiger.

John Coptoo was clearly a man of some wealth and importance, but little is known of his ancestors or his descendants.

In 1413 William Copto and Agnes his wife were parties to a fine concerning 2 messuages, 1 toft, 280 acres of arable, 18 acres of meadow, 40 acres of pasture, 5 acres of wood and 10s. rent in the Suffolk parishes in which John Coptoo held land in 1469 (excepting Cockfield and Lawshall). This transaction, which puzzled the editor of the Great Whelnetham Parish Registers, must have been a settlement or mortgage, not a sale, for the lands were still in the possession of John Coptoo fifty years later.
This must be the same William Copto and Agnes his wife who, with their son William Copto, had land in South Ockendon in 1419. The earliest reference to William is in 1393, when he was one of the parties to whom John Scolemaster of Chelmsford quitclaimed one toft, etc., in Great Dunmow. In 1412, William was one of eight plaintiffs (including Joan, countess of Hereford) to hold 3s. rent in South Ockendon.

In his will, John Coptoo refers to the grave of his brother, Sir Thomas Coptoo, clerk. This can hardly be any other than the Thomas Copto, chaplain, who in 1435 was granted the free chapel of Alvethee (Aveley), void by resignation of John Wellys, last warden, in the king’s gift by reason of the minority of Edmund Inglethorp, kinsman and heir of Elizabeth Pole. On 22 June, 1437, when rector of North Ockendon, he acknowledged a debt of £100 to John Gladwyn, of Westthorndoun (West Horndon), and on 12 October of the same year he acquired a messuage called the Feldchores with 200 acres of land and 10 acres of meadow in East and West Horndon, Childerdictch and Bulvan (now represented by Field House in West Horndon) from Thomas Gladwyn, of Great Whelnetham (Suffolk), heir of John Gladwyn, of Westthorndoun.

Whether William and Agnes Copto were the parents of John Coptoo of High Easter is not proved, but it appears most probable. The dates agree and William, John, and Thomas were all connected with the same parts of Essex and Suffolk. John Coptoo in 1469 made a bequest to his cousin John. Was this John a son of the John Cobto (Coptoo, Copto) of Riale or Royall (Ryhall in Rutlandshire), who was collector of taxes in Rutland between 1401 and 1416? If so, this John was a brother of William.

P. H. REANEY.

The New History of Felsted School.—We are now in the period of School Quater-centenaries, and the imminence of these important events has spurred faithful masters to write their School histories.

In 1946 Mr. J. H. Johnson’s Chelmsford Grammar School was reprinted in booklet form from his serial history in the Essex Review for

---

1 Essex Fines, vol. iii, p. 270.
2 Including Richard Waldgrave, whose family had land in Great Whelnetham in 1429 (Great Whelnetham Parish Registers, p. 285) and Clement Spicke, one of the cooffees of William Copto in 1413.
4 Ibid., p. 259.
6 Cal. Close Rolls Hy VI (1435-41), vol. iii, pp. 124, 159.
1945-46. This excellent account anticipated by five years the School's celebrations of 1951, and thus gave past and present scholars plenty of time to learn about their long history before the quater-centenary arrived.

The History of Colchester Royal Grammar School (1539-1947), by G. H. Martin, followed in 1947. This carefully compiled brochure, embodying considerable research, is noteworthy as being the work of one who was at the time a senior scholar at the School.

Brentwood School's four-hundredth anniversary is to be celebrated in 1957, and it is good to know that a new history of the School is being prepared by a member of the staff.

Felsted School believes in noticing two quater-centenaries—1555, when Lord Rich e founded Felsted Chantry, and 1564, when he converted it into a School. And in 1955 there has appeared a noble History of Felsted School, 1564-1947, written by Michael Craze. In this 360-page book, well produced by Cowells of Ipswich, the author has presented a chronicle of absorbing interest which should increase all Old Felstedians' pride in their foundation. Mr. Craze has preserved a good balance between the early and recent history of the School, and has dealt with both with equal devotion. It is important to set down some of the discoveries made by him in the course of his extensive research. These comprise:

1. the Funeral Record of Richard, Lord Rich e, in the College of Arms, and the Edward Turnour Latin letter of 1602 to his son at school, both printed in appendices;
2. a series of letters between 1690 and 1712, between Patron, Vicar, and Headmaster, heavily drawn on in the Simon Lydiatt chapter;
3. biographical details of the early headmasters, especially George Manning, Martin Holbeach, Christopher Glascock, Simon Lydiatt, and Thomas Surridge.

Apart from all this new material, Mr. Craze has cleared away the cobwebs of legend at point after point, not least in the nineteenth century. He dispels the illusion (perpetrated even in A. L. Rowse's England of Elizabeth) that Lord Rich e filched a bit of the churchyard on which to build his new School. This point is emphasized—it gives the reader something of a shock—in the caption 'Guildhall' (not Old School) to the illustration of the building affectionately known to all Felstedians and Essex archaeologists.

This book sets a high standard of scholarship which other schools will find it difficult to emulate, and it should be on the shelves of everyone interested in the history of Essex. F. G. EMMISON.
The Geldart Collection of Drawings.—Mr. Duncan W. Clark, F.S.A., has called attention to a collection of drawings by the Rev. Ernest Geldart, which has recently been presented to the Library of the Royal Institute of British Architects by Miss N. Kerr, through the kind offices of Mr. John Betjeman. The Librarian of the Institute states that this collection 'deserves particular mention'; it should certainly possess a special interest for Essex ecclesiologists.

Ernest Geldart was rector of Little Braxted from 1881 to 1900. He was an authority on church architecture, and on leaving Braxted he practised as an architect, for which profession he was originally trained, having been a pupil of Alfred Waterhouse, R.A., in 1864. He travelled much on the Continent and in Australia and America (The Times, July 16, 1929). He was ordained in 1873. As a decorator and restorer he did work in several Essex churches during his incumbency. He believed in symbolism, and his point of view was that of the Victorian ecclesiologist; but if his designs are in conflict with present-day standards, they reflect the taste of the time, and for that reason are not without interest.

The exuberant decoration of Geldart's own church at Little Braxted, with its painted walls, was intended to illustrate what he would have termed the Ministry of Art. On its completion he published a booklet (now very scarce), entitled The Story of the Church for old and young, told to the parishioners of S. Nicholas, Little Braxted in 1886, some of it by the Church itself, and the rest by the Rector, which gives an insight into his approach to such matters. Incidentally, there is also a humorous allusion to his personal appearance, for in describing the original Norman windows, he said they were like himself, 'small, narrow, and round-headed'. Other works of his in Essex included: Ardleigh (sanctuary paintings); Coggeshall and Wickham Bishops (organ-cases); Kelvedon (almshox); Leigh (reredos). He was also responsible for the restoration of Tolleshunt d'Arcy, Wendens Ambo, and Wennington churches.

He was the author of The Art of Garnishing Churches (1882), and A Manual of Church Decoration and Symbolism (1899), as well as of several other publications.

Geldart died on 11 July, 1929, at Holmbury St. Mary, Surrey, at the age of 81.

I am indebted to the Rev. J. W. M. Vyse, M.A., the present rector of Little Braxted, for the loan of records in his custody.

G. MONTAGU BENTON.
The Font Cloth in Essex.—Although fonts had permanent wooden covers, a cloth was also used in medieval times to veil the font-bowl; or it may have hung on or over the cover itself—at St. Nicholas, Warwick, in 1556, 4d. was ‘Payd for Iron and workemanshipe to hange the clotte on over the Font.’ A number of churches possessed two or three of these font cloths, and St. Columb Major had as many as eight. Originally protective, they became an outward sign of reverence. The material seems to have been usually of white linen, or coloured silk; sometimes they were ‘paynted or stayned,’ or otherwise decorated. Their use, if not general, was widespread in England, and the custom was observed, to some extent at least, in counties as far apart as Cornwall, Surrey, Lincolnshire, and Yorkshire. It was also practised in Essex, as the following extracts from the Edwardine inventories of 1552 show:

Bardfield, Great.—A white clote for the fonte.¹
Bentley, Little.—Itm one founte clote.²
Bradfield.—Itm a flownte clote.³
Eastwood.—Itm a lynnent clote for the funt.⁴
Hockley.—Itm one clote for y′ founte.⁵
Laver, Little.—A fonte clote, Delivered to the curate for the Divine Service.⁶
Rayleigh.—[Received] for one paynted fount cloth sold to John Hastler, iiij ′ iiij ′.⁷
Win.—A fount cloweth that Nycholases Roith had, p′ce, ij ′ iiij ′.⁸

The inventories of church goods, dated 1582-93, in the wardens' accounts of St. Mary, Chelmsford, contain the following entry:

Three very old torna table cloths, of which one serveth to cover the fonte, and one hath red crosses.

This supplies additional evidence that the use of the font cloth in England survived the Reformation. Indeed, the custom prevailed at Luccombe, Somerset, and Lynton and Martinhoe, Devon, until the middle of the nineteenth century. The late Dr. Francis C. Eecles, writing in 1908, stated that the font cloth is ‘an ornament of which very little is known. More evidence would have to be collected before very much could be said about it.’ Thanks to Dr. Eecles' subsequent researches, fresh light has since been thrown upon the subject, see his paper, ‘The Font Veil,’ Archi Journ., vol. cvii (1952), pp. 78-83.

G. Montagu Benton.

² Ibid., vol. i (n.s.), p. 8.
³ Ibid., p. 10.
⁴ Ibid., vol. iv (o.s.), p. 219.
⁶ Ibid., vol. ii (n.s.), p. 233.
⁷ Ibid., vol. v (o.s.), p. 119.
IN MEMORIAM

WILLIAM KAHLED STUART KING.

William Kahled Stuart King died at his home, The Abbey, Mistley, on 3 February, 1948, at the age of 83. He was elected a member of the Essex Archæological Society in 1925, and, although he did not take an active part in its affairs, he did most valuable work in collecting voluminous historical records of Mistley and the adjoining parishes of Bradfield and Manningtree. His typescripts, which are carefully arranged and bound in files, will prove of the greatest service to future local historians, and his wish that they should eventually find a home in the Library of our Society has been carried out by his niece, Miss Anchorettta E. King.

Mr. King was a director of Messrs. Free, Rodwell and Co. Ltd., maltsters, of Mistley, for forty-four years, and chairman of the Board for nearly twenty years. A native of Northern Ireland—his brother, Richard, was Dean of Derry from 1921 to 1946—he spent some years as a planter in Behar, India, before going to Mistley in 1903. He was a member of the Harwich Conservancy Board, a Foundation manager of the Norman Primary School, and a churchwarden of St. Mary's Parish Church, Mistley.

He paid much attention to the upkeep of the churchyards in Mistley, and he was deeply interested in the discoveries made when the site of the destroyed church of St. Mary was excavated in 1923. The foundations of the building were then uncovered, as well as several memorial- and altar-slabs. It is intended to embody the photographs and careful notes on the subject that he left, in a paper which it is hoped will appear in these Transactions.

His study of local history was of long standing, and for many years past absorbed much of his leisure. He was also a keen gardener.

Religion coloured his whole life, and he was a loyal member of the Church of England. He supported many charities; generosity was habitual to him, and was as unbounded as it was little paraded. He attended the early service on 4 January, when he received what might almost be termed his viaticum, for three days later a serious fall caused his fatal illness.—R.I.P.

G. MONTAGU BENTON.
Sidney Charles Ratcliff died at Chichester on 8 September, 1948, at the age of 75. Born on 22 January, 1873, he was educated at the City of London School, and Wadham College, Oxford. He began his career at the Public Record Office of Ireland, in 1896, and was transferred to London in 1903—he was lent to Belfast for a year in 1923—and in 1929, on the death of R. C. Fowler, our Hon. Editor, became a senior Assistant Keeper of the Public Records.

He was secretary of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, 1923-38, and at the end of the latter year was appointed a Commissioner. He was awarded the Imperial Service Order in 1930. He edited *Elton Manorial Records* for the Roxburghe Club in 1936, and was joint-editor of the first seven volumes of *Warwickshire County Records*, and planned the scheme of the whole series; he also compiled the P.R.O. *List of Papal Bulls*. For many years, and until 1947, he was secretary of the Canterbury and York Society.

Referring to his work at the P.R.O., The Times said: 'He built up a wide knowledge of all sorts of records. His advice was continuously sought by his colleagues, and imparted to them with lavish kindness and rare clarity of expression. Indeed, to most of the younger men he stood in an almost paternal relationship. He was equally accessible to students of records outside the office, particularly in the field of local history.'

Ratcliff’s association with our Society dated from 1929, when he was elected an Hon. Member; in 1931 he was appointed to the Council, and grateful acknowledgements are due to his memory for the kindness and help he generously afforded in various ways. He shared Fowler’s interest and wishes regarding *Essex Fines*, and undertook the exacting task of collating the parts of volume III as issued (see preface). I was in the habit of visiting his familiar room at the P.R.O., as in his predecessor’s time, to seek his help in solving problems incidental to research. He was always available, and spared no pains to settle the questions submitted to him. His knowledge was such that, seated on the edge of the table, he would readily supply out of his well-stored brain the information required, or, if necessary, he would consult books in the library on one’s behalf. Moreover, he grudged neither time or trouble in placing his knowledge and experience at the service of any of our student members who enlisted his help.

In himself he was the gentlest and kindest of men, and possessed in abundance those unobtrusive qualities which make friendship precious—sympathy, loyalty, and wise counsel; a truly lovable character.

I have happy recollections of days spent with him at his home in
Sussex the year before he died, and of visits to Boxgrove Priory, the Roman villa at Bignor, with its remarkable tessellated pavements, and other places of interest. He was an ideal companion, but his eyesight was beginning to fail, and this affliction, together with loss of memory, clouded the last twelve months of his life, and prevented him from pursuing his old interests. He was, however, without pain, and faced these discomforts with simple faith and courage. His allegiance to the Church meant much to him, and, fortified by the Sacraments, he passed peacefully ' into the world of light'.—R.I.P.

G. MONTAGU BENTON.

HENRY WILLIAM LEWER, F.S.A.

Henry William Lewer, who died at his home, Priors, Loughton, on 13 April, 1949, aged 90, was a staunch friend and one of the leading personalities of this Society. He became a member in 1902, had served on its Council since 1912, appointed Treasurer in 1917, and in 1944 was elected a Vice-President 'in recognition of his varied and devoted services to the Society'. He was elected a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries in 1914.

He was born at Wimborne, Dorset, on 11 August, 1858, and educated at Mr. de Winton's School in that town, and afterwards at Clifton. On leaving school in 1876, he entered the firm of W. H. Smith and Sons, booksellers. Here he was under a manager who was a keen book-lover, and it is possible that this may have fostered his love of books, and such literary ability as he displayed later. On the death of an uncle, who founded the business, he joined, at the age of 22, the staff of John Galpin, paper-makers' agents, and remained with the firm for 68 years, becoming in due time Managing Director. He naturally had much to do with publishers and books, and, it may be said, spent his life among them. His love of antiquarian research may have been inherited from his grandfather, Edward Lewer, of Merley Hall, Wimborne, who was instrumental in restoring the Minster, which contains a window dedicated to his memory.

Short, and of slight build, Lewer's energy was remarkable, and when he and his brother, Sidney (d. 1951, aged 89), came to London, and lived at Highbury, they used to walk to business and back (some 7 miles) each day, to keep fit for football and cricket; later, he played tennis. He was also a keen gardener.

I well remember the occasion when we first met. It was in 1919, in the Board Room at Liverpool Street Station, at a special function arranged by the Society. Our mutual interests quickly cemented a
HENRY WILLIAM LEWER, F.S.A.

lasting friendship. He was essentially humble in heart, and the kindest counsellor and ally. Moreover, he was given to hospitality. The life and craftmanship of Medieval England fascinated him, and he found a delight in tracing the by-ways of the past; he was also particularly interested in old china and furniture, and 'bygones'. His attitude of mind is reflected in the following extract culled from one of his letters: ‘I dislike immensely, as you do, hearing sweet words, etc., at the Annual General Meeting. Our one wish is to do all we can to help our beloved Society’. Certainly he used every opportunity to promote its honour and interest. For many years, and until the last war, the Council meetings of the Society were held at his office, 40-43 Fleet St., E.C.

A busy business man, he devoted his week-ends to dull routine work in connection with the Hon. Treasurership, at the expense of more congenial activities; he also paid all the postal charges out of his own pocket. Of the many other generous acts with which he benefited the Society, only a few can be mentioned at random. He made numerous gifts to the Library, and also invited our late Hon. Librarian to visit his private library and take away with him any Essex books and MSS. that he thought the Society should have. He provided the paper used for the book on The Church Plate of Essex, and gave a handsome donation towards the cost of its production. He presented the seventeenth-century President’s chair in the Library at Holly Trees. Distressed to find an early eighteenth-century Communion Cup and Paten, formerly belonging to Pattiswick church, in a silversmith’s shop in London, he purchased and presented them to the Society, so that it might loan them to the church in perpetuity. Afterwards he agreed that the Society should present them to the church on condition that arrangements were made to prevent their future alienation. He presented five valuable silver spoons, of Tudor and later date, to the Society, in order that they might be given to the Borough of Colchester as tokens of appreciation of the debt the Society owed to the Corporation for many kindesses received in the past. He also bequeathed to the Colchester Museum his collection of silver caddy-spoons, 300 in number, and probably the finest collection of its kind in existence. But enough has been said to show what manner of man he was.

With regard to his literary output, it is remarkable that apart from notes, book-reviews, and obituaries, his sole contribution to these Transactions is a paper on ‘The Testament and Last Will of Elizabeth, widow of John de Veer, thirteenth Earl of Oxford’ (1930). Several articles by him, however, appear in The Essex Review (of which he was formerly a director). He edited A Book of Simples (1908), the elaborate green and gold binding of which is a reduced facsimile of the
binding of the original MS. The compilers of An Anthology of Essex (1911) state that 'the volume owes its being to the enthusiasm of an untiring friend, Mr. H. W. Lewer'. He was also the author (with J. Charles Wall) of The Church Chests of Essex (1931), The China Collector (n.d.), and (with Maclver Percival) The Bric-à-Brac Collector (n.d.).

Notwithstanding his great age, and the disability of deafness, which had been a serious trial for many years, he remained active in the affairs of business almost until the last. Less than seven months prior to his death he could write: 'To bed always at 10.30 p.m. I live by rule and find that it works well. Called at 7.30 a.m., breakfast, and off to the city by 9 a.m.' Eight days before he died he visited the auditor and signed the Society's annual statement of accounts as Hon. Treasurer.

He was twice married, first, in 1888, to Florence Eliza Stressiger, by whom he had two sons, the eldest son, Richard Roy, F.G.S., a promising geologist, having died of war wounds in 1916; secondly, he married, in 1918, Mabel Maud Longley, by whom he had one son; she died in 1940.

At the funeral service at Manor Park Crematorium, the Society was represented by the Hon. Secretary and Mrs. Benton, Mr. W. Addison, and Miss I. L. Gould. The ashes were afterwards buried in the grave of his second wife, in the churchyard of St. Gennys. This Cornish village was for him the 'one spot . . . beloved over all'. He owned a house there (Trenance), where he spent his holidays, and he was greatly attached to the parish church, to which he made several gifts, including a stained glass memorial window.

No history of the Society during the past half-century will be complete unless it includes the figure of Henry William Lewer. One feels that yet another of the good old school of antiquaries has left us, never again to be replaced, and it is counted an act of pietas to pay this tribute to his memory.—R.I.P.

G. MONTAGU BENTON.

On Saturday, 6 May, 1950, a party of 80 members and friends visited Thorrington and St. Osyth. Thorrington church was described by the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley; St. Osyth's Priory, by Mr. David George, and the church by the vicar (Rev. E. B. Holtby). St. Clerc's Hall was also inspected by courtesy of Mr. and Mrs. V. A. Grantham. Six new members were elected.

On Saturday, 20 May, 1950, about 48 members and friends took part in an excursion to West Bergholt, Wormingford, and Bures (Suffolk). West Bergholt church was described by Mr. David George; Wormingford church by the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley, Church Hall was also visited by courtesy of Colonel H. D. Harington; Bures church was described by the vicar (Rev. Cyril Sharp), and St. Stephen's chapel, containing the monuments of the Earls of Oxford, formerly at Earls Colne, by Colonel G. O. C. Probert. Two new members were elected.

On Wednesday, 21 June, 1950, an excursion to Manningtree and District was attended by about 70 members and friends. Manningtree church was described by the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley, who acted as guide throughout the day. A brief visit was afterwards paid to Mistley Towers, and the other buildings inspected comprised: Little Bromley church; Bradfield church, Hall (by courtesy of Mr. F. C. Bradnam), and Bradfield Place Hotel (Mrs. Widdicombe); Wix Abbey (exterior, by courtesy of Mr. G. K. Mitchell, jun.) and church.

On Wednesday, 20 July, 1950, a party of nearly 150 took part in an excursion to Stebbing and Thaxted. Stebbing church was described by Mr. Laurence King; the old 'Church House', immediately to the east of the churchyard, also attracted attention. An hour was afterwards spent in viewing, in the sunshine of a perfect summer day, this attractive village, which retains a considerable number of houses and cottages dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Among those visited were Church Farm (by courtesy of Mr. and Mrs. Howland); Parsonage Farm (Mr. James Lanyon); and Porter's Hall (exterior, Mrs. Moore). After a picnic lunch in the vicarage garden, members left for Thaxted, where the church was described by the
vicar (Rev. J. C. Putterill). The fifteenth-century Guildhall, northeast of the church, was also inspected. But interest was not confined to these two outstanding features, for the whole aspect of the little town is eloquent of the past. The party then went on to Horham Hall, which was visited by invitation of Lady Binney, who, in addition to a kindly welcome, gave an interesting description of this important building, chiefly of early sixteenth-century date. Tea was taken in the garden before departing for the homeward journey at 5 p.m. Five new members were elected.

On Wednesday, 27 September, 1950, there was an excursion to Leighs and Felsted, at which some 140 members and friends were present. Great Leigs church was described by Mr. Laurence King. Leez Priory was next visited by courtesy of Mr. V. E. Goodman, under the guidance of Mr. Harry East. After a picnic lunch in the garden, the party went on to Felsted, where the church, and the adjoining Guildhall (not Old School House) were described by Mr. M. C. G. Hooton; the sixteenth-century barn at Bury Farm was also inspected by kind permission of Mr. H. T. Smith. Fifteen new members were elected.

Two excursions to London were held in 1951. On Saturday, 7 April, a visit to Blackfriars was attended by about 105 members and friends. The party assembled at the College of Arms, Queen Victoria Street, which was described by Major M. R. Trappes-Lomax (Somerset Herald). After lunch a brief tour of the district was made from Blackfriars Tube Station, followed by a visit to Apothecaries' Hall, by courtesy of the Worshipful Society of Apothecaries of London. Mr. William Kent, F.S.A., editor of An Encyclopaedia of London, described the building, and tea was served in the Great Hall of the Company. Five new members were elected.

On Thursday, 26 April, a party of 75 visited Westminster. In the unavoidable absence of the rector (Canon C. H. E. Smyth), St. Margaret's church was described by the verger, Mr. A. J. Elliott. The President (Rev. G. Montagu Benton) then gave a detailed account of the famous east window, which dates from c. 1520, and was, it seems, purchased by St. Margaret's in 1758. He said that this important example of glass painting undoubtedly had Essex associations, but fact and fiction were so interwoven in the story connected with it, that it was impossible to trace its exact history. After carefully reviewing the evidence, all that the late Professor W. R. Lethaby was prepared to admit was that the window appears to have been made for the Chapel of New Hall, Essex, as rebuilt by Henry VIII, and to be the
work of the successors of Barnard Flower', the King’s Glazier. Following the luncheon interval, the whole afternoon was devoted to exploring the precincts of Westminster Abbey, ‘the treasure-house of medieval England’. Under the expert guidance of Mr. Lawrence E. Tanner, C.V.O., F.S.A., Keeper of the Muniments, two delightful hours were spent in touring the less familiar parts of the Abbey buildings, including the Library and Muniment Room, where items of Essex interest had been given special prominence. Mr. R. P. Howgrave-Graham, F.S.A., also exhibited and described some of the effigies of wood and wax, on whose restoration he had been working with infinite patience since the end of the war. Tea was afterwards served at Church House, Great Smith Street, and at 5 p.m. the coach departed for Colchester. Eight new members were elected.

On Thursday, 28 June, 1951, about 125 members and friends joined in an excursion to Clavering, Wendens Ambo, and Audley End. Clavering church was described by Mr. Laurence King; and the Old House, near-by, was visited by courtesy of Mrs. Elizabeth Atha. Lunch was afterwards taken in the garden at Dancey’s, by kind permission of Lt.-Colonel T. Slingsby. The party then went on to Wendens Ambo church, which was described by the vicar (Rev. H. E. Gardner); the ‘Tiger and Mirror’ bench-end was also described by the President, who said it was on a visit to the church in 1920 that he had had the pleasure of informing the Society of the true significance of this strange carving, which had long been a puzzle to antiquaries (see Trans. E.A.S., vol. xv (n.s.), pp. 267-271). A visit to Audley End (usual entrance fee remitted by the Ministry of Works) completed the day’s programme. A succinct account of the house and its various owners was given by Mr. William Addison, whose recently published book, Audley End, should give pleasure to those who have visited this historic Jacobean mansion. After a picnic tea members departed for the homeward journey at 5.15 p.m. Five new members were elected.

On Wednesday, 18 July, 1951, a party of about 90 visited Helion and Steeple Bumpstead, and Great Yeldham. Helion Bumpstead church was described by Mr. Laurence King, and Steeple Bumpstead church by the vicar (Rev. L. C. Smale). The School House (Moot Hall), Post Office, and other old buildings in the vicinity of the latter church were also viewed. On arriving at Moyns Park (by courtesy of Capt. J. P. and Mrs. Walker), lunch was taken in the picturesque garden, which, with the moat and surroundings, was pronounced a delightful spot. The house—a striking and handsome building of c. 1580—was afterwards inspected under the guidance of Mrs. Walker,
who did not spare herself in describing the various points of interest. Great Yeldham church, described by the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley, was next visited; also the fifteenth-century Rectory (by courtesy of the Rev. H. E. and Mrs. Gant). Tea was taken in the Rectory garden before leaving for the homeward journey at 5 p.m. Four new members were elected.

An excursion to Chelmsford on Thursday, 16 August, 1951, was attended by at least 70 members and friends. The Cathedral was described by Mr. G. J. Bragg; and after the luncheon interval the party made its way to the Shire Hall, to visit an Exhibition, illustrating 'Eight Centuries of Essex History in Records'. A display of historical manuscripts, paintings, and prints had been arranged by the County Record Office, and Mr. Francis W. Steer, and Mr. A. C. Edwards conducted members round, and explained many of the items. Miss Hilda E. P. Grieve later gave a lecture on 'Medieval Chelmsford To-day', illustrated by records. In conclusion tea was served at Cannon's Restaurant at 4.15 p.m. Five new members were elected.

A party of 86 journeyed to Bury St. Edmunds (Suffolk) on Wednesday, 26 September, 1951. The site, and the Gateway and Norman Tower of the Abbey were visited, as well as the Cathedral Church of St. James, St. Mary's church, the Unitarian chapel (1711), and Moyse's Hall—a Norman dwelling, which houses the Borough Museum. Tea was served at the Town Hall (by courtesy of the Borough Council), where a notable collection of documents and manuscript books had been specially placed on view by the local Record Office. It included a thirteenth-century Bury Chronicle; a fifteenth-century psalter from the Abbey; and an account of the Keepers of the shrine of St. Edmund, 1520-1521. Certain entries in the latter document attracted particular attention, namely: a payment of 8d. to the door-keeper of the refectory at Whitsun and Michaelmas for administering the cup of St. Edmund to pilgrims and other strangers; and payments to minstrels, and for cleansing and repair of the sword of St. Edmund, and 5s. to the two keepers of the shrine for carrying it. Mr. H. J. M. Maltby, curator of the museum, kindly acted as guide for the day. Seven new members were elected.

On Saturday, 10 May, 1952, about 120 members and friends visited Hatfield (Herts.), where, after a welcome by the rector (Rev. S. E. Woods), the church was described by Miss Butterfield. The rest of the day was devoted to Hatfield House, the home of the Marquess of Salisbury, K.G., F.S.A. 'The building is on the scale of a palace rather than of a country house, and is one of the finest existing examples of
early seventeenth-century architecture.' Nearly two hours were spent in viewing the pictures and many artistic and historical treasures it contains. Tea was afterwards served in the Banqueting Hall of the Old Palace (built by Cardinal Morton, archbishop of Canterbury, in 1497), and at 5 p.m. the party dispersed. Three new members were elected.

An excursion to Southwark on Thursday, 29 May, 1952, was attended by about 50 members and friends, and 50 girls from the Fonnerneau House School, Ipswich. They were met at the Chapter House, St. Thomas's Street (part of the original St. Thomas's Hospital), by Canon T. P. Stevens, chaplain to the Sheriff of London, who kindly acted as guide throughout the day. The George Inn, rebuilt c. 1677, with galleries, was first visited before going on to Southwark Cathedral, which has passed through many changes of fortune. 'A hundred years ago it looked derelict and moribund. To-day it is as alive and as beautiful as it has ever been.' The sites of the Globe and Rose Theatres, associated with Shakespeare, were afterwards visited, and at 4.40 p.m. tea was served in the Chapter House. The party was welcomed by the Mayor of Southwark (Miss F. Stroud). Two new members were elected.

On Saturday, 28 June, 1952, a party of 120 went to Shalford, Finchingfield, and Great Bardfield. Shalford church was described by the vicar (Rev. R. B. Vaizey). Spains Hall was visited by courtesy of Sir John Ruggles-Brise, Bart., who kindly conducted members over the house—a fine example of Elizabethan brickwork, of c. 1570; lunch was afterwards taken in the garden. Finchingfield, with its spacious green surrounded by old houses, pond, and winding road leading up to the church (described by Professor J. Wallis), and the old timber-framed Guildhall, has the reputation of being the most picturesque village in Essex, and sufficient time was spent there to enable members to appreciate its charm. Great Bardfield church was described by the vicar (Rev. R. O. Masheder), and Place House was visited by courtesy of Mr. J. A. M. Aldridge. Tea was afterwards served in the Village Hall. Eleven new members were elected.

On Tuesday, 22 July, 1952, about 80 members and friends joined an excursion to Great and Little Chesterford, Strethall and Chrishall. Little Chesterford church, and the thirteenth-century Manor House, were described by Mr. Laurence King, who acted as guide throughout the day. After lunch in the garden of Great Chesterford vicarage, by kind permission of the vicar, the church, and the churches of Strethall and Chrishall were visited. Five new members were elected.
An excursion to Mount Bures, Pebmarsh, Alphamstone, and Middleton, held on Friday, 26 September, 1952, was attended by about 120 members and friends. Mount Bures church was described by the rector (Rev. W. R. Saunders)—the fortified mount to the north of the church was also visited by courtesy of Mr. D. McMaster; Pebmarsh and Alphamstone churches were described by the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley. Lunch was taken in the garden of Mill House, Pebmarsh, by kind invitation of Sir Ronald Storrs. Middleton church, which is greatly in need of repair, was described by the rector (Rev. O. E. R. Alexander), and in response to an appeal the sum of £4 17s. 6d. was contributed by members to the restoration fund. Tea was afterwards served at Ballingdon Hall. Eight new members were elected.

(The warm thanks of the Society are due to the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley, F.S.A., late Hon. Excursion Secretary, for arranging, with few exceptions, and at the expense of much time and labour, the sixteen interesting and varied excursions recorded above.)

Lectures, 1950-1952

Dr. C. Willett Cunnington : English Fashions in Christian Names. 5 June, 1952.
THE REV. THOMAS DENIS SCOTT BAYLEY, M.A., F.S.A.

President of the Essex Archaeological Society,
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE
ESSEX ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY,
AT THE TOWN HALL, COLCHESTER,
ON THURSDAY, 22 JUNE, 1950.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Following a Commemoration of deceased members of the Council,
a tribute was paid by Mr. Benton to the memory of the late Mr. H. W. Lewer, F.S.A. A brief silence was then observed.

An Address of Welcome was given by the Mayor (Councillor J. Andrews), who spoke with appreciation of the work of the Society. The President expressed the Society's thanks to the Mayor, and to the Corporation for the use of the Grand Jury Room.

The Rev. T. D. S. Bayley, M.A., F.S.A., the out-going President, said he had had the honour of serving as President for the full term of five years, and now proposed the Rev. G. Montagu Benton, M.A., F.S.A., as his successor, with a view to his holding office in the Centenary year, 1952. Canon Fisher seconded, and the resolution was carried with acclamation. Mr. Benton then took the Chair and expressed his thanks to the meeting for the honour accorded him.

The new President moved a hearty vote of thanks to Mr. Bayley for his invaluable services to the Society as President and Hon. Excursion Secretary during the past five years. The resolution was seconded by Mr. A. Laver Clarke and carried with acclamation.

The President also referred to the three new officers of the Society; to the excellent work of Miss I. L. Gould, when acting as Hon. Treasurer after the death of Mr. Lewer; and to the approaching Centenary of the Society.

The Vice-Presidents and Council were re-elected en bloc, with the addition of the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley as a Vice-President, and Dr. J. Llewellyn Jones as a member of the Council.

On the motion of the President, the Annual Report was taken as read and adopted.
The Hon. Treasurer presented the Annual Statement of Accounts, which was approved and adopted on the motion of Mr. W. Addison, seconded by Mr. Duncan Clark.

The President, Mr. Duncan Clark, and Canon J. L. Fisher, were re-elected as the Society's representatives on the Museum and Muniment Committee of the Colchester Town Council, on the motion of Mr. Bayley, seconded by the Assist. Hon. Secretary. The Rev. W. R. Saunders, B.Sc., B.Litt., was nominated in place of Mr. G. O. Rickword, resigned, on the motion of the President, seconded by Mr. Bayley.

Eleven new members were elected.

Sir Godfrey Haggard called attention to the serious condition of Black Chapel, at Ford End, and suggested that the Society should approach the Trustees. It was agreed that Mr. F. W. Steer be asked to act for the Society; Miss A. M. Ward also promised to make enquiries regarding the Trustees.

The President referred to a panel of ancient stained glass belonging to East Horndon church, which was damaged during the war, and is now in a builder's workshop at Brentwood. Repairs and reinstatement would cost £12, and the money was not available in the parish. Eventually it was agreed that Mr. F. W. Steer should make further enquiries and act on behalf of the Society.

Following the adjournment for luncheon, the party assembled in the Lecture Room at the Public Library, where a lecture on 'The Braybrooke Collection', illustrated by lantern slides, was given by Dr. G. H. S. Bushnell, F.S.A.

The important Braybrooke Collection, consisting of a magnificent series of Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon antiquities, with valuable objects of both earlier and later date, was formed by the Hon. R. C. Neville, afterwards 4th Lord Braybrooke, mainly from his excavations in Cambridgeshire, and N.W. Essex about a century ago. It has recently been acquired by the Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, of which the lecturer is Curator.

A unanimous vote of thanks was subsequently accorded the lecturer, on the motion of the President.
REPORT FOR 1949.

The Council has pleasure in presenting its ninety-seventh Annual Report.

During the year the Society has lost 48 members by death, resignation and deletion; 43 new members have been added to its roll.

The total membership, which on 31 December, 1948, was 592, on 31 December, 1949, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1948</th>
<th>1949</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual members</td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life members</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary members</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A serious loss has been sustained by the death of the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. W. Lewer, F.S.A. Although quiet and retiring in public, owing to extreme deafness, he rendered, with a rare devotion, manifold services to the Society, and for upwards of half-a-century was one of its outstanding members. He published several books, and was co-author (with Mr. J. C. Wall) of *The Church Chests of Essex* (1913). Other losses by death include the Rev. F. L. Bridges, M.A., a generous benefactor; Canon H. J. E. Burrell, M.A., F.S.A., a gifted craftsman in wood, whose work in Balsham Church, Cambridgeshire, and elsewhere, bears witness to his remarkable knowledge and skill; Sir Charles Nicholson, Bt., the eminent Church architect; and Mr. E. J. Wythes, C.B.E., elected a life member in 1895.

Under Rule 6, the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley, M.A., F.S.A., having served for five successive years, retires from the Presidency of the Society. The Council wishes to place on record the deep sense of gratitude felt by members to Mr. Bayley, who as President, as well as Hon. Excursion Secretary, has spared no pains in furthering their interests. He has not missed presiding over a single meeting, and the courtesy and ability he has displayed have added considerably to the well-being of the Society. It is a happy coincidence that the conclusion of his term of office as President should be marked by his election as a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries.

The Council recommends the election of the Rev. G. Montagu Benton, M.A., F.S.A., as President for the ensuing year. Elected a member in 1913, and of the Council in 1919, Mr. Benton has, throughout this long period, been entirely devoted to the affairs and welfare of
the Society, of which, indeed, he has been for many years the main-
spring. With one exception he has held each of the Society's offices
in turn, and has been Hon. Secretary since 1923. But he has not yet
been its President, and the Council considers it fitting that he should
be now elected, with a view to holding office at the celebration of
the Centenary in 1952. The re-election of the Vice-Presidents, with
the addition of the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley, is further recommended; also
the re-election of the Council, with the addition of Mr. J. Llewellyn

The Society has been fortunate in securing the services of the Rev.
O. E. R. Alexander, M.A., Henny Rectory, Sudbury, Suffolk, as Hon.
Treasurer. The death of the late Treasurer inevitably dislocated the
business routine of the Society and this threw much additional work
on the shoulders of the Hon. Secretary. Fortunately, the burden was
considerably lightened by Miss Isabel L. Gould, of Chigwell, kindly
acting as Hon. Treasurer during the interregnum. She carried out her
self-imposed duties most efficiently, and the Council wishes to express
its warm appreciation of her timely and valuable help in bridging over
a difficult period.

Owing to the new Hon. Treasurer's distance from London, and to
suit his convenience, Messrs. Norman Green & Co., Chartered
Accountants, of Sudbury, Suffolk, have been appointed auditors to
the Society in place of Mr. J. Robert Avery. The Council much
regretted the necessity for the change, and is not unmindful of the debt
owing to Mr. Avery, and his late father, for their long and largely
honorary services.

The Rev. W. R. Saunders, B.Sc., B.Litt., Mount Bures Rectory,
Colchester, has been elected Hon. Librarian, to succeed the Hon.
Secretary, who has been temporarily acting in this capacity since the
death of Mr. P. G. Laver, in 1941. Mr. Benton has agreed to assist
the Librarian in conjunction with Mr. Duncan W. Clark.

Mr. David C. George has accepted the office of Assistant Hon.
Secretary.

During the year the Index to Vol. III of *Feet of Fines* was issued
to members. The long delay in publishing Part I of Vol. XXIV of
*Transactions* is much regretted, but it is now in an advanced stage
and will be a substantial volume. *Essex Sessions of the Peace, 1357,
1377-79*, is also in the printers' hands and is making satisfactory
progress.

Negotiations are taking place with the Essex Roman Society with a
view to co-operation.
REPORT.

It is with feelings of gratitude and relief that the Council announces the receipt of £500, bequeathed by our late member, the Rev. F. L. Bridges, of Bath. In view of the work in hand, and the present high cost of printing, this windfall has arrived at an opportune moment. The executors have expressed the hope that 'the money will be devoted entirely to the printing of publications, or to literary research work in connection therewith, and, to a limited extent, to the purchase of books for the Library'.

Excursions were held at follows:—

30 April: Earls Colne.
14 May: Fyfield, Chipping Ongar and Greensted.
30 June: Waltham Abbey, Roydon, and Stanstead Abbotts and Hunsdon (Herts.).
27 July: Halstead and District.

The Annual General Meeting was held at Colchester on 6 October, and was followed, in the afternoon, by a lecture on 'The Sutton Hoo Ship-burial', given by Mr. R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford, F.S.A., to a crowded audience.

Five Excursions have been planned for 1950 (two on Saturdays); and arrangements have also been completed for two or three Lectures to be given at Colchester.

The Hon. Librarian reports that progress has been made in unpacking and arranging on the shelves, in the room formerly known as the 'Rendall Library', at Holly Trees, the numerous parcels of books that have been in store since the war. The previous inadequate accommodation, and the influx of accesses in recent years, had caused serious congestion, which is now being remedied.

A notable gift has been received from Sir A. Claud Hollis, G.C.M.G., C.B.E., comprising a type-script 'History of the Hollis, Ainslie, Bullock, Smith, Griffiths, Murkin, and Perry Families, and Widdington Village', compiled by the donor, and the result of many years' research. It is gratifying that our members are recognizing that it is desirable their personal manuscript collections, or copies of them, should find a place in the Society's Library, either by gift or bequest.

Members are reminded that gifts of books on general archaeological subjects are always welcome, as well as old drawings and photographs of Essex churches, houses and antiquities.
ACCOUNT OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS

1948.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Subscriptions—</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the year 1949</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less amount returned</td>
<td>1 16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 14 6</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 0 0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Subscriptions and Donations—</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 12 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colne Priory Chartulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Compositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 2 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dividends, etc., on Investments—</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 8 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3% London County Consolidated Stock (less Tax)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 15 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3% Savings Bonds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Building Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3% Savings Bonds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 19 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excursion and Lecture Receipts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634 18 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance from previous year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BALANCE SHEET.

FOR YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER, 1949.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cr.</strong></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Colchester Corporation—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curator’s Salary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent—Holly Trees</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£ s. d.</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 13 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Printing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 15 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Blocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Secretarial Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 19 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Postages, Stationery, Printing and Addressing Members’ Circul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 9 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Purchase of Books for Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Subscriptions, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 6 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Insurance (Library)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Binding Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Audit Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Library Endowment Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Morant’s Grave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 10 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 6 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830 5 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Bank on Current Account</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Building Society</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglian Trustee Savings Bank</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount due from Library Fund</td>
<td>3 5 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 16 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>934 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Amount due to Secretary</td>
<td>2 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910 10 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,078 17 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1,078 17 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£1,777 9 6
**BALANCE SHEET.**

1948.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dr.**

To Balance from previous year
Grant from General Fund
" Interest—
3% Savings Bonds
3½% War Stock
2½% Defence Bonds

£165 7 10

**Library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£103 2 10

**BALANCE SHEET AS Liabilities.**

1948.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90 Members at £5 5s. 0d.</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 Members at £10 10s. 0d.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Subscriptions paid in advance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sundry Creditors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Excavation Funds</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Essex Archaeological Trust Fund</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Library Endowment Fund</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

913 14 2

" Accumulation Fund—
Surplus of Assets in favour of the Society

£2,178 2 8 £2,270 0 6

We have examined the foregoing Accounts with the Books and Records the Investments.

O. E. R. ALEXANDER,
Hon. Treasurer.

18th February, 1950.
BALANCE SHEET.

ENDOWMENT FUND.

1948.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td>By Purchase of 2½% Defence Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 11 3</td>
<td>Balance—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 7</td>
<td>At Bank on Current Account 106 8 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due from General Fund ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Amount due to General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 5 10</td>
<td>103 2 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£165 7 10

£103 2 10

AT 31 DECEMBER, 1949.

Assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>208 5 9</td>
<td>By Investments—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 8 9</td>
<td>£199 11s. 2d. 3% Savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190 7 2</td>
<td>Bonds, 1935/65 ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 18 6</td>
<td>£50 0s. 0d. 3½% Savings Bonds,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 3 6</td>
<td>1965/75 ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 8 9</td>
<td>£186 13s. 9d. London County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 7 6</td>
<td>Consolidated 3% Stock,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 8 9</td>
<td>1962/67 ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td>£107 4s. 10d. 3½% War Stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 3 6</td>
<td>100 1 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 8 9</td>
<td>£126 18s. 6d. Conversion 3½%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 7 6</td>
<td>Stock, 1961 ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 8 9</td>
<td>£100 0s. 0d. 3½% War Stock,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td>1952 (Library Fund) ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 8 9</td>
<td>£100 0s. 0d. 3% Savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td>Bonds, 1960/70 (Library Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 0 3</td>
<td>£100 0s. 0d. 2½% Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td>Bonds (Library Fund) ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 0 3</td>
<td>£70 0s. 0d. 3½% Savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 0 0</td>
<td>Bonds, 1965/75 (Library Fund)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,179 8 11

1,096 2 8

1,097 6 7

£2,178 2 8

£2,270 0 6

of the Society and find them in accordance therewith. We have verified

33 King Street, Sudbury, Suffolk. 18th February, 1950.

NORMAN GREEN & CO., Chartered Accountants.
THE Treasurer reports that:

Members' subscriptions during the past year, including arrears £13, and payments in advance £11 5s., amounted to £300 16s. 2d., compared with £319 19s. 6d. in 1948.

Sales of publications amounted to £11 4s. 2d., a decrease of £15 18s. 3d. compared with 1948, when sales were abnormally large.

The total standing to the credit of the Library Endowment Fund on 31 December 1949 was £557 3s. 4d. This is represented by investments; the balance being held on Current Account at the Bank.

The large expenditure on 'Printing', viz. £525 19s. 6d., includes sundry payments on account for printing the Index to Volume III of the *Feet of Fines* and the First Part of Volume XXIV of *Transactions*.

One hundred and one members have compounded their subscriptions, and the total amount received from them is £588. The unexpended balances on the Excavation Funds, viz., £52 6s. 7d., are the same as in the previous year, but they have now been amalgamated into one Excavation Fund; and that on the Trust Fund is also unchanged, viz., £15 3s. 6d. The Rev. F. L. Bridges' bequest of £500 has been placed on deposit with the East Anglian Trustee Savings Bank.

To meet its liabilities the Society had investments valued on 31 December 1949 at £643 7s. 0d., and cash at the Bank, etc. amounting to £1066 5s. 3d. The surplus in favour of the Society is, therefore, £1044 0s. 9d., as compared with £913 14s. 2d. on 31 December 1948.
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE
ESSEX ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY,
AT THE TOWN HALL, COLCHESTER,
ON FRIDAY, 28 DECEMBER, 1951.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

An address of welcome was given by the Mayor of Colchester (Councillor H. Hepburn Reid), who spoke warmly of the Society's work for the town.

The President expressed the Society's thanks to the Mayor for his address, and to the Corporation for the use of the Grand Jury Room.

The Rev. G. Montagu Benton, M.A., F.S.A., was unanimously re-elected President, on the motion of the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley, seconded by Mr. F. G. Emmison. Mr. Benton then resumed the Chair, and returned thanks.

On the motion of Mr. Duncan Clark, the Vice-Presidents were re-elected; and on the motion of the President, the Council was re-elected, with the addition of Mr. F. W. Steer.

The President and Hon. Secretary presented the Annual Report. He called attention to the forthcoming Centenary of the Society in 1952, and to the special Centenary volume of Transactions, which was to be issued to commemorate the event. He said that Volume XXIV had cost over £1,000 to produce, and appealed for donations towards the cost of the Centenary publication.

The Rev. T. D. S. Bayley, chairman of the Centenary Celebrations Sub-committee, gave some details of the preliminary arrangements for the celebrations. Mrs. B. M. Rose drew attention to the unsatisfactory condition of the brass tablet in Coggeshall church, commemorating the Rev. E. L. Cutts, the virtual founder of the Society. Colonel R. J. Appleby volunteered to clean the brass.

On the motion of Mr. W. Addison, seconded by Mr. K. R. Mabbitt, the Report was taken as read and adopted.
The Hon. Treasurer presented the Annual Statement of Accounts, and moved its adoption. In seconding, Mr. Duncan Clark called attention to the financial position of the Society, which he described as critical. A special Sub-committee on 'Ways and Means' had been appointed, and had prepared a report for consideration by the Council. A lengthy discussion followed: Colonel R. J. Appleby felt that in order to increase its membership the Society needed more publicity, and its aims and objects should be more clearly set forward; Mr. A. F. J. Brown said the Society could secure publicity through other organizations with kindred interests.

The Accounts were unanimously approved and adopted.

The Society's four representatives (see p. 130) on the Museum and Muniment Committee of the Colchester Town Council were re-elected on the motion of Mr. W. Addison, seconded by Mr. F. W. Steer.

Four new members were elected.

The President drew attention to the Memorandum on Ancient Monuments, published by the Council for British Archaeology, and distributed copies to several interested members.

The meeting then adjourned for luncheon. At 2.30 p.m. members re-assembled in the Lecture Room of the Public Library, when a lecture on 'Sculpture, Ancient and Modern', illustrated by a fine series of lantern slides, was given by Mr. R. P. Bedford, R.W.A., F.S.A., formerly Keeper of Sculpture in the Victoria and Albert Museum.
REPORT FOR 1950.

The Council has pleasure in presenting its ninety-eighth Annual Report.

During the year the Society has lost 99 members by death, resignation, and deletion; 55 new members have been added to its roll.

The total membership, which on 31 December, 1949, was 587, on 31 December, 1950, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Member</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual members</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life members</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary members</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One member compounded for life during the year. Four life members died. After making 39 deletions for serious arrears of subscriptions, there are now 23 still due for 1950, otherwise all subscriptions have been paid up to date.

It must be emphasised that the rising costs of printing make an increase in membership absolutely necessary, if the standard of our publications is to be maintained. Members are therefore urged to interest their friends in the aims and objects of the Society.

The losses by death include Sir Alfred Clapham, C.B.E., F.B.A., F.S.A., a Vice-President, who, as editor to the Historical Monuments Commission, made an outstanding contribution to the historical study of English architecture; Major Allan D. Laurie, a benefactor to the Society (see Financial Report); and Dr. Thomas Wood, the eminent musician.

The Council recommends the re-election of the Rev. G. Montagu Benton, M.A., F.S.A., as President for the ensuing year, also the re-election of the Vice-Presidents, and of the Council.
No publications were issued during 1950, but in view of the proposed Centenary volume of *Transactions*, it was decided that instead of confining the next issue to Part I it should comprise volume XXIV complete, save for title-page and index. This will be in course of circulation at the time this report reaches members.

The Hon. Assistant Secretary (Mr. David C. George, 7 Wellesley Road, Colchester) has agreed to relieve the Hon. Secretary, as far as possible, of the routine secretarial work of the Society, which hitherto has absorbed much of his valuable time.

Excursions were held as follows:

- 6 May: Thorrington and St. Osyth.
- 20 May: West Bergholt, Wormingford and Bures.
- 21 June: Manningtree and District.
- 20 July: Stebbing and Thaxted.
- 27 Sept.: Leiggs and Felstead.

A Meeting was held at Colchester on 23 March, when a lecture was given by Mr. J. W. Brailsford, F.S.A., on ‘The Mildenhall Treasure’. The Annual General Meeting was also held at Colchester on 22 June, and was followed in the afternoon by a lecture on ‘The Braybrooke Collection’, given by Dr. G. H. S. Bushnell, F.S.A.

The Council wishes to express its gratitude to the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley and Mr. Laurence King for the time and careful thought they give to their exacting task of arranging excursions. Without interesting excursions—they are certainly more than pleasant outings—the membership would undoubtedly fall by nearly half, and the finances of the Society would thereby suffer seriously in consequence. This important fact is, perhaps, not always sufficiently realized.

The Hon. Librarian reports that satisfactory use continues to be made of the Library. The chief accession during the year was a copy of Professor E. W. Tristram’s *English Medieval Wall Painting: the thirteenth century*, in two part. This was purchased out of the generous bequest made by the late Rev. F. L. Bridges, and is inscribed to his memory. Numerous publications and transactions of learned societies, at home and abroad, have also been received.

An additional library rule has been introduced, whereby borrowers are requested to insert a paper strip in each space from which a book is removed. It is now possible to see at a glance from which shelves books have been taken, and missing volumes can be tracked with greater accuracy.
The inaugural meeting for the purpose of establishing the Essex Archaeological Society was held at Colchester on 14 December, 1852. Arrangements, therefore, will shortly have to be made for celebrating the Centenary of the Society. It is also proposed to issue a special Centenary volume of Transactions. Several important contributions have been promised, and it will be a well-illustrated and noteworthy publication if sufficient funds are available for its production. Owing to its various commitments, and the high cost of printing, the Society will require generous financial support. Contributions, however small, for the purpose are earnestly invited, and should be sent to the Hon. Treasurer (Rev. O. E. R. Alexander, M.A., Henny Rectory, Sudbury, Suffolk). A list of donors will be printed.

The Council rarely advertises the action it takes from time to time in regard to the preservation of ancient buildings and other antiquities, and this appears to have led to some misunderstanding. It therefore seems desirable to quote from a statement published by one of our members in connection with the Dene-holes in Hangman's Wood, Grays:

'The Urban District Council of Thurrock had decided to fill in these ancient excavations, and a letter of protest was sent by the Essex Archeological Society, and contact made with the Ministry of Works. The Society were alone in making the protest against the proposed vandalism, but public opinion began to turn in their favour and gained volume. At a later meeting of the Thurrock Council it was reported that the Ministry of Works had agreed to schedule the workings as "ancient monuments" and protect them for all time under the Act. This shows how local representatives of a learned Society can assist in preserving the amenities and ancient history of "England's green and pleasant land".'

Another case in point is Gosfield Hall. Two of the Society's officers attended, by request, a public enquiry concerning the future of this important building, and it is hoped that their evidence contributed towards the making of an order for its preservation; but the final issue is, it is believed, not yet determined.

It may be added that our Hon. Secretary has for many years been Chief Hon. Correspondent in Essex for the Ministry of Works, and that he, Mr. Bayley, and Canon Fisher are members of the Chelmsford Diocesan Advisory Committee for the Care of Churches. Mr. Benton is also a member of the Central Council for the Care of Churches.
The Treasurer reports that:

The amount of members' subscriptions during the past year, including arrears £34 10s., and, in advance £6 15s., was £347 2s., as compared with £300 16s. 2d. for 1949.

Sales of publications amounted to £20 17s. 6d. as compared with £11 4s. 2d. in 1949.

Major Allan Dyson Laurie left '£100 to the Society on condition that they will invest it separately and call it the Allan D. Laurie Memorial Fund, the interest to be paid to the General Expenses Fund as my Perpetual Subscription, for I have been a life member so long that I feel I have become a liability rather than an asset to the Society'. It has been invested in 2½% Defence Bonds.

The total standing to the credit of the Library Endowment Fund at 31 December, 1950, is £580 8s. 10d. This is represented by investments in £100 3½% War Stock, £270 3% Savings Bonds, and £100 2½% Defence Bonds, the balance being held on Current Account at the Bank.

Ninety-eight members have now compounded their subscriptions, and the total amount received from them is £577 10s. The unexpended balances on the Excavation Funds and the Trust Fund are unaltered, namely £52 6s. 7d. and £15 3s. 6d. respectively.

To meet these liabilities the Society had investments valued on 31 December, 1950, at £753 14s. 11d., and cash at the Bank, etc., amounting to £1,318 2s. 8d. The surplus in favour of the Society is, therefore, £1,420 2s. 6d., as compared with £1,044 0s. 9d. on 31 December, 1949.

Lack of space has made it necessary to omit the Accounts and Balance Sheet for 1950. The receipts and payments for that year, however, are shown in the Accounts for 1951 (pp. 150-153).
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE ESSEX ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY, AT THE TOWN HALL, COLCHESTER, ON THURSDAY, 5 JUNE 1952.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

An address of welcome was given by the Mayor (Councillor W. C. Lee), who referred to the President’s book on Fingringhoe Church; the approaching Centenary Celebrations (in which he desired to participate), and the work of the Society’s representatives on the Museum Committee.

The Rev. G. Montagu Benton, M.A., F.S.A., was unanimously re-elected President for the ensuing year, on the motion of the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley, seconded by Mr. F. W. Steer. On resuming the Chair, Mr. Benton returned thanks to the meeting.

The Vice-Presidents and Council were re-elected on the motion of Colonel R. J. Appleby, seconded by the Rev. M. W. Manthorp, Mr. L. E. Dansie being added to the Council on the motion of Mrs. K. Gilmour, seconded by the President.

It was agreed that names and number of attendances at Council meetings be printed in the Annual Report, on the motion of Mrs. Gilmour, seconded by Mr. E. Calvert.

The Council’s proposal that Life Membership be abolished without prejudice to the rights of existing Life Members, was adopted on the motion of the President, seconded by Mr. L. E. Dansie.

The Hon. Secretary presented the Annual Report, and on his motion, seconded by the Rev. M. W. Manthorp, it was taken as read and adopted. Several points were discussed by members.

The Hon. Treasurer presented the Annual Statement of Accounts, and on his motion, seconded by Mr. F. G. Emmison, it was approved and adopted.
The Hon. Excursion Secretary spoke of the difficulty in arranging excursions, and Miss Campkin, Sir Godfrey Haggard, Mrs. Cater, and Miss Baggs, offered to help in their respective districts.

A proposal to increase the annual subscription was discussed, but on the motion of Mrs. Gilmour, seconded by Colonel Appleby, it was decided that it be left to voluntary gifts for the present, the matter to be reconsidered by the Council before the next Annual Meeting.

The Society's four representatives (see p. 130) on the Museum and Muniment Committee of the Colchester Town Council were re-elected on the motion of the Rev. T. D. S. Bayley, seconded by Mrs. Pearson.

Ten new members were elected.

On the motion of the President, a hearty vote of thanks was accorded the Mayor and Corporation for the use of the Council Chamber.

Mr. L. J. Wickes suggested that an Exhibition might be held, in conjunction with the proposed Bring and Buy Sale, as a means of raising funds.

The President spoke in commendation of the newly formed Association of Friends of Essex Churches.

The meeting then adjourned for luncheon. In the afternoon Dr. C. Willett Cunningham gave a lecture on 'English Fashions in Christian Names', in the Lecture Room at the Public Library.
REPORT FOR 1951.

The Council has pleasure in presenting its ninety-ninth Annual Report.

During the year the Society has lost 57 members by death, resignation, and deletion; 56 new members have been added to its roll.

The total membership, which on 31 December, 1950, was 543, on 31 December, 1951, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual members</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life members</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary members</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>542</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No one compounded for life membership during the year. Nine members died; 38 resigned; and 10 were deleted owing to non-payment of subscriptions.

Owing to the present inadequacy of the fee, the Council is of opinion that Life Membership should be abolished, without prejudice to the rights of existing Life Members.

The losses by death include Mr. Francis W. Reader, an authority on domestic wall-paintings, several of whose fine drawings have been reproduced, some in colour, in the Society’s Transactions; and Canon J. T. Steele, M.A., who, elected in 1897, was the senior member, but one, and a life-long student of ecclesiology.

The Council recommends the re-election of the Rev. G. Montagu Benton, M.A., F.S.A., as President for the ensuing year, also the re-election of the Vice-Presidents and Council.

During the year Vol. XXIV of Transactions was issued for the years 1944-1949. It appears to be generally agreed that the long and regrettable delay in publication is more than atoned for by the size and interest of the volume. But the cost of its production, with incidental expenses, amounted to the almost incredible sum of £1,147: 7s.: 8d., and in consequence the Society is faced by an acute financial problem. It is obvious that with printing costs increased by two hundred and fifty per cent., and the annual subscription increased only by about fifty per cent., extra money must be forthcoming if the Society is to carry out its publication programme.
The work in progress includes *Essex Sessions of the Peace, 1351, 1377-1379*—this important work is mainly in type and will entail a heavy expense; as an economy measure, Mr. G. H. Martin, B.A., has generously undertaken the exacting task of compiling the indexes to vols. XXIII and XXIV of *Transactions*, for which there has been a considerable demand from the libraries; several valuable contributions, with numerous illustrations, have already been received for the projected Centenary volume of *Transactions*; and the material for a good many parts of *Feet of Fines for Essex* awaits printing.

The Council has appointed a sub-Committee to consider 'ways and means', and it is anxious that the urgency of the matter should be fully realized by members. A campaign to increase membership is suggested; and those who are able to do so are invited to voluntarily increase their annual subscription, or to make a donation to the publications fund. Contributions should be sent direct to the Hon. Treasurer (Rev. O. E. R. Alexander, M.A., Henny Reetory, Sudbury, Suffolk).

Excursions were held as follows:

- 7 April: London—Blackfriars.
- 26 April: London—Westminster.
- 28 June: Clavering, Wendens Ambo, and Audley End.
- 16 Aug.: Chelmsford.
- 26 Sept.: Bury St. Edmunds (Suffolk).

A Meeting was held at Colchester on 11 January, when a lecture was given by Mr. Sheppard S. Frere, F.S.A., on 'Recent Excavations at Canterbury'. A meeting was also held at the Moot Hall on 8 March, in conjunction with the Friends of the Colchester and Essex Museum, when Mrs. M. Aylwin Cotton, F.S.A., gave 'An Account of the 1950 Excavations in Colchester Castle Park'. The Annual General Meeting took place at Colchester on 28 December, and was followed in the afternoon by a lecture on 'Sculpture, Ancient and Modern', given by Mr. R. P. Bedford, F.S.A., formerly Keeper of Sculpture in the Victoria and Albert Museum.

The Council is gratified by the growing use that is being made of the Library. But the Hon. Librarian reports there is still room for improvement in the treatment of the books—owing to a borrower's carelessness the back of a newly-bound volume has been smothered with tar—and in the manner they are returned to their shelves; sometimes they are carelessly placed in any gap that may occur, and in consequence cannot easily be found when required. Two of the missing books have been surreptitiously placed on the shelves after
an absence of some years; but Gibson's *Flora of Essex* is still lacking — the gift of a copy of this rare work would be very acceptable.

Among the more notable accessions during the year are a transcript of Sandon parish registers, 1554-1812 (Baptisms, selections only), and two MS. books containing miscellaneous notes, mostly relating to Sandon church, from the Rev. J. F. Williams, F.S.A.

A sub-Committee has been appointed to make arrangements for the *Centenary celebrations*, which it has been decided to postpone until May or June, 1953.
ACCOUNT OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS

**Dr.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Subscriptions—</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrears</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>16 10 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the year 1951</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less amount returned</td>
<td>10 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>305 17 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>306 10 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 15 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In advance</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>15 15 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>338 15 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Composition</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 17 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Publications</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dividends, etc., on Investments—</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 8 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3½% Conversion Stock</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>4 8 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 15 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3½% War Stock</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3 15 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% London County Consolidated Stock (less tax)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3 0 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 15 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% Savings Bonds</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>4 14 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½% Defence Bonds</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2 1 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Building Society Interest</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 9 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglian Trustee Savings Bank Interest</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12 15 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excursion and Lecture Receipts</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>114 3 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan D. Laurie Bequest</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centenary Fund</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2 10 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,064 3 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance from previous year</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1,318 2 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**£1,659 15 5**

---

**£1,806 15 10**
FOR YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER, 1951.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Colchester Corporation—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 0 0</td>
<td>Curator's Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 0 0</td>
<td>&quot;Printing &quot;Transactions&quot; on a/c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>11 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Secretary</td>
<td>28 0 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Assis. Secretary</td>
<td>1 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Treasurer</td>
<td>5 11 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Librarian</td>
<td>5 17 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 5 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51 12 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 5 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51 12 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 11 0</td>
<td>&quot;Photographs&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 9 0</td>
<td>&quot;Subscriptions, Museum Reports, etc.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 6 0</td>
<td>&quot;Insurance (Library)&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 6 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5 0</td>
<td>&quot;Audit Fee&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 0 0</td>
<td>&quot;Library Endowment Fund&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 8</td>
<td>&quot;Morant's Grave&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 9 11</td>
<td>&quot;Excurion and Lecture Expenses&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>120 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td>&quot;Purchase of 2½% Defence Bonds&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341 12 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>958 12 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Balance—&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706 13 6</td>
<td>At Bank on Current Account 223 18 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td>Colchester Building Society 100 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 9 2</td>
<td>East Anglian Trustee Savings Bank 524 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>848 2 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,318 2 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,808 15 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1,659 15 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,806 15 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALANCE SHEET.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Balance from previous year</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant from General Fund</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% Savings Bonds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3½% War Stock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½% Defence Bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BALANCE SHEET AS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Life Compositions—</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Members at £5 5s. 0d.</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Members at £10 10s. 0d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions paid in advance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Funds—</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation Funds</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Archaeological Trust Fund</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Endowment Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation Fund</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus of Assets in favour of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>577</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>551</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>864</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£2,076 16 3

We have examined the foregoing Accounts with the Books and Records the Investments.

O. E. R. ALEXANDER,
Hon. Treasurer.
### BALANCE SHEET.

#### ENDOWMENT FUND.

1950.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Purchase of 2½% Defence Bonds</td>
<td>100 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Books</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Bank on Current Account</td>
<td>3 6 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£140 17 10

£134 6 6

### AT 31 DECEMBER, 1951.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Investments—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 0 11</td>
<td>£199 11s. 2d. 3% Savings Bonds, 1955/65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 2</td>
<td>199 11 2 182 18 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 5 0</td>
<td>£50 0s. 0d. 3% Savings Bonds, 1965/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>50 0 0 41 17 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182 2 4</td>
<td>£186 15s. 9d. London County Consolidated 3% Stock, 1962/67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>176 17 6 162 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 16 0</td>
<td>£107 4s. 10d. 3½% War Stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>100 1 9 86 4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 10 8</td>
<td>£126 18s. 6d. Conversion 3½% Stock, 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>100 0 0 103 12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 0 0</td>
<td>£100 0s. 0d. 3½% War Stock, 1952 (Library Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>99 12 3 80 7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 15 0</td>
<td>£100 0s. 0d. 3% Savings Bonds, 1955/65 (Library Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>100 0 0 91 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 5 0</td>
<td>£100 0s. 0d. 3½% Savings Bonds, 1960/70 (Library Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td>100 0 0 86 15 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td>£100 0s. 0d. 2½% Defence Bonds (Library Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td>100 0 0 100 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 11 0</td>
<td>£70 0s. 0d. 3% Savings Bonds, 1965/75 (Library Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>70 0 0 58 12 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td>£100 0s. 0d. 2½% Defence Bonds (Allan D. Laurie Memorial Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 0 0</td>
<td>100 0 0 100 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,214 5 11</td>
<td>£1,296 2 8 1,194 6 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at Bank and in Colchester Building Society and East Anglian Trustee Savings Bank—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,318 2 8</td>
<td>£1,296 2 8 1,194 6 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 17 10</td>
<td>£1,296 2 8 1,194 6 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>34 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Endowment Fund</td>
<td>882 9 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£2,652 6 5

£2,076 16 3

of the Society and find them in accordance therewith. We have verified

33, King Street, Sudbury, Suffolk.

12th March, 1952.

NORMAN GREEN & CO.

Chartered Accountants.
NEW MEMBERS

1950.

17 Jan. GOODEN, C. WYNN, Cremyll, Earls Colne.
MANDLER, D. H., F.B.S.S., 1 Creffield Road, Colchester.
WARREN Miss SALOME, Rockhaven, Earl's Colne.

21 Feb. GEORGE, Commander ERIC F. B., R.N.(Ret.), Sheepcote, Great Henny, Sudbury, Suffolk.
GEORGE, Mrs. GLORIA W., Sheepcote, Great Henny.
LAWRENCE, GEOFFREY W., L.D.S., R.C.S., 111 Upton Road, Bexley Heath, Kent.
MINNESOTA, UNIVERSITY LIBRARY OF, Minneapolis 14, Minnesota, U.S.A.

23 Mar. BERRY, Miss LILLY, The Curatage, Castle Hedingham.
CHAMBERLIN, Mrs. K. L., c/o Hedingham Castle.
ISHERWOOD, Mrs. B. E., The Curatage, Castle Hedingham.
RITTER, Miss AUREA, 11 Roddarn Close, Colchester.
SHILLING, Mrs. HELEN, Rose Cottage, Elmstead Heath.
TOLLEMACHE, Mrs. JOHN, Ford Place, Stifford, Grays.

6 May BROOKS, Miss DOROTHY, The Cottage, Chapel, Colchester.
DUNCAN, T. B., 40 Chadwick Road, Westcliff-on-Sea.
FRENCH, T. H., 30 Nelson Road, Lexden, Colchester.
HART, CYRIL J. R., 104 Heathway, Dagenham, Essex.
JOHNSON, F/Sgt. H. S., R.A.F. Station, Upper Heyford, Oxon.
WILLIAMSON, Mrs. C. F., Church Hill, Finchingfield, Braintree.

20 May MAY, Miss ELIZABETH, 80 Roman Road, Colchester.
TRYDELL, Capt. J. A. S., 8 East Hill, Colchester.

22 June CHISWELL, Mrs. CONSTANCE V., The Folly, Great Easton.
DANSEY, Mrs. M., Magnolia, Beatrice Road, Walton-on-Naze.
HEYWORTH, Miss P. H., Hawkwood Manor, Sible Hedingham.
HILKIN, Mrs. E. BARKLEY, Red House, Clare, Suffolk.
LEIGH, Miss C. R., Hawkwood Manor, Sible Hedingham.
MACKINTOSH, Mrs. JAMES A., Scrares, Broomfield, Chelmsford.
SNOW, Mrs. R. S., High Pale, Bures, Suffolk.
WIDDICOMBE, Mrs. B., Bradfield Place Hotel, Manningtree.

20 July FITZGIBBON, Mrs. F., 104 Lexden Road, Colchester.
FOSTER, Mrs. G. E., Paul's Farm, Little Bardfield, Braintree.
GANTZ, Mrs. N. M., Nether Houses, Fobmarch, Halstead.
LAZELL, Miss ALICE M., 6 Fitzwalter Road, Colchester.
NETTLETON, EDWIN L., 32 Balgores Lane, Gidea Park, Romford.
27 Sept.

ALLEN, Miss EVA E., Little Orchard, White Colne.
BLUNT, Mrs. B. G., Ulting Wick, near Maldon.
BRIDGE, F. A., 12 St. John's Street, Colchester.
    The Old Manse, Stansted Mountfitchet.
FETCH, D. C., Heather Cottage, Alresford, Colchester.
FURBER, Mrs. E. C., B.A., Ph.D., c/o History Dept., University of
    Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A.
GRAHAM, FREDERICK, Providence Cottage, Gainsford End, Top-
    pnessfield.
HUNT, Miss DOROTHY H., Tanners, Kelvedon.
    Vicarage, South Weald.
LAURIE, Mrs. V. S., The Old Vicarage, South Weald.
MACDONALD, Mrs. STUART, The Hall, Little Baddow.
MOODY, AUBREY R., Thatched Cottage, Little Braxton, Witham.
SYMNS, Miss D., High Stile, Dunmow.
WOOLSEY, Mrs. CATHERINE A., 5 Piercing Hill, Theydon Bois.

1951.

11 Jan.

ALPORT, C. J. McC., T.D., M.P., The Cross House, Layer-de-
    la-Haye.
BARKER, Mrs. Barbara, The Hall, Abberton, Colchester.
BOOTH, E., The Vicarage, Ears Colne.
CAWSTICK, Mrs. W., North House, Dunmow.
CATTLEY, Mrs. J. M., Twins, Pehmarsh, Halstead.
FARRANDS, Lieut.-Commander. R. H., R.N.R., 26 Main Road,
    Harwich.
HUGHES, Col. A. M., O.B.E., M.C., T.D., Riversdale, North
    Flembridge.
JOHN, Mrs. MARY L., Brook End, Little Dunmow.
PILMER, Miss JEAN G., St. Osyth's Training College, Clacton-
    on-Sea.

8 Mar.

JONES, Mrs. MARGARET, Greys Cottage, Kelvedon
MAGIC, Mrs. RICHARD, Springfield Lyons, Chelmsford.
MUD, Miss PAULINE, Pantiles, Southminster.
TINS, Mrs. M. R. H., 8 Ireton Road, Colchester.

7 Apr.

BLACK, Miss HELEN, High Bushes, Little Baddow, Chelmsford.
COTTINGHAM, Mrs. M. B. C., Graemere House, Layer-de-la-
    Haye.
CROSSMAN, Mrs. J. M. A., Glebe House, 31 Queen's Road, Col-
    chester.
GREGORY, Mrs. C., Cow Cottage, Woodham Walter, Maldon.
OWALD, ARTHUR, Rosslyn House, Dornmansland, Lingfield,
    Surrey.

26 Apr.

BROWN, A. F. J., B.A., 146 Lexden Road, Colchester.
GREEN, Mrs. F. G., Easterling, Ardleigh, Colchester.
HINSTONE, Miss E. A., The Limes, Great Cornard, Sudbury,
    Suffolk.
JOHNSON, C. R., 51 Hall Lane, Walton-on-the-Naze.
NASH, Miss C. K., Abbots, Alphanstone, Bures.
SAWARD, A. C., 10 Colne Road, Brightlingsea.
WHITE, Mrs. M. A., The Limes, Great Cornard, Sudbury,
    Suffolk.
CHELMSFORD, The Rt. Rev. SHERARD FALKNER ALLISON, D.D.,
    Lord Bishop of, Bishopscourt, Chelmsford (Hon. Member).
NEW MEMBERS.

28 June  
CLARK-KENNEDY, Mrs. P. G., The Lodge, Great Abington, Cambs.
CLAY, Mrs. JANET, Penny Pot, Alton Road, Clacton-on-Sea.
GORDON, Mrs. STRATHEARN, Quilter’s Farm, East Hanningfield.
ROGERS, R. H., 10 Sandle Road, Bishop’s Stortford, Herts.

18 July  
CUNNINGTON, Mrs. P. E., The Nothe, West Mersea.
HOOD, Mrs. WALTER R., Hill Cottage, Little Baddow.
MAHER, Mrs. H. E., The Dale, Hadham Road, Bishop’s Stortford Herts.

16 Aug.  
MOREING, Mrs. A. H., Fyshe House, Bures, Suffolk.
ROBINSON, Lady M. Z., Blackbrook, Dedham.
SKETCH, F. G., Burnt House, Alphamstone, Bures.
SKETCH, Mrs., Burnt House, Alphamstone, Bures.
VICKERS, JAMES, Paycock’s House, Cogshall.

26 Sept.  
FULLER, E. W. J., Breeze, Stradbroke Grove, Buckhurst Hill.
GOODWIN, Mrs. J. B., Hopwell’s Farm, Great Maplestead.
GOSNELL, Mrs. IDA, 43 Cowdray Avenue, Colchester.
MATHER, Mrs. LUCY I., The Mount, Stansted Mountfitchet.
TRENDELL, Mrs. E., Manor House, Pembridge, Halstead.
VERN, Miss ROSE, Little Garlands, Layer-de-la-Haye.

28 Dec.  
BOVILL, EDWARD W., Little Laver Hall, Harlow.
BOVILL, Mrs. SYLVIA MARY, Little Laver Hall, Harlow.
CLARKE, H. FRANCIS, Sunny Holme, Great Bentley.
ROBERTS, Mrs. LLEWELLYN, Pembridge, Halstead.

1952.

19 Feb.  
FARRELL, SYDNEY B., Healey, Chelmsford Road, Brentwood.
GIBBS, L. G., 21 Kavanaghs Road, Brentwood.
SHEED, ALICK H., Town Farm House, Hatfield Broad Oak.

27 Mar.  
BURDON, ERIC R., M.B.E., c/o Bury Free Press, Bury St. Edmunds.
COWAN, ARTHUR, Boughton, Wakes Colne, Colchester.
HOMES, J. H., B.A., Braeside, Well Lane, Stock. Ingatestone.
WRIGHT, DR. JAMES, Brothock House, Great Bentley, Colchester.

10 May  
JENNINGS, Mrs. F. E., Ivy Cottage, Pembridge, Halstead.
LAURENCE, Mrs. N. W., Crownden, Kelvedon Hatch, Nr. Brentwood.
RUSSELL-SMITH, Mrs. FAITH, Pinfarthings, West Mersea, Colchester.

29 May  
JENNINGS, Mrs. G. WELLS, The Old Rectory, Wickham Bishops, Witham.
RANDALL, Miss B., Northrepps, Park Way, Shenfield.

5 June  
BROOKS, Lt.-COL. C. ATTFIELD, The Lecture House, Dedham.
BYFORD, Miss G. E., 8 Honeywood Road, Colchester.
BURT, Mrs. JAMES, Staneway, Rayne, Braintree.
GARDNER, JOHN S., Monkwell, Cogshale.
LUBBOCK, Mrs. MARK, The Old Forge, Althorne, Nr. Chelmsford.
PAWSLEY, Mrs. E., 14 Courtauld Road, Braintree.
SEELEY, G. S., 39 Thames Avenue, Chelmsford.
SEELEY, Mrs. F. M. K., 39 Thames Avenue, Chelmsford.
NEW MEMBERS.

5 June
WARRELL, JOHN, 33 Rosebery Avenue, Colchester.
WILSON, Dr. WILLIAM, Hillside, Burnham-on-Crouch.

28 June
BROTHERS, Miss LOUISE G., Gowan Brae, Broad Road, Bocking,
BRAINTREE.
GUTHRIE, Miss CHARLOTTE A. I., Gowan Brae, Broad Road,
Bocking, Braintree.
HERBERT, Miss DIANA, Greenwood School, Halstead.
LUPTON, H. R., Parsonage Downs, Dunmow.
LUPTON, Mrs. JOYCE, Parsonage Downs, Dunmow.
PEMBERTON-BILLING, Mrs. VERONICA, T.S.M.Y., Commodore,
Burnham-on-Crouch.
RANSON, Dr. J. S., Shardhighs, Gosfield, Halstead.
RUGGLES-BRISE, Sir JOHN, O.B.E., Spains Hall, Finchingfield.
WALLIS, Professor J., Finchingfield.
Rivers, Nr. Ongar.
WATLEY, G. STUART, Gatwoods, Finchingfield.

22 July
HEARSEY, J. E. N., Tronoh House, Peldon, Colchester.
HEATH, Mrs. J., 3 Windhill, Bishop's Stortford.
LAMB, Mrs. V. M., The Cottage, Foxearth, Sudbury.
WARD, Mrs. DAVID, The Cottage, Foxearth, Sudbury.
WICKES, Dr. IAN, Ballards Croft, Stock, Essex.

26 Sept.
ARCHER, Miss LUCY M., L.R.A.M., 24 St. Edmunds Road,
Ipswich.
CARROLL, E. W., Hanford House, Thorpe-le-Soken.
ELLINGER, Mrs. N. G., Brooke House, Newton Green, Sudbury.
GLASGOW UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
GREEN, Mrs. JOHN, J.P., Hedingham Castle, Essex.
MCMASTER, DAVID, The Hall, Mount Bures, Colchester.
PUGH, Miss E., Macmurdo's, Wickham Bishops, Witham.
WILCOX, Miss G. MAY, 58 Fourth Avenue, Chelmsford.

27 Nov.
DRINKELL, LEONARD, Ernest Road, Wivenhoe.
EMERY, W. H., F.C.I.S., Balgownie, Waverley Lane, Farnham,
Surrey.
JONES, Miss MARY E., R.R.C., 10 Vint Crescent, London Road,
Colchester.
LEICESTER, University College Library.
MANSFIELD, Captain A. D., R.A., F.R.G.S., Redlow, Kingsland
Road, West Mersea.
REANEY, P. H., Litt.D., Ph.D., 35 Leigh Road, Hildenborough,
Tonbridge, Kent.
UPJOHN, Lady, The Old Rectory, Little Tey, Colchester.
DONATIONS TO THE SOCIETY
1 January, 1950 to 31 December, 1952.

Mr. R. W. WALLACE, Tunbridge Wells—

Mrs. E. CLARK, Sandgate, Kent—
‘The Memoirs of Thomas Brand-Hollis’.

Mr. C. A. NEWNUM—
‘Essex County Hospital: Colchester and District Workers’ Committee. Annual Reports, 1911-1948’. (Bound volume.)

The late Rev. F. L. BRIDGES, M.A.—
Transcripts of the Court Rolls of the Manors of Old Hall, New Hall, and Dickley, in Mistley; Court Rolls of the Manor and Rental (1529) of the Manor of Dale Hall, in Lawford; Lands and tenements belonging to the Manor of Little Bromley, 1592.

Mr. DOUGLAS SCOTT HEWETT—

The HEADMASTER, Brentwood School—

Mr. W. A. FOYLE—

The Rev. J. D. ALLEN, B.A.—

WOODFORD HISTORICAL SOCIETY—

Mr. G. ELAND, F.S.A.—
‘The Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Great Canfield, Essex’, by the donor, 1951.

Miss A. D. HARRISON—
‘Copford in History’, by the donor, 1951.
Mr. G. F. Straker—

'The House of Straker, 1800-1950.'

This business was founded by William Buck, a native of Coggeshall, in 1800. He started work as a printer at Romford, at the age of 22, following in the footsteps of his forbears, one of whom was Thomas Buck, Printer to the University of Cambridge, 1622-1639. In 1803 he married Jemima Moss, member of a well-known Coggeshall family, and in the same year returned to his native town. He did not remain there, but returned again in 1812, when he added a book shop to his printing interests, and opened a branch at Halstead. The business was finally removed to London in 1825.

Mrs. Gladys A. Ward, Ph.D.—


Mr. E. Auston—

'The Colne Valley', by the donor, 1950.

The Records Committee of the E.C.C.—

'Ornament and Decoration in Essex Records', by Hilda Grieve and Frederick Roberts, 1950.

'Essex in Pictures', 1952.

Council for British Archaeology—

'Archaeological Bulletin for Great Britain & Ireland, 1948-1949.'

Mr. Cyril Hart, M.B.—

'John Clarke, M.D., c.1583-1653'. [Son of Clement Clarke, gent., of Brooke Hall, in Wethersfield; President of the College of Physicians, 1645-1650], by the donor, 1951. Reprint.

Mr. F. W. Steer, F.S.A.—

'Thaxted in Essex', by the donor, 1951.

The Rev. G. Montagu Benton, F.S.A.—

'The Coming of the Friars', by Augustus Jessopp, 1908.

'The Calendar of the Prayer-Book illustrated', Parker, 1872.

'The Memoirs of Ann Lady Fanshawe, 1600-1672.' Ed. by Evelyn John Fanshawe of Parshoes, 1907.

'An Essex Pie', by T. M. Hope, 1951.

'Worthy Dr. Fuller', by William Addison, 1951.


Mr. A. F. J. Brown, B.A.—

'Smuggling and Wivenhoe', by the donor, 1951.

Mr. F. H. Laws—

'Maldon a Thousand Years Ago', by the donor, 1952.

Mr. W. A. Voss—

'Rayleigh Mount, Essex', by the donor. (National Trust.)
DONATIONS TO THE SOCIETY.

Mrs. B. M. Rose—
‘Coggeshall Abbey’, by the donor. Typescript.

Purchased,
‘Saffron Walden then and now’, by C. Brightwen Rowntree, 1951.

The publications of the Societies in union with the E.A.S. have also been received. They comprise nearly all the British and several Foreign Archaeological Societies.
Head of statue of Claudius as Jupiter: Vatican Museum. Pl. III

Head of bronze Mercury from Gosbeck's Farm: Colchester and Essex Museum. Detail of Flavian relief found near the Cancelleria, Rome: Museo Capitolino Nuovo. Pl. IV (1) (2)


Funerary head: Château de Servan. Funerary head: Vienne. Pl. VI (1) (2)

Funerary head from Towcester: British Museum. Ivory Gladiator from Colchester: British Museum, Pl. VII (1) (2, 3)

En harbotine cups from Colchester: Colchester and Essex Museum, Pl. VIII (1) (2) (3)

Lost terra-cotta plaque from Colchester. Fig. I

Glass phalerae with portraits: British Museum, etc. Pl. IX

Temple and 'Forum' at Colchester: General plan. Fig. 1

Forum: A. Pier 3 and walls, looking east; B. Pier 3 and wall 4, looking west. Pl. I

— Detailed plan of the Kent, Blaxill site. Fig. 2

— South face of platform, with pier 2 and the plaster moulding of wall 3 (left). Pl. II

— Sections A to F, Kent, Blaxill site. Fig. 3

— A. South face of platform; B. The smaller drain. Pl. III

— Fragments of coloured marbles. Pl. IV

— A. Stone with incised carving; B. Stone bearing part of a carved wreath (?). Pl. V

— A. Cornice-moulding with dowel-holes; B. Spring-moulding with dowel-holes. Pl. VI

— A. Dressed stone with hollow-moulding; B. White plaster moulding. Pl. VII

— A. Drain found in 1932; B. (1) Pottery Ball, (2) Lug-handle of a vessel with green glaze. 16th century. Pl. VIII

— Roman Pottery from the Kent, Blaxill site. Figs. 4 and 5

Glass Vessels of the Saxons found in England. Pl. I

Gerpins Farm, Rainham: Coin pendant, Mauritius Tiberius, A.D. 582-602; Saxo Brooches, Pl. II

— Saxon bronze Girdle-hanger, Rings, etc., and glass Beads. Pl. III

— Saxon glass Drinking-horn, Pl. IV

The Bourchier Shield in Halstead Church. Pl. I

Back of Shield. Fig. 1

Sketches of Monuments in Halstead Church. Pl. II

Effigy with Shield (before restoration) attached. Fig. 2

Effigies of Robert, First Lord Bourchier, and Margaret (Prayers). Pl. III

The Bourchier Shield; Drawing by the Rev. D. T. Powell, 1804. Pl. IV

Effigies in Westminster Abbey: (1) Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke; (2) Edmund Crouchback, Earl of Lancaster. Pl. V

Englefield, Berks.: Effigy of (? Sir Roger) de Englefield; St. Stephen's Chapel, Bures: Effigy of Robert de Vere, 5th Earl of Oxford (?). Pl. VI

Shield at Bakewell, Derbyshire: (1) Front, with Royal Arms; (2) Back, showing iron strap for suspension. Pl. VII

Sketch of Monument in Halstead Church to John, Second Lord Bourchier, K.G., and Elizabeth (Coggeshall). Pl. VIII

Marks scratched on Shield. Fig. 3

Lambourne Church: Wall-painting of St. Christopher.

In Memoriam: Henry William Lever, F.S.A.
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