

OPENING ADDRESS TO THE SECTION OF ARCHITECTURE
AT THE LEAMINGTON MEETING.¹

By R. S. FERGUSON, F.S.A.
(Chancellor of the Diocese of Carlisle).

There is, I am informed, an unwritten law among the traditions of the Archæological Institute that the President of the Architectural Section must not be an architect. Of this I was not aware, until I was both surprised and alarmed by being asked to fill the chair of this section at Leamington. In a moment of weakness I consented. I next endeavoured to find out what was expected from me, and I ascertained that my predecessor of last year, Precentor Venables, had laid down my duties for me with terrible distinctness. He says :

The President of the Architectural Section will fulfil his task most adequately if he offers a rapid survey of the architecture of the district—ecclesiastical, domestic and military—and also makes mention of the chief architectural events of the past year bearing on this science in its archæological aspect.²

These duties I utterly refuse to discharge. I decline to follow the lead given me by the learned Precentor. I am a stranger here. I know nothing about the “one hundred and fifty eight parishe churches,” which Speed mentions as “dispersedly situated in the five hundreds of this shire’s diuision”: and I know less of the “many foundations of religious monasteries therein laid.” I fail to make out the eight strong castles that he speaks of, though in early youth I have seen two at least of them, Warwick and Kenilworth. To a borderer like myself, eight seems but a poor allowance of castles for a large county. Mr. Geo. T. Clark, F.S.A., reduces it to but six, while he allows little Westmorland 13, Durham the like

¹ Delivered at Leamington August 9th, 1888.

Architecture at the Salisbury meeting, by the Rev. Precentor Venables. *Archæological Journal*, vol. 44, pp. 244, 245.

² Opening address to the Section of

number, Cumberland 22, and Northumberland 51,¹ a number he afterwards makes up to 60.² To the Warwickshire castles must be added the moated manor houses of which the shire has its share; but, if to the castles of the northern counties you add the barmkin, bastel-houses, and peel towers, with which they are studded, you will get overwhelming evidence of the normal peacefulness of a midland county as compared with the perpetual turbulence of the eastern, middle, and western marches towards Scotland.

Two only of the Warwickshire castles are on the programme of our visit, but those two are Warwick and Kenilworth, the two greatest and most famous of the fortresses of the Midlands, both famous not merely for ancient strength and later magnificence, but for their association with events and personages of great note in English history. But over Warwick and Kenilworth it is unnecessary to linger. I understand that Mr. Hartshorne will be our guide over these places, and it is not for me to anticipate what he will tell: I certainly need not vouch for his capabilities. At Warwick and at Kenilworth we have an hereditary claim upon the services of Mr. Hartshorne, for when we last met in Warwickshire his father conducted the Institute over Warwick and Kenilworth Castles.³ I may, however, point out that Warwick was fortified as a "burh" by the Lady of the Mercians to block the great Fosse Way between Lincoln and Bath along the face of the oolitic range which stretches from the estuary of the Severn to the estuary of the Humber.⁴ For this purpose she selected the settlement of the Wærings on a little rise near the sluggish waters of the Avon, and here she fortified the "burh," which has grown into our Waeringauric or Warwick. For the defence of this settlement she reared between town and river one of those mounds which marked the defensive warfare of the time, and which, stripped as it is of every trace of the fortress with which she crowned it,

¹ Military Architecture, by Geo. T. Clark, F.S.A. *Archæological Journal*, vol. I, pp. 98, 107.

² Mediæval Military Architecture, by Geo. T. Clark, F.S.A., vol. I, p. 94.

³ *Archæological Journal*, 21 pp. 377, 379.

⁴ The Conquest of England, by John Richard Green, p. 202.

and covered with works of far later date, still remains to witness to the energy of the lady of Mercia.

Tamworth Castle, another Warwickshire, or, rather, Warwickshire and Staffordshire Castle (for it stands half in either county), was also erected by the lady of Mercia to block the older line of Watling Street on the upper Severn.

Of Kenilworth Mr. Geo. T. Clark writes :

Its site possesses much of quiet sylvan beauty, but nothing of obtrusive military strength ; and yet, in the hands of skilful engineers, it became in point of size, strength, and accommodation, one of the most important military posts in England. It had walls capable of great passive resistance, a capacity for containing a numerous garrison and immense stores of provision, and a front protected by a large sheet of water, which again was protected by a formidable outwork. Moreover, the Midland districts were, from an early period, traversed by main and cross roads, favourable to the concentration of troops and the transfer of stores, seldom sought in vain in so fertile a country. For all these qualities, strength, capacity, a central position, and facilities for collecting and feeding a garrison, there was, in the days of its pride, no fortress in England superior, probably none equal to Kenilworth.¹

In connection with the chief architectural events of the past year, it may not be out of place to notice briefly a controversy which has raged, more or less intermittently, from a period a little anterior to the visit of the Institute to Chester in 1886, and on which the last word is, as yet, far from being said. Great confusion has been occasioned in this controversy by a want of precision in defining the issue ; in clearly stating what the dispute is about. The battle has raged over the very broad question, "Are the walls of Chester Roman or not"—a puzzlingly vague subject for discussion, inducing on the one hand the too ardent partisan to maintain, and the too unwary hearer or reader to believe that the existing walls of Chester are for long stretches mainly of Roman construction ; on the other hand that there is nothing in them older than the Lady of the Mercians and much that dates from the times of the "Troubles" of the seventeenth century, or even later.

All this tends much to confusion, but narrow the issue, as it is gradually narrowing in the course of the controversy, and it will be found that the truth lies "betwixt

¹ *Medieval Military Architecture*, by Geo. T. Clark, F.S.A., vol. II, p. 180.

and between," and that the disputants are not so far apart as they themselves believe.

Be this as it may: when in 1886 Mr. Gosselin, Mr. Pullan, and myself visited Chester to make the arrangements for the meeting of the Institute, we found the local archæological atmosphere somewhat charged with electricity; the local antiquaries and the citizens who took interest in the matter were divided into opposite camps; the one party swore by Roach-Smith and by Hughes; the other by Thompson Watkin and by Shrubsole: these gentlemen were cited as authorities for this, that, and the other. But, with your permission, I propose to ascertain what one or two of these great authorities actually say, for Mr. Roach-Smith was either ignored or misunderstood in various articles in the local press. I propose also to clear up certain misapprehensions as to what was said on the matter in issue by some of the members of the Institute at the meeting in 1886; and, further, to go into the facts so far as I have been able to get at them.

The British Archæological Association held their sixth Congress at Chester in 1849. Mr. Roach-Smith was present, and the result of his investigation of the walls of Chester appeared in the fifth volume of the *Journal of the Association* in a paper called "Notes on Roman Remains at Chester," and he further dealt with the subject under the title of "Chester: its Roman Remains" in the sixth volume of the *Collectanea Antiqua*. I am particular in citing these titles; they commend themselves to me as models for imitation. Mr. Roach-Smith is, and was always, too accurate an archæologist to commit himself to any such vague title as "Are the walls of Chester Roman?"

Let us see what he says: in the fifth volume of the *British Archæological Journal* he writes thus of the walls of Chester:

The usual alternate courses of stones and tiles which characterize the walls of London, Colchester, Verulam, York, Lincoln, Caerleon, and other towns, are nowhere to be discerned at Chester; and a superficial observer would be tempted to decide, that in the reparations of subsequent times, the remains of the original work had been totally encased or destroyed. Such however, is not the fact; and we are indebted to the Rev. W. H. Massie, for laying before us at the late Congress, the

results of a close and patient examination of the walls, and for directing our attention to particular parts which, he had noticed, varied so remarkably from the general construction, and at the same time harmonized so strikingly with each other, as to incline him to believe he had detected the original Roman work among the anomalous and perplexing styles of different periods, by which it was surrounded and imbedded.¹

Mr.[†] Roach-Smith then proceeds to name three places in the walls of Chester, as those where Roman work *in situ* may be seen: viz, the Kaleyards, a place near the North Gate, kenspeckled by a famous cornice, and some stones on the Roodee; these places were pointed out in 1886 to those members of the Institute, who went round the walls of Chester. Mr. Roach-Smith continues:—

The silence of topographical writers shews, that if Roman work had been suspected to exist in the Chester city walls, it had never before (*i.e.* prior to 1849) been verified.¹

In the sixth volume of the *Collectanea Antiqua*, printed, but not published, in 1868 Mr. Roach-Smith dealt with “Chester; its Roman Remains.” He wrote:—

The remains of the walls of Deva are worthy of much more consideration than has been generally given to them. It is probable that the very peculiarities which make them remarkable have tended frequently to confound them with the less ancient additions with which they are encumbered; for the reparations being somewhat similar to the original portions, it is rather difficult to detect at once the latter, and to distinguish between the two. The work is, moreover, of a character so very different from what is generally met with in the walls of Roman towns in this country, and even in those of continental towns of Roman origin, that it can be well understood why it has so often been questioned whether any portions of the Roman walls are yet extant.²

In this article Mr. Roach-Smith has added to the three places in the walls of Chester, which he named in his earlier article as places where Roman work *in situ* was to be found, a fourth:—in the North wall near the Phoenix Towers. As this piece is near the portion where is the cornice, Mr. Roach-Smith in his earlier article probably reckoned the two as one. Mr. Roach-Smith’s opinion was adopted by the Chester antiquaries generally, and in course of time the portions of the walls considered Roman got gradually exaggerated, until it became to be a local article of faith that the walls of Chester were Roman, a

¹ *Journal British Archaeological Association*, Vol. v, pp. 211 and 212.

² *Ibid* pp. 213, 214.

³ *Collectanea Antiqua*, Vol. vi, p. 42.

somewhat too broad way of putting the proposition, and one which I do not find Mr. Roach-Smith laying down.

So the matter remained until about 1883, when Mr. G. W. Shrubsole advanced the view that the three places in the walls of Chester, named by Mr. Roach-Smith as Roman, were not so. Much discussion ensued locally : and Mr. Thompson-Watkin in his long delayed, but valuable "Roman Cheshire" supported with great ability Mr. Shrubsole's views. This book was published in 1886, a very few days before the visit of the Institute to Chester, and an impression got abroad that an authoritative deliverance on the matter would be made by that body. But no opportunity for a proper investigation presented itself. I wish to be particular in stating what was done and said then, because the erroneous idea has been promulgated that the Archæological Institute "*saw nothing Roman in the walls of Chester*,"¹ a most extraordinary misrepresentation due probably to some careless reporter.

On the first day of the meeting the members of the institute made a peregrination of the walls in two parties, one of which was under the guidance of Mr. Thompson-Watkin and Mr. G. W. Shrubsole; the other of His Honour Judge Brown, Mr. C. Brown, and Mr. T. C. Hughes; such a peregrination does not afford much opportunity for forming any very critical opinion, but it was summed up by our editor, Mr. Hartshorne, thus:—

It would be as difficult to explain, off the spot, the various points for and against the vexed question of the walls of Chester being Roman, as to alter the conviction of an inhabitant of the city who had already made up his mind upon the matter. But it certainly appeared to antiquaries, well able to judge, that the walls as we now see them were decidedly not Roman. On the other hand, there can be little doubt that they follow, to a great extent, the Roman lines, and there seems to be sufficient evidence to show that old materials have been worked up, not *more Romano*. Indeed, it is the opinion of a high authority that stones may be seen in the walls which would certainly be called Roman at Perigueux or Le Puy.²

¹ See the preface to advance copies of a paper by Mr. Roach-Smith on "The Walls of Chester," published in the *British Archæological Journal*, Vol. 44, p. 129, where the preface is not reproduced. The paragraph is "It has repeatedly been asserted for the Archæological Institute, which held its Congress in Chester in 1886, that it saw nothing

Roman in the walls; but I cannot find upon what authority that Society is to be blinded contrary to the usual convictions of the Association; and of some, if not all, of its most eminent members. C. R. S." Mr. Roach-Smith has been misled as to the views of the Institute.

² *Archæological Journal*, vol. 43, p. 432.

The high authority is Mr. Freeman, who in a note to his address on "The Early History of Chester," writes thus:

May I say this still? A great deal of discussion about the walls of Chester went on later in the meeting, which I had not the advantage of hearing. From such light as I can pretend to I will venture two remarks. First, if anybody thought that the walls, as they stand, were Roman walls, or that there was any Roman work in them besides pieces of foundation here and there, his error was so plain as hardly to be worth arguing against. But, secondly, in more parts than one I saw stones which, if I had seen them at Rome, or Arles, or Sens, or Perigueux, I should certainly have set down as remnants of the Roman defences.¹

A small self-constituted committee of a few members of the Institute present at Chester, viz., the veteran Dr. Bruce, Professor Clark, F.S.A., and Mr. C. J. Ferguson, F.S.A., all well acquainted with the methods used by the Romans in building, both in England and at Rome, Mr. Baylis, Q.C., and myself² examined on the 11th of August a long stretch of the walls of Chester, including the places named by Mr. Roach-Smith. We were accompanied by Mr. Shrubsole, who, on the 13th August, read a paper before the Institute on "The Age of the City Walls of Chester," in which he said;—

I arrive at the same conclusion as Pennant that no part of the Roman wall is now visible above ground.³

Dr. Bruce on being called upon by the chairman at the conclusion of Mr. Shrubsole's paper, delivered the verdict of the committee:—

That he could not say that anything he had seen was Roman work *in situ*.⁴

I have been particular in leading you to this, because it has been erroneously stated, as I have already said, that the verdict of the Institute on the walls of Chester was *that there was nothing Roman in them*. We of course had no opportunity of seeing what was below ground.

Since the visit of the Institute to Chester, in 1886, much has been done, said, and written about the walls of Chester. In the following year the British Archæological Association held their Annual Congress at Liverpool, and

¹ *Ibid.* p. 265 n.

² Sir Charles Newton and Prebendary Searsh were asked to join, but they were otherwise engaged, as was also

Precentor Venables.

³ *Archæological Journal*, vol. 44, pp. 15, 24.

⁴ *Ibid.* vol. 43, p. 457.

the programme included a visit to Chester. In anticipation of this, excavations were made, and trenches carried down to the foundations at various points in the circuit of the walls of Chester, and a large find of inscribed and sculptured stones of Roman date occurred.¹ An extensive newspaper correspondence ensued; a set debate was held at the Grosvenor Museum in January last, to which I had the honour of being invited, but which I was unable to attend; each side was ably represented:—the Romanists by Sir James Picton, F.S.A., Mr. W. de Grey Birch, F.S.A., and Mr. E. P. Loftus Brock, F.S.A. The *non*-Romanists by Mr. Thompson-Watkin and Mr. Shrubsole: “the conclusions arrived at were not identical,” as Sir James Picton puts it, or in other words each party convinced only itself. With the exception of Mr. Thompson-Watkin, to whose death I have already alluded, all the gentlemen here named have put their views on permanent record, and Sir James Picton’s paper is accompanied by most valuable plans and sections.² The conclusion at which he arrives is that—

There are considerable remains of Roman work in the walls *below the surface* on three sides of the city (the north, east, and south). Above ground the ascertained Roman portion is limited to the wall near the Northgate, to a small part in the south wall east of the Bridgegate, and to the masses of masonry outside of the walls in the Kale Yards and the Roodeye.

Sir James thinks the place near the Phoenix Tower, where the Roman stones were found, to be the renovations of Ethelred and Ethelfleda.³ He thus makes rather more of the walls of Chester to be Roman than Mr. Roach-Smith did, but he includes as Roman all the places named as such by Mr. Roach-Smith.

¹ The suggestion was made, as to one of these stones having on it two figures, that it was mediæval and ecclesiastical; but this cannot be maintained after its exhibition before the Society of Antiquaries, and the remarks then made by Mr. W. de Grey Birch, F.S.A., and others. *Proc. Soc. Ant.*, 2nd series, vol. xii, p. 44, *et seq.*

² See Considerations relating to the ground plan and walls of Chester, by E. P. Loftus Brock, F.S.A. *Journal British Archaeological Association*, vol. 44, p. 39. Notes on the City Walls of Chester, by Sir James Picton, F.S.A. *ibid.*, p. 135. See also, The Walls of Chester, by C. Roach

Smith, F.S.A., *ibid.*, p. 129. The Age of The City Walls of Chester, by G. W. Shrubsole, *Archæological Journal*, vol. 44, p. 15. For W. de Grey Birch’s remarks, see *Proc. Soc. Antiq.*, 2nd series, vol. xii, p. 41.

³ *Journal British Archaeological Association*, vol. 44, pp. 156, 157, 158. I understand from Sir James’ account that at this point the lower courses below ground were solid ashlar, above the wall had an ashlar facing, and the Roman fragments had been thrown promiscuously into the core: Saxon work above the Roman.

I think Sir James has made out his case, saving always that I reserve my opinion about the piece of wall, where is the cornice, until I have revisited Chester.

It is very difficult to form any sound opinion without seeing for oneself. This is well illustrated by placing side by side Sir James Picton's and Mr. Shrubsole's accounts of what they saw.

THE ROODEYE.

MR. SHRUBSOLE.

Here we find a group of massive stones at the base of a sloping bank of clay, some forty feet in height. Recent excavations long-side have shewn that they form no part of a wall so called. They are certainly not Roman, since they exist only as a single row of stones, evidently placed there to assist in holding up the clay bank, on the top of which is the modern wall. Railway embankments are secured in like manner. The base of the stones rests upon a quicksand, which is the bed of the old river. To have neglected the solid ground above, and to have built the wall of the castrum on quicksands, in a hole fifty feet below the level, is a mode of proceeding I cannot imagine any military engineer capable of, least of all a Roman engineer. The purpose of the stones being placed there is clear enough. They are the "footings" of a wall and nothing more.¹

SIR JAMES PICTON.

Here there has existed from time immemorial a layer of large stones, on a cursory glance seeming to have been simply deposited on the surface. The general opinion, confirmed by the inspection of the Royal Archaeological Institute in 1886, has been that the stones were "placed here to prevent, by their weight, any landslip from the bank above, which here rises high and steep. To determine this, a trench was sunk, and it was found that the supposed loose stones were the upper courses of a massive wall. At the depth of about 10 feet below the outer surface of the land, the further progress of excavating was stopped by the influx of water. The back of this wall could not be reached without a very extensive excavation; but its massiveness will be evident from the following particulars:—A little below the water line, occurs a set back of 4 inches. Above this rises a wall of squared stones 7 feet 9 inches high in seven courses. These stones are set without mortar, but in a few of the vertical joints a pointing was found of a cement in which traces of pounded tile were discovered. Then occurs another set back of 2 feet 5 inches, and a wall 1 foot 10 inches high in two courses; then a further set back of 1 foot, and an ashlar wall 6 feet 6 inches high in five courses. This is the summit, and from the outer

¹ *Archæological Journal*, vol. 44, p. 17.

face of the masonry the actual city wall sets back 17 feet. This projecting masonry extends from north to south 134 feet, but is partially covered by an earthen bank. . . . Has this mass of masonry any connection with the city walls? and to what period may its erection be attributed? There is no connection between this masonry and the upper wall which stands on the edge of the cliff above. This wall scarcely goes below the surface, and stands on a bank of loose earth. There are a number of massive buttresses, a few of which are bonded into the wall but the majority are simply built up against it without any ties. The whole of this wall, in its original state, was very poor, both in material and workmanship.¹

Sir James Picton concludes that these stones on the Roodeye formed the Roman wharf before the Dee retired. Mr. Shrubsole has shown strong reason for believing that deep water once came up to them.² In this opinion I agree; these stones remind me much of the remains of the Roman wharf at Luxor on the Nile. That wharf, when I saw it in 1872, was deserted by the main channel of the Nile but stood at the edge of a backwater, which, though of considerable depth at high Nile, dried up at low Nile.

THE WALL NEAR THE KALEYARDS.

MR. SHRUBSOLE.

"We next examined the reputed Roman work at the Kaleyards. There we have a broken course of large stones, on the outside of the present wall. To ascertain the purpose of these stones, an excavation was carried down to the base of the principal group. It was then found to be a single course of stone, six or seven feet in depth, having an Edwardian plinth, and

SIR JAMES PICTON.

"The first trench examined was cut outside the wall at the Kaleyards, about fifty yards north of the east end of the Cathedral, near the Postern Gate. The wall above ground is a patch-work of various ages and styles. Starting from a buttress and going southwards, there is a length of 37 feet 9 inches of rubble work, when we arrive at a vertical joint. From thence there

¹ *Journal British Archaeological Association*, vol. 44, p. 150, with plans and sections.

² In a paper in the *Chester Courant*, March 28th, 1877, cited by Mr. Thompson-Watkin in his *Roman Cheshire*, p. 102.

strongly inclined outwards. It had evidently at one time been part of a wall, of which these stones formed the outer course. Its history would appear to be somewhat as follows:—Some few centuries ago, the city wall stood on the spot now occupied by these stones; the foundation of clay proved treacherous, aided by the loose ground of the fosse in front, and the outward thrust of the ground of the churchyard. Together these causes proved too much for the stability of the wall; it was pushed outwards to such an extent as to be useless—it was dismantled—but the base of it was wisely left in the place where it was found, and the new wall built inside of the old one, on its present site.”¹

is a length of coursed ashlar, much decayed, rising from a chamfered plinth at the ground level, which is here, on the summit of a sloping bank, about 6 feet in perpendicular height. At the end of this length we come to another vertical joint, beyond which the wall for some distance southwards is ashlar, in irregular courses. Here we find a mass of solid masonry outside of the line of the present wall. A trench was carried down about 12 feet below the bank surface. Commencing at the bottom, there are layers of boulders below the wall, then three courses of rubble, and one of solid masonry, measuring 3 feet 10 inches in height. The solid masonry mainly consists of large blocks well squared, and bedded without mortar. Then comes a set off, receding 8 inches. The solid wall again commences, carried up 9 feet 8 inches, in courses of the same character as those in the work below. One stone measured 5 feet in length, 1 foot in height, and 2 feet 4 inches bed.”²

These two accounts are very hard to reconcile, but Sir James gives sketches and sections which verify his account.

THE CORNICE.

MR. SHRUBSOLE.

Looking over the wall at this point, we see a bold precipitous front of sixty feet—twenty feet of wall, and forty feet of rock, cut to form the canal. Owing to the precipitous character of this scarped rock face, on which the wall rests, no examination of it has been possible, since the canal was made in 1778. Two years since, a scaffolding was reared in front of it, for necessary repairs. After some rubbish had been cleared away at the base, there was exposed

SIR JAMES PICTON.

Following the north wall westward, along the line of the canal, we find it based on the scarped perpendicular rock, and visible from top to bottom. This wall, for the most part, is built without mortar, . . . below the ground level. Along this line runs a moulded cornice or string course, was much frayed in the projecting part, but, it is stated, in some places still retaining a portion of its deep mouldings. The deep gully or ravine in which the canal runs was originally the

¹ *Archæological Journal*, vol. 44, p. 18.

² *Journal British Archæological Association*, vol. 44, p. 147.

the base of a plinth, which is Edwardian if it is anything. This opportunity was taken advantage of to thoroughly examine into the construction of the wall. Owing to certain clearances, we now see the wall under exceptionally favourable aspects. Some features are now exposed for the first time. We select that part of the wall adjoining the North gate for our examination, as being the more characteristic. Looked at as a whole from the base to the top, it must be confessed that, for genuine Roman work, it presents several anomalies, if not unique features. We are supposed to be looking at a wall which from its plinth to the cornice, is believed to have been part of the wall of the castrum which encircled Deva on this side. To begin, the base has a very English like look about it. Then the irregular size of the stones, large and small intermixed, has not the characteristic appearance of Roman work. The whole is crowned by a cornice, an unparalleled example, and more nearly allied to the debased classic cornices to be seen in the front of some of the gabled houses in Bridge Street, of Jacobean age, than in anything Roman. We miss here, too, from the wall the well known bonding tiles, and the characteristic mortar.¹

fosse of the city. The situation of the wall in this position—it being to a great extent a retaining wall—has prevented its being meddled with in mediæval times, since there could be no object to gain by disturbing it. It is therefore a fair inference that we have here the original construction. . . . This wall is built with well squared ashlar in courses 12 to 15 inches in depth without mortar, crowned with the cornice already mentioned. The natural conclusion from all the appearances is, that this is the original wall. Being only exposed on one side, there could be no object served by interfering with it, besides its being a task attended with difficulty and danger. The masonry corresponds very closely with the work below the surface in the excavations, as already referred to. The upper portion above the cornice is work of a later date. The inference is very strong that this portion of the wall is of Roman workmanship.²

As I have said before, I wish again to see this “cornice.” I cannot understand a military engineer putting a cornice in a wall intended for defence: it would be a protection for an enemy, if he succeeded in gaining a lodgment at the foot of the wall.

Another architectural event of importance in the past year has been the issuing by the Society of Antiquaries of London to the archbishops, bishops, and chancellors of dioceses, deans, archdeacons and rural deans of the Church of England, of a memorandum on church resto-

¹ *Archæological Journal*, vol. 44, pp. 18, 19.

² *Journal British Archæologica Association*, vol. 44, pp. 149, 158.

ration. From this memorandum I would quote two paragraphs, though the whole of it is well worth perusal.

It is constantly the case that on visiting a "restored" Church it is found that monuments and painted glass, of which the existence is recorded in County Histories, have not only been removed from their original positions, but are no longer forthcoming; that inscribed slabs from tombs have been used to bridge over gutters or to receive hot-air gratings, or have been covered with tiles; that the ancient fonts have been removed, the old Communion Tables destroyed, the Jacobean oak pulpits broken up or mounted on stone pedestals, and not unfrequently the old and curious Communion Plate sold. The architectural features and proportions of the Churches have in innumerable instances been modified, especially so far as regards the East windows, and the character of the Chancels generally. The Society is aware that in the majority of instances no Faculty is granted for the restoration of a Church, so that this legal check upon the destruction of ancient remains has been practically released. It is much to be regretted that this should have been the case, as the application for a Faculty would at all events give an opportunity for the authorities to insist upon no destruction of ancient work taking place without due enquiry, nor without the written consent of the Bishop. If it be urged that Faculties are too costly, some means may probably be devised for lessening their expense and at the same time increasing the observance of the law under which they are necessary.

The law as to faculties is clear enough. The chancellor of London in a recent case said :—

I take this opportunity of mentioning that any churchwarden or other person who makes alterations in a churchyard or church without a faculty is liable to be articted in the Ecclesiastical Courts and to be censured and condemned in costs.

My experience is that in cases of restorations or repairs to churches, where the fabric is to be interfered with, or where the outlay is considerable, running into three figures, a faculty is generally applied for, but in cases where a smaller sum is to be expended, the alterations are done, in violation of the law, without any faculty. It is in cases where small sums, say under £100, are to be expended, that the most mischief occurs. It is in this way that ancient fonts are removed, old communion tables destroyed, Jacobean oak pulpits broken up, monuments and painted glass shifted from place to place, or taken away *in toto*. All this and worse may be done under the very nose of the chancellor of the diocese, but he has no power, that I know of, to move his own court. He must wait for some person to set him in motion. I have had the *chagrin* to have to look on while parson and church-

wardens, with the assent (if silence gives consent) of the parishioners, calmly laid to the public road a large strip of the churchyard together with the corpses buried therein.

This, however, is an extreme case. Some method ought to be devised for making faculties compulsory in all cases. I cannot help suggesting that chancellors should be required to know something about the churches of the diocese over whose consistory court they preside. The memorandum to which I have drawn attention, took its rise from a report on church restoration in a diocese, which I will not name, made to the Society of Antiquaries by one of their local secretaries, Mr. J. W. Willis Bund, F.S.A. This report discloses a most deplorable state of things in that diocese. The chancellor is non-resident in the diocese, and holds four other chancellorships. Able and eminent lawyer that he is, he can know little about the churches whose destinies are in his power.